

<https://api.parliament.uk/historic-hansard/sittings/1901/feb/28>

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

Thursday, 28th February, 1901

One other Member took and subscribed the Oath.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILL PETITIONS [Lords] (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED WITH).

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

Chester Corporation Tramways.

South Lancashire Tramways.

Watford and District Tramways.

Wigan Corporation Tramways.

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

PRIVATE BILL PETITIONS (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED WITH).

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

London County Council (Tramways and Street Widenings).

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

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).

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

Thames and Severn Provisional Order Bill.

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

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (TRAMWAYS AND STREET WIDENINGS).

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

METROPOLITAN POLICE PROVISIONAL ORDER.

Bill to confirm a Provisional Order made by one of His Majesty's Principal
Secretaries of State under the Metropolitan Police Act, 1886, and the
Metropolitan Police Courts Act, 1897, relating to lands in the parishes of
Erith; Banstead; St. John, Horselydown; St. Leonard, Shoreditch; Clapham; and
Greenwich, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Jesse Collings and Mr. Secretary
Ritchie.

METROPOLITAN POLICE PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

"To confirm a Provisional Order made by one of His Majesty's Principal
Secretaries of State under the Metropolitan Police Act, 1886, and the

Metropolitan Police Courts Act, 1897, relating to lands in the parishes of Erith; Banstead; St. John, Horselydown; St. Leonard, Shoreditch; Clapham; and Greenwich," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 73.]

PETITIONS.

BEER BILL.

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

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (HIGHER GRADE AND EVENING CONTINUATION SCHOOLS).

Petitions for alteration of Law, from Cardiff; Colne; Queensbury; Birmingham; Widnes; Gateshead; and Drighlington; to lie upon the Table.

FRANCHISE AND REMOVAL OF WOMEN'S DISABILITIES BILL.

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

POOR LAW OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1896.

Petitions for alteration of Law, from Barnet; Wimborne and Cranborne; Aberavon; and Martley; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Partick; and Colchester; to lie upon the Table.

SUNDAY CLOSING (MONMOUTH SHIRE).

Petition from Colchester, for alteration of law; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

COUNTY COURTS, ENGLAND (FEES).

Copy presented, of Treasury Order, dated 22nd February, 1901, regulating Court Fees in County Courts [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

MILITARY WORKS ACTS, 1897 and 1899.

Account presented, for the period ended 31st March, 1900, together with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 66.]

BOARD OF TRADE (LABOUR DEPARTMENT).

Copy presented, of Seventh Annual Abstract of Labour Statistics of the United Kingdom, 1899–1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PIERS AND HARBOURS (PROVISIONAL ORDERS).

Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade of their Proceedings under the General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, and the General Pier and Harbour Act (1861) Amendment Act [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 67.]

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.

Copy presented, of Order in Council, dated 9th February, 1901, entitled the Persia (Regulations) Order in Council, 1901 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION ACT, 1889.

Copies presented, of Minutes sanctioning the subjects to be taught under Clause 8 of the Technical Instruction Act, 1889, for the following counties and boroughs;

County of the Isle of Wight (Fourth Minute), dated 7th December, 1900;

County of the Soke of Peterborough (Eighth Minute), dated 18th January, 1901;

County Borough of Oldham (Eighth Minute), dated 25th January, 1901

[by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

ARMY (ORDNANCE FACTORIES) SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1900–1901).

Copy presented, of Estimate of the Further Amount required during the year ending 31st March, 1901, to defray the expense of the Ordnance Factories [by Command]; referred to the Committee of Supply, and to be printed. [No. 65.]

ARMY (MEMORANDUM ON ESTIMATES).

Copy presented, of Memorandum of the Secretary of State relating to the Army Estimates of 1901–2[by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA (NORTH-WEST FRONTIER).

Copy presented, of Papers regarding British relations with the neighbouring Tribes on the North-West Frontier of India and Punjab Frontier Administration [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PRISONS (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Rule made by the Secretary for Scotland appointing the Police Cells at Haddington to be a legal Prison for the detention of untried prisoners for a period not exceeding fourteen days before or during trial, and of convicted prisoners for a period not exceeding seven days from the date of conviction [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

PRISONS (SCOTLAND) DIETARIES.

Copy presented, of Rules made by the Secretary for Scotland under the Prisons (Scotland) Act, 1877, establishing new rates of Dietaries for the several classes of prisoners [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL REGISTRATION OF TITLE (IRELAND) ACT, 1891. AND SMALL, DWELLINGS ACQUISITION ACT, 1899 (RULES).

Copy presented, of Rules made by the Judge nominated as an additional Land Judge for the purposes of the Local Registration of Title (Ireland) Act, 1891, with the approval of the Lord Chancellor [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS, 1901–1902 (VOTE ON ACCOUNT).

Estimate presented, showing the several Services for which a Vote on Account is required for the year ending 31st March, 1902 [by Command];

Referred to the Committee of Supply, and to be printed. [No. 68.]

ALLOTMENTS (SCOTLAND).

Return ordered, "of all Lands acquired in Scotland for Allotments under the Allotments (Scotland) Act, 1892, and the Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1894, showing in how many cases requisitions by the Parish Council to the County Council for the compulsory acquisition of Land for Allotments have been made, and with what result.

Parish and county.

Number of Allotments granted, giving particulars of acreage and rental.

Number of cases where Allotments refused.

;(Mr. Eugene Wason.)

PAUPERISM (ENGLAND AND WALES) (MONTHLY STATEMENTS).

Return ordered, "of Statements for each month of the year 1901 of the number of paupers (except lunatics in county and borough asylums, registered hospitals and licensed houses, and vagrants) in receipt of relief in England and Wales (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 135, of Session 1900)."; (Mr. Grant Lawson.)

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICA;INQUIRY INTO THE CONDUCT OF THE WAR.

*MR. LOYD (Berkshire, Abingdon): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in the event of a general public inquiry into the whole course and conduct of the war in South Africa being granted, the Government will place any limit to the cost or duration of such an inquiry; and would such a general public inquiry be in lieu of, or in addition to, the expert military inquiry necessary to ascertain and clearly define the lessons of the war.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): As the hon. Member is aware, we have promised a general inquiry, and the cost of the inquiry and its duration must depend on the discretion and competence of the body to whom inquiry is entrusted. The Government can lay down no limitation as to matter of time. As to the last paragraph in the question, of course the lessons of the war are constantly studied by the military authorities of the War Office.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham): May I ask whether, and if so when, the House will be informed of the circumstances attending the surrender at Nicholson's Nek and other places, and of the opinion of the Commander-in-Chief thereon?

*MR. SPEAKER: That hardly arises out of the question on the Paper.

GOVERNMENT'S KNOWLEDGE BEFORE THE WAR OF ALLIANCE BETWEEN THE TWO REPUBLICS.

MR. C. P. SCOTT (Lancashire, Leigh): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, before the month of September, 1899, the Government were in possession of information that, in the event of war breaking out with the Transvaal, the Orange Free State would take the side of the sister Republic, and that this country would have to face the combined forces of the two States; and, if not, at what period this information reached them.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not quite know what the hon. Gentleman means by this question. There was no treaty that I am aware of between the Orange Free State and the Transvaal Republic of an offensive character.

MR. C. P. SCOTT: I referred to the Report, a copy of which has within the last few days been placed on the Library, issued by the Intelligence Department of the War Office about four months before the war began, in which it is stated that;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; Notice had better be given of the question.

JAMESON RAID INDEMNITY;COUNTER-CLAIM OF THE CHARTERED COMPANY.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will lay upon the Table of the House evidence showing that the Chartered Company had a claim of £;5 to every £;1 claimed by the late Transvaal Government for the Jameson raid.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. Chamberlain, Birmingham. W.): No, Sir; I have not received any such claim from the Chartered Company.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES: Will the right hon. Gentleman consider this question further, as the statement was made in the House on his behalf by the Chancellor of the Exchequer?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No, Sir. I do not think that my right hon. friend used the words which are repeated in the question. In any case I can only deal with the

claim if made by the company in question. No such claim has been made.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES: Will the right hon. Gentleman tell us what are the words he refers to?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

CAPE TOWN DOCK POLICE ;GEORGE KERR'S ESTATE.

MR. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been directed to the case of the late George Kerr, a member of the dock police of Cape Town, who died early last year, and is believed to have left property undisposed of in Cape Town; whether he is aware that the police authorities at Cape Town realised the property referred to and sent to his relatives in Ireland as the result a sum of about £;19; and can he state by what right the police authorities so acted, and whether there is now any means of ascertaining if the sum mentioned represented the whole value of the estate.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I have no information on the matter, which appears to be one entirely for the consideration and decision, of the Cape Government.

SOUTH AFRICAN COMMISSIONS.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies what portions of the Vote of £;7,800, under Subhead O 1 of Vote for Colonial Services, in Supplementary Estimates is due to the Transvaal Concessions, the Land Settlement, and the Transvaal Financial Commissions respectively, and when the House may expect to be in possession of the Reports of these three Commissions or missions of inquiry.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: (1) The figures are as follows: Transvaal Concessions, £;3,500; Land Settlement Commission, £;2,650; Transvaal Financial Commission, £;1,650;total £;7,800. (2) I cannot say until I have received and considered them.

MR. JOHN ELLIS: Is the Land Settlement Commission proceeding?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Yes; it is considering its Report. As I stated the other day, the evidence has not yet reached me.

THE PAARDEBERG ARMISTICE.

MR. YERBURGH (Chester): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can inform the House what general granted the armistice of twenty-four hours to General Cronje, which Lord Roberts on his arrival at Paardeberg, as he states in his despatch of the 28th February, 1900, immediately revoked on the ground that the request for an armistice was obviously only an expedient to gain time for reinforcements to arrive.

THE SECRETARY of STATE for WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): The paragraph referred to is a little misleading. The facts are as follows: On the morning of the 19th February a message arrived from General Cronje asking for an armistice for twenty-four hours to enable him to bury his dead and send out his wounded. Lord Kitchener, as chief of the staff, replied to the message in the name of the senior officer at Paardeberg; Lieutenant-General French ; who was with the cavalry some little distance off, to the effect that the message was being sent to the Field Marshal commanding, and that, pending his reply, Cronje's laager would not be attacked. Lord

Roberts received the message about 10 a.m. the same day, on his arrival at Paardeberg, and gave orders that the armistice could not be granted for the reason given in the despatch.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): May I ask the right lion. Gentleman whether when Lord Kitchener replied he was actually in command of the British army on that day at Paardeberg?

MR. BRODRICK: No, Sir; the actual control was in the hands of the senior general officer, who, at that moment, by local rank, was not Lord Kitchener. Lord Kitchener was empowered by Lord Roberts to offer advice if he thought it necessary, and, if he offered such advice, no doubt it was taken by the senior officer on the spot.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): What was the strength of Cronje's force as compared with the British?

[No answer was given.]

MILITARY COURTS OF INQUIRY.

MR. YERBURGH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether an officer whose conduct forms the subject of a court of inquiry has the right or is afforded the opportunity of appearing in person before such court, and of calling witnesses in his defence; and whether officers of all ranks, against whom steps have been taken by the War Office in consequence of the finding of a court of inquiry before which they have not had the opportunity of appearing, have the right, whether on full or on half-pay, to demand a court-martial; and, if not, whether they have any, and, if so, what right of appeal.

MR. BRODRICK: The officer on whom a court of inquiry is held has the right and is afforded the opportunity of appearing before the court. The court of inquiry may report circumstances directly or indirectly affecting other officers, but in such cases the fact that they have not been called is considered in dealing with the finding of the court. No officer has a right of appeal to a court-martial, but to the Commander-in-Chief and the Sovereign, in accordance with Section 42 of the Army Act.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield): May I ask if steps are being taken by the War Office to alter these rules in accordance with the promise given by the right lion. Gentleman and the First Lord of the Treasury the other day.

MR. BRODRICK: No promise was given as to the alteration of rules, but certain pledges were given as to the way in which officers were to be treated in certain cases, and these pledges will be adhered to.

MR. YERBURGH: What I would like to ask the right lion. Gentleman is, are all officers whose conduct may be the subject of a court of inquiry given the opportunity of appearing before the court?

MR. BRODRICK: It is impossible to assure the procedure to such a degree that, when the conduct of one officer is under consideration by a court of inquiry, no evidence may be by any chance brought forward which may affect some other officer who may not be present. But should any action be taken on such evidence, or on the report made on it, of course the fact of such officer not being present is taken into account.

MR. YERBURGH: I desire to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether where punishment is passed upon an officer in accordance with the result of a court of inquiry that officer is given as a matter of right the opportunity of having his case heard before sentence is passed upon him?

MR. BRODRICK: I think the hon. Member had better put his question down. I am quite aware of the case to which he refers, and I am prepared, at the proper time, to answer it, but I am not prepared to enter into a debate on this question in the form of a question and answer across the floor of the House. But I may state that the officer to whom the hon. Member refers had had an opportunity of making an explanation, and the substance of his explanation was well known to the officer who made the recommendation in regard to it.

COLONIAL TROOPS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether it is possible to state the number of men sent to South Africa by the Dominion of Canada, the Colony of New Zealand, and each of the six Australian Colonies respectively, and the number in each case who have completed their service and returned to the Colonies; also the number in the case of each of these Colonies now serving in South Africa.

MR. BRODRICK: I fear I must ask the hon. Gentleman to postpone this question for a fortnight, in order to obtain the information.

REPORTED SURRENDER OF GENERAL BOTHA.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs): Have the Government any official information as to the reported surrender of General Botha?

MR. BRODRICK: No official information has been received.

LORD ROBERTS AND GENERAL BOTHA; FARM BURNING.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon, etc.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will lay upon the Table of the House the correspondence between Lord Roberts and General Louis Botha in reference to the burning of farms in the vicinity of railways damaged by the Boers.

*MR. BRODRICK: Yes, Sir.

PAY OF VOLUNTEER INFANTRYMEN IN SOUTH AFRICA.

MR. RENWICK (Newcastle-on-Tyne): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, having regard to the fact that the pay of the Imperial Yeomanry is now 5s. per day both for the newly enrolled members of that corps and for those who are already serving in South Africa, whether he will take into his favourable consideration an increase of pay to the artillery, engineer, and rifle Volunteers who are now serving in South Africa, and to the members of the Volunteer service companies which have recently been enrolled for active service, so as to place the members of these corps on an equal footing with those of the Imperial Yeomanry.

*MR. BRODRICK: It would be impossible to place members of the Volunteer service companies on a different footing as regards pay from the Regular infantry with whom they are serving. We are endeavouring to relieve as many as possible of the Volunteers who went out to South Africa last year.

PENSIONS FOR SOLDIERS' WIDOWS.

MR. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War

whether, if a soldier on active service in South Africa dies of disease contracted during and incidental to such service, his widow is entitled to either a gratuity or a pension; and can he say when the Government propose to initiate a pension scheme for the widows of such men; and whether they will undertake to do so before making any grants to victorious generals.

*MR BRODRICK: Under existing regulations the widow of a soldier dying under the circumstances stated does not receive pension or gratuity from public funds. Under a scheme, which will shortly be issued, pensions will be given in such cases.

VOLUNTEERS AND THE IMPERIAL YEOMANRY.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state approximately what was the contribution in men of the Volunteer Force to the first levy of the body styled Imperial Yeomanry, and what to the new levy, and how many came respectively from the Yeomanry Cavalry of Great Britain.

*MR. BRODRICK: The number contributed to the first levy of the Imperial Yeomanry by the Yeomanry Cavalry was 1,898, and by the Volunteers 1,145. Corresponding figures for the second levy are not at present available.

WOODSTOCK HOSPITAL, CAPE TOWN.

MR ARTHUR STANLEY (Lancashire, Ormskirk): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether Woodstock Hospital, Cape Town, is still being used for enteric patients; and whether, in view of the smells which are acknowledged to exist at Woodstock, any

steps have been taken to find another and more suitable site in the neighbourhood of Cape Town.

*THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westthoughton): The hospital is still being used for enteric patients. Many improvements have recently been made in the hospital, and the senior medical officer in charge now describes everything as satisfactory. The only change contemplated is the removal of the drainage outfall.

MILITIA OFFICERS' GRATUITIES.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, considering the inconvenience and expense incurred by Militia officers now actually embodied and serving, he will grant them, on completion of a year's service, the gratuity of £100 now paid to officers whose regiment has been disembodied.

*LORD STANLEY: This question has been thoroughly considered. I am not prepared to alter the decision already arrived at.

VOLUNTEER CAMP REGULATIONS.

MR. GRAY (West Ham, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state the conditions which will apply to Volunteer camps this year; and, in particular, whether fourteen days service in camp will be required, and whether the same rate of pay as last year will be allowed; and can he remove the doubts which arose last year as to the first and last day of the period in camp by stating what the War Office regards as a day.

*LORD STANLEY: An announcement with regard to this subject will be made very

shortly.

SUB-LETTING OF GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether he can now state the results of his investigations into the charges made against Messrs. Musgrave and Company, ironfounders, and Messrs. Wilson and Sons, tent and sail makers, both of Belfast, of having violated the conditions under which they held their contracts from the Government.

*LORD STANLEY: With regard to Messrs. Musgrave, the Department was; misled by the firm in the reply given to the House on the 13th December, 1900, as regards sub-letting, † It has: since been ascertained from personal inquiries made by the Director of Contracts that this firm did to a certain, extent infringe the terms of their contract in respect of sub-letting, and they have-been warned that this must not be repeated. With regard to Messrs. Wilson, the case has been further considered, but I can see no reason for altering the answer given to the hon. Member on the-13th December by my predecessor.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: Will a Commissioner be sent to Belfast to investigate the case against Messrs. Wilson, as was done in the case of Messrs. Musgrave?

*LORD STANLEY: The matter has been fully considered. I am afraid I cannot give any further answer.

IMPERIAL YEOMANRY;ACCOMMODATION FOR RECRUITS AT ALDERSHOT

MR. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that the recruits for the Imperial Yeomanry who are sent to Aldershot find no proper barrack accommodation ready for them; whether rifles in some cases have not been issued to them for a fortnight; and whether, as under these circumstances it is difficult to drill the men, he will take steps to have proper arrangements made.

*MR. BRODRICK: The General Officer Commanding at Aldershot reports that there has naturally been considerable difficulty in accommodating, almost at a moment's notice, over 6,000 recruits who came there immediately on enrolment without any military organisation. This difficulty has been rendered greater by many of the men arriving unexpectedly after the authorised hours. As the barracks are temporarily occupied by more than the normal number, it has been necessary to provide trestle camp

† See The parliamentary Debates [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxxviii., p.678. beds, but every man has been provided with a bed and plenty of bedding. As regards clothing, there has been no unnecessary delay, as every man has to be carefully fitted, more especially with boots. It is not true that men have been drilled in the snow un-provided with proper clothing or boots. Every man is provided with a warm jersey to wear under his khaki serge frock. As regards the rifles, all demands of the Commandant, Imperial Yeomanry, have been met without any hitch or delay. The Commander-in-Chief has sent General Mackinnon to Aldershot to take command, under Sir Redvers Buller, of the large body of Yeomanry now there. Arrangements have been made to cope with the difficulties, and drafts are being rapidly despatched to South Africa.

MR. JEFFREYS: Why send the men to Aldershot at all?

*MR. BRODRICK: Because it is the most convenient station at which to deal with them.

LANCASHIRE HUSSARS ;ACCOMMODATION FOR RECRUITS AT ALDERSHOT.

MR. ARTHUR STANLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that forty-three men of the Lancashire Hussars, who had volunteered for service in South Africa, were ordered to join at Aldershot on the 4th of February last; that on their arrival there they found that no provision whatever had been made for them; that thirty-seven of them were at last put into a room which had only accommodation for twenty-three men; and that as no food was given to them they were dependent upon what they could buy for themselves; and whether any steps have been taken to prevent a recurrence of such mismanagement.

LORD STANLEY: The men arrived two hours after the hour laid down as the latest for receiving recruits. Thirty-five were put into a barrack room, a number not in excess of the winter occupation authorised for the room. There was no necessity for them to buy food.

PRICE OF IRISH HORSES.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if there is any objection to state for the year 1899 or the year 1898 the average price paid to dealers for Irish horses, and also the average price paid to farmers or non-dealers.

*LORD STANLEY: It would not be in the public interest to make these prices known.

ARMY CONTRACTS;SECRECY AS TO DETAILS.

COLONEL NOLAN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether contracts for the conveyance of troops are kept secret; whether contracts for or the prices of arms, ammunition, clothing, medical comforts, tents, saddlery, food, and forage are kept secret; whether the prices given for Argentine horses is a secret; and can he say, where prices or contracts are secret, what machinery is used to prevent fraud, corruption, and waste.

LORD STANLEY: The prices paid under the contracts are not disclosed. The prices paid for Argentine horses have likewise, in the interest of the public, not been made known; but full particulars of all purchases, whether by contract or otherwise, are given to all officers concerned for the purpose of audit.

COLONEL NOLAN: The Financial Secretary has not answered the last part of the question, which is its main point.

LORD STANLEY: I think we can trust our officers to see that there is no fraud, corruption, or waste.

COLONEL NOLAN: Does the Secretary for War accept the responsibility for all this secrecy, seeing that millions of money are involved in these contracts?

[No answer was returned.]

FOURTH BATTALION BORDER REGIMENT;OFFICERS' PAY.

MAJOR BALFOUR (Christchurch): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that the officers' pay of the 4th Battalion Border Regiment, quartered at Youghal, which was due on 1st November, and which, by Article 276, Pay Warrant 1900, is ordered to be paid monthly in advance, was not issued

by the paymaster till 10th December; and will he take steps to prevent the repetition of this breach of the Regulations.

LORD STANLEY: It appears that, owing to a misapprehension on the part of the officer commanding the battalion, the pay in question was issued in arrear instead of in advance. The Regulation on the subject is generally well known, and it does not appear necessary to issue further orders to meet what appears to be an isolated case.

GERMAN GUNS FOR THE BRITISH ARMY.

MR. WALFORD GREEN (Wednesbury): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the quick-firing field guns, purchased in Germany and issued to the 16th and 17th Brigade Divisions of the Royal Field Artillery stationed at Aldershot, have proved unsatisfactory; whether half of the guns issued have been returned disabled to Woolwich Arsenal; whether defects in the breech mechanism have been discovered; and whether the recoil has proved destructive to the gun carriages.

MR. BRODRICK: The guns in question have not proved unsatisfactory; they have been found, on the contrary, to shoot with remarkable accuracy. No defects have been discovered in the breech mechanism, nor has the recoil proved destructive to the carriages. The threads of some of the breech screws have become burred owing to the guns being used for drill purposes without drill carriages; a slight damage which can be repaired locally. Some of the axles of the gun carriages having cracked in travelling, the firm which supplied the batteries is replacing all the axles by axles of an improved pattern at its own expense. Fourteen guns have been returned to Woolwich for this purpose.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): Have any of the guns been used in South Africa; and, if so, will the right hon. Gentleman consider the desirability, with the view of finishing the war, of sending out a few competent German officers with them?

ARMAMENTS OF VOLUNTEER ARTILLERY.

MR. DUNCAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Otley): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he is aware that some battalions of Volunteer Artillery have only guns of a pattern nearly forty years old, and if he can give any promise to issue to them, at an early date, guns of more modern design.

LORD STANLEY: It is intended, as was explained to the House last year, to re-arm the Volunteer Artillery. The heavy guns required for the batteries of position are now being manufactured. I cannot give the exact date on which new guns can be issued.

SECTION D RESERVE MEN.

*MR. M'CRAE (Edinburgh, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state if the rule which exacts an extra year's service from Reservists who have completed twelve years service in the First Class Reserve also applies to those men who have enlisted under Section D Class to complete sixteen years; and whether Reservists at present serving in South Africa are being detained beyond the period of their engagement to serve for sixteen years.

LORD STANLEY: The answer to the first of the hon. Member's questions is in the affirmative. No man by reason of his serving abroad may be retained beyond one additional year.

*MR. M'CRAE: Is the noble Lord aware that complaints are coming from South Africa of men being detained beyond their agreed period of service?

LORD STANLEY: I am not aware. If they are complaining I think there must be a misunderstanding. They are liable to serve an extra year.

*MR. M'CRAE: Under what Army Order is that extra year made applicable to a man who has already done sixteen years service?

LORD STANLEY: I must ask for notice of that.

MEMBERS OF THE ROYAL FLEET RESERVE IN GOVERNMENT EMPLOY. MENT.

Lieut.-COL. LEE (Hampshire, Fareham): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether retired non-commissioned officers of the Royal Marines, or retired petty officers, Royal Navy, who are now in Government employment in any of the Naval establishments and who may join the Royal Fleet Reserve, will be granted the necessary leave to attend the annual trainings without loss of or prejudice to their positions in such Government employment.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.): Yes, Sir. This point is specially provided for in the Royal Fleet Reserve Regulations.

HIRE OF TRANSPORTS FOR THE CAPE.

*MR. ALFRED DAVIES: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can explain why the Government did not exercise the powers in the subsidy contract with the steamship companies when war was imminent with the late Transvaal Government, and when the ultimatum had been issued and British territory invaded, by taking their fastest steamers for transports which were available, some of which have an average speed of twenty-one to twenty-two knots, and would have done the passage to Cape Town in twelve to fourteen days (the length of passage by ordinary steamers being sixteen days), instead of chartering at that time steamers many of which had an average speed of ten to twelve knots, and took twenty to twenty-eight days for the passage to Cape Town; and whether, Shaving regard to the importance of the arrival of troops eight or twelve days earlier at that critical time, he can state why the following steamers were employed for carrying troops; namely, the "Jelunga," which took thirty-six days from Southampton to Durban; the "Harlech Castle," which took twenty-six days from Southampton to Cape Town; the "Manila," which took twenty-six days from Southampton to Cape Town; and the "Zibengla," which took twenty-eight days from Birkenhead to Cape Town.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: It is doubtful whether the Admiralty had power to take up subsidised ships for the purpose of transport, and in any case the Admiralty does not consider it desirable

to make a demand upon the steamship companies which would clearly be at variance with the intention of both parties when entering into the contract. The intention of the Admiralty was to obtain the use of these vessels as armed cruisers, and not as transports in a non-maritime war. Many of the steamers on the Admiralty List, especially the Atlantic vessels of very high speed, are not suited for the purpose of Army transport, and would require extensive alterations and refitting to make them available for the purpose. When two of the Atlantic vessels were subsequently engaged (not under the Subsidy Agreements) they took eighteen and nineteen days respectively to reach Cape

Town. They are quite unsuited for the conveyance of artillery (for which the first requisition was received) and for cavalry. The "Jelunga" was all ready fitted when requisition for the despatch of troops was received. It was necessary to send her via the Mediterranean and Suez Canal, as the Rifle Brigade, which was one of the regiments selected for South Africa, was stationed at Crete. With regard to the other vessels; looking to the necessity in every case of erecting special fittings, it was obviously necessary to take the most suitable ships actually in British ports, a necessity which, of course, limits choice. The "Harlech Castle" and "Manila" each lost four days on their passage through heavy weather. As there were only three weeks in which to prepare transport for 20,000 men, the ships that could be got at once had to be taken to enable it to be done, as it was.

*MR. ALFRED DAVIES: Were not some of the ships only fit to be broken up for old iron at the time they were hired?

[No answer was given.]

ROYAL MARINE ARTILLERY; DUTY FREE TOBACCO.

*MR. REGINALD LUCAS (Portsmouth): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether permission may be given to Royal Marine Artillery serving ashore to purchase their ship's tobacco duty free, as in the case of sailors and Marine Light Infantry.

*THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): The power of issuing tobacco free of duty is granted by the Customs Consolidation Act, 1876, sections 123 to 125, and applies to ships on service only. The regulations as to men being allowed to purchase tobacco free of duty apply equally to all belonging to H.M. ships (except coastguard when on shore), whether seamen, Royal Marine Artillery or Royal Marine Light Infantry. Neither men of the Royal Marine Artillery or Royal Marine Light Infantry are allowed the privilege when at their divisions in barracks.

FOREIGN WARSHIPS IN BRITISH DOCKS.

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether Japanese or other foreign war ships are now occupying and have recently occupied docks at Chatham and elsewhere, though at the same time His Majesty's ships are waiting to enter these docks for repairs; and whether, if this is correct, he can state by what authority foreign authorities use His Majesty's dockyards when these docks are urgently needed for the Navy, and whether the practice will be at once put an end to.

*MR. PRETYMAN: No Japanese or other foreign warship is now occupying any of the docks at the present time, but the Japanese cruiser "Iwate" was recently docked at Chatham. This is a courtesy that has been occasionally granted to Japanese and other foreign ships by the Admiralty. It is always arranged so as not to interfere with the docking of any of His Majesty's ships. I may mention that the Japanese recently extended the same courtesy to us by allowing the "Victorious" to be docked in Japan.

ROYAL VISIT TO THE COLONIES-PRESS ARRANGEMENTS.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether it is intended to exclude, with one exception, the correspondents of all

the newspapers desiring to be represented on the occasion from the ships of war accompanying the Royal

Mission to Australia; whether Sir Donald Mackenzie Wallace has been deputed to accompany the Duke of Cornwall and York as official reporter; and whether that gentleman will also represent The Times, which will thus, enjoy privileges denied to the London press generally.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: At the same time, may I ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, seeing that newspaper correspondents have been refused permission to sail in His Majesty's cruisers accompanying H.R.H. the Duke of York to Australia, and that the effect of this will be to prevent special correspondents reaching places at which His Royal Highness will call in time to send home descriptive reports, he will state if Sir Donald Mackenzie Wallace, a special representative of The Times newspaper, has been selected historian for the trip., and whether he will be prohibited from sending reports of the voyage to The Times, so that it may not have an advantage over other daily newspapers.

*MR. PRETYMAN: Sir Donald Mackenzie Wallace will accompany His Royal Highness the Duke of Cornwall and York on his projected tour. The First Lord of the Admiralty is in communication with representatives of the press for the purpose of ascertaining whether it is possible to arrange for other representatives to accompany His Royal Highness. I may say, however, that the accommodation available is exceedingly limited, and the question is one of some difficulty. If the hon. Member will put down a further question at a future date I shall be happy to give him the information he requires as soon as the First Lord of the Admiralty has come to a decision.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I shall put a question down for Monday.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: Arising out of that question, is the hon. Gentleman aware that on the occasion of the funeral of the late Queen Victoria the representative of the Times was admitted to Frogmore Chapel on condition;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; That does not arise out of the question on the Paper.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: I was coming to a supplementary question, Sir. My question is whether in the event of The Times correspondent alone being allowed to accompany their Royal Highnesses he would be under an obligation to supply his reports to some central news agency, so that all the newspapers may be placed on an equal footing.

MR. PRETYMAN: I understand that Sir Donald Mackenzie Wallace is not representing The Times.

ROYAL MARINES;DISCHARGE PAYMENT.

MR. REGINALD LUCAS: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, seeing that an ex-soldier upon joining the Royal Reserves has refunded to him two-thirds of the money with which he has previously purchased his discharge, and that this re-payment is denied to ex-non-commissioned officers and men of the Marines, His Majesty's Government will in future recognise the claim of the latter to similar treatment under similar circumstances.

MN. PRETYMAN: The conditions of service in the Royal Marines are more analogous to those prevailing in the Royal Navy than to those in the Army, and it has not

been found possible to extend the Army rules on this point to the Marines without considering the Royal Navy. The formation of the Royal Fleet Reserve, however, may make some modification in the existing rules for the Royal Navy and Royal Marines desirable, and the question is now under consideration.

AMERICAN EXPORTS.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he is aware that the exports from America of iron, steel, and agricultural implements amounted last year to 145,000,000 dollars, or treble the value in 1897; and that the greater proportion of these surplus goods, not required by the American people, were sent to England, Scotland, and Ireland to compete with British productions, taxed by Imperial imposts and local rates; and whether, in the interests of British and Irish workers, he will take steps to secure such fiscal treatment of these and other competing foreign manufactured imports, amounting to £100,000,000, as shall establish the equality of foreign goods with British goods in the British markets, and place upon the foreigner some portion of the pecuniary burden of the Boer War.

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (SIR M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): The exports from America of iron, steel, and agricultural implements amounted last year, as stated by my hon. Friend, to 145 million dollars, which is not treble, but just over double the value of 1897. But I must demur altogether to his statement as to the proportion taken by the United Kingdom. For the year ended 30th June, 1899, the proportion of these exports taken by the United Kingdom was, according to figures furnished to me by the Board of Trade, under 20 million dollars, out of a total of over 106 million dollars. The figures for 1900 are not yet fully made up, but they are not expected to differ greatly in this respect from those of the year before. If I rightly understand the second paragraph of the question, it suggests a fiscal policy to which I am not disposed.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I shall take an early opportunity of raising this question.

BEER ADULTERATION.

COLONEL BROOKFIELD (Sussex, Rye): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is prepared to give effect to the suggestion made in the Majority Report and endorsed in the Minority Report of the Beer Materials Committee, that columns for hops and hop substitutes should be inserted in the brewers' entry books.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: Yes. I have given directions that the change is to be made. I find there would be practical difficulties, which my hon. friend will no doubt appreciate, in the way of altering the books in the middle of the brewer's year. So I propose to introduce the change on 1st October next.

COLONIAL LOANS ACT, 1899.

MR. STUART SAMUEL (Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can state to what colonies up to the present time sums have been advanced by the Treasury under the Colonial Loans Act, 1899, and for what purposes, to what amounts, and at what rates of interest; also the date on which each such loan was granted and the date fixed for its repayment.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The information asked for cannot be satisfactorily given within the limits of an answer to a question. I will lay a Return on the Table.

COOPER'S HILL COLLEGE.

Colonel MILWARD (Warwickshire, Stratford-on-Avon): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he can state when the Cooper's Hill Papers, which were laid upon the Table in dummy upon the 21st February, will be ready for distribution.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): The Papers I understand will be delivered to-morrow.

NEWSPAPER LICENCES IN GIBRALTAR.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been called to an application made, on 17th December last, by Arturo Sacramenti to the Governor of Gibraltar for a licence to publish a newspaper devoted to the interests of the working classes, under the Press Ordinance, Gibraltar, 1869; and can he explain why the application was refused.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The issue of newspaper licences in Gibraltar is entirely at the Governor's discretion. Sir George White reported to me last month that he had decided to refuse Sacramenti's application for a licence, in the interests of the peace and good order of the fortress, for the maintenance of which he is responsible.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: Is it proposed to lay on the Table any Papers on this subject?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No, Sir.

BRITISH AFRICAN PROTECTORATES; GRANTS-IN-AID.

MR. JOHN ELLIS: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what have been the total sums voted or to be voted up to the 31st March, 1901, in respect of the British Central African, East African, and Uganda Protectorates (including the purchase of the interests of any Chartered Companies), and what is the total sum advanced, or proposed to be advanced, up to 31st March, 1901, in respect of any railways or other public works in the above Protectorates.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS Viscount CRANBORNE, Rochester): The grants in aid of the revenues of the several Protectorates, including Somaliland, and of the Uganda Railway are as follows:; British Central Africa, £;239,700; East Africa Protectorate, £;793,675 (including £;50,000 paid to the Imperial British East Africa Company for surrender of its charter, etc., and also including the Supplementary Vote before Parliament for £;149,000); Somaliland Protectorate (Supplementary Vote, before Parliament), £;60,000; Uganda Protectorate, £;1,222,400; Uganda Railway, £;3,999,000 ; total, £;6,314,775.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he can state what has been spent of public money during the last ten years on British East Africa, Uganda, Somaliland, and the minor Protectorates in the neighbourhood of these countries.

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: The terms of this question are covered by the answer already given to the hon. Member for the Rushcliffe Division of Nottingham. The figures given include all grants made in respect of the Protectorates and

railway. These grants go back to 1894 only, covering therefore a period not of ten but of seven years.

CHINA;ITALY AND BRITISH PROPERTY AT PEKING.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether His Majesty's

Minister at Peking has received a protest from Sir Robert Hart against the proposed appropriation of the Imperial Customs buildings by the Foreign Legations, and particularly the Italian Legation, which proposes also to take possession of land which is the property of Sir Robert Hart himself.

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: We understand that in connection with the scheme of defence for the Legation quarter a plan is under consideration which would require an open zone 150 yards wide all round, and that to obtain this it would be necessary to take a great part of the site of the Customs Administration. On the 20th instant Sir Robert Hart addressed a letter to His Majesty's Minister and also to the Doyen of the Diplomatic Body expressing his surprise at this appropriation, but stating that if military necessities required the cession of the sites for the defence of the Legation quarter he would not protest or oppose it. But we are in communication with His Majesty's Minister on the subject.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Can the noble Lord say what compensation is to be paid?

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: We have not got to that point.

THE YANG-TSZE VICEROYS.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT (Sheffield, Ecclesall): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether His Majesty's Government will take steps to ensure the maintenance in their office of the Yang-tsze Viceroy who have rendered such services in the interests of Great Britain and of civilisation in their provinces, and to enable them to carry out essential reforms of which they are in favour.

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: The matter referred to was carefully considered some time ago, but His Majesty's Minister at Peking reported that he was satisfied that there was no danger of the, Viceroy's removal. His Majesty's Government fully appreciate the services which they have rendered.

NEWFOUNDLAND;FRENCH CLAIMS.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether His Majesty's Government are at present in negotiation with the French Government in reference to French claims in Newfoundland; and, if not, whether the advisability of commencing negotiations will be taken into consideration at once.

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: It would not be correct to say that negotiations are proceeding with the French Government in reference to Newfoundland; but His Majesty's Government have repeatedly shown themselves willing to take any favourable opportunity for adjusting this long-standing difficulty, and are now in consultation with delegates from the Government of the colony upon the subject.

WALFISCH BAY.

SIR BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any information which he can communicate to the

House respecting the alleged cession of Walfisch Bay to Germany, and whether Walfisch Bay is a portion of the territory primarily under the control of the Government of Cape Colony.

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: There is no question of a cession of Walfisch Bay to Germany. Walfisch Bay is administered as part of Cape Colony.

LEAD POISONING IN THE POTTERIES;NEW RULES.

MR. COGHILL (Stoke-upon-Trent): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware, of the dissatisfaction that is felt amongst all classes of the Staffordshire Potteries with the suggested new rules; will he state who drew them up and who is responsible for their production; and will he, in view of the condemnation they are receiving at the hands of every practical person engaged in the manufacture of china and earthenware, take an early opportunity of withdrawing them.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): I am not aware of any such general dissatisfaction as my hon. friend suggests, though objections

have been taken to the new rules. The rules were drawn up by the officials of my Department, and I am responsible for their production. I see no reason for withdrawing the rules. The objections must now, in accordance with the statutory provisions on the subject, be settled by arbitration.

MR. COGHILL: Why was no notice of the new rules given to the operatives in the district?

*MR. RITCHIE: They are as fully aware of the rules as the manufacturers.

MR. COGHILL: They got no notice.

CORONERS AND THE PUBLIC EXECUTIONER.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can give any instances of a public executioner having been required by a coroner's request, summons, or warrant, to give evidence to satisfy the law and the public that an execution was properly carried out within a prison in Great Britain; and whether he can state any instances in which the executioner attended and gave evidence, and any instance in which he refused to attend on the coroner's summons or warrant.

*MR. RITCHIE: So far as I have been able to investigate the matter, I am not aware of any instances of the nature referred to in the question.

DANGERS OF TOY PISTOLS.

MR. HELME (Lancashire, Lancaster): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been called to the accidents frequently resulting from the use of so-called toy pistols, and to the recommendation of the jury at the inquest held on Norman S. Allen, of Lancaster, who was shot on the 19th instant by a playfellow, and died immediately after; and if the Government would be willing to adopt measures to restrict the sale of weapons capable of inflicting such injury. In putting the question, I should like further to ask the right hon. Gentleman if he has seen a telegram announcing the death of a lady aged twenty-two, at Ashton-under-Lyne, in consequence of being shot with a toy pistol; and has he received a memorial from the Mayor and Corporation of Lancaster urging that legislation should be initiated.

*MR. RITCHIE: I have received several memorials of the nature referred to, but I have not heard of the death at Ashton-under-Lyne. I have this morning received the recommendation of the jury referred to. I am fully sensible that the question of pistol accidents is a serious one, but as I said two days ago, I cannot promise legislation on the matter this session.

LADY INSPECTORS OF FACTORIES.

MR. BIGNOLD (Wick Burghs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, seeing that Miss Paterson, who resides in Glasgow, is the only lady inspector in Scotland under the Factory and Workshops Act, and that an increase in the number of lady inspectors was recommended by the Chief Lady Inspector in London, then Miss Abraham, and that this course has been successfully adopted in England and Ireland, he will take into consideration the appointment of additional lady inspectors, or lady inspectors' assistants for Scotland.

*MR. RITCHIE: The lady inspectors are not assigned to England, Scotland, and Ireland separately, or to particular divisions thereof. The lady inspector who resides in Scotland may be and often is employed in England and Ireland, and, conversely, the inspectors residing in England may be employed in Scotland. The increase in the staff of the Lady Inspectors' Department, to which my hon. friend refers, has therefore benefited all parts of the United Kingdom. I am sorry that I do not see my way at present to propose any further increase.

JUSTICES AND THE OATH OF ALLEGIANCE.

SIR JOHN DORINGTON (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the letters patent of 15th February, 1901, relating to the Commission of the Peace and announced in the Gazette of the same date, constitute a new commission superseding and determining the existing commission within

the meaning of the statute of Anne 1, stat. 1, c. 8; or, if not, what is the effect of such letters patent; and if such letters patent constitute a new commission, must two justices at least from each county take the judicial oath and the oath of allegiance before the Lord Chancellor or one of His Majesty's judges in order to enable a court of quarter sessions to be formed before which the other justices can take the necessary oaths as required by the Promissory Oaths Act, 1871, or will some person be appointed by His Majesty in accordance with Section 2 of that Act.

*MR. RITCHIE: I have been in communication with the Lord Chancellor, from whose office the letters patent referred to were issued. The answer to the first and second questions is that the letters patent do not constitute a new commission, and that their effect is not to determine but to continue existing commissions. Consequently the third question does not really arise, but seeing that justices may think it desirable (in accordance with the advice which I stated a few days ago had been given to me) to take the oaths afresh, I am considering whether I shall recommend His Majesty, for the sake of general convenience, to make an appointment under the Promissory Oaths Act, 1871.

RAILWAY SERVANTS AND THE WORK MEN'S COMPENSATION ACT.

*MR. THOMAS SHAW (Hawick Burghs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention, has been called to the case of Brodie

against the North British Railway Company, in which the Second Division of the Court of Session in Scotland recently decided that a railway servant who had been injured while engaged in the company's work as a goods guard was not entitled to compensation under the Workmen's Compensation Act, because the place at which the accident occurred was upon a private siding connected with the main line of rails; whether he is aware that the existing state of the law as declared by this decision has been the subject of much discussion and dissatisfaction among the railway servants of the United Kingdom; and whether it is the intention of His Majesty's Government to bring in any measure to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act so as to include within its scope accidents of the kind before mentioned, to which such a large class of the working men of this country are subject in the regular course of their duties.

*MR. RITCHIE: I have seen a report of the case referred to, but I have not received any representations on the subject from railway servants. No doubt the point will have to be considered when an amending Bill is taken in hand, but I am not at present in a position to promise legislation on the subject.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that half the railway servants of the United Kingdom are deprived of the beneficent provisions of this Act?

[No answer was returned.]

CHEAP TRAINS ACT.

DR. MACNAMARA: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the time has now come when steps should be taken for an extension of the Cheap Trains Act of 1883, in order that greater facilities for cheap locomotion for working men and women may be secured.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): No, Sir. I am of opinion that the Act of 1883 is at present adequate. I would refer the hon. Member to the voluminous Return published last year showing the facilities that now exist in the matter of workmen's trains and fares.

UNITED STATES STEEL TRUST.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he is aware that eight of the largest iron and steel firms in the United States have combined their forces with a capital of £229,000,000, with the main object of destroying the iron and steel industries of the United Kingdom, the only market throughout the world open to them without a toll; and what steps His Majesty's Government propose to take to safeguard the interests of the principal staple trades in Great Britain and the workers dependent upon it.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I have no official information on the subject, but I believe from statements which have been publicly made that a combination of iron and steel firms in the United States is now in course of formation. I am not prepared to accept my hon. and gallant friend's statement of the main object of the combination, and I do not think that any action on the part of His Majesty's Government could usefully be taken.

DESERTIONS FROM THE MERCANTILE MARINE.

*MR. HAIN (Cornwall, St. Ives): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can give the number of desertions of seamen and others from the mercantile marine during the past three years; and if he will lay upon the Table

of the House a Return giving full particulars similar to the Return presented to Parliament by the Registrar General of Seamen some three years ago.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I am quite willing to give this Return; its preparation will take a little time.

REGISTERED TONNAGE OF SHIPS.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that in some instances the registered tonnage of vessels is only about one tenth of the gross tonnage or cargo carried; whether he has had complaints from Irish Harbour Boards upon this subject; and whether he can state if the Board of Trade propose to remedy this inequality between the registered and gross tonnage of vessels.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Yes, Sir; I am aware of the circumstances to which the hon. Member refers, and the Board of Trade have under consideration an instruction to their officers which it is hoped will mitigate the inequality complained of. Meanwhile, as I have already stated to the House, it is open to harbour authorities to endeavour to obtain powers to levy dues based on the gross instead of on the net tonnage of vessels by means of local Acts.

LONDON WATER COMPANIES; WITHDRAWAL OF PROPOSED REGULATIONS.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, considering the character of the regulations which the eight water companies of the Metropolis have prepared, the expense that would be thrown upon consumers if any sanction were given to them, and the alarm that has been created amongst the local authorities and inhabitants of London by these proposals, he will undertake that no sanction shall be given to them by his Department without further Parliamentary consideration.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): I understand that the proposed regulations have been withdrawn.

MR. LOUGH: Can the right hon. Gentleman suggest any means by which local authorities and the inhabitants of London may be saved from the great expense and trouble they have been put to by such regulations being brought forward?

MR. WALTER LONG: The regulations were brought forward by the companies in consequence of the direct recommendation of the Royal Commission. They were submitted to the Local Government Board in proper form, and if the Commissioners thought it was desirable that the regulations should be put forward, I have no suggestion to make as to the way in which the expense may be avoided.

TUBERCULOSIS SEIZURES.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, following up the Circular dated 11th March, 1899, respecting tuberculosis seizures, he has received any communications from local authorities pointing out their inability to comply with the suggestions of the Board; whether he is aware, as the result of non-compliance, that actions at law have risen and are now arising in which the recommendations contained in the said Circular are ineffectively cited although based upon the Report of the Royal Commission; and whether the Local Government Board will again draw the attention of local authorities to the aforesaid Circular.

MR. WALTER LONG: The answer to the first and second paragraphs of the question

is in the negative. I am not aware of any sufficient reason at the present time for complying with the suggestion in the last paragraph of the question.

THE HOUSING QUESTION.

DR. MACNAMARA: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is prepared to accede to the request of the London County Council that in its scheme of repayment of loans contracted in connection with its housing schemes it may be permitted to take the value of the land wholly or in part out of the Kinking Fund, thus treating the value so excluded as an asset against debt.

The following question also appeared on the Paper::

DR. MACNAMARA: To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is prepared to accede to the request of the London County Council that it may be permitted to spread the repayment of the loans contracted in connection with its housing schemes over a period of 100 years.

MR. WALTER LONG: Perhaps in replying to this question. I may be allowed also to answer that to my right hon. friend the First Lord of the Treasury, which stands in the name of the hon. Member. Proposals of the kind referred to in these questions were more than once discussed in this House last year in connection with the Bill for the Housing of the Working Classes. It clearly appeared that the sense of the House was adverse to them, and I am not now prepared to propose the legislation which would be necessary for carrying them into effect. In connection, however, with the very pressing question of the provision of housing accommodation for the working classes, I welcome any suggestions which may be made to me and will give them my most careful consideration.

MR. GRAY: Is it not the fact that the discussion on this question arose in the last and not in the present Parliament?

MR. WALTER LONG: Yes, but it was only last June.

DR. MACNAMARA: Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the advisability of appointing a Committee to see whether proposals might be made to deal with this pressing question.

MR. WALTER LONG: If that course seems desirable I shall not hesitate to recommend it to the House. I have issued circulars to the various local authorities in the country asking them to inform me what are the precise difficulties which stand in the way of carrying out the Acts, and I would rather wait to receive their replies before I decide to appoint a Committee.

MR. LOUGH: Might not the period allowed for the repayment of the loan on the value of the land be extended?

MR. WALTER LONG: I am not quite sure whether the hon. Member is entitled to press the question. I have to consider whether we ought to treat the land as holding a permanent value when there is one section in the House which would be willing, by legislation, to depreciate its value.

MR. LOUGH: What ground has the right hon. Gentleman for saying that I entertain an opinion which would depreciate the value of the land, or of anything else, for that matter?

MR. WALTER LONG: I did not intend to cast any imputation on the hon. Member, but I understand the hon. Gentleman is one of those who favour the imposition of a

special taxation on land, which certainly would not increase its value.

DR. MACNAMARA: When you get the replies from the local authorities will you state the effect to the House?

MR. WALTER LONG: I do not think I can make any promise to offer a statement. I am doing my best to bring about a solution of this very difficult question.

DEFAULTING POSTMASTERS.

MR. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether, in the case of defaulting postmasters, the Post Office Authorities proceed against the sureties before they have failed to realise from the principal in default; and, if so, whether the practice will be altered, so as to leave the sureties free till all the usual steps have been taken to make the property of the principal liable for the debt.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): No, Sir. The practice is to proceed against the defaulter in the first instance, before calling on the sureties to make good the deficiency.

SOUTH AFRICAN MAIL DELAYS.

MR. BARTLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that the South African mail arrives frequently, as it did this week, on Monday, thus taking nineteen days from Cape Town; whether he is aware that the new mail boats do the voyage in fifteen or sixteen days, thus securing delivery of the letters three and four days earlier; whether, under a recent arrangement, the voyage of the mails was to be done in sixteen days; and whether he will take steps to secure that the mails shall not in future be carried by the old slow boats of the Union Castle Line.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: On three occasions during this year the South African correspondence has only been delivered in London on Monday, the packet having reached Southampton on two of those occasions on Sunday morning, and on the third, late on Saturday night. On the two occasions of a Sunday arrival the packet exceeded, in adverse circumstances, the time allowed for the voyage under the contract, namely sixteen days twenty hours. A contract time of sixteen days fifteen hours comes into force on the 1st of October, 1903. It is a fact that the voyage has been completed by some of the packets in sixteen and even in fifteen days; but the Postmaster General cannot prevent the use of any particular packet of the Union Castle Line which is not up to that speed, especially if the ships can in normal circumstances do the contract speed. If a vessel incapable of performing the contract were habitually employed, the Postmaster General would, of course, represent the matter to the Colonial Government. The contract is not with the Postmaster General, but with the Government of the Cape Colony. Penalties are prescribed for cases in which the contract time is exceeded.

MR. BARTLEY: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that this week again the mail arrives on a Sunday. Can he not do something to facilitate the carrying of them?

[The answer was inaudible.]

PRIVATE POSTAL COLLECTIONS; SHEFFIELD CASE.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the

Postmaster General, whether he is aware that Mr. J. G. Graves, a leading merchant of Sheffield, carrying on a large business through the Post Office, has petitioned the Post Office authorities to have parcels of a less postal value than 5d. either collected at his place of business or accepted at the nearest branch office; and whether the Postmaster General will accede to this request.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The person referred to by the hon Member already enjoys exceptional facilities in regard to the collection of his parcels, both ordinary and registered, by the Post Office, and he desires the further privilege of having registered letters collected from his premises. No provision exists for this purpose, but the Postmaster General is considering whether a scheme can be devised which under prescribed conditions would apply to the public generally. A decision will, it is hoped, be shortly arrived at.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Has not the gentleman referred to a right to a private collecting box on payment of a fee of a guinea a year?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I have no personal knowledge as to that.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he is aware that inconvenience has been caused to the Sheffield public having business at the General Post Office by the crowding and work entailed there by the representatives of a postal customer to the extent of about £18,000 a year, owing to the refusal of the authorities to collect the registered packets of his firm, as they did prior to the reduction in the postage rate by the last Postmaster General; and whether the Postmaster General will give directions for the ordinary business practice of all carriers to be at once resumed so that mutual annoyance and loss of time may be avoided.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General is aware that a good deal of inconvenience has been caused by the proceedings of the person referred to, who has been warned that if he persists in obstructing public business at the Sheffield Post Office it will be necessary to take proceedings against him. The Department has not in the past made special provision for collecting registered letters from his business premises. The latter part of the question is not understood.

REGISTERED LETTERS; COMPENSATION REGULATIONS.

*MR. THORNTON (Clapham): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether his attention has been called to the statement and table of figures printed on the back of the envelopes made to inclose registered packets, that, subject to the conditions published in the Post Office Guide as to registration, compensation for loss or damage is given in respect of inland registered packets of all kinds according to a table which includes a fee of 2d. to secure compensation limited to £5; and seeing that this statement may lead the public to believe that by paying the 2d.

registration fee they are ensuring repayment in full up to £5, of money which has been registered but which is lost in course of post, instead of the £2 limited by the above-mentioned conditions: whether he will give instructions that on all future issues of such envelopes a clearer statement shall be printed of the amount of specie recoverable through registration in the post.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I am in communication with the Postmaster General on

this subject. I should be glad if the hon. Member would postpone his question for a week.

ELECTION PETITIONS CLERK;SALARY AND DUTIES.

*MR. MANSFIELD (Lincolnshire, Spalding): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the Election Petitions Clerk receives a salary of £;450 per year, although the work of his office can be done in about a week per year; whether he has just retired on a pension of £;300 per year; and whether he will consider the advisability of adding the office to some other department with a lower rate of payment.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The gentleman to whom I understand the hon. Member to refer is a first-class clerk in the central office of the Supreme Court, receiving a fixed salary of £;700 a year, plus a fee of two guineas for each petition lodged and registered. He has: not retired on a pension. He already performs the ordinary duties of a clerk in the Taxing Department, besides the work connected with petitions.

LONDON CUSTOM HOUSE;ACCOUNTS OFFICES.

MR. O'MALLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether any reorganisation of the tea and dry goods accounts offices in the London Custom House is in contemplation by the substitution of clerks for officers of the outdoor department; and, if so, what steps are proposed to be taken to safeguard the interests of the staff at present employed in those offices.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: In any scheme for the re-organisation of the tea office, the legitimate interests of existing officers will not be overlooked. The exact measures which will be adopted cannot be stated in advance.

GLASGOW SMALL-POX EPIDEMIC.

MR. THOMAS BAYLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if he will institute an inquiry into the outbreak of small-pox in Glasgow in a manner similar to that in which the Local Government Board have granted inquiries on the occasions of recent outbreaks in England; and if he will extend such inquiry into the sanitary conditions of the city and its water supply.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM Murray, Buteshire): I am informed by the Local Government Board for Scotland that there does not seem to them to be any reason at present for instituting an inquiry into the sanitary condition of Glasgow and its water supply. The reference to the practice of the English Local Government Board is, I am informed by that Board, rather misleading. That Board usually send one of their medical inspectors to a district where small-pox is epidemic, in order that he may assist the local authorities with his advice and experience, but the Board have not on any recent occasion held an inquiry into an outbreak of small-pox.

ST. SEPULCHRE. HOLBORN;BELLTOLLING AFTER EXECUTIONS.

MR. H. C. RICHARDS (Finsbury, E.): I beg to ask the Parliamentary Charity Commissioner if the attention of the Charity Commissioners has been directed to the new rules of the Home Office with regard to the tolling of the bell of the parish church for fifteen minutes after each execution; and if the Commissioners will restore to the parish of St. Sepulchre, Holborn, the income of the

benefaction bequeathed for such purpose, and which has been withheld or diverted from the I parish by the Commissioners for some years past.

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

With reference to the question in the first paragraph, the Commissioners have no knowledge of the new regulation mentioned in the question beyond what has appeared in the newspapers. The benefaction in question was a gift by Robert Dowe, in the year 1705, to the end that the vicar and churchwardens of St. Sepulchre, London, should for ever, previous to every execution at Newgate, cause a bell to be tolled, and certain words to be delivered to the prisoners ordered for execution. Under the provisions of the City of London Parochial Charities Act, 1883, the sum representing Dowe's gift, which amounts to £;1 6s. 8d. a year, was scheduled as an ecclesiastical charity, and freed from all previously existing trusts, and by a scheme established under this Act it became part of the City Church Fund, the balance of which, after providing for various City church purposes, is paid to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. An amendment to that scheme could only be made on the initiation of the trustees of the London Parochial Charities.

ST. CROSS (WINCHESTER) CHARITY SCHEME.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): I beg to ask the hon. Member for the Tunbridge Division, as representing the Charity Commissioners, whether in the new scheme for St. Cross there is a provision giving to the town council of Winchester the nomination of one of the trustees; whether there is a restriction in the choice of the person nominated that he must be a member of the Church of England; whether in recent years there is any precedent for making the election of a representative trustee appointed by a town council on another public body subject to such restriction; and whether he will lay upon the Table of the House the correspondence on the subject, and any protests made against the new scheme.

MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN: There is in the recently established scheme for St. Cross a provision giving to the town council of Winchester the nomination of one of the trustees. But the scheme in question is not a new scheme in the sense that it reorganises the charity. It is in the main a scheme consolidating the provisions of previous orders of the Court of Chancery and of the Charity Commissioners. There is such a restriction in the scheme as that mentioned in the second part of the hon. Member's question. The restriction is in accordance with the provision made by the Court of Chancery in 1857, that the mayor of Winchester should be a trustee if a member of the Church of England. In answer to the third part of the question, there are many recent precedents for requiring in schemes that representative trustees of Church of England trusts shall be members of that Church. I shall be glad to lay the correspondence on the Table if the hon. Member desires it.

IRISH SCHOOL TEACHERS' PENSIONS.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Irish national teachers in the service on the 31st March, 1900. and who will be graded according to the new system higher than their present classes, receive the pension of the class or grade to which they will be promoted by paying an increased premium, in the same way that teachers appointed

after the 31st March, 1900, and who will be similarly graded, will get pension rights.

MR. THOMAS O'DOXNELL (Kerry, W.): At the same time may I ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether teachers in Irish national schools will in future get pensions according to their new grades or according to the classification which has been abolished; and, if the latter, can he state what arrangements have been made for promoting deserving teacher's to a higher class on the list of prospective pensions.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): At present teachers pay for the pensions of the classes which they have obtained by examination. Under the new scheme they will rise from grade to grade, as distinguished from classes, by seniority and efficient service. The commissioners have resolved that teachers in the service prior to the 1st April, 1900, are to retain their classifications. How far this decision will affect the pension rules and the pension fund I am not at present prepared to say. The matter is one requiring careful consideration.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: Will the teacher who was formerly classed as first class, but who may now be in the second class, get the first or second class pension?

MR. WYNDHAM: I have communicated with the Board of Education on this matter, and have given the hon. Member their decision, so far as it has been arrived at. I have also explained that the way in which that decision will affect the pension scheme will have to be carefully considered.

SCHOOL ATTENDANCE IN IRELAND.

MR. THOMAS O'DOXNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the decreasing population of Ireland, and the subdivision of labour required under the new programme in national schools, he will urge upon the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland the necessity of reducing the average attendance required for the first assistant from sixty to fifty.

MR. WYNDHAM: The answer to this question is in the negative.

EVICITION AT NEWTOWN-CUNNINGHAM.

MR. M'FADDEX (Donegal, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been drawn to the eviction of a tenant named Allison, in the petty sessions district of Newtown cunning ham, county Donegal, when the sheriffs' officer had to remove the tenant from a sick bed; whether a doctor's certificate that it was dangerous to remove the tenant was produced; is he aware that the tenant, at the hearing of proceedings at the Newtowncunningham Petty Sessions, stated that he had paid in rent to the landlord over £2,000 down to the value of the fee simple of the farm; and whether the forces of the Crown will in future be sent to assist the sheriffs in Ireland in carrying out such evictions.

MR. WYNDHAM: The eviction of Allison was carried out on the 6th instant in pursuance of a magistrate's warrant for possession. At the hearing of the case a statement was made on behalf of the tenant to the effect mentioned in the third paragraph; the statement, however, was not proved. After eviction, a sum of £50 was offered to Allison by the agent, but was rejected. I am informed that

Allison was carried out of the house in his bed. No medical certificate, however, was produced such as is alleged, nor was a doctor present. Upon the information before me, it appears that the man was in his usual health before, during,

and after the eviction. In reply to the last paragraph, it is the imperative duty of the Crown to afford protection to sheriffs or their officers in the execution of writs or decrees issued by a competent Court.

MR. M'FADDEN: Was the evicting landlord in this case one of the Government candidates at the last General Election?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

HORSE BREEDING IN IRELAND.

MR. DALY (Monaghan, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can say why it is that the Royal Dublin Society, in awarding premiums for stallions on the register of the Agricultural and Technical Department, give twenty-five prizes of £;100 for thoroughbred stallions, while agricultural stallions get only three premiums of £;50 each; whether he will request the Royal Dublin Society to give a larger number of premiums in the case of agricultural stallions, considering that Ireland is an agricultural country.

MR. WYNDHAM: The twenty-five premiums of £;100 each offered at the recent Stallion Show at Balls Bridge will be paid out of the fund payable annually to the Royal Dublin Society under the Probate Duties Act of 1888. They absorb one-half of the fund; the other half is allotted to bull premiums. The three premiums of £;50 each for Agricultural Stallions are not paid out of public money; they will be paid out of the private funds of the Royal Dublin Society.

MR. DALY: But cannot the number be increased, seeing that Ireland is so suitable a country for horse-breeding?

MR. WYNDHAM.: That question raises the policy of the Agricultural Department, which I am not prepared to discuss now. As the hon. Member is aware, horse-breeding is a very important business in Ireland.

MR. DALY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, under the new horse-breeding scheme in connection with the Department of Agriculture, no sire has been allotted to County Monaghan, while two sires are given to County Cavan; and if he will direct that one sire at least be placed at the disposal of the farmers of County Monaghan.

MR. WYNDHAM: This question refers, I am informed, not to the horse-breeding scheme of the Department of Agriculture, but to that of the Royal Dublin Society. I understand that only one stallion was entered from the County Monaghan, but that it was withdrawn by the exhibitor. One stallion is allotted to County Cavan, which will be available for Monaghan, as will also a stallion at Oldcastle, in Meath.

MR. DALY: Cannot you give us a stallion for County Monaghan? You place two in County Cavan?

MR. WYNDHAM: That rests with the Royal Dublin Society.

HAND AND EYE TRAINING IN IRISH SCHOOLS.

MR. WILLIAM MOORE (Antrim, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord

Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that classes have been formed to instruct teachers in the new system of hand and eye training at Ballymena and at Coleraine; that most of the teachers in the Ballymoney district are by reason of the rule as to distance ineligible for either of these classes; and can he state what provision will be made for the Ballymoney and Ballycastle teachers by the Commissioners of National Education for instructing them in this subject, and will equal facilities be afforded to those now given by the Commissioners in Coleraine and Ballymena.

MR. WYNDHAM: A class for the instruction of teachers in hand and eye training is in operation at Coleraine, and a similar class is in course of formation at Ballymena. These places have been selected because each is favourable for the attendance of a large number of teachers. The claims of Ballymoney and Ballycastle will be considered as soon as possible, and classes will be formed when teachers can be assembled in sufficient numbers.

LAND PURCHASE IN IRELAND; SECURITY FOR ADVANCES.

MR. WILLIAM MOORE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, having regard to the pledges of certain Ulster Members, he will consider the propriety of recommending in the proper quarters the appointment of a Commission to inquire into the question of the financial security for advances to be made from Imperial sources for the purposes of land purchase in Ireland over and beyond the balance of the £;33,000,000 secured by the Guarantee Fund (Probate Duty grant, local taxation and grants, etc) under Section 5 of the Purchase Act, 1891, and to report on the means by which such advances may be best secured.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): Can the right hon. Gentleman say who are the Members referred to in the question and what was the nature of the pledges said to have been given by them?

MR. WYNDHAM: No, Sir; I have no information which will enable me to answer the supplementary question. The matter referred to in the question is now under consideration by the Government. I am not at present in a position to make any statement on the subject.

INTEREST ON ACCUMULATED EXCHEQUER CONTRIBUTIONS.

MR. CLANCY (Dublin County, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state what becomes of the interest payable on the sum of £;200,000, the amount of the accumulated Exchequer contributions which are levelled up to meet possible deficiencies in the payment of instalments of purchase money under the Land Purchase Act of 1891; and if the interest is not paid, together with the annual contribution of £;40,000, to the local authorities for the purpose of building labourers' cottages, can he explain why not.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: It is presumed that the hon. Member refers to the Reserve Fund created under Section 5 (2) (b) of the Act. On this understanding, the answer to his question is that, pursuant to Section 15 (7) of the Act, the interest on the investments representing the Reserve Fund is accumulated, reinvested, and added to the Fund. The investments on account of the Fund now amount to £;241,000 Consols.

LAND PURCHASE AND LABOURERS' COTTAGES.

COLONEL M'CALMONT (Antrim, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state how many farms have been sold in Ireland under the Land Commission since the Act of 1890 became law; also how many labourers' houses have been erected or improved in connection with such farms in pursuance of the order of the Land Commission under Section 26.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Act of 1891 is presumably intended to be referred to. Between the passing of that Act and the 31st ultimo, advances have been made in 27,924 cases to enable tenants to purchase their holdings under the Acts of 1891 and 1896. The number of Orders made under the 26th Section of the Act of 1891 has been three.

LABOURERS' COTTAGES AT LETTERKENNY.

MR. O'DOHERTY (Cork County, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in the month of May, 1899, representations were forwarded to the Letterkenny District Council on behalf of fifteen labourers residing in that district; that the district council decided not to formulate a scheme, and that an appeal from that decision, as provided by Section 4 of the 1891 Act, was forwarded to the Local Government Board; that nothing was done in the matter by the said Board; that subsequently other representations were forwarded to said district council, and acted upon by them; that at an inquiry held with reference to the latter representations, evidence was produced before Mr. Kelly, Local Government inspector, to the effect that the district council had shelved the representations lodged with them in May, 1899; that Mr. Kelly stated that the scheme then before him was inadequate; and that he

reported accordingly to the Local Government Board; and whether the Local Government Board will order an inquiry by their inspector into the representations lodged in May, 1899, and order the district council to promulgate a scheme which will include cottages for those labourers whose representations are so long pending.

MR. WYNDHAM: The facts are generally as stated. It appears that the district council received representations for the erection of twenty-four labourers' cottages, but they decided to make a scheme for eleven only, as that was the number of applicants' dwellings which the medical officer of health actually condemned as unfit for human habitation. The scheme so made is being confirmed by Provisional Order, and it appears from recent minutes of the district council that they are considering further representations with the view of making a supplemental scheme. The effect of an inquiry such as that asked for would be to coerce the council to act on particular applications, but as that body seems to be exercising a reasonable discretion in the matter, the Board do not think there is any cause for interference on their part.

MR. O'DOHERTY: What was the reason for the rejection of the scheme?

MR. WYNDHAM: The district council put forward a scheme affecting a number of houses which had been condemned by the medical officer. They are now considering a further scheme, and under those circumstances I see no reason for interference on the part of the Local Government Board.

RENT FIXTURES.

COLONEL M'CALMONT: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland will he state what is the number of cases in which rents have been fixed by the Land Commission or by agreement in Ireland; and how many cases in which orders have been made under Section 19, Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1881, directing cottages to be built or improved; in how many of these cases have the orders been complied with; and in how many cases have the penalties for non-compliance with orders been enforced.

MR. WYNDHAM: The number of fair rents fixed by the Land Commission has been, for a first statutory term, 174,849; for a second term, 34,367. The number fixed by agreements and declarations lodged with the Commission has been, for a first statutory term, 132,051; for a second term, 27,777. Fair rents have also been fixed in the civil bill courts for a first statutory term in 18,477 cases, and for a second term in 2,492 cases; and by agreements in the same courts, for a first term in 7,329, and for a second term in 146 cases. The number of orders made by the Land Commission under the enactment referred to in the second paragraph is 853. I am unable to say, without further inquiry, in how many cases these orders have been complied with. The duty of enforcing compliance with the order devolves primarily upon the sanitary authority, and it is only in cases where complaint is made to the Local Government Board by householders in the district that the Board act in lieu of the sanitary authority. Only one such case has so far occurred, and in that the Board took proceedings and enforced the penalty.

MR. FLAVIN: How many future tenancies have been created?

MR. WYNDHAM: I will give the hon Member the information privately if he will allow me.

MR. FLAVIN: I will put a question down.

IRISH LAND PURCHASE.

MR. FFRENCH (Wexford, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, having regard to the fact that the Land Judge as seller of an estate under the 40th section of the Land Act of 1896 frequently asks a higher price than that fixed by the Land Commission, and that the possession of such power by the Land Judge prevents sales to the tenants and deprives them of the benefits of the 40th section, whether the Government intend to amend the law so that the Land Judge cannot ask a higher price than that fixed by Land Commission.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): The answer to this question is in the negative.

MR. FFRENCH: Would it not greatly facilitate the sale of estates if the Land Judge had power to increase the loan or no power to increase the price?

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: Is it not the practice of the Land Judges in these cases to demand payment of arrears?

MR. ATKINSON: I must ask for notice.

MR. FFRENCH: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether the Land Judge must give the first chance of purchasing their holdings to the tenants when there is an absolute order for the sale of an estate under the 40th section of the Land Act of 1896; and whether, seeing that owing to insufficient notice

the tenants are often not in court when the 40th section is applied, steps will be taken to have notice served directly on the parties interested.

MR. ATKINSON: The tenants must, and as a matter of fact always do, get an opportunity of exercising the right of preemption. The rules and orders provide that the tenants must get notice of the day fixed for the consideration by the Land Judge of the report of the Land Commission. No alteration in the procedure is necessary. If the tenants do not attend the fault is their own.

MR. FFRENCH: Is any notice given except in the law lists in the daily paper, and can anyone who is not a lawyer understand them?

MR. ATKINSON: I think anyone who can read can understand the law lists. I understand, however, that the tenants have a special notice.

EXPENDITURE ON THE INSANE IN IRELAND.

MR. CLANCY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the increase in the numbers admitted to lunatic asylums in Ireland and in the consequent expenditure, for buildings and maintenance, in those institutions; whether he has come to any conclusions as regards the suggestions made to him by the deputation of medical men which recently waited upon him in reference to that subject; and if he has considered the question whether the cost of the maintenance and treatment of the maintenance and treatment of the insane ought to be made a State charge.

MR. WYNDHAM: The answer to the first paragraph is in the affirmative. The object of the deputation referred to in the second paragraph was the establishment of a central pathological laboratory. In reply to the last paragraph, I would prefer to wait for the Report of the Royal Commission on Local Taxation before expressing a final opinion on the subject.

GOVERNMENT GRANT TO IRISH LUNACY AUTHORITIES.

SIR JAMES HASLETT (Belfast, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state when the portion of capitation grant for lunatic asylums not paid by Government in 1899 will be paid over to the local authorities: and what is the reason for withholding it so long.

MR. WYNDHAM: The position in reference to the payment of the grant in aid of the maintenance of pauper lunatics for the period mentioned has repeatedly been explained, both in answer to questions in this House and in communications addressed by Government to the local authorities. It is erroneous to assume that these authorities have been deprived of any portion of the grant by reason of the change in the year of account. It is true that the expenditure during the quarter ended 31st March, 1899, does not form an element in the calculation of the grant for 1900–1, but in lieu of it the somewhat greater expenditure for the corresponding quarter of 1900 has been taken, and the local authorities have thus received for this year, as heretofore, a full year's grant.

An HON. MEMEBER: Is it not the case that the grant is sometimes kept back three months? Will the right hon. Gentleman inquire into an instance of that laid before him?

MR. WYNDHAM: I have inquired into it very fully. It is a very complicated matter.

DEPORTATION OF PAUPERS TO IRELAND.

MR. GILHOOLY: On behalf of the hon. Member for North Tipperary, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the deportation of a woman named M'Cabe from Glasgow to Nenagh (Ireland); whether he is aware that it appears from the depositions of Mrs. M'Cabe, that she left Ireland when eight years old and went to England where she resided fifty-two years, then went to Scotland when, after a residence of four weeks in a workhouse in Glasgow, she was sent to Nenagh; and whether the authorities connected with the Glasgow Workhouse are empowered to take such action; and, if so, whether he will cause the law to be amended to prevent a repetition of similar action.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am informed that the facts are correctly stated in the question. The Local Government Board for Scotland have informed the Guardians that the Parish Council of Glasgow were acting within their legal rights in removing this poor person, and that she did not reside in Glasgow sufficiently long to confer upon the Irish Board of Guardians a right of appeal against her removal. The case is doubtless one of hardship, but I am afraid I can hold out no hope of an amendment of the law, as suggested.

MR. DALY: Why was this woman, who lived fifty-two years in England, not sent there instead of to Ireland?

MR. WYNDHAM: I understand the law is that a person who has resided for five or six years in a place has to be maintained there, but if the term of residence is shorter, then the birth-place is the place of settlement. Hence this poor woman was not sent to England.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether, in view of the extreme hardships of cases like these, he will consider the advisability of altering the law, so that a person who has lived fifty-two years in England shall not become a burden on the Irish ratepayers?

[The answer was inaudible.]

SOLICITORS AS MAGISTRATES.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether solicitors

who become magistrates by election as chairman of public bodies in Ireland under the Local Government Act are disqualified by becoming magistrates from practising their profession; and if so, whether the Government will take steps to remove such disqualifications.

MR. WYNDHAM: Solicitors who become justices of the peace by virtue of being elected to the post of chairman of a county or district council are not thereby disqualified from practising their profession. But it would obviously be most improper for them to practise as solicitors in the petty sessions courts in which they are in the habit of sitting, or are entitled to sit as justices.

TYPHUS FEVER IN THE ARRAN ISLANDS.

MR. DUFFY (Galway, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that typhus fever has broken out in one of the Arran Islands, Galway; that no steps were taken by the medical inspector to prevent this outbreak; and that the unsanitary condition of the burial grounds

was brought under the notice of the late Chief Secretary by questions asked in the House on, 6th July and 2nd August, 1900; whether the medical inspector has visited the island since complaint was made in July; whether he is aware that one death from typhus has already occurred; and whether he will inquire if the person placed in charge of the patients is a man duly fitted to discharge the duties entrusted to him.

MR. WYNDHAM: There are four cases of typhus under treatment in the Arran Islands. One other case has proved fatal. The condition of the graveyard has been repeatedly brought under the notice of the local, council, and questions were addressed to my predecessor on the subject. The duty of taking steps to prevent outbreaks of fever devolves upon the local authority, and not upon the medical inspector of the Local Government Board. That gentleman visited the islands last week. The medical officer of health considers the person referred to in the last paragraph competent to discharge his duties. The medical inspector proposes to visit the islands again to-day, and he will consult with the medical officer as to further steps, if any, that may be required.

*MR. DUFFY: Is it a fact that the Local Government Board inspector never visited this island from July last until this question appeared on the Paper a day or two since?

MR. WYNDHAM: My reply shows that the duty of taking the necessary preventive measures rests in these cases with the local authorities.

CONGESTED DISTRICTS IN COUNTY MAYO ;MARQUESS OF SLIGO'S ESTATES.

DR. AMBROSE (Mayo, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to a resolution of the Westport Rural District Council urging upon the Congested Districts Board for Ireland the great importance of the purchase by the board of the Louisburgh and Aughagower estates of the Marquess of Sligo; and would he, as President of the Board, use his influence in bringing about the speedy purchase of those estates, and thereby contribute to putting a stop to the tide of emigration from those districts.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN (Cork): At the same time I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, seeing that the Congested Districts Board many months ago entered into negotiations for the purchase of the estates of the Marquess of Sligo, in the parishes of Louisburgh and Aughagower, he can say what is the cause of the delay in completing the purchase.

MR. WYNDHAM: Owing to the purchase by the Congested Districts Board of so large an estate as that of Lord Dillon, the limit of advances of guaranteed land stock fixed by the Land Law Act, 1896, has been reached in the case of the County Mayo, and until a considerable portion of that estate has been resold to the tenants the Board will not be able to resume negotiations for the purchase of other estates. There ought to be no long delay.

MR. DILLON: Can the right hon. Gentleman not see his way to remove the difficulty?

MR. WYNDHAM: I should prefer not now to discuss a question of policy or legislation.

FEES UNDER THE LABOURERS (IRELAND) ACTS.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether solicitors in Ireland, who appear to oppose representations at inquiries held under the Labourers Acts, are entitled to fees to be paid, on the order of the Local Government Board, by the rural district council, whether the opposition is successful or not; and if so, to what fee are such solicitors entitled.

MR. ATKINSON: The Local Government Board have, in the exercise of the powers conferred upon them by the seventh section of the Labourers Act of 1883, made an Order fixing the costs and expenses which may be allowed to owners of land proposed to be taken opposing a scheme. These costs include, of course, the solicitor's fee, and are payable by the rural district council. The practice is to allow costs only when the opposition is successful, in which case the solicitor's fee is fixed at 10s. 6d.

ROYAL UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Government is prepared to adopt the resolution recently passed by the Senate of the Royal University of Ireland, and to issue a Royal Commission to inquire into the working of the Royal University, and to report as to the means by which University Education in Ireland may receive a greater extension and be more efficiently conducted than it is at present.

MR. WYNDHAM: The resolution to which reference is made has not yet been officially received. I understand my noble friend will be approached in a day or two on the subject, and I should not

like to anticipate his reply to the request of the Senate.

IRISH POOR LAW OFFICERS' ASSISTANTS.

MR. M'FADDEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to a sealed order, dated 4th February last, addressed by the Local Government Board of Ireland to the boards of guardians in Ireland, making it mandatory for them to appoint assistants to the several poor law officers set forth in said order in all cases in which the Local Government Board consider such appointments necessary; and whether it is intended by such order to further increase the number of officials in Ireland without first consulting the elected representatives of the ratepayers as to the necessity for such increase.

MR. WYNDHAM: The reply to the first paragraph is in the affirmative. The occasion for the making of the Order was a default in some cases by guardians to appoint nurses when their own medical officers were of opinion that such nurses were absolutely necessary for the proper care of the sick poor. The Order does not confer any new power on the Local Government Board, but was made in pursuance of Section 31 of the Poor Relief Act, 1838.

MR. M'FADDEN: Then am I to understand that the Order is not final?

MR. WYNDHAM: Any representation that may be made by local authorities against the Order will, of course, be carefully considered by the Board.

IRISH RURAL DISTRICT COUNCILLORS AND CONTRACTS.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether any decision of the High Court in Ireland has yet

been obtained as to the effect which an interest in a contract of tenancy by a person otherwise qualified has on the right of such person to act as a member of a rural district council with which he has such contract.

MR. WYNDHAM: In the case which the Local Government brought to test this question, in pursuance of their undertaking, the King's Bench Division have, in a judgment which I have not as yet seen, overruled the decision of the justices, and held that the occupant of the labourers' cottage was not disqualified.

LETTERKENNY TOWN COURT.

MR. M'FADDEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in the town of Letterkenny there has been established and is held a town court, under the Towns Improvement (Ireland) Act, 1854, for the hearing and determining of offences against said Act, and offences against Section 12 of the Licensing Act of 1872, committed within the boundary of said town; will he explain why the constabulary authorities have refused to prosecute before said town court for offences committed within the town boundary in cases where the offenders reside outside the township, particularly in cases coming within the 12th section of the Licensing Act of 1872, although the urban council of Letterkenny and magistrates of the district petitioned the authorities to have all such offences committed within the town boundary prosecuted before the said town court, which petition has been refused; whether he is aware that by this action of the constabulary the urban council of Letterkenny are deprived of a considerable source of revenue owing to such prosecutions being conducted at petty sessions in the name of the constabulary as complainants; and whether His Majesty's Government will cause directions to be issued to the constabulary authorities that such offences be prosecuted in the several town courts in Ireland, so that the fines resulting there from may be available for the reduction of the heavy taxation with which all urban districts have to contend.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am aware of the fact mentioned in the first paragraph. The rule is that in cases where the offender lives outside the town, or his address is unknown, the police prosecute in their own name before the justices in petty sessions, and not in the town court, one half of the penalties in such cases being paid to the town commissioners. All other cases are prosecuted in the town court in the name of the commissioners, who receive, in these cases, the whole of the penalties. The rule has operated generally throughout Ireland for many years, and I am advised it should not be altered.

PRESS PROSECUTIONS IN IRELAND.

MR. DUFFY: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether he is aware that Mr. John M'Philpin, editor and proprietor of the Tuam News, Tuam, county Gal way, has been summoned by the Crown to give evidence in respect to resolutions and newspaper reports published in his paper, and alleged to have been furnished to him by persons awaiting their trial at Athenry on 14th March next; and whether, in view of the announcement made recently in respect to similar summonses issued in the city of Waterford, he will direct the immediate

withdrawal of the summons against this newspaper editor.

MR. ATKINSON: I have called for a report from the Crown Solicitor in reference to the matter referred to, and would ask the hon. Member to postpone his question until Monday. The case has been adjourned until the 8th of March, so there is ample time to make inquiry.

MR. DUFFY: Is it not the fact that within the past week an explicit statement was made in reference to a similar case at Waterford, and will like treatment be meted out to Mr. M'Philpin?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order. order!

IRISH KELP INDUSTRY.

MR. O'MALLEY (Galway, Connemara): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the importance of the kelp industry to the people along the coasts of the congested districts of Connemara, and in view of the conditions under which that industry has been and continues to be carried on, he will take steps to urge on the Congested Districts Board the advisability of establishing a depot in some central locality, where the industry could be carried on on a more scientific basis, to the advantage of the people engaged in it.

MR. WYNDHAM: Owing to the possibility of the importation of iodine from South America being at any time largely increased, the market for kelp, in the opinion of the Board, is an uncertain and, to some extent, an artificial one which should not be disturbed by any precipitate action of the kind suggested. The Board are, however, making inquiry as to the possibility of teaching better methods of preparing kelp.

MAYDEW GRAVEYARD.

MR. J. P. FARBELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state on what date the order of the Local Government Board closing Maydew graveyard takes effect; whether it is within the Board's knowledge that no arrangements have been made to provide any further burial accommodation there: and whether, under these circumstances, the Board will suspend the enforcing of the order until some arrangement to provide for future interments can be made.

MR. WYNDHAM: The order closing this burial ground will take effect from the 1st April next. The Local Government Board are not aware whether the rural district council have taken steps to provide future burial accommodation. If, however, the council make an effort in this direction, the Board, on the application of the council, will be prepared to extend the time for closing the graveyard, should such a step be necessary to enable the council to complete their arrangements.

POSTPONEMENT OF FAIR RENT APPLICATIONS.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the practice of the Land Commission of postponing indefinitely the hearing of fair rent applications in cases where negotiations for sale are pending: and whether he will take steps to secure a more speedy hearing of such cases in future.

MR. WYNDHAM: Perhaps the hon. Member will repeat this question on Monday next,

as communication is necessary with the Commissioners, some of whom are out of Dublin.

HANGING GALES.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware of the fact that what is commonly known in Ireland as a hanging gale, comprising a half-year's rent, is claimed by the landlords as being due to them out of all agricultural holdings; but demanded only when the tenants are entering court to have fair rents fixed; and whether, in any future legislation affecting the relations of landlord and tenant in Ireland, the advisability of having this hanging gale abolished will be considered.

MR. WYNDHAM: A hanging gale is a debt due to the landlord by the tenant which the latter gets six months or more to pay after it has become due. This indulgence is given to tenants on many estates in Ireland, but I have no means of ascertaining whether it is demanded when the tenant enters the courts as suggested. I am unable to promise any legislation to deprive a creditor of his debt because he has given time in this way to the debtor.

MR. FLAVIN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that in many cases the landlord issues the writs within fourteen days of the current gale becoming due?

[No answer was returned.]

THE RECENT "DAY OF GENERAL MOURNING"; POLICE AND WICK-LOW SHOPKEEPERS.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the police ordered the publicans of Roundwood and Lara, county Wicklow, to keep their shops closed on Saturday, 2nd February, and whether they acted on their own initiative, or upon instructions received from a superior officer, and under what statute are the Irish constabulary entitled to order the closing of public-houses on an ordinary weekday.

MR. WYNDHAM: The fact, I understand, is as stated in the first part of the question. The police acted on the instructions of the district inspector, who was of opinion, erroneously, that the public-houses should be closed as on a day of public fast under the 35 and 36 Vict. cap. 94, Section 78.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: Will the attention of the Inspector General of the Irish Constabulary be drawn to this case?

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes, his attention has been drawn to the error.

EVICCTIONS IN ULSTER.

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.) : I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the fact that during the quarter ending 31st December, 1900, the number of eviction notices filed in the county courts of Ulster was 46 per cent, of the number of all Ireland, he will consider the expediency of repealing Section 7 of the Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1887.

MR. WYNDHAM: The number of eviction notices filed in the county courts in Ulster in the last December quarter was 145, out of a total of 310 throughout Ireland, or a percentage on the latter of 46. I cannot hold out any hope of legislation in the direction suggested.

MR. O'MARA: Is this percentage so large because of the sympathy that exists between the Government and the Ulster Members?

[No answer was given.]

ALLOTMENTS ACT; EXTENSION TO IRELAND.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will introduce a Bill to extend the Allotments Act to Ireland this session.

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

IRISH PROSECUTIONS UNDER THE FACTORY ACTS ; KEADY LINEN COMPANY.

MR. DONAL SULLIVAN (Westmeath, S.): On behalf of the hon. Member for North Louth, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that when complaint was made to the factory inspector, Belfast, that children in the Ready Linen Company were fined for not coming to work on a factory holiday (15th August), the inspector returned the fine, and did not prosecute the company; and that when the father of the children wrote to the Home Office for an explanation, he was referred by letter of 18th February to the inspector complained of; and can he state the number of prosecutions under the Factory Acts for the last two years in county Armagh and county Donegal respectively.

*MR. RITCHIE: I have made inquiry and find that the facts are as stated in the first paragraph of the question. The inspector seems to have taken much trouble to see that the fines wrongly imposed on the two children by their employers were returned. It was a matter for his discretion whether or not to report the case for prosecution. The number of prosecutions during the last two years has been as follows; In Armagh eighteen firms were prosecuted for a total of eighty-four offences, and in Donegal seven firms were prosecuted for sixteen offences.

DUBLIN POSTAL TELEGRAPHIC STAFF; STAGNATION OF PROMOTION.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether the Postmaster General is aware that in the telegraph branch of the post office, Dublin, of a staff of 212 sorting clerks and telegraphists employed, there are over forty at present at the maximum of their scale of pay; whether, having regard to the slowness in promotion in the telegraph branch of the post office as compared with the sorting branch, any steps are being taken in the revision of the Dublin establishment, at present under consideration, to remedy this state of affairs; whether it is being taken into account in this revision that the four London and Dublin news wire repeaters, which should be manned by officers of the rank of clerk, have been staffed by sorting clerks and telegraphists almost continuously for the past five years; and also whether it is contemplated to allocate clerkships for the Intelligence, Examining, Circulation, and Correspondence sections, as has been done in Liverpool and other large centres.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: A revision of the telegraph staff of the Dublin Post Office is now under consideration. It will include such additional provision, if any, as may be found necessary for the duties referred to by the hon. Member. The number of superior appointments, however, must of course be strictly

regulated by the requirements of the service, and no increase in them could be sanctioned merely in order to afford promotion to telegraphists who are at the maximum of their scale.

ENNISKILLEN POST OFFICE.

MR. JORDAN (Fermanagh, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he is aware that though under the terms of Mr. Raikes's scheme of revision, announced in 1890, the commencing wages of sorting clerks and telegraphists were; first year 12s. per week, second year 11s. per week, and third year 18s. per week, this scale was refused to the staff at Enniskillen, and instead, one of 12s. per week, rising by annual increments of 2s. per week, insisted on; that this matter was submitted to the surveyor, who replied that Mr. Raikes's scheme did not apply to that office, and is he aware that the form used by the postmaster of Enniskillen when recommending the starting pay had the initial scales of pay given by Mr. Raikes printed on the margin; and whether inquiry can be made with a view to restitution to those sorting clerks and telegraphists on the establishment at Enniskillen, appointed subsequent to July, 1890, and prior to February, 1896, who have been affected.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: There appears to be some misapprehension in this case.

The scale of pay for sorting clerks and telegraphists on appointment at Enniskillen, sanctioned by the Treasury in 1890, was the same as at all other offices of a similar class; namely, 12s. the first year. 14s. the second year, and 18s. the third year, and then rising by 2s. per week annually to the maximum. It appears, however, that two officers, who are probably those referred to, did not enter the scale at 12s.

per week, but, in pursuance of further authority obtained in 1891, granting a concession to officers who had rendered unestablished service of not less than a year and had attained certain qualifications, were allowed to enter the scale at 14s. a week; and in their case the pay was, as laid down in the authority, 16s. a week for the second year, and 18s. a week for the third year; so that instead of receiving 12s. a week for the first year, 14s. a week for the second year, and 18s. a week for the third year, they received 14s. a week for the first year, 16s. a week for the second year, and 18s. a week for the third year.

Another officer, appointed in 1892, with longer unestablished service, was, in accordance with the same authority, allowed to enter the scale at 10s. a week, receiving 18s. a week for the second year, then rising by 2s. per week annually.

SUNDAY DELIVERY AT COOLARTY (CO. LONGFORD).

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that three complaints and a petition, signed by the residents of thirteen townlands, were sent to the Dublin office of the Department, asking for a Sunday delivery of letters at Coolarty, county Longford, and a wall box to be put at Springpark gate; and will the prayer of the petition be now attended to.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The complaints and petitions referred to by the hon. Member, which it now appears were, addressed to the Dublin Post Office, have not yet reached the Postmaster General; but in consequence of the hon. Member's previous question of the 18th instant, instructions were at once sent to the

Dublin Post Office to make inquiry as to the practicability of affording a Sunday delivery of letters at Coolarty, county Longford, and erecting a letter box at Springpark. A Report shall be obtained as soon as possible and the result made known to the hon. Member.

LIGHTS ON THE IRISH COAST; MIZEN HEAD.

MR. GILHOOLY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether repeated representations have been made by the shipowners and the nautical community generally, as well as the Harbour Commissioners of Cork, as to the necessity for the erection of a lighthouse and fog signal on or near Mizen Head; and whether, seeing that a number of casualties have occurred there within recent years, he will take steps to compel the Irish Lights Commissioners to remedy this defect.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The question of the erection of a lighthouse and fog signal on or near Mizen Head was discussed at a conference which was held last month at the offices of the Board of Trade, and at which representatives of the General Lighthouse Authorities and of a committee of shipowners and others interested in shipping attended. The latter were asked to state their views on the subject in writing, and these will be considered by the Commissioners of Irish Lights. I may add that the Board of Trade have no power to compel a General Lighthouse Authority to undertake any work.

BULL ROCK AND MEW ISLAND FOG SIGNALS.

MR. GILHOOLY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether it has been decided to replace the fifteen-minute fog guns on the Bull Rock by an automatic fog signal, and whether it has been decided to fit a siren there; whether he is aware that a siren has been found by experience to be a less efficient and more costly form of fog signal than a reed horn such as is in use by the Belfast Harbour Commissioners; and whether he will ascertain and inform the House of the cost of the fog-signal machinery at Mew Island, and also at Belfast Loch No. 1.

*MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The Board of Trade sanctioned in 1897, and a tender has been accepted for, the erection of a siren on Bull Rock. On the general question as to the relative efficiency and cost of sirens and reed horns I am not prepared to express an opinion, but I may mention that the Trinity House propose to make some experiments on the subject in the course of the present year. The fog siren at Mew Island has, I understand, cost about £3,400, but I have no information as to the cost of the fog-signal machinery at Belfast Lough, which was not provided by the General Lighthouse Authority.

LUCIFER SHOAL RED LIGHT.

MR. GILHOOLY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether representations have been received from the nautical community as to the character of Lucifer Shoal fixed red light; and whether, seeing that representations have been made that this is liable to be mistaken for the port side light of a sailing ship, the Irish Lights Board will take steps to remove this danger.

*MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Such representations have been made, and I am informed that

the Commissioners of Irish Lights are considering the question of improving the character of the light at the Lucifer Shoal.

INISTRAHUL FOG SIGNAL.

MR. GILHOOLY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether representations as to the necessity for a fog signal at Inistrahul have reached the Irish Lights Board; and, if so, can he explain why no notice has been taken of them.

*MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I understand that the question of providing a fog signal at Inistrahul has been considered by the Commissioners of the Irish Lights, but that they are of opinion that it would be a most unsuitable place for that purpose.

RATHLIN ISLAND LIGHT AND SIGNAL.

MR. GILHOOLY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether representations have been received from the shipping community that a light and fog signal should be erected on the west side of Rathlin Island, and whether he will take steps to compel the Irish Lights Board to remedy the defect; and whether, seeing that other works are being undertaken during the coming financial year, the Board of Trade will exercise their veto upon such an expenditure pending the carrying out of the above-mentioned works.

*MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Yes, sir, representations have reached me in regard to Rathlin Island. I understand, however, that the Commissioners of Irish Lights consider that the present lighthouse is in the best position for both outward and homeward bound ships, and that they do not consider it necessary to have an additional light on the western end of the island.

PROTECTION OF TOWN TENANTS' IMPROVEMENTS.

MR. NANNETT: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he has received a copy of a resolution passed at a meeting of the guardians of the South Dublin Union, requesting the Government to take urgent steps to have a Bill passed through Parliament for the protection of town tenants, whereby the occupier would in case of disturbance or expiration of lease be entitled to compensation for his own improvements: and whether he will be able to see his way to give effect to the desire expressed in this resolution.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The resolution referred to in the first paragraph of the question has been received. I am not able to hold out any hope of legislation as suggested in the second.

MR. FLYNN: Can the right hon. Gentleman give Irish Members any assistance in passing a Bill?

[No answer was returned.]

ILLEGAL PRACTICES IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

MR. CHARLES MARTIN (Liverpool, Exchange): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether his attention has been directed to the continued resort by a section of the clergy of the Established Church to practices not prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer or ordered by lawful authority, such as masses, celebration of Holy Communion without the requisite number of communicants, children's Eucharists, ceremonial use of incense, and the inculcation of habitual confession; whether he is aware that the bishops continue to veto legal

proceedings intended to check such irregularities; whether the laity in large numbers are thus deprived of their constitutional right to the ministrations of religion in their parish churches in accordance with the rites of the Church of England, and that disturbances in Divine worship have been occasioned in connection with these irregularities; and whether he will consider the desirability of carrying into effect the Resolution of the House of Commons on 10th May, 1899, that if the efforts now being made by the archbishops and bishops to secure the due obedience of the clergy are not speedily effectual, further legislation will be required to maintain the observance of the existing laws of Church and Realm.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: As my hon. friend is aware, I have no official cognisance of the matters referred to in the first three paragraphs of the question. He must therefore take my answer as conveying my own personal views for what they are worth. I hope, and believe, that the efforts of the bishops have had, and are having, a great effect in diminishing practices in the Church of England which are unlawful or inexpedient. I have heard of no employment of the veto by any bishop except in the case of Colonel Porcelli, who was not a parishioner of any of the churches of which he complained, nor did he represent any responsible body or association in the country. I ought to add that my hon friends enumeration of the unlawful practices he desires to see dealt with is somewhat misleading. He enumerates five practices which he implies are contrary to the law. The first of these is Masses. If he means to describe the Communion Service of the Church of England by the word "Mass," it seems to me to be a misleading and foolish expression. But it is not illegal. As to the second point, the celebration of the Holy Communion without the requisite number of communicants is undoubtedly illegal; but I have no ground for thinking it is otherwise than of rare occurrence, and when it happens it is often by accident. The third point is children's Eucharists. If this means, as I suppose it does, the presence of children during the Communion Service, it seems to me to be a very undesirable practice, but it cannot be described as unlawful. I may add that it has been frequently objected to by the bishops. The ceremonial use of incense is undoubtedly illegal, but I believe the practice has greatly diminished, and is diminishing, through the action of the bishops. As to the fifth point, the inculcation of habitual confession is, wherever it takes place, a most unfortunate practice.

MR. DILLON: This is a speech, and a very offensive one. On a point of order I desire to ask whether the First Lord of the Treasury is in order in delivering a long speech giving his opinion on controversial matters to which hon. Members are not at liberty to reply.

*MR. SPEAKER: I must say I think the fault, if any, is rather of the questioner than the answerer. The question enters into matters of opinion which, if I had seen it, I should not have allowed to appear on the Paper. The first part of the question does refer to these practices as illegal, and I cannot say the right hon. Gentleman is out of order in offering his opinion whether they are illegal or otherwise. He is speaking, not of the merits of the practices, but strictly to the question whether they are in accordance with the law of the Church of

England.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: If the hon. Gentleman supposes I was making any reflection on observances in the Church of which he is a member he is mistaken. I was referring only to the Church of England, and to practices as they are regarded by the Protestant community. To make confession a condition of receiving Communion is not only repugnant to the whole spirit of the Church of England, but is wholly illegal. I do not think the imposition of such a condition has been attempted, and if it were it would not receive a moment's toleration from any member of the episcopal bench.

MR. CHARLES MARTHUR: I will take the first opportunity of drawing the attention of the House to this subject.

MR. SAMUEL SMITH (Flintshire): Will the Government give facilities for discussion of the subject during the present session?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I believe there are two Bills on the subject actually on the Orders of the House.

MR. SAMUEL SMITH: With no chance of debating them.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Will the right hon. Gentleman give facilities for discussing the question whether Catholics are or are not idolators?

[No answer was returned.]

ANCIENT IRISH GOLD ORNAMENTS.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can state when he intends to carry out the promise made last year that the Government would test in a Court of Law the right of the British Museum authorities to retain in their possession certain gold ornaments found in Ireland.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The kaleidoscopic changes on this question seem to be endless. In August last the then Chief Secretary said it had recently been ascertained that the right to possession was governed by a grant of James I., confirmed by charter of Charles II., and since then doubts have arisen whether the Crown have any right to press a claim against the British Museum.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: But do the Government intend to fulfil their pledge to ascertain if the British Museum has a right to retain these ornaments?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The present Chief Secretary for Ireland has been going carefully into the matter, giving it his personal attention, and has received a deputation on the subject. If the hon. Member will communicate with my right lion, friend, all the information at the disposal of the Government would be placed before him. I may point out, however, that the doubts to which I have referred have arisen since the pledge was given.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): Will the information be laid before the House? Many Members are interested in the subject.

MR. WYNDHAM: The position of the Crown in such a matter introduces complications which make it impossible at the moment to carry out the pledge given last year.

THE BUDGET.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can approximately fix the date for the introduction of the Budget.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I can fix no approximate date for the introduction of the Budget. It will not be in the immediate future.

NAVAL WORKS AT GIBRALTAR.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I beg to ask the First Lord of the-Treasury if he is now in a position to-state the constitution of the proposed Committee or Commission on the Naval Works at Gibraltar, the terms of reference, and the date on which the members are to proceed to Gibraltar for the purpose of the inquiry.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It will not be a Committee or Commission in the formal sense of the word; it will be an inquiry by experts into certain points and put before the First Lord of the Admiralty and the Secretary for War. It will be a full inquiry, but not with terms of reference, as the hon. Gentleman appears to suppose.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Will there be a Report?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not know whether there will be a connected Report: probably separate points will be laid before different officers. It will be an informal inquiry.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): Can the First Lord give the House any information as to the course of business?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I propose to-morrow (Friday) to proceed with the Civil Service Supplementary Estimates and follow with the Navy Supplementary Estimates. On Monday I propose to move the Order for Ways and Means, and. ask the House to give the Government Tuesdays for financial business up to Easter. On Tuesday I shall probably ask the House to take a Vote on Account.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Can you give us any idea when you will move the Speaker out of the chair on going into-
Committee of Supply on the Army and Navy Estimates?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It will not probably be necessary to move the Speaker out of the chair for the Army Estimates before the end of next week.

NEW MEMBER SWORN.

Charles Alfred Cripps, esquire, K.C., for South East Lancashire (Stretford Division).

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

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

CIVIL SERVICE (SUPPLEMENTARY) ESTIMATES, 1900–1901.

Class I.

1. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £;5,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Houses of Parliament Buildings."

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I have long been waiting for this opportunity, and I hope the question I am about to raise will not be debated upon party lines. I allude to the necessity of providing for the Members of this House a new and a more airy smoking place. Those of us who make a practice of attending steadily and regularly to our duties in this House have been long groaning under an intolerable grievance in the shape of the present smoking-room accommodation.

*THE CHAIRMAN: How does the hon. Member propose to raise such a discussion upon this Vote?

MR. DILLON: IT is for the cost of certain alterations in the House of Commons

*THE CHAIRMAN: But these alterations do not relate to the smoke-room.

MR. DILLON: My point is that they ought to relate to the smoke-room.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The discussion must be confined to the matters dealt with in this Supplementary Estimate.

MR. DILLON: How are we to know what is included? The items are not set forth.

*THE CHAIRMAN: If the hon. Member will look on page 4 he will see them.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): This Vote relates to the new rooms which have been placed at the disposal of the House, and I ask therefore is it not in order to discuss to what use they should be put?

*THE CHAIRMAN: It is obvious that there is no relation between the late clerk's residence and the provision of a smoking-room.

MR. LOUGH: Would those rooms not enable us to have another smoking room?

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N): The present smoke-room was changed not long ago, and I believe the alteration is a portion of the expense in connection with this Vote. It will be remembered that the smoke-room has quite recently been removed to the other side of the corridor, and the present room is a very great inconvenience to the majority of the Members of this House

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member, to bring himself in order, must show that the late residence of the Chief Clerk ought to have been converted, or might have been converted, into a smoking-room. If he can show that, then he will be in order in discussing that, but if he is suggesting that other rooms should be devoted to a smoke-room, or that the accommodation of the present smoke-room ought to be improved, then he is not in order.

MR. DILLON: I confess that I did not think you would draw the rule so close as to say that it should be a room in the residence of the late Chief Clerk. Of course, I can argue my point upon that as well as if it were any other room in the House. This Vote provides some fresh accommodation for the members of the press, and for the warming and ventilating of a portion of the House. My contention is that the present smoking-room is not sufficient accommodation for the Members of the House who frequent it, and I do think that it is a monstrous thing that in the House of Commons we cannot have decent accommodation in the smoke-room and the dining-room. I would prefer to take the new smoke-room from the House of Lords, but I can see that I cannot argue in favour of that proposal under your present riding. My primary object is to get this accommodation wherever we can, and I am quite ready to accept an additional room if the First Commissioner of Works can offer one of those which belonged to the residence of the late Chief Clerk. What are the conditions to which we are subjected? In the first place the room is not large enough, and I myself and other hon. Members have gone and found it impossible to get in, the room being so crowded, and the atmosphere absolutely unhealthy, and calculated to make one weary and ill, instead of making Members refreshed to return to business in the House. Not only is that the case, but the present smoking-room is situated over the kitchen or some other subterranean place where fires are kept up in the

summer time. It looks into a closed yard in which there is no free circulation of fresh air, the consequence of which is that when summer comes it is absolutely intolerable, and I have seen the thermometer there standing at 90 degrees day after day, so that it was, practically speaking, uninhabitable. I think that that is a condition of things which the Members of the House of Commons ought not to be subjected to. At all events, if we are to have no other smoking-room accommodation except the present room, then I would ask that some attempt should be made, by a system of ventilation, to relieve the vitiated atmosphere of the room.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is not confining himself to the subject. The house of the late clerk is the point to which the hon. Member must confine himself.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER of WORKS (MR. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's):

Perhaps it will shorten the debate upon this subject if I state now what the Government propose to do, and it may save a good deal of time. I fully admit the inadequacy of the present smoking-room accommodation, and it has been my earnest endeavour to improve the ventilation of that spot. Owing to the vacation of the late clerk's residence we have been able to make a different allocation of the rooms, and at the present moment there are some four or five rooms which have not been allocated on the Terrace front. I had intended to ask the House at the commencement of this session to reappoint the House of Commons Accommodation Committee, so that they might make some recommendations upon this point. Besides further smoking-room accommodation, some hon. Members opposite require further accommodation for their private secretaries and for typewriting, and it has always been the practice of this House, that whenever structural alterations of the building take place, this should only be done upon the Report of a Committee of this House. I did not see fit last autumn to make these alterations, because I intended to move for the re-appointment of this Committee for that purpose. It is quite possible to make a decent smoking-room on the site to which I have alluded. I am not certain that it would be adequate for the large number of hon. Members who use the smoking-room, but, at all events, it would be a great improvement on the existing room, and not being over the kitchen, would be free from the smells of which the hon. Member complains, as it would be possible to ventilate it thoroughly. I will do my best to: provide this extra accommodation. In regard to the other small requirements of the House, I think these had better be left to the Committee, and if the hon. Member is satisfied with my explanation I will put down a notice for the appointment of the Committee.

MR. DILLON: I rise simply to convey my grateful thanks to the right hon.

Gentleman. Nothing could have been more satisfactory than his statement.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) asked if an additional smoking could not be provided.

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: That is a point to which the attention of the Committee will be directed. Of course Ave shall be guided by the recommendations of the Committee, and we had better wait until it reports.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: When will you appoint the Committee?

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: I will put it down on the Paper as soon as I can.

COLONEL WELBY (Taunton) said they all knew the condition of many parts of the House on a hot July day, and he would make a suggestion as to the ventilation of the lobbies;

*THE CHAIRMAN: No question arises on the lobbies,

MR. LOUGH thought that the statement of the right hon. Gentleman in regard to the appointment of a Committee was quite satisfactory, and it would be more convenient for hon. Members to bring any suggestions they had to make before the Committee rather than discuss them there. A reference was made in the Estimates to ventilation. Members had suffered greatly from the thoroughly bad ventilation of the big Committee rooms upstairs. He understood that experiments were promised a long time ago with the object of determining whether the ventilation of these rooms could be improved. He did not know whether this would come within the scope of the reference to the Committee, but he would ask whether the right hon. Gentleman could not adopt some of the simple expedients now common in other places; such as electric fans; so as to make the ventilation quite right. There was also a reference in the Vote to the increased cost of fuel. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman could give some information on the point which might be interesting to the House, for other people had suffered from the increased price of coal. Would the right hon. Gentleman say what the Government were doing in the pur-

chase of fuel, and whether the price was going down, so that this difficulty might soon disappear.

MR. FLYNN said he wanted some information in regard to the item under the heading D,; "Cost of furniture & etc., in connection with the opening of Parliament by the King in person." He objected to this Vote in toto, not because the King had opened Parliament in person, but because the whole of the arrangements had been most unsatisfactory and most undignified. He would like to know what that additional furniture was and where it was placed. He had never seen any of it. The sum; £800; was not very great, but the principle involved in this Vote was important. The House had to find the money for these ceremonies, but hon. Members were deprived of any accommodation to witness them except that which they would not give a lackey. He himself had taken no part in the proceedings, because he had a distaste for ceremonials of that kind, but he had been assured by hon. Members who were there that the only accommodation they could get enabled them to gain a peep view over their neighbour's shoulders. In fact, they had no more opportunity of catching sight of the King and Queen than a man in a theatre had of securing a view of the stage if he sat behind a lady wearing a tall feathered hat. The result was that hon. Members had suffered considerable pain of mind and body. He had great sympathy with hon. Members on both sides of the House who had been engaged in the discreditable football rush towards the bar of the other House, and who, when they got there, could not even see their Majesties.

SIR BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.) said he had placed on the Notice Paper a motion to reduce this Vote by the sum of £1,300. He would not have done so if it had really been the opening of Parliament for which they were asked to pay the reasonable expenses. But it was not the opening of Parliament, but the

opening of an assembly of ladies and friends of the Lord Great Chamberlain; and it was

too much to ask the British taxpayer to pay the expenses, at this time, of such a ceremony. He believed that the people who went to see this show and who had no constitutional right or necessity to be there, should pay the expenses, just as they would pay for seats at the opera or theatre. A great constitutional question was involved in this Vote, because if Parliament was to be opened by the Sovereign in person, and if the King was to deliver his gracious Speech from the Throne to the Lords and his faithful Commons, the Commons ought to be there, and it was for them that room ought to be supplied. He was not making any attack upon the right hon. Gentleman opposite. He knew it was not the right hon.

Gentleman's fault, and that the matter was entirely in the hands of the Lord Great Chamberlain. He spoke not only for Members of that House, but also for Members of the other House, who had been worse treated even than the Commons were, and had been deprived of their usual seats. It was most important that the House should show that they meant to be as loyal and faithful to His Majesty the King as they were to the late Queen; but if they passed this Vote it was as much as saying that they did not value the privilege of access to His Majesty, and that they did not care to hear his gracious Speech from the Throne. He thought that, having been prevented from obeying the first command given to them by His Majesty after his accession, they should make this protest; and he hoped hon. Members would take that, the only opportunity they had, of testifying their loyalty to His Majesty by refusing to vote this sum. He moved that the Vote be reduced by the sum of £;1,300.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That a sum not exceeding £;3,700 be granted for the said Service."; (Sir Brampton Gurdon.)

*COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.) said he might fairly support the Amendment for the reasons given by the hon. Member. He had not been in the crush, but everything had been done to put hon. Members in a position in which they were very likely to be crushed. When he got to the House of Lords he had a view of several very handsome peeresses, very prettily dressed, but he saw very little else, and had only a peep at His Gracious Majesty. But he had a much more serious reason for moving the reduction of this Vote, as he had intended doing. He thought that it would have been far better if the King had not come to open Parliament on that occasion, and the £;1,300 would have been saved. Her late Majesty, when she came to open Parliament, was fulfilling a very important part of the Constitution, and therefore she was to be encouraged in doing so; but on this special occasion the King ought not to have come, and his reason for saying so was that he wished His Majesty had put off making the Declaration calling him an idolater.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order; That has nothing to do with the Vote before the Committee.

*COLONEL NOLAN said he might not be allowed to argue the question, but he could not be compelled to vote £;1,300 to pay the expenses of His Majesty coming, as was alleged, to open Parliament. He did not blame the King. He knew that whatever His Majesty said, he was advised to say by his responsible Ministers.

If he was not allowed to give the reasons for the vote he was going to record, everyone should know why he objected to the Supplementary Estimate asked for. Not only every Roman Catholic Member, but every enlightened Protestant ought to join in the endeavour to cut it down.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) said that all this bother in the House of Commons was, as usual, due to an hereditary gentleman; the Hereditary Lord Great Chamberlain. He was perfectly convinced that if the matter had been left in the hands of the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works, the House of Commons would not have been treated in the fashion it had been, and that hon. Members would have had allocated to them a fair space in the House of Lords when His Majesty came to deliver his gracious Speech from the Throne. He would like some-

one to explain how far the functions of this hereditary gentleman; the Hereditary Lord Great Chamberlain; went. He had an objection to vote anything as long as that gentleman had the disposal, in any sort of way, direct or indirect, of the funds voted by the House of Commons. He believed that there was a time when this Hereditary Great Chamberlain exercised a jurisdiction over all the palaces in the country; but, by degrees, he had been disestablished in every palace except that of Westminster. He really thought it was full time that they should claim that the Palace of Westminster, being the seat of the Legislature of the country, should be in the hands of some responsible Minister, like the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works. He would point out that the Hereditary Great Chamberlain was a peer, and looked after his own friends; especially the peeresses. He (Mr. Labouchere) was as fond of a show as anyone else, but he had had no opportunity of seeing this one. Surely, if it became a question as to whether peeresses or the Members of the House had the privilege of witnessing the show, representatives of the Commons, who were a component part of the Legislature, had the first call in regard to space. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would take some steps to take the control of the Palace of Westminster out of the jurisdiction of the Lord High Chamberlain, and place it in the control of a responsible Minister.

*MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) expressed a hope that the right hon. Gentleman who asked for the Vote would take notice that what had been said was a faint echo of the widespread dissatisfaction that existed in regard to this matter. On the occasion of the opening of Parliament hon. Members endeavoured to squeeze themselves into a place which could not accommodate them, and the arrangements made were such as to mar the dignity and decorum which everyone desired should permeate such an occasion. He did not look at the matter from a spectacular but a constitutional point of view. The Sovereign, the Crown, the Lords, and the Commons were the component parts of Parliament, and it was the King's command which took hon. Members to the other House; and, putting the spectacular aspect of the matter on one side, the only proper way in which the King's command could be obeyed was for proper accommodation to be made for the Commons to assemble in the House of Lords, as was desired-He had been shocked to see the way in which the House of Lords had been transformed. If the Lords cared to have. their

benches put up and stacked away and narrow wooden benches erected for themselves and their peeresses, certainly he did not object. But outside the space of the actual technical House of Lords the Commons had the first claim. He would like to know why Members were deprived of the possibility of going into the galleries in the House of Lords which were reserved for them, especially when those galleries were not fully occupied. The only remedy for preventing a recurrence of the unseemly spectacle which was witnessed on this occasion was that steps should be taken; and they could be taken at the beginning of a new reign, for of course the Crown was above precedent as regards its own high officials; to put the Lord Great Chamberlain in his proper place in these matters.

MAJOR JAMESON (Clare, W.) also protested against the arrangements which were made for the reception of the House of Commons when they started to obey the King. Many reasons had been given: to show that the First Commissioner of Works was not to blame, but he considered that that Gentleman was entirely to blame. In the unseemly crush which took place when the House was summoned to hear the Speech from the Throne, he had been content to put up with the loss of a hat, but one hon. Member had been so injured that he had never been out of bed since. Until the House received some kind of apology from the right hon. Gentleman for what had occurred, when he knew, under the circumstances, that all Members of the House would like to attend, he should consider he was to blame for not making arrangements with the Lord Great Chamberlain on the subject.

*MR. STEVENSON (Suffolk, Eye) was glad that this opportunity had been taken for adequately expressing the widespread feeling of dissatisfaction which prevailed on this subject. A short time since he had put a question to the First Lord of the Treasury as to the advisability of appointing a Committee to consider the comparative merits of Westminster Hall as a place where Parliament might be convened. The proceedings on the opening day marked a complete divergence of the theory and the practice of Parliament, and they were, in so far as the House of Commons was concerned, a positive scandal. Until the reign of Henry VII., and possibly on some subsequent occasions, the opening of Parliament took place in the Painted Chamber, the Lords sitting on the one side and the Commons on the other; and at this date, when the Painted Chamber was no longer in existence, the chamber which most closely approximated was Westminster Hall. The cost of utilising what was acknowledged to be the grandest hall in England would not greatly exceed the cost at present involved in opening Parliament.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.) said it appeared to him that in this particular case the House of Commons was in the same position as an Irish county council in connection with the court-houses in Ireland. They built and maintained the court-houses, yet those court-houses were not in their control, but in the control of the High Sheriff. In this case the House of Commons paid the money, and the control was in the Lord Great Chamberlain. He should certainly go into the lobby against the Vote asked for. He intended to vote against the proposal as an expression of his feeling in connection with the proceedings at the opening of Parliament.

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: I am not at all surprised at the dissatisfaction which has

been expressed by the Committee with regard to the arrangements made at the opening of Parliament. As many hon. Members on the other side of the House were kind enough to say, those arrangements were not in my hands or in the hands of the Government. It has always been my wish on these occasions to represent in the proper quarter that accommodation of a suitable character should be found for the House

of Commons. But so far as I am concerned, I have no power in this matter to act for the House of Commons. With regard to the particular question and the jurisdiction of the Lord Great Chamberlain, I venture to offer the protest that this is hardly the opportunity when complaints in regard to that distinguished officer can be made. All we are asked on the present occasion to do is to vote a sum of money with regard to certain arrangements made for the opening of Parliament in the House of Lords, arrangements made not by the Great Chamberlain's office, but by the Department I represent. I hope I shall be able to justify that expenditure and show, if pressed, that the actual amount of money spent has been represented by the goods provided. But with regard to the general question of the convenience of Members on that occasion. I would point out that I recognise that the House of Commons is properly dissatisfied with the arrangements then made, but I think that that dissatisfaction is general not only to the House of Commons, but to the other House and to the public at large. I am quite sure that there is no one in this country more anxious to provide proper accommodation for his faithful Commons than His Majesty the King. With regard to Westminster Hall, the hon. Member who has just sat down has made an appeal to me, and although I agree with him as to the suitability of the building, I wish to put on record a protest with regard to the expenditure likely to be incurred. I should like to guard myself in that matter, because undoubtedly the expenses would be considerable in providing accommodation.

*MR. STEVENSON: My only point with regard to expenditure is that Westminster Hall would require little decoration.

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: With regard to decoration, yes; but with regard to stands and other things I may tell the hon. Member that I have taken pains to go into the figures, and to get these things would involve considerable expenditure, but I do not think there need be a difficulty; if both Houses are agreed and if the King is pleased to agree in making the necessary alterations.

May I point out that not only did we recognise that the accommodation at present is unsatisfactory, but that we have at once met the appeals made to us from both sides of the House to find some remedy, and my right hon. friend the Leader of the House at once consented to the appointment of a committee to take into consideration not only the accommodation available in the House of Lords, but also the advisability of substituting Westminster Hall for use on similar occasions? That motion has been on the Paper two or three nights, and it is only owing to the action of hon. Members from Ireland who complain of the general arrangements on that occasion that that motion has not received the approval of the House of Commons. I hope that the motion may be carried to-day, especially after the discussion we have had. Before that committee the whole of the subject can be raised in a much fuller way, with all the materials required before it,

than can be the case on the present occasion. I trust, in view of the anxiety expressed by the (government to meet the views of Members on both sides, the Committee will not only agree to the expenditure which has been incurred for the opening of Parliament this year, but also allow us to proceed with the motion to-night for the committee to inquire into the providing of proper accommodation on a future occasion.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) thought the House would recognise the very sympathetic reply of the right hon. Gentleman. He was sure they were all agreed that if the arrangements had been in his hands the state of things that existed would not have occurred. The right hon. Gentleman had told them that this was not the occasion to raise this point. The hon. Member would like to know when the occasion would arise. This gentleman's salary did not come up on the Estimates, and they had practically no other occasion whatever for raising the question. It appeared to him that if they were dissatisfied at the insult offered to the House of Commons it was the duty of the House to refuse to vote this money, as a protest against the system. If the individual responsible for what had happened had brains he ought to have foreseen the state of things. He himself did not attempt to get into that portion of the House of Lords which was allocated to Members of the House of Commons on that particular day. The individual responsible must have known that the House of Commons would be summoned to the House of Lords, and if he had only calculated the space required he would have come to the conclusion that it was impossible to have his own particular friends and the peeresses present on that occasion. There was another matter, and that was the ridiculous arrangements made for the press on that occasion. The accommodation for the press was materially limited, in fact only comparatively few selected newspapers were represented, and many important journals in the country were unable to have their representatives there. In fact, in his opinion, they were treated in the most contemptuous way by the individual responsible. That was a state of things which deserved severe condemnation, and showed utter incapacity on the part of the person responsible. There were persons in the House of Lords that day who had no more claim to be there than the man in the street. It seemed to him to be part of the general policy pursued in reference to recent processions and other things. If it were in order to discuss them now he should say something of the arrangements made on the occasion of her late Majesty's funeral, but it was impossible to enter upon that matter now. It showed to him that there was a feeling practically of contempt with regard to that House on the part of the individual responsible, for this treatment was continued. This official seemed to think that he might pursue that course, because the House of Commons did not vote his salary.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT (Sheffield, Ecclesall) said everyone who experienced the inconvenience arising from the arrangements made for the opening of Parliament must feel that there was great neglect of the interests of that House, but he was not at all sure that they were fair in laying all responsibility, or indeed any very large share of it, on the Lord Great Chamberlain. No doubt these affairs were governed by precedent. He thought there was great want of a

sense of responsibility on the part of the Government to see that the House of Commons was properly looked after on the occasion. The right hon. Gentleman said he was not responsible. What he wanted to know was, which member of the Government ;there were twenty of them;was responsible for seeing that the House of Commons was treated with ordinary decorum? The hon. Member for the Kirkcaldy Burghs had referred to the want of arrangement on the occasion of Her late Majesty's funeral. That want was most deplorable.

*THE CHAIRMAN: That matter cannot be raised on this Vote.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: Quite so. He would say no more about it. He only referred to it, not to argue the matter, hut as an illustration of the necessity for some new arrangement being made in the interests of the House of Commons. He suggested that either some special official should be appointed to look after the interests of the House of Commons, or that the Government should distinctly depute his right hon. friend the First Commissioner of Works to deal with this question. Then no doubt they would have all the arrangements satisfactory. He was quite certain that there was no person in the realm who would regret the want of proper accommodation for Members of the House of Commons more than His Majesty himself. He thought if proper representations had been made to him by someone, the interests of the House of Commons would have been better looked after.

MR. DALY (Monaghan, S.) said the interest of the Nationalist Members in this question had reference to the money involved. He had no sympathy at all with hon. Members who got jostled in the rush to the House of Lords. He thought those who were crushed deserved all they got on the occasion. He rose to ask the right hon. Gentleman a question with regard to the new smoke-room.

*THE CHAIRMAN said it would not be in order to raise that matter on this Vote.

MR. HEYWOOD JOHNSTONE (Sussex, Horsham) said he was very glad that, on the occasion referred to, the side galleries, usually available in the House of Lords for Members of the House of Commons, were not open to them. If they had been he was quite certain that a larger number would have shared in the discomforts of the occasion. He did not think that any of the Members who had spoken had grappled with the real difficulty of this question. It was not to be solved by making the office of Lord Great Chamberlain an elective one, or by any method of that sort. The real difficulty was to get the quart of the House of Commons into the pint of the House of Lords. The House of Commons could not attend His Majesty as a whole, and it would be well to consider whether some small number of Members should not be selected to represent the House.

MR. BARLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield) said he would vote for the reduction of this Vote. The Government had proposed a Committee to deal with this subject, but the Committee would have no legal right to go to the Lord Great Chamberlain and ask him to do anything on their behalf. If the House had the moral courage to protect its own dignity and constitutional rights in connection with the granting of money when they were treated as they had been, things would be managed differently on such occasions. He would support the Government and the Committee in the action they were taking.

MR. DILLON said he should be sorry to allow it to be supposed that the Irish

Members had any grievance in not getting into the House of Lords. They had not the slightest desire to enter the House of Lords, and they watched with amusement and surprise the degradation of others of the House. If the Members of the House had any proper sense of their own dignity they would let these high and mighty persons know that if they were going to treat them with contempt they must put their hands into their own breeches pockets. If the House of Commons refused to pay the bill, ample accommodation would be forthcoming on the next occasion. He heartily agreed with the sentiment expressed by one hon. Member who said that on the occasion referred to they had been treated as they deserved to be. He had never attended any of these ceremonials, but during the time he had been in the House he had seen Members come there after great ceremonials weeping, lamenting, and bewailing the gross insults with which they had been treated. On one occasion they went in procession through Victoria Street to present congratulations to the Queen in connection with the Jubilee, and they were practically kicked downstairs, and he found the House of Commons literally boiling with indignation over the treatment to which they had been subjected. That had been repeated over and over again, and until the House of Commons did some specific act different from grumbings and growlings, and showed that they were not going to submit to that treatment, they would be treated in the same way. They had a simple way of stopping it if they chose, and that was by stopping the supplies. Let it be known that if they were going to carry on ceremonials at the public expense they must treat the House of Commons with civility, and that otherwise the House of Lords could raise a subscription for these entertainments. He thought they would then find that the Lord Great Chamberlain would become civil to the House of Commons. The right hon. Gentleman opposite had on these occasions done his best for the House of Commons. He trusted sincerely that if they passed the Vote they would get kicked out as before.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny) said he rose to call attention to the accommodation provided in the press gallery of the House of Commons. He was not sure that it was in order to do so under this Vote.

*THE CHAIRMAN said the Amendment which had been moved related solely to the provision for the opening of Parliament, and the debate must be confined to that.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN gave notice that on another occasion he would call attention to the fact that, in his opinion, there was not proper accommodation in the press gallery.

MR. JORDAN (Fermanagh, S.) said there were no details given of the expenditure, and they were absolutely

in the dark as to what the money was asked for. They did not know whether they had got fair value for the money or not.

MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.) said the remark made by the hon. Member for South Fermanagh showed the Ulster keenness about pounds, shillings, and pence. As an Irish Member he had no fault to find with the accommodation provided at the opening of Parliament, but he suggested that in connection with the Coronation ceremony a few hundred pounds should be spent in providing ambulances for

Members of the House who at risk of life and limb attempted to attend. Moreover, it would be as well that Irish Catholic Members should not be asked to go to the House of Lords on such occasions to hear their religion insulted.

SIR BRAMPTON GURDON thought that to go to a division was the only means the House had of apologising to the King for not obeying his command. Furthermore, as the hon. Member for Rushcliffe Division had truly said, if the Lord Great Chamberlain had removed the benches from the House of Commons, that House would very soon have wanted to know the reason why. The Lords, however, have no constitutional privileges in this way, and so were obliged to suffer. The House of Commons, therefore, should have some feeling for the House of Lords, and help them where they could not help themselves.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick's) would not have intervened but for the remarks of a previous speaker. Being an Irish Member he had no desire to assist in the House of Lords at the opening of Parliament, especially when the King used an Oath which in the opinion of Catholics was blasphemous;

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order; I have already pointed out more than once that the matter is not one to be discussed on this Vote.

MR. FIELD did not propose to discuss the matter further than to say that as an Irish Member;

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is not entitled to say anything further after I have told him it would be disorderly to refer to the matter. He really must not go on with the subject.

MR. FIELD said that while the Irish Members had no desire to go into the House of Lords, they insisted on sufficient accommodation being provided for Members of the House of Commons. He could not understand why an invitation should be given if no accommodation was provided. If the noble Lords, who occasionally came down for a few minutes to carry on or to obstruct the business of the country, occupied all the available room, there was no use in requiring the Members of the House of Commons to attend, and the Vote should be opposed by all hon. Gentlemen who had any respect for their own dignity.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.) asked for further details as to the expenditure under discussion. There was an item of £200 for the extension of electric lighting to the Royal Gallery; another £200 for additional supply of electric current; and £1,100 for additional cost of fuel, mainly in respect of steam coal used by the engineering branch. What was the steam coal required for? No justification had been given for the expenditure of such a large sum. The electric light was supplied from the electric mains; therefore, why should there be this additional expenditure in regard to steam coal?

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: Those items are not in connection with the opening of Parliament at all. The £1,400 is mainly in respect of steam coal used by the engineering branch during the year, and, as everyone knows, the price of coal has enormously increased during that period. With regard to the £200 for supply of electric current, that is an additional sum owing entirely to the fact that Parliament met for an autumn session, and also for a short

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)

Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Burt, Thomas
Allan, William (Gateshead)
Blake, Edward
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud
Boland, John
Caldwell, James
Ambrose, Robert
Boyle, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Brigg, John
Carew, James Laurence
Atherley-Jones, L.
Broadhurst, Henry
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Barlow, John Emmott
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Cawley, Frederick

period in January of this year, over and above the period for which the estimate was made. As to the provision of the electric light in the Royal Gallery, that is not merely for the occasion of the opening of Parliament, but for all time; it is for the supply of standards and so on in a portion of the House which has not been used for forty years for similar purposes. The furniture consisted of curtains, etc., and seating accommodation in the House of Lords, the Royal Gallery, the Robing Room, and other apartments in that portion of the House. Colonel NOLAN: Are they the perquisites of the Lord Great Chamberlain after the ceremony is over?

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: No.

MR. TULLY thought the valuable information the right hon. Gentleman had volunteered proved that the criticism from the Irish benches had some foundation. As to this £800 for furniture, was that of a permanent character, or would a similar amount be required each time the King opened Parliament in person?

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: This is not a sum which will appear again. The furniture was required in consequence of the fact that it is something like forty years since Parliament has been opened in state. This furniture will always be available in future.

MR. JORDAN asked whether the furniture in question was supplied under contract, or were tenders invited?

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS was understood to reply that all furniture was supplied under a contract extending over a period of years.

Question put.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 167; Noes, 219. (Division List No. 20.)

Cogan, Denis J.

Hobhouse, H. (Somerset, E.)

O'Mara, James

Coghill, Douglas Harry

Holland, William Henry

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.

Colville, John

Hope, John D. (Fife, West)

Palmer, George Wm.(Reading)

Condon, Thomas Joseph

Hutton, Alfred E. (Merley)

Partington, Oswald

Craig, Robert Hunter

Jacoby, James Alfred

Philipps, John Wynford

Crean, Eugene

Jameson, Major J. Eustace

Power, Patrick Joseph

Cremer, William Randal

Jones, David Brynmor (Swans'a

Price, Robert John

Crombie, John William

Jordan, Jeremiah

Rea, Russell

Cullinan, J.

Joyce, Michael

Reckitt, Harold James

Daly, James

Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth

Reddy, M.

Dalziel, James Henry

Labouchere, Henry

Redmond, John E.(Waterford)

Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)

Langley, Batty

Redmond, William (Clare)

Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan

Layland-Barratt, Francis

Reid, Sir R. T. (Dumfries)

Delany, William

Leese, Sir Joseph F.(Accrington

Rickett, J. Compton

Dewar, John A.(Inverness-sh.

Leng, Sir John

Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Dillon, John
Levy, Maurice
Robson, William Snowdon
Donelan, Captain A.
Lloyd-George, David
Roche, John
Doogan, P. C.
Lough, Thomas
Russell, T. W.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Lundon, W.
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Duffy, William J.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Scott, C. Prestwich (Leigh)
Duncan, James H.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Dunn, Sir William
M'Crae, George
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)
Edwards, Frank
M'Dermott, Patrick
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Elibank, Master of
M'Fadden, Edward
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Emmott, Alfred
M'Govern, T.
Soares, Ernest J.
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Stevenson, Francis S.
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
Sullivan, Donal
Farrell, James Patrick
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Fenwick, Charles
Mooney, John J.
Tennant, Harold John
Ffrench, Peter
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)

Field, William
Morley, Rt Hn. John Montrose
Thomson, F.W. (York, W.R.)
Fison, Frederick William
Moulton, John Flethher
Tomkinson, James
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Murphy, J.
Tully, Jasper
Flynn, James Christopher
Nannetti, Joseph J.
Walton, J. Lawson (Leeds, S.)
Foster, Sir W. (Derby Co.)
Nolan, Col. John P.(Galway, N.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Furness, Sir Christopher
Nussey, Thomas Willans
White, George (Norfolk)
Gilhooly, James
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
White, Patrick (Meath, North
Goddard, Daniel Ford
O'Brien, Kendal (Tippera'y Mid
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)
Grant, Corrie
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Guthrie, Walter Murray
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Haldane, Richard Burdon
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Wilson, H. J. (York, W. R.)
Hammond, John
O'Doherty, William
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
O'Donnell, John (Mayo. S.)
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Yoxall, James Henry
Hayne, Rt. Hon. C. Seale

O'Dowd, John
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir A. D.
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Helme, Norval Watson
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon N.
Sir Brampton Gurdon and
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.
O'Malley, William
Mr. Robert Wallace.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F
Bill, Charles
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Aird, Sir John
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn)
Cranborne, Viscount
Allhusen, Augustus Hy. Eden
Brassey, Albert
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Allsopp, Hon. George
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Arrol, Sir William
Bulliard, Sir Harry
Dewar, T. R. (T'r H'mlets, S Geo.
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Cautley, Henry Strotber
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Austin, Sir John
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)

Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Baird, John George Alexander
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J (Birm.
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Balcarres, Lord
Chamberlain, J. Austen(Worc'r
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Baldwin, Alfred
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Balfour, Rt, Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W(Leeds
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Banbury, Frederick George
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Barry, Sir Francis T.(Windsor)
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Faber, George Denison
Bartley, George C. T.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Fardell, Sir T. George
Beach, Rt Hn. Sir M. R. (Bristol)
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn Sir J. (Manc'r
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Round, James
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Leigh-Bennet, Henry Currie
Rutherford, John
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Fisher, William Hayes
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter(Bristol, S)
Samuel, Harry S.(Limehouse)

FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos Myles
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Sasson, Sir Edward Albert
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison
Shaw-Stewart, M. H.(Renfrew)
Forster, Henry William
Macdona, John Cumming
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Maconochie, A. W.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Gore, Hon F. S. Ormsby
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Smith, H. C. (Nrthmb. Tyneside)
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Goschen, Hon George Joachim
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D.(Strand)
Graham, Henry Robert
Majendie, James A. H.
Spear, John Ward
Green, Walford D. (Wednesb'ry)
Malcolm, Ian
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ryS Edm'nds)
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Groves James Grimble
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart
Hall, Edward Marshall
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Hambro, Charles Eric

Melville, Beresford Valentine
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Ld. G. (Midx
Milward, Colonel Victor
Stroyan, John
Hamilton, Marq. of (Londndrry
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert Wm.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Hare, Thomas Leigh
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Thornton, Percy M.
Harris, F. L. (Tynemouth)
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Tufnell, Colonel Edward
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Morgan, Hn. Fred (Monm'hsh.)
Valentia, Viscount
Heath, Arthur, H. (Hanley)
Morrell, George Herbert
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H. (Sh'ffld
Heath, J. (Staffrds., N. W.)
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Henderson, Alexander
Morton, Arthur H. A.(Deptford
Walker, Col. William Hall
Hermon Hodge, R. Trotter
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Higginbottom, S. W.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry
Wason, J. Cathcart (Orkney)
Hogg, Lindsay
Murray, Co). Wyndham (Bath)
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E. (Tauntn
Hope, J. F. (Sheffi'ld, Brightside
Welby, Sir C. G. E. (Notts.)
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne)

Hoult, Joseph
Nicholson, William Graham
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Howard, Capt. J. (Faversham)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord.
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Wills, Sir Frederick
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Wilson, A. S. (York, E. R.)
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Plummer, Walter K.
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir J. H.
Pretymann, Ernest George
Wilson-Todd, Wm.H.(Yorks)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)
Purvis, Robert
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R (Bath)
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Pym, C. Guy
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Knowles, Lees
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Wylie, Alexander
Lambton, Hon. Fredk. Wm.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Law, Andrew Bonar
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Lawson, John Grant
Renwick, George
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Lecky, Rt. Hn. Wm. Edw. H.
Ritchie, Rt Hon. Chas. Thomson
Sir William Walrond and
Lee, Capt. A. H. (Hants, Fareham

Ropner, Colonel Robert
Mr. Anstruther.

Original Question again proposed.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN asked whether the Committee to be appointed would be empowered to inquire into the necessity of better accommodation for the press, and of a fairer distribution of the seats already provided?

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS replied that in answer to a similar question on the previous day the First Lord of the Treasury said the matter was barely within the reference.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: What I am dealing with is the Press Gallery in this House.

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: Oh, I beg the hon. Member's pardon.

THE CHAIRMAN: That will not arise on this Vote at all. I thought the hon. Member was referring to the accommodation in the House of Lords.

Question put and agreed to.

2. Motion made and Question proposed, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £2,500, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for Expenditure in respect of Art and Science Buildings, Great Britain."

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE asked whether a corresponding supplementary Vote would be submitted with, regard to similar buildings in Ireland?

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: I do not think that really arises here, but I am only too glad to answer any question. I understand the hon. Baronet to ask whether there is a corresponding Vote required for Ireland. I will endeavour to obtain that information, but I am not responsible for any buildings outside Great Britain.

MR. DILLON said the Committee knew there would not be a corresponding Vote for Ireland, as the present represented the whole of the Civil Service Supplementary Estimate for the year. This Vote was claimed simply and solely on account of the increased price of coal. The point of the hon. Baronet was why, if this Supplementary Estimate was necessary in regard to public buildings in England and Scotland, was not a corresponding Vote required in connection with similar public buildings in Ireland? There should be some proof that this was a bonâ fide claim due to a real deficit caused by the increase in the price of coal. Were the Committee to understand that in Ireland when coal rose in price the unfortunate inhabitants were obliged to shiver and do without coal in order to keep within the Estimate, while in Great Britain a different principle was applied?

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: As I pointed out to the Committee, I am quite prepared to justify the Vote which I am asking for in regard to the extra expenditure due to the higher price of coal, so far as it affects those buildings for which I am responsible. But it is not for me to say whether the Secretary to the Treasury, who administers the public buildings in Ireland, has been more fortunate in his contracts. I can only tell the House what has occurred in regard to the price of coal in the buildings for which I am responsible in England. I will take this opportunity of answering the question put to me by the hon. Member opposite, which applies to all these Votes. The reasons for the extra cost in the coal contracts for the year are

two. In the first place there was a very large increase in the cost of steam coal since the time that the original estimates were prepared. There has been a very great increase in this respect, and consequently we have had to ask for more money for the warming and the lighting of these buildings. The other reason is because we have a different system in vogue now to that which has hitherto been the practice. We are paying this year for fourteen months supply of coal in the place of twelve months, because we are now supplying ourselves directly from the pit's mouth, instead of supplying ourselves through the middlemen and contractors in London; and we are paying ready money for our coals instead of paying quarterly, so that we are asking for a larger sum than if we bought under the old system. This is an advantage, because we get a very much better class of coal, and we have the control of the supply in our hands. We also get the advantage of the overweight which is always given when dealing direct with the colliery. We have saved in efficiency at least 15 per cent., and at least 5 per cent, in the overweight, besides securing a better quality of coal.

MR. JORDAN thought that in view of the fact that the right hon. Gentleman had been buying coal at cost price, and also getting the overweight, he would have been able to reduce and not increase the sum required for coal.

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: We should have had to pay a great deal more, owing to the extra price of coal, had we not been able to make this economical arrangement under the new system of purchasing direct from the collieries.

MR. JORDAN said that possibly this explanation was satisfactory, but he did not understand how that explanation could apply to such articles as water and household furniture.

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: If the hon. Member will look at the bottom of the page he will see that the extra cost is due to the increase in the price of steam coal.

Question put.

The House divided::Ayes, 271; Noes, 71. (Division list, No. 21.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Dorington, Sir John Edward

Lawson, John Grant

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-

Lecky, Rt. Hn. Wm. Edw. H.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Doxford, Sir William Theodore

Lee, Capt. A. H. (Hants, Farehm

Allen, Charles P (Glouc, Stroud

Duncan, James H.

Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)

Allhusen, Augustus Hy. Eden

Dunn, Sir William

Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage

Allsopp, Hon. George

Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin

Leigh, Sir Joseph
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Edwards, Frank
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Arrol, Sir William
Elibank, Master of
Levy, Maurice
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Emmott, Alfred
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Faber, George Denison
Long, Rt Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Asquith, Rt Hon Herbert Henry
Fardell, Sir T. George
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Atherley-Jones, L.
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Lucas, Reginald J (Portsmouth
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison
Austin, Sir John
Fenwick, Charles
Macdona, John Gumming
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Maconochie, A. W.
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Baird, John George Alexander
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Balcarres, Lord
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Baldwin, Alfred
Fisher, William Hayes
M'Crae, George
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Fison, Frederick William
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
M'Kenna, Reginald

Banbury, Frederick George
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
M'Killop, James (Stirlingah.)
Barlow, John Emmott
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Majendie, James A. H.
Bartley, George C. T.
Forster, Henry William
Malcolm, Ian
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Foster, Sir W. (Derby Co.)
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Beach, Rt Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Max well, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Bill, Charles
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. Herbert J.
Milward, Colonel Victor
Blundell, Col. Henry
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Godson, Sir Augustus Fred k.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Boseawen, Arthur Griffith
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Bousfield, William Robert
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Bowles, T. Gibson (King'sLynn
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Brassey, Albert
Grant, Corrie
Morgan, Hn. Fred. (Monm'thsh.
Brigg, John
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Broadhurst, Henry,
Groves, James Grimble
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu

Guthrie, Walter Murray
Morrell, George Herbert
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Haldane, Richard Burdon
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Hambro, Charles Eric
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford
Bullard, Sir Harry
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Ld. G. (Midx.
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Burt, Thomas
Hamilton, Marq. of (Londndrry
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Rbt. Wm.
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Caldwell, James
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashfrd.
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Nicholson, William Graham
Cautley, Henry Strother
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lanes.)
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Cawley, Frederick
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Artliur D.
Philipps, John Wynford
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Heath, A. Howard (Hanley)
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Heath, James (Staffords. N. W.
Plummer, Walter R.
Chamberlain, J. A. (Worc'r)
Helme, Norval Watson

Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Henderson, Alexander
Pretymann, Ernest George
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Hermon-Hodge, R. Trotter
Price, Robert John
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Higginbottom, S. W.
Purvis, Robert
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Hobhouse, H. (Somerset, E.)
Pym, C. Guy
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Hogg, Lindsay
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Holland, William Henry
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Hoult, Joseph
Reid, Sir R. T. (Dumfries)
Colville, John
Howard, Capt. J. (Faversham)
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Rentoul, James Alexander
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Renwick, George
Craig, Robert Hunter
Jacoby, James Alfred
Rickett, J. Compton
Cranborne, Viscount
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. T.
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Robson, William Snowdon
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Ropner, Colonel Robert

Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Round, James
Dewar, T. R. (T'RH'mlets, SGeo.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W (Salop)
Russell, T. W.
Dickson, Charles Scott
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Rutherford, John
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Kinloch, Sir John Geo. Smyth
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Knowles, Lees
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alex.
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Law, Andrew Bonar
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Talbot, Rt. Hon. J. G. (Oxford Univ
Welby, Sir C. G. E. (Notts)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Tennant, Harold John
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Wilcox, Sir John Archibald
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Thornton, Percy M.
Wills, Sir Frederick
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)
Tomkinson, James
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Smith, H. C. (Nrthmb. Tyneside
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks
Tufnell, Col. Edward
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Smith, Samuel (Flint)

Valentia. Viscount
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H.(Yorks.)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Vincent, Sir C. E.H.(Sheffield)
Wodehouse,Rt. Hn. E. R.(Bath
Soares, Ernest J.
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B.Stuart-
Spear, John Ward
Walker, Col. Wm. Hall
Wylie, Alexander
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Walton, J. Lawson (Leeds, S.)
Wyndham, Rt.Hon. George
Stewart, Sir Mark J.M'Taggart
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Stroyan, John
Wason, John C. (Orkney)
Sir William Walrond and
Strutt, Hon. Chas. Hedley
Welby,Lt.Col.A.C.E.(Tauntn
Mr. Anstruther.
NOES.
Abraham, William(Cork,N.E.)
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Ambrose, Robert
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
O'Dowd, John
Blake, Edward
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Roland, John
Joyce, Michael
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon,N.)
Boyle, James
Leng, Sir John
O'Mall'ey, William
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Lough, Thomas

O'Mara, James
Carew, James Laurence
Lundon, W.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Cogan, Denis J.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
M'Dermott, Patrick
Reddy, M.
Crean, Eugene
M'Fadden, Edward
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Cremer, William Randal
M'Govern, T.
Redmond, William (Clare)
Crombie, John William
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Cullman, J.
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
Roche, John
Daly, James
Mooney, John J.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Dalziel, James Henry
Moulton, John Fletcher
Sullivan, Donal
Delany, William
Murphy, J.
Tully, Jasper
Dillon, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Doogan, P. C.
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Duffy, William J.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Farrell, James Patrick
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Woodhouse, Sir J.T. (Huddersfield)
Ffrench, Peter
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'y, Mid)
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)

Field, William
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Yoxall, James Henry
Flavin, Michael Joseph
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)
Gilhooly, James
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Hammond, John
O'Doherty, William
Sir Thomas Esmonde and
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Captain Donelan.

3. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £;2,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for Expenditure in respect of Diplomatic and Consular Buildings."

MR. DILLON said this Vote was a glaring example of a custom which had grown from year to year since the present Government came into office, and which threatened to be a great public nuisance. He alluded to the system of covering the Notice Paper with Supplementary Estimates in almost every department of the public service. When he first came to the House of Commons Supplementary Estimates were very few, and it was considered to be a reproach to any Minister to be compelled to put down a Supplementary Estimate unless he could allege some unforeseen circumstances. When a Minister came down to the House of Commons in past years and asked for a Supplementary Estimate he was always on the defensive, and he was bound to make out some special cause for his action.

Consequently Ministers bringing forward such Estimates always rose and made a statement in regard to the grounds upon which the money was asked for. Nowadays, Ministers seemed to be proud of Supplementary Estimates, and the number and the amount of them was growing year by year. The original Estimate for Diplomatic and Consular Buildings was £;30,000, and they were now asked, without any details whatever, to add to that sum an additional £;2,000 for the maintenance and alterations of those buildings. The reason given for this extra expenditure in the Estimate was as follows;

"Sundry urgent works, some due to changes of occupation, not anticipated when the original Estimate was prepared, were required to be carried out at, among other places, Vienna Embassy House, Brussels and Lisbon Legation Houses, and Cairo Agency House."

What was the meaning of "urgent works"? What were the urgent works necessary in the embassy and legation houses at Vienna and Lisbon? These urgent works were not anticipated at the beginning of the financial year, and why could they not have waited? He should like to know why the right hon. Gentleman had departed from the good and orthodox system of endeavouring to keep within the original Estimate unless something really urgent occurred.

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS said that this increase of £;2,000 was almost entirely due to changes in the personnel in the diplomatic and consular service which had rendered a change of occupants necessary. A certain amount of expense for the redecoration and repair of official residences upon a change of consul or ambassador was unavoidable. It was the custom, even in private life, when a man had been in possession of a house for a certain time to incur a certain amount of expense in order to prepare it for his successor.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford. N.) did not think that the explanation of the right hon. Gentleman was satisfactory, for this large expense seemed to have been incurred without steps being taken to carry out the work in the most economical way. He thought hon. Members from Ireland were only exercising their ordinary rights in closely criticising the proposals of the Government in the smallest detail. As an Irish Member he strongly protested against the Government having a free hand in expenditure of this kind without taking contracts in the usual way. Unless some more satisfactory explanation was given he would move a substantial reduction in the Vote. He thought they were entitled to demand a more explicit statement in regard to this increased expenditure than that which they had received from the right hon. Gentleman, and he begged to move the reduction of this Vote by £;2,000.

*THE CHAIRMAN: That is the total amount of the Vote.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: Then I will move to reduce it by £;200.

Motion made, and Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £;1,800, be granted for the said service."; (Mr. J. P. Farrell.)

MR. DILLON said the explanation of the right hon. Gentleman was by no means satisfactory. The only ground given for the increased Estimate of £;2,000 was that changes had occurred in our embassies. Changes were always occurring in our embassies or agencies. It was the average state of things, and it ought to have been in the power of the Government to produce a more reasonable Estimate than the one before the Committee. He was aware that it was not reasonable to press unduly for details in the Estimates, because the elaborate details were matters for the Committee of Accounts, but the persons responsible for preparing the Estimates were surely bound to go so far as to let the Committee know where the money had been spent. The Estimates showed that £;2,000 had been spent in Vienna, Brussels, Lisbon, and Cairo, and the Committee was entitled to know how much had been spent on each house. The real reason for his protest against this particular Estimate was the extraordinary statement of the First Lord of the Treasury on a previous occasion, that it was the practice of the Committee of Supply never to examine the Estimates. Such a practice would open the floodgates to every kind of jobbery and loose expenditure, if a Minister wished to make any additions to his house, if such openings were afforded by such a statement being made beforehand that it was the settled practice not to examine the Estimate. He protested against such a statement being made. It was the duty of the Committee to examine the Estimates with great care, and to endeavour to remove any abuses and ensure economy in the financial business of the nation. SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derby, Ilkeston) desired to emphasise the views just put before the House, and appealed for a more definite explanation of that increase

in the Estimate which, though small in itself, was a considerable amount when one considered the amount of the original Estimate. With a very little consideration, the Government ought to have been able to provide in the ordinary Estimates sufficient to cover these charges, but with the want of foresight which was so great a characteristic of the Government, they could not even look twelve months ahead.

MR. LABOUGHERE said in his opinion the Vote ought to be reduced by at least £;1,000, if at all, because although it might be necessary to keep up such establishments at Vienna and Brussels, it certainly was not at Lisbon and Cairo. At the time it was proposed to buy these houses he protested against it because it would lead to increased expenditure. It was unnecessary to bring into the present Estimates the residencies at Lisbon and Cairo, and therefore he should vote for the reduction.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.) said that the Supplementary Estimate, although not large in itself, presented a large percentage of increase. He endorsed the remarks of the Member for East Mayo. When the First Lord introduced the Rule for the guillotining of the debate, it was pointed out that it would lead to a certain amount of looseness in preparing the Estimates, and when those who were in the House in the eighties recalled the trouble Ministers took to explain every Vote, they would recognise the change which had come over the practice of the House in the discussion of the financial business of the country, and that every year the amount of information given by the Ministers responsible was less.

MR. TULLY said so far as the debate had gone it had shown that very little supervision was exercised over the financial business of the House. The Supplementary Estimate was not large in itself, but at the same time the Committee was entitled to know how it had been expended and how much was spent on each house. The expense of an Agency in Cairo should not have been incurred, seeing that Egypt was a British dependency and, as he understood, was administered at a profit to this country. He supported the Amendment.

MAJOR JAMESON disclaimed any desire to detain the House, but felt compelled to say that what he objected to in this Estimate was its unbusinesslike character. He had some knowledge of how a Government contractor did his work; repairs were often made which were absolutely unnecessary, simply for the purpose of increasing the Expense, and whatever might be the position of England, Ireland at all events had not too much money to pay for these estimates. The four items dealt with should have been kept separate and not lumped together in one Estimate, because when it came to a question of voting Supplementary Estimates no one knew where it was going to end. So far as the Irish Members were concerned, they were determined to extract the greatest possible information from the Government in regard to them.

MR. FIELD said the House of Commons took upon itself to criticise the work of some of the count councils in Ireland, but, as a member of a county council, he would inform the Committee that no county council in Ireland could carry on its financial business in the way in which the fiscal business of the Empire was conducted. The fiscal business of the Empire was carried on in the loosest

possible manner; the House being expected to vote millions of money on the mere word of a Minister, no financial committee making any examination into the Estimates until they came to be considered by a Committee of the House. Such a practice was not one to recommend itself to a business man. He thought the business of the Empire ought to be carried out on business principles, and therefore he supported the Amendment.

MR. DALY did not know who was responsible for the Estimate, but the Estimate itself certainly showed that very loose management existed in the Department from which it emanated. It showed a great want of economy. He regretted also that as the amount was so small and we were so near the new financial year this Estimate could not have gone over with the ordinary Estimates, but no doubt the reason for bringing it in in this way was in order that the general Estimates should be made to look less. He was pleased the Amendment had been moved, and was of opinion that if a good fight were made by the Irish Members it would tend to make the Government more careful in the future.

COLONEL NOLAN thought that the Vote ought to be reduced by at least £1,500, as he saw no reason for maintaining any of these Embassies in Catholic countries.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order; The hon. Member is not entitled to go into that question. All that is open to discussion is the amount in the Supplementary Estimates.

COLONEL NOLAN drew attention to the fact that in the original Estimates a sum was allowed for this purpose, and he thought that amount ought never to be exceeded.

MR. FLYNN expressed the opinion that if a county or district council in Ireland prepared their accounts in such a fashion as the Estimates of the Empire were prepared there would soon be a strong complaint from the Local Government Board. Some explanation ought to be given by those responsible for the Estimates such as the Committee had the pleasure to listen to when the Treasury was represented by the present President of the Board of Agriculture. On the Front Opposition Bench there was at one time a party whose cry was Peace, Retrenchment, and Reform, but that party, judging from the state of the bench, had disappeared. It had come to this, that the iconoclastic, revolutionary, and semi-socialistic persons representing in that House the people of Ireland were the only persons who looked at the Estimates with a critical sense of economy.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.) hoped some explanation would be forthcoming. All that the right hon. Gentleman said was that urgent work was necessary; he gave no details. He submitted that no business man would accept an account which only contained the lump sum in respect of several items, and in this case the House ought to be treated as a customer who, having to pay the money, was entitled to receive a detailed account.

MR. DALZIEL complained that the application by hon. Members for details had not been acceded to, but he thought, at all events, they were entitled to a courteous reply, if it only contained reasons why no details were to be given.

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS said he had already explained that there had recently been many changes in the personnel of the diplomatic and consular service, and

expense had unavoidably been incurred in redecoration and repairs of official residences on a change of Consul or Ambassador. It was the general thing to do. Hon. Members themselves did it when they took a house after the expiry of a lease.

MR. JORDAN had no objection to putting these houses into repair, that was a thing that everybody did. His objection lay in the fact that no details; being before the Committee, the Committee was unable to form an opinion as to whether the work had been economically carried out. In all these cases there was a lack of business detail. If the Committee had been in possession of the details of the £2,000 they might, having found the details correct, have agreed to the Estimate. As matters stood, he should vote against the lump sum.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid) said it appeared to him that what was generally complained of was a want of specification in the Estimate. The Committee would notice that in Section B there was a Vote for £500 for anything that might not be foreseen. There were a great many changes in our diplomatic service every year, and the changes of one year balanced the changes of another, and that sum of £500 was put in in order to meet anything extraordinary which might take place. The Estimate ought to have stated what the particular expenses were, and the amount required at each place. The whole complaint

AYES.

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

Grant, Corrie

O'Doherty, William

Allen, C. P. (Glouc, Stroud)

Hammond, John

O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)

Ambrose, Robert

Harmsworth, R. Leicester

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

Boland, John

Hayden, John Patrick

O'Dowd, John

Bolton, Thomas Dolling

Hayne, Rt.Hn. Charles Seale-

O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)

Boyle, James

Helme, Norval Watson

O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N)

Bring, John

Holland, William Henry

O'Malley, William

Broadhurst, Henry

Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)

O'Mara, James

Burke, E. Haviland-

Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Caldwell, James
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Jordan, Jeremiah
Power, Patrick Joseph
Cawley, Frederick
Joyce, Michael
Rea, Russell
Cogan, Denis J.
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Reddy, M.
Colville John
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Redmond, William (Clare)
Crean, Eugene
Leng, Sir John
Rickett, J. Compton
Cremer, William Randal
Levy, Maurice
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Crombie, John William
Lundon, W.
Roche, John
Cullinan, J.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Daly, James
M'Dermott, Patrick
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh.)
Dalziel, James Henry
M'Fadden, Edward
Soares, Ernest J.
Delany, William
M'Govern, T.
Sullivan, Donal
Donelan, Captain A.
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Doogan, P. C.
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
White, George (Norfolk)

Duffy, William J.
Mansfield, Horace Kendall
White, Patrick(Meath, North)
Duncan, James H.
Mooney, John J.
Whiteley, George(York, W. R.)
Edwards, Frank
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Murphy, J.
Wilson, Henry J. (York.W.R.)
Fenwick, Charles
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Huddersfield)
French, Peter
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
Field, William
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Yoxall, James Henry
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Gilhooly, James
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Mr. Tully and Mr. J. P.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
Farrell.
NOES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire)
Dyke, Rt. Hon, Sir Wm. H.
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Faber, George Denison
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Arkwright, John Stanhope

Chamberlain, J. A. (Worc'r)
Fergusson, Rt. HnSir J(Manc'r)
Arrol, Sir William
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Finch, George H.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Austin, Sir John
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.
Fisher, William Hayes
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Baird, John Geo. Alexander
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Balcarres, Lord
Colston, Chas. E. H. Athole
Forster, Henry William
Baldwin, Alfred
Cook, Frederick Lucas
Gladstone, Rt.Hon.Herbert J.
Balfour, Bt.Hn.A.J.(Manch'r
Corbett, A. C. (Glasgow)
Godson, Sir Aug. Frederick
Balfour, Rt. Hn.G.W. (Leeds)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Gordon, Hn.JE.(Elgin&Nairn)
Bartley, George C. T.
Cranborne, Viscount
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Greene, Sir E. W. (Bury St. Ed.
Bousfield, William Robert
Dickson, Charles Scott
Greene, H. D.(Shrewsbury)
Bowles, T. Gibson(King'sLynn
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles

Grenfell, William Henry
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Gretton, John
Bullard, Sir Harry
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Groves, James Grimble
Butcher, John George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Cautley, Henry Strother
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore
Hambro, Charles Eric;
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lanes.)
Dunn, Sir William
Hamilton, RtHnLordG(Mid'x

against the Government seemed to be a want of specification.

Question put.

The Committee divided::Ayes. 101; Noes, 175. (Division List No.22.)

Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.

Molesworth, Sir Lewis

Spear, John Ward

Hardy, Laurence(K'nt,Ashf'rd

Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)

Stanley, Lord (Lanes.)

Hare, Thomas Leigh

More, Rt. Jasper (Shropsh.

Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart

Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley

Morgan, D. J.(Walthamstow)

Stifling-Max well, Sir John M.

Heath, James(Staffords. N. W.)

Morrell, George Herbert

Stone, Sir Benjamin

Henderson, Alexander

Morris, Hon. Martin Henry E.

Stroyan, John

Higginbottom, S. W.

Morton, ArthurH. A.(Deptford

Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier

Hogg, Lindsay

Murray, Rt Hn AGraham(Bute

Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr

Hoult, Joseph

Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)

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

Howard, Capt J(Kent,Faversh.
Murray,Col.Wyndham (Bath)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Newdigate, Francis Alex.
Thornton, Percy M.
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Tomlinson,Wm. Edw. Murray
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Pilkington, Richard
Tufnell, Col. Edward
Kennaway,Rt. Hon. SirJohn H.
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Valentia, Viscount
Kenyon, James (Lanes.,Bury)
Plummer, Walter R.
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Keswick, William
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Walker, Col. William Hall
Knowles, Lees
Pretymann, Ernest George
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Law, Andrew Bonar
Purvis, Robert
Wason, John C. (Orkney)
Lawson, John Grant
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Welby, Sir C. G. E. (Notts.)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne)
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Reid, James (Greenock)
Willoghby de Eresby, Lord
Long, Rt. Hon.W. (Bristol, S.
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Rentoul, James Alexander
Wills, Sir Frederick
Lucas,Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Renwick, George
Wilson, A. Stanley(York,E.R.)
Macdona, John Cumming

Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
 Wilson, John (Falkirk)
 Maconochie, A. W.
 Ropner, Colonel Robert
 Wilson, John (Glasgow)
 M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool
 Round, James
 Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
 M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.
 Russell, T. W.
 Wylie, Alexander
 M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinb'h, W.)
 Rutherford, John
 Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
 M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
 Sadler, Col. Samuel Alex.
 Yerburch, Robert Armstrong
 Majendie, James A. H.
 Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
 Malcolm, Ian
 Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
 TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
 Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
 Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
 Sir William Walrond and
 Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
 Smith, H. C. (North'mb Tynesde
 Mr. Anstruther.
 Milward, Colonel Victor
 Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
 Original Question put.
 The Committee divided:; Ayes, 176; Noes, 91. (Division List No. 23.)
 AYES.
 Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
 Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
 Forster, Henry William
 Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
 Churchill, Winston Spencer
 Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
 Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
 Clare, Octavius Leigh
 Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
 Anson, Sir William Reynell
 Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
 Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
 Arkwright, John Stanhope

Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Arrol, Sir William
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Greene, Sir E. W. (B'y SE dm'ds
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Colston, Chas. E. H. Athole
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Cook, Frederick Lucas
Grenfell, William Henry
Austin, Sir John
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasg'w
Gretton, John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Groves, James Grimble
Baird, John George Alexander
Cranborne, Viscount
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Balcarres, Lord
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Hambro, Charles Eric
Baldwin, Alfred
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Mid'x.
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Dickson, Charles Scott
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Bartley, George C. T.
Dimsdale, Sir J. Cockfield
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanl'y
Beach, Rt Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Heath, James (Staffords. N. W.
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Henderson, Alexander
Bousfield, William Robert
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Higginbottom, S. W.
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn)
Dyke, Rt Hon. Sir Wm. Hart

Hogg, Lindsay
Broadhurst, Henry
Faber, George Denison
Hoult, Joseph
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Fardell, Sir T. George
Howard, Capt J (Kent, Faversham)
Bullard, Sir Harry
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Butcher, John George
Fenwick, Charles
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Cautley, Henry Strother
Fergusson, Rt Hon Sir J. (Manc'r
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lanes.)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Finch, George H.
Kenyon, James (Lanes., Bury)
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Keswick, William
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Fisher, William Hayes
Knowles, Lees
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.)
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Law, Andrew Bonar
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Lawson, John Grant
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Stroyan, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Plummer, Walter R.
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Long, Rt Hon Walter (Bristol, S.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Pretymann, Ernest George
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. 'R.)

Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsm'uth
Purvis, Robert
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Macdona, John Cumming
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Thornton, Percy M.
Maconochie, A. W.
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Tomlinson, W. Edw. Murray
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool
Reid, James (Greenock)
Tufnell, Col. Edward
M'Calmont, Col.J.(Antrim,E.)
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Valentia, Viscount
M'Iver, Sir L.(Edinburgh, W.
Rentoul, James Alexander
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
M'Killop, Jas. (Stirlingshire)
Renwick, George
Walker, Col. William Hall
Majendie, James A. H.
Ridley Samuel F. (BethnalGr'n
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Malcolm, Ian
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. C. Thomson
Wason, Hn. Cathcart (Orkney
Maxwell, W.J.H.(Dumfriessh
Roberts, JohnBryn (Eifion)
Welby, Sir CharlesG.E(Notts'.)
Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir Fred. G.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Whiteley, H.(Ashton-u.-Lyne)
Milward, Colonel Victor
Round, James
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Russell, T. W.
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Montagu, G.(Huntingdon)
Rutherford, John
Wills, Sir Frederick
More, Robert J. (Shropshire)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alex.
Wilson,A.Stanley (York, E.R.
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)

Sandys, Lt. -Col. Thos. Myles
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Morrell, George Herbert
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Wodehouse, RtHonE. R. (Bath)
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Smith, HC(Northmb.Tyneside
Wylie, Alexander
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Buth)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
Spear, John Ward
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Murray, Col. Wyndham(Bath)
Stanley, Lord (Lanes.)
Newdigate,Franeis Alexander
Stewart,SirMark J.M 'Taggart
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Sir William Walrond and
Pilkington, Richard
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Mr. Anstruther.
NOES.
Abraham,William(Cork,N.E.)
Grant, Corrie
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Ambrose. Robert
Hammond, John
O'Connor, James(Wicklow,W.
Boland, John
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
O'Doherty, William
Boyle, James
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Brigg, John
Hayne, Rt.Hon.Charles Seale-
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Burke, E. Haviland-
Helme, Norval Watson

O'Dowd, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Caldwell, James
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
O'Malley, William
Cawley, Frederick
Jordon, Jeremiah
O'Mara, James
Cogan, Denis J.
Joyce, Michael
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Colville, John
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Power, Patrick Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Reddy, M.
Crean, Eugene
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Cramer, William Randal
Leng, Sir John
Redmond, William (Clare)
Crombie, John William
Levy, Maurice
Rickett, J. Compton
Cullinan, J.
Lundon, W.
Roche, John
Daly, James
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Delany, William
M'Dermott, Patrick
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh.
Donelan, Captain A.
M'Fadden, Edward
Soares, Ernest J.
Doogan, P. C.
M'Govern, T.
Sullivan, Donal

Duffy, William J.
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Duncan, James H.
M'Laren, Charles-Benjamin
White, George (Norfolk)
Dunn, Sir William
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
White, Patrick (Meath, North
Edwards, Frank
Mooney, John J.
Whiteley, Geo. (York, W.R.)
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
Ffrench, Peter
Murphy, J.
Yoxall, James Henry
Field, William
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Mr. J. P. Farrell and Mr. Tully.
Flynn, James Christopher
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Gilhooly, James
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Goddard, Daniel Ford
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Md)

4. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a supplementary sum, not exceeding £;7,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the expenses of the Post Office and Post Office Telegraph buildings in Great Britain, including furniture, fuel, and sundry miscellaneous services."

MR. J. P. FARRELL thought it would be admitted that the criticism of these Votes had been very useful. The total original Estimate in this instance was £;316,000, and without any explanation an additional £;7,000 was asked for. It was said to be in consequence of the additional cost of steam coal in the engineering branches. He did not know much about the arrangements for the postal service in London, and perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would explain what was meant by the "engineering branches." Everybody knew that coal had increased in price, but he understood that the Post Office were now paying more for coal at the pit mouth than they were formerly paying to the contractors.

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: Less, not more.

MR. J. P. FARRELL accepted the correction of the right hon. Gentleman, but he

was speaking on the authority of Members who knew something of the subject when he made the statement. There was another reason why the Irish representatives should discuss this Vote. London was one of the largest and richest cities in the world, and served by a very big Department. But the Irish people gained no benefit whatever from the large expenditure involved, and it was not fair that they should be expected to contribute something like £30,000 for the accommodation of the people of London in this matter. It was an extraordinary thing that in each case where the Department came for a Vote it was increasing an original Estimate which it had been thought would be sufficient for the year. If satisfactory explanations were not forthcoming it would be the duty of the Irish Members to take the opinion of the House as to whether these constant increases were justified. There was an utter absence of detail in regard to the expenditure. For all the House knew, there might be a large amount of jobbery concealed in these items. It certainly would not be much trouble to print, in addition to the bald information now supplied, a schedule giving particulars which would explain these matters.

MR. TULLY thought this Vote was another instance of the slovenly manner in which the Estimates were presented. It was not fair to ask for an additional sum of £7,000 on an original Estimate of £15,009 without giving any information. If officials got a free hand in these matters, knowing there would be no inquiry, they would pile up extras at an enormous rate. No confidence could be placed in any estimate coming from the Post Office Department, as Committees sitting upstairs knew how the leading officials of the Department juggled with the finances of the country. As an illustration he might instance the case of the telegraphs; they were to have been bought for £3,000,000, but when the Post Office had done taking the public money £17,000,000 had been paid. The Committee had been told that instead of buying the coal from contractors the Post Office officials were to do a stroke of economy by buying at the pit mouth, and thus avoid the middleman's profits. What was the result as soon as they had this free hand? There was this increased demand for £7,000. That ought to appeal to the Liberal Members to support the Irish representatives more than they had done in criticising these Votes. If these small sums were not looked into with care and discrimination they would soon mount to very large totals.

MR. DALY pointed out that in the footnote to this Estimate it was stated that this £7,000 was due partly for steam coal. What did "partly" mean? With regard to purchasing coal at the pit mouth, was the contract put out to tender, or had the Government given it to some particular firm? As one who knew a little about the coal business, he was surprised to hear that by buying the coal direct from the collieries the right hon. Gentleman obtained extra weight. If he had been so fortunate he had been more lucky than most people. What foundation had the right hon. Gentleman for that statement? Had he personally seen the coal weighed? Another point was, how much per ton had the Government paid for the coal? That there should be a Supplementary Estimate of £7,000 on an original Estimate of only £15,000 seemed to point to great incapacity on the part of the department that made such a wrong calculation, and it was nothing short of an insult to the Committee that they should be asked to pass such Supplementary

Estimates without any particulars or explanation whatever.

MR. CALDWELL, in reference to the appeal to the Liberal benches by the hon. Member for South Leitrim, said he had not seen any necessity for the Liberals to interfere in the Votes so far as they had gone. The Local Government Act in Ireland had evidently been most beneficial, one of its fruits being that Irish Members, being now accustomed to local government and to the manner in which accounts should be kept, were able with that experience to come and give a lesson in the matter of accounts to the House of Commons. He never thought that the Government would have put forward the price of coal as a reason for the present Estimate, because there had not been a rise in the price since the Estimates were prepared. The Government evidently thought that they were going to make a good bargain by taking the coal supply into their own hands, and they made a contract for fourteen months supply of coal just before the price went down.

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS said he could only repeat the explanation which he had given on the previous Vote as to the causes of the increase. A very great increase had taken place in the price of the coal. The Estimates were prepared in November and December of the year before the last, and that Estimate had been exceeded. Hon. Members opposite must be aware that the extra cost of coal had been felt very severely not only by individuals, but also by large undertakings. Under the new arrangement which the Government had made they were paying for a fourteen months supply, whereas the original estimate was made only for twelve months. They had been told that as the Government were very large consumers of coal, and consumed in their public departments something like 24,000 tons of steam coal annually, they ought to make arrangements whereby they could supply themselves from the pit's mouth. Such an arrangement was entered into, and it came into effect on the 3rd of July last. They were now getting steam coal direct from the collieries, and it was being paid for monthly, whereas it was paid for quarterly before. They were distributing it themselves, and were actually placing it in the cellars of the public departments. By this means they could guarantee that the coal was of the description which it professed to be, and they could ensure greater punctuality in the delivery. By this new system they got not only a very much better class of coal but they had a much smaller amount of what were known as "sweepings." On the whole, the experiment they had made in this direction had worked extremely well. They had now got their own wharf in London, and they had a practical man resident there who inspected the coal and saw it weighed before it was delivered to the Government departments. They had now under the present system an assurance that the coal they were receiving was of the quality ordered. They were also getting the advantage of the overweight by dealing directly with the collieries, and they would not get that additional weight if they bought from the middleman or the contractor. With regard to the price, they were paying for steam coal 18s. 3d. per ton at the pit's mouth. They were consuming some 24,000 tons of coal annually, and they were practically saving about 1s. per ton upon the prices which they would have to pay in London.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) agreed that the Department were doing

well in dealing directly with the collieries, instead of allowing the middleman to get a profit. That course was certainly putting the matter on a more businesslike footing. The right hon. Gentleman opposite had given the Committee a full explanation, but he agreed with his hon. friend behind him that some such explanation ought to have been put on the Estimate itself. If the terms of this new arrangement had been set forth on the Estimate this discussion would have been unnecessary, and the right hon. Gentleman would have been saved a good deal of trouble. One point he wished for an explanation upon was how the right hon. Gentleman made out that he had effected a real saving by taking this contract for fourteen months instead of twelve months, in view of the high price of coal?

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: We did not make such a contract. What I said was that by the present system we are paying ready money, whereas formerly we paid only quarterly. It is only for this particular year that we are paying for this extra two months supply. By this system of paying ready money instead of paying quarterly we have got two more months supply in the year.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said that when the new contract was arranged last July the price of coal was about the highest, and it had come down in price since that time.

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: But we did not enter into a contract for a year at all. We simply made this new arrangement, and the extra two months, as I have-already explained, is entirely owing to the different method of payment. We are now paying for our coal in advance, and consequently we have to put two more months in the Estimate. We did not enter into a year's contract last July.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON accepted this explanation, and said there was one other point upon which he should like an explanation. He wished to know whether a considerable number of respectable producers were asked to contract for the supply, and was the lowest tender accepted.

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: Yes, a considerable number of producers were asked to tender, and the lowest tender was accepted.

MR. DALY said that the right hon. Gentleman's explanation was not satisfactory. He moved a reduction of the Vote by £1,000.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £6,000, be granted for the said Service." (Mr. Daly.)

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green) said he desired to enter his protest against this increase in the expenditure, because it showed very bad management on the part of the parties responsible. He happened to be connected with a corporation which had to buy coal, and when the difficulty complained of by the right hon. Gentleman occurred they made their arrangements for purchasing coal accordingly. The parties responsible for this contract had very much mistaken their position, and they had made a mistake in giving out a contract which was far in excess of the requirements of the case. He was very much surprised indeed that hon. Gentlemen opposite were satisfied with this state of things, and were leaving all the criticism to Members on the Opposition side of the House.

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.) said the right hon. Gentleman opposite had pointed out that the Government had been purchasing coal in a cheaper way, and under those

circumstances he could not understand why there had been an increase of £4,000 in twelve months. Last winter was not very cold, and how was it that in public offices some attempt was not made to economise in the quantity of coal used and so reduce the expenditure of the country? To his mind 18s. 3d. per ton was a very excessive price to pay for steam coal.

MR. FLAVIN regarded the right hon. Gentleman's statement as very unsatisfactory, and he wished to know why a fourteen months contract was entered into last July.

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: I did not state that such a contract was entered into last July. What I said was that the new arrangement came into force in that month. We certainly did not make such a contract in July.

MR. FLAVIN said he understood that the new system came into operation in July. He wished to know when the Government commenced paying the price which had been quoted, and had that price been continued up to the present moment. The right hon. Gentleman had not explained that point. If the information he had received was correct, steam coal was now worth between 3s. to 5s. a ton less than it was in July, when this arrangement was entered into.

Taking the 24,000 tons consumed during the fourteen months at 18s. 3d. per ton, according to the present price of steam coal they were paying an overcharge of 5s. per ton. [Ministerial laughter.] He thought he was perfectly entitled to say that, because the First Commissioner of Works had given them no explanation of it. Hon. Gentlemen opposite sat there and absolutely refused to ask a single question upon this subject. This was not the first occasion upon which Irish Members had considered it their duty to examine the details of a Supplementary Estimate, and they were quite prepared to accept the laughter of hon. Gentlemen opposite. The fact remained that they laughed and did nothing else. What they wanted to know was when the contract was entered into, and whether the price of 18s. 3d. per ton was given last July, August, or September.

MR. CLEAN (Cork, S.E.) said that what struck him in connection with this Vote was not so much the amount of money in excess of the original estimate, but the system of contracting. If the humblest county or parish council in Ireland were to prepare its estimates in this fashion, and then add 50 per cent, to them, the Local Government Board would come down on it, surcharge the amount, and make the members pay the excess. If that system were introduced in the Government departments they would have none of these Supplementary Estimates. At present the work was evidently done in a very slipshod way. He was perfectly well aware that so long as the Government had such a big majority behind them, their supporters would swallow anything, even if it were as big as a whale, or so long as it was for the consumption

of Government money. He supposed the same thing would happen if the Liberals were in power, and he maintained that it was the Irish Nationalists who could alone, with clean hands, criticise the Government departments in their dealings with the country. If the war contracts were conducted on the same principle as the right hon. Gentleman had conducted the contracts for his office, no wonder they were spending hundreds of millions in South Africa. The Irish people had to pay the piper more in proportion to their means than the English, and they could not afford to allow this extravagant expenditure over estimates to go on.

[Laughter.] Hon. Gentlemen opposite might laugh, but they would laugh with the wrong side of their mouth if they did that sort of thing in Ireland. Hon. Gentlemen opposite were very good when they went to their constituents and said they would carefully look into these things; but the moment they were elected they did not care how the taxpayer's money was spent. They in Ireland did care, and hence their protest against this extravagance. He did not want to waste the time of the Committee, but if more time was spent in discussing the Estimates there would be less waste of public money.

*MR. MANSFIELD (Lincolnshire, Spalding) said he did not question the principle of these contracts, but the true secret was to choose the right time for entering into them. The right hon. Gentleman had explained that the contract was for fourteen months and not for twelve months, but he had given no idea when it was entered into. If that had been done in July it was what no business firm would have done.

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS said he would point out again that although the contract, for a certain fixed amount of coal, dated from the 1st of July, it did not necessarily follow that they made it on that date. There was no desire whatever on the part of the Department to keep back anything from the House, but to give the actual facts as to the date of the contract.

*MR. MANSFIELD thought that under the circumstances it would be better to postpone the Vote. What he was seeking to know was, whether the contract was entered into on the 1st of July at July prices, or whether it was entered into prior to July at lower prices. At what price per ton did the contract allow the coal proprietor? He would like to be clear as to whether the Government had given a price at high-water mark, and so secured for the contractors a rate which in a year's time the contractors could not have hoped to have obtained. He noticed that the fuel for the Post Office had risen 50 per cent., while that for the Science and Art Department had only increased 6 per cent., and for Public Buildings Department 8 per cent. Would the right hon. Gentleman tell the Committee the reason for this enormous difference? Was there one contract, or different contracts entered into at separate times? It would not be amiss if someone went down from the Public Buildings Department, or, better still, from the Science and Art Department to the Post Office, and made some inquiries as to the cause of these enormous differences. It would be a pity if they were asked to vote for this huge increase, and to be kept absolutely in the dark as to the reason for it.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE said that if the right hon. Gentleman could not give the information, he supposed it was not owing to his fault, but to that of the person who drew up the statement. He thought the right hon. Gentleman should postpone the Vote to enable him to obtain full and accurate information.

MR. CALDWELL said he too would appeal that the Vote should be postponed. The right hon. Gentleman had, after he had drawn attention to it, himself to admit that the Vote was not correct in this respect, that whilst they had put £7,000 under item M, item Bought to have been included, which would have brought the sum up to £20,000. That one point showed that the Government came before the Committee with defective Estimates. But more than that, if the right hon.

Gentleman would refer to the explanation given in the foot-note, he would find that it had nothing to do with; the explanation now given from the Front Bench. The explanation in the foot-note was; "Additional cost of fuel, partly steam coal, required for the engineering branches." But the explanation given from the Front Bench was that the increase was due to the contract being for fourteen months instead of twelve. But the difference would only amount to £;4,000 for the two months, supposing the whole quantity of coal had been taken, and that left £;3,000 or £;4,000 entirely unexplained. The increase in the price of coal had nothing whatever to do with the increase of expenditure, because, if they took this same Vote under item J, for coal fuel for the port of London and the outports in England, Wales, and Scotland, amounting to £;9,000, no increase was asked for. How did they make out that in a particular Department in London there was an enormous increase in the price of coal, while there was no increase whatever in the price throughout England, Wales, and Scotland? There must be some explanation, but obviously that given both on the Estimates and from the Front Bench was insufficient and incomplete. For their own credit he beseeched the Government to withdraw this Vote; the Estimates would not all be pushed through that night; and bring it forward on Monday with full information, and then the Committee would be able to deal with it in a spirit which would be intelligent at least. His experience of the House was that when person the Government would not get on with their other Estimates if they insisted on going on with the disputed one without explanation.

MR. JORDAN said his excuse for the right hon. Gentleman was that he was new to his office, and had not been able to give the attention desirable to his permanent officials, who desired, of course, to "boss" the whole thing. These permanent officials had evidently furnished the right hon. Gentleman with Estimates without any details, and they had thought that hon. Members were fools enough to pass them without discussion. But the Committee had been indueed with a spirit of investigation, and intended to exercise it. He appealed to the right hon. the First Commissioner of Works to postpone the Vote, at any rate until Monday; and between now and then he could see his permanent officials and consult with them as to how a detailed Estimate could be brought in. The right hon. the First Commissioner could come on Monday fresh and primed for his work, as they also would be.

MR. O'MARA said he had just been doing a little sum on paper, and found that there had been an increase of 26 per cent, on the original Estimate. If the First Commissioner had been chairman of a railway company, and had come before his shareholders and told them that there had been an increase of 26 per cent, in the cost of running the locomotive department, the shareholders would have immediately appointed a committee of investigation to inquire where the money had gone. An hon. Member had drawn attention to the fact that this increase was only for London. The figures were very interesting. Over the whole country £;316,000 was spent for fuel, and in London £;22,000. That was only 7 per cent, of the total amount spent in the whole of England. Now, it was a very curious thing that there should have been an increase of 50 per cent, in the cost of

coal in London, and no increase at all in the money spent in all the provincial towns. He could not understand how the price of coal had risen 50 per cent, in London, and had remained the same in every town in the country. He joined in the appeal made to the right hon. Gentleman to withdraw this Vote until he had a full explanation to offer to the Committee. [Laughter.] Although there was a good deal of laughter on the Government benches, the country would not be satisfied with the explanation given by the First Commissioner.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) said it was an extraordinary thing that no British representative, except a few on the Opposition side of the House, had offered any opposition whatever to

these accounts. Was it to go out to the public that supporters of His Majesty's Government were prepared to sit perfectly silent when they found such a large increase in the Votes without one of them asking the Minister responsible why the increase had come about? Outside the House he had heard representatives of the British public saying that they opposed Home Rule because they were always glad in Committee of Supply to have the Irish Members standing up and objecting to extravagance on the part of the Government, which the supporters of the Government were either unwilling or afraid to put out. The hon. Member who spoke from Scotland had appealed to the First Commissioner of Works to postpone this Vote, and he would repeat that appeal. He would ask whether any Gentleman representing the Government on the Front Bench could point to a single precedent where a responsible Minister in Committee of Supply had got up and frankly admitted that he had not got the particulars asked for, and at the same time refused to postpone the Vote in question until he had obtained the particulars which would enable him to answer inquiries made? If they were not to receive detailed explanation from the Minister in charge of these Votes, and if inquiries addressed to him in a reasonable way were not to be listened to the sooner a fresh arrangement was made the better, whereby Ministers could allocate the public money in any way they pleased without coming to the House and asking for it. He had heard it said that the reason for this large increase of £7,000 in one year was due to the increased price of coal. That might be the reason for all he knew, but it ought to be the duty of the responsible Minister to take steps to guard the public against such an exorbitant increase, in the price of a necessary of life like coal, which came from time to time on the public. They had heard that fuel ought to be laid in stock by municipalities, so that the public could have a supply at a reasonable rate. Whether that were so or not, he submitted that the Government ought to take steps to lay in a sufficient supply of fuel, in order to protect the taxpayers, when they had reason to believe that the price was to be raised to an exorbitant rate. If this extraordinary increase was the result of the increased price of coal, then that increased price had been purely fictitious, and had enormously and extravagantly enriched the coal merchants, and to a great extent the coal-owners, from which the public ought to have been protected. For the Government to come down and, without a word of explanation, calmly to ask the representatives of the taxpayers to pay £22,700, instead of £15,700, owing to an increase in the price of coal, was an extravagant and outrageous thing. He quite agreed with what fell from the hon.

Member for North Wexford, that the lack of details and the absence of explanations asked for might not be in any single way the fault of the First Commissioner of Works. So far as he had had experience of the right hon. Gentleman in the office he held, they had always found him quite ready to give any explanation in his power; but on this occasion he told them frankly that he had not got at his disposal the facts that would throw some light on this extravagant increase. He certainly thought that some hon. Gentlemen supporting His Majesty's Government should lend assistance to the appeal they were making to the right hon. Gentleman; because, after all, the constituents of hon. Gentlemen opposite were as much interested in this matter as Irish constituents. He believed there was not one of them who,

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Bousfield, William Robert
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Brassey, Albert
Cust, Henry John C.
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Billiard, Sir Harry
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Arclidale, Edward Mervyn
Butcher, John George
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Cautley, Henry Strother
Dickson, Charles Scott
Arrol, Sir William
Cavendish, K. F. (N. Lancs.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbysh.)
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Austin, Sir John
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Doxford, Sir William T.
Bailey, James (Walworth)

Chamberlain, J. Austen(Wore.
 Duke, Edward Henry
 Bain, Colonel James Robert
 Charrington, Spencer
 Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
 Baird, John Geo. Alexander
 Churchill, Winston Spencer
 Dyke,Rt. HonSirWilliamHart
 Balearres, Lord
 Clare, Octavius Leigh
 Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
 Baldwin, Alfred
 Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.
 Faber, George Denison
 Balfour,Rt.Hn.A.J. (Manch'r)
 Coghill, Douglas Harry
 Fardell, Sir T. George
 Balfour, Rt. Hn. G.W. (Leeds)
 Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
 Fellowes,Hon.AilwynEdward
 Banbury, Frederick George
 Colston, Chas. Edw. H.Athole
 Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
 Bartley, George C. T.
 Cook, Frederick Lucas
 Fielden, EdwardBrocklehurst
 Beach,Rt. Hn. SirM. H. (Bristol
 Corbett,A. Cameron(Glasgow)
 Finch, George H.
 Big wood, James
 Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
 Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
 Bill, Charles
 Craig, Robert Hunter
 Fisher, William Haves
 Blundell, Colonel Henry
 Cranborne, Viscount
 Fison, Frederick William
 Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
 Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
 FitzGerald,SirRobertPenrose-

at a meeting of his constituents, would be able to deny that, in the demand they were now making, the Irish Members were doing a service to the taxpayers of the United Kingdom. It seemed to him that if the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works desired, as they did, to facilitate the business of the House;[Laughter.] It appeared to be perfectly impossible to convince hon.

Gentlemen opposite that they on the Irish benches were just as anxious as those hon. Gentlemen were to get through Supply as soon as possible; and if they did not understand that, then they characteristically and pre-eminently misrepresented the feeling of the Irish people. If the object of the First Commissioner of Works was to get through Supply in reasonable time, he would be well advised if he conceded the demand made to postpone the Vote until he had furnished himself with the information desired.

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

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

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 222; Noes, 135. (Division List No. 24.)

Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon

Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie

Renwick, George

Fletcher, Sir Henry

Leighton, Stanley

Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)

Flower, Ernest

Long, Rt. Hon. Walter (Bristol, S)

Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson

Forster, Henry William

Loyd, Archie Kirkman

Ropner, Colonel Robert

Foster, Sir Michael (Lond Univ.)

Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)

Round, James

Garfit, William

Lucas, Reginald J (Portsmouth)

Royds, Clement Molyneux

Godson, Sir Augustus F.

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

Russell, T. W.

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

Macdonald, John Cumming

Rutherford, John

Gore, Hon. P. S. Ormsby-

MacLver, David (Liverpool)

Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-

Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon

Maconochie, A. W.

Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander

Gosehen, Hon. George Joachim

M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)

Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)

Goulding, Edward Alfred

M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)

Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
M'Iver, Sir L.(Edinburgh,W.)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Green.WalfordD(Wednesbury
M'Killop, Jas. (Stirlingshire)
Smith,Abel H. (Hertford,East)
Greene,SirEW (B'rySEdni'nds
Majendie, James A. H.
Smith,H.C.(NorthumbTynesd
Grenfell, William Henry
Malcolm, Ian
Smith, Hon. W. F. D.(Strand)
Gretton, John
Manners, Lord Cecil
Spear, John Ward
Groves, James Grimble
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Maxwell. WJ H (Dumfriesshire
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir Jn. M.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Milner,Rt. Hn. SirFrederickG.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Hambro, Charles Eric
Milton, Visconut
Stroyan, John
Hamilton, RtHnLordG.(Mid'x
Milward, Colonel Victor
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Hamilton,Marq.of (L'nd'derry
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Hardy,Laurance(K'nt,Ashford
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Thornton, Percy M.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Tollemache, Henry James
Hay, Hon. Claude George
More, R. Jasper (Shropshire)
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Heath, A. Howard (Hanley)
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Tufnell, Col. Edward

Heath, James(Stanfford,N.W.)
Morgan, Hn. F.(Monmouthsh.
Valentia, Viscount
Helder, Augustus
Morrell, George Herbert
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Henderson, Alexander
Morris, Hn. Martin Henry F.
Walker, Col. William Hal).
Hermon-Hodge, Robt. Trotter
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Hobhouse, Henry(Somerset,E.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Wason, John C. (Orkney)
Hogg, Lindsay
Murray, Col. Wyndham(Bath)
Welby, Lt. -ColA C E(Taunton)
Hoult, Joseph
Newdigate, FrancisAlexander
Welby, SirCharlesG. E. (Notts.
Howard, CaptJ(Kent,Faversh.
Nicholson, William Graham
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Wills, Sir Frederick
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Pilkington, Richard
Wilson, A. Stanley (York,E. R.)
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. SirJohnH.
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Kenyon, Jamas (Lanes., Bury)
Plummer, Walter R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col.W (Salop)

Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Keswick, William
Pretymann, Ernest George
Wodehouse, Rt Hon E.R.(Bath)
Knowles, Lees
Purvis, Robert
Wylie, Alexander
Law, Andrew Bonar
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Wyndham, George
Lawrence, William F.
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Lawson, John Grant
Reid, James (Greenock)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Lee, Capt A.H.(Hants, Fareham)
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Sir William Walrond and
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Rentoul, James Alexander
Mr. Anstruther.
NOES.
Abraham, William(Cork,N.E.)
Colville, John
French, Peter
Allen, C. P. (Glouc, Stroud)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Field, William
Ambrose, Robert
Crean, Eugene
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Barlow, John Emmott
Crombie, John William
Flynn, James Christopher
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Cullinan, J.
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Boland, John
Daly, James
Fuller, J. M. F.
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Dalziel, James Henry
Furness, Sir Christopher
Boyle, James

Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Gilhooly, James
Brigg, John
Delany, William
Gladstone, Rt Hon. Herbert John
Broadhurst, Henry
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Burt, Thomas
Doogan, P. C.
Hammond, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Douglas, Chas. M. (Lanark)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Caldwell, James
Duffy, William J.
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Duncan, James H.
Hayden, John Patrick
Carew, James Laurence
Dunn, Sir William
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Carvill, Patrick G. Hamilton
Edwards, Frank
Helme, Norval Watson
Cawley, Frederick
Elibank, Master of
Holland, William Henry
Channing, Francis Allston
Farrell, James Patrick
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Cogan, Denis J.
Fewick, Charles
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Jones, David Brynmor, Swansea
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid)

Shipman, Dr John
Joyce, Michael
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh.
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
Soares, Ernest J.
Labouchere, Henry
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Stevenson, Francis S.
Layland-Barratt, Francis
O'Doherty, William
Sullivan, Donal
Leese, Sir Joseph F (Accrington)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Leigh, Sir Joseph
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Tennant, Harold John
Levy, Maurice
O'Dowd, John
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Lloyd-George, David
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.
Lough, Thomas
O' Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
Tomkinson, James
Lundon, W.
O'Malley, William
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
O'Mara, James
Tully, Jasper
M'Crae, George
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Warner, Thos. Courtenay T.
M'Dermott, Patrick
Power, Patrick Joseph
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan'
M'Fadden, Edward
Rea, Russell
White, George (Norfolk)
M'Govern, T.
Reckitt, Harold James
White, Patrick (Meath, North

M'Hugh, Patrick A.
Reddy, M.
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
M'Kenna, Reginald
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Whiteley, J. H. (Halifax)
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Mansfield, Horace Kendall
Rickett, J. Compton
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Huddersfield)
Mooney, John J.
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East).
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Murphy, J.
Robson, William Snowdon
Sir Thomas Esmonde and
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Roche, John
Captain Donelan.
Question put accordingly, "That a sum, not exceeding £6,000, be granted for the
said Service."
AYES.
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N.E.)
Dunn, Sir William
M'Dermott, Patrick
Allen, Chas. P. (Gloucester, Stroud)
Edwards, Frank
M'Fadden, Edward
Ambrose, Robert
Farrell, James Patrick
M'Govern, T.
Asquith, Rt Hon. Herbert Henry
Fenwick, Charles
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
Barlow, John Emmott
French, Peter
M'Kenna, Reginald
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Field, William
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Boland, John

Flavin, Michael Joseph
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Flynn, James Christopher
Mooney, John J.
Boyle, James
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Brigg, John
Fuller, J. M. F.
Murphy, J.
Broadhurst, Henry
Furness, Sir Christopher
Naunetti, Joseph P.
Burt, Thomas
Gilhooly, James
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Buxton, Sidney Charles
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Caldwell, James
Hammond, John
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'y, Mid
Carew, James Laurence
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Hayden. John Patrick
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W)
Cawley, Frederick
Hayne. Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Channing, Francis Allston
Helme, Norval Watson
O'Doherty, William
Cogan, Denis J.
Holland, William Henry
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Colville, John
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry', W.)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)

O'Dowd, John
Craig, Robert Hunter
Jacoby, James Alfred
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Crean, Eugene
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
O'Kelly, J. (Roscommon, N.)
Crombie, John William
Jones, D. Brymnor (Swansea)
O'Malley, William
Cullinan, J.
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Mara, James
Daly, James
Joyce, Michael
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Kinloch, Sir John Geo. Smyth
Power, Patrick Joseph
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Rea, Russell
Delany, William
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Reckitt, Harold James
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Reddy, M.
Dillon, John
Levy, Maurice
Redmond, J. E. (Waterford)
Doogan, P. C.
Lough, Thomas
Redmond, William (Clare)
Douglas, Chas. M. (Lanark)
Lundon, W.
Rickett, J. Compton
Duffy, William J.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion),
Duncan, James H.
M'Crae, George
Robson, William Snowdon
The Committee divided:; Ayes, 132; Noes, 222. (Division List No. 25.)
Roche, John
Tennant, Harold John

White, Patrick (Meath.North)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Whiteley, G. (York, W. R.)
Scott, Charles P. (Leigh)
Thomson, F. W. (York,W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Shipman, Dr. John
Tomkinson, James
Williams,Osmond(Merioneth)
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Woodhouse,SirJT(Huddersf'd
Soares, Ernest J.
Tully, Jasper
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
Stevenson, Francis S.
Warner, Thomas CourtenayT.
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Sullivan, Donal
Wason, E. (Clackmannan)
Sir Thomas Esmonde and
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
White, George (Norfolk)
Captain Donelan.
NOES.
Acland-Hood,Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Doxford,SirWilliam Theodore
Keswick, William
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Duke, Henry Edward
Knowles, Lees
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Law, Andrew Bonar
Allhusen, Augustus Hy. Eden
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir Win. Hart
Lawrence, William F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Lawson, John Grant
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Elibank, Master of
Lee, Capt. AH (Hants. Fareham
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas

Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Arrol, Sir William
Faber, George Denison
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Fardell, Sir T. George
Leighton, Stanley
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Long, Rt. Hu. Waiter (Bristol.S
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Austin, Sir John
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Finch, George H.
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Fiulay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Macarctney, Rt. Hn. W. G. Ellison
Baird, John Geo. Alexander
Fisher, William Hayes
Macdonald, John Cumming
Balcarres, Lord
Fison, Frederick William
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Baldwin, Alfred
FitzGerald, Sir R. Penrose-
Maconochie, A. W.
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manchester)
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward A.
M. Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds)
Fletcher, Sir Henry
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Banbury, Frederick George
Flower, Ernest
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W)
Hartley, George C. T.
Forster, Henry William
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)
Foster, Sir M. (London Univ.)
Majendie, James A. H.

Bigwood, James
Garfit, William
Malcolm, Ian
Bill, Charles
Godson, Sir Augustus Fred.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin&Nairn
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Bousfield, William Robert
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Brassey, Albert
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Milton, Viscount
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Milward, Colonel Victor
Bullard, Sir Harry
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Butcher, John George
Green, Walford D (Wednesbury
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Cautley, Henry Strother
Greene, Sir E. W. (Bury St. Ed.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Cavendish, R, F. (N. Lancs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Cavendish, V.C. W. (Derbysh.)
Gretton, John
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Groves, James Grimble
Morgan, Hn Fred. (Monmouthsh.
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Morrell, George Herbert
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Wore.

Hambro, Charles Eric
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford)
Charrington, Spencer
Hamilton, Rt Hon Lord G. (Mid'x)
Murray, Rt Hon A Graham (Buth)
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'donderry)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Nicholson, William Graham
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.)
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Cook, Frederick Lucas
Helder, Augustus
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Henderson, Alexander
Pilkington, Richard
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotter
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Cranborne, Viscount
Higginbottom, S. W.
Plummer, Walter R.
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Hogg, Lindsay
Pretymann, Ernest George
Cust, Henry John C.
Hoult, Joseph
Purvis, Robert
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Howard, Cap. J. (Kent, Faversham)

Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Reid, James (Greenock)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Rentoul, James Alexander
Dimsdale, Sir Jos. Cockfield
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Renwick, George
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)
Ridley, S. F. (Bethnal Green)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Charles T.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Round, James
Stroyan, John
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Royds, Clement-Molyneux
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Russell, T. W.
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Ox'd Univ.
Wills, Sir Frederick
Rutherford, John
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Wilson, A. Stanley (York. E. R.)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Thornton, Percy M.
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Sadler, Col. S. Alexander
Tollemache, Henry James
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Wilson-Tond, Wm. H. (Yorks.)

Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Tufnell, Col. Edward
Wodehouse, Rt. Hon. E. R. (Bath)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Valentia, Viscount
Wylie, Alexander
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Smith, HC (North'mb. Tyneside)
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Spear, John Ward
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Welby, Lt. -Col. ACE (Taunton)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir J. M.
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
MR. AKERS DOUGLAS claimed, "That the Original Question be now put."
AYES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Grenfell, William Henry
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Gretton, John
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Cranborne, Viscount
Groves, James Grimble
Allhusen, Augustus Hy. Eden
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Oust, Henry John C.
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Hambro, Charles Eric

Arrol, Sir William
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G (Mid'x
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Dickson, Charles Scott
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Austin, Sir John
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)
Bain, Col. James Robert
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Heath, J. (Staffords., N.W
Baird, John George Alexander
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Helder, Augustus
Balcarres, Lord
Duke, Henry Edward
Henderson, Alexander
Baldwin, Alfred
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Hermon-Hodge, Robt. Trotter
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Higginbottom, S. W.
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W (Leeds
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Hobhouse, Hy. (Somerset, E.)
Banbury, Frederick George
Elibank, Master of
Hogg, Lindsay
Bartley, George C. T
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Hoult, Joseph
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Faber, George Denison
Howard, Capt J (Kent, Faversham.
Bigwood, James

Fardell, Sir T. George
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Bill, Charles
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Fergusson, Rt. Hon. Sir J. (Manc'r
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Bousfield, William Robert
Finch, George H.
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Brassey, Albert
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir J. H.
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Fisher, William Hayes
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)
Bullard, Sir Harry
Fison, Frederick William
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Butcher, John George
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Keswick, William
Cautley, Henry Strother
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Knowles, Lees
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lanes.)
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Lawrence, William F.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Flower, Ernest
Lawson, John Grant
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Forster, Henry William
Lee, Capt. A. H. (Hants, Fareham)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Foster, Sir Michael (Lond. Univ.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Garfit, William
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick

Leighton, Stanley
 Charrington, Spencer
 Cordon, Hn.J.E(Elgin&Nairn
 Long, Rt. Hn. W. (Bristol, S.)
 Churchill, Winston Spencer
 Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-
 Loyd, Archie Kirkman
 Clare, Octavius Leigh
 Gorst, Rt. Hon. SirJohnEldon
 Lucas, Col. Francis(Lowestoft)
 Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
 Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
 Lucas, R. J. (Portsmouth)
 Coghill, Douglas Harry
 Goulding, Edward Alfred
 Macartney.Rt. Hn. WGEllison
 Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
 Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
 Macdona, John Gumming
 Colston, Chas. Edw. H.Athole
 Green, WalfordD(Wednesb'ry
 MacIver, David(Liverpool, W.),
 Cook, Frederick Lucas
 Greene,SirEW(B'rySEdm'nds
 Maconochie, A. W.
 Original Question put accordingly.
 The Committee divided::Ayes, 229; Noes, 126. (Division List No. 26.)
 M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
 Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
 Talbot,RtHn.J G(Oxf'dUniv.
 M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim,E.)
 Pretymann, Ernest George
 Thorburn, Sir Walter
 M'Iver, SirL. (Edinburgh.W.
 Purvis, Robert
 Thornton, Percy M.
 M'Killop,James(Stirlingshire)
 Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
 Tollemache, Henry James
 Majendie, James A. H.
 Ratcliffe, R. F.
 Tomlinson, Wm, E. Murray
 Malcolm, Ian
 Reckitt, Harold James
 Tufnell, Col. Edward
 Manners, Lord Cecil

Reid, James (Greenock)
Valentia, Viscount
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Maxwell, WJH (Dumfriesshire)
Rentoul, James Alexander
Walker, Col. William Hall
Milner, Rt Hon. Sir Fred. G.
Renwick, George
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.
Milton, Viscount
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Milward, Colonel Victor
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas Thomson
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Ropner, Colonel Roberts
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Round, James
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Taunt'n)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Russell, T. W.
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Rutherford, John
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Morgan, Hn. Fred. (Monm'thsh)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Morrell, George Herbert
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Wills, Sir Frederick
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford)
Sandys, Lieut. -Col Thos. Myles
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert

Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Wilson-Todd, W. H. (Yorks.
Murray, Charles I. (Coventry)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Smith, H C. (North'm. Tyneside
Wylie, Alexander
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Nicholson, William Graham
Spear, John Ward
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sir William Walrond and
Pilkington, Richard
Stroyan, John
Mr. Anstruther.
Plummer, Walter R.
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Fenwick, Charles
Mooney, John J.
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud
Ffrench, Peter
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Ambrose, Robert
Field, William
Murphy, J.
Asquith, Rt. Hn Herbert Henry
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Barlow, John Emmot
Flynn, James Christopher
Nolan, Col. Jn. P. (Galway, N.)
Boland, John

Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Furness, Sir Christopher
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Brigg, John
Gilhooly, James
O'Brien, Kendal(Tipper'ryMid
Broadhurst, Henry
Goddard, Daniel Ford
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Burt, Thomas
Hammond, John
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow,W.)
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Hardie, J. K. (MerthyrTydvil
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Caldwell, James
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
O'Doherty, William
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Carew, James Laurence
Hayne, Ht. Hon. Chas. Seale-
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Helme, Norval Watson
O'Dowd, John
Cawley, Frederick
Hope, John Deans (Fife, W.)
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Channing, Francis Allston
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N
Cogan, Denis J.
Jacoby, James Alfred
O'Malley, William
Colville, John
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
O'Mara, James
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Jones,David Brynmor(Sw'ns'a
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Craig, Robert Hunter
Jordan, Jeremiah

Power, Patrick Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Joyce, Michael
Rea, Russell
Crombie, John William
Kinloch, Sir Jn. George Smyth
Reddy, M.
Cullinan, J.
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Daly, James
Leese, Sir Joseph E. (Accrington)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Dalziel, James Henry
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Rickett, J. Compton
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Levy, Maurice
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Delany, William
Lough, Thomas
Roche, John
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
London, W.
Samuel, S. M. (Whitchapel)
Dillon, John
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Doogan, P. C.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Shipman, Dr. John
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
M'Crae, George
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)
Duffy, William J.
M'Dermott, Patrick
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Duncan, James H.
M'Govern, T.
Soares, Ernest J.
Dunn, Sir William
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
Stevenson, Francis S,
Edwards, Frank
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Sullivan, Donal

Fanrrell, James Patrick
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Tennant, Harold John
Wason, E. (Clackmannan)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
White, George (Norfolk)
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Tomkinson, James
Whiteley, G. (York, W. R.)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Sir Thomas Esmonde and
Tully, Jasper
Williams, Osmond (Marioneth)
Captain Donelan.

Resolutions to be reported.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £35,200, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, in respect of sundry Public Buildings in Great Britain, not provided for on other Votes."

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: I wish to ask for information with regard to this Vote. In the Votes we have been discussing this evening, our chief difficulty has been that we have not had that information which would be thought requisite in submitting an original Estimate. My contention is that these items ought not to appear as Supplementary Estimates at all. They ought to have been anticipated at the time the Estimates were framed, and it is not right or fair to the House of Commons, which has to vote the money of this country, that these enormous Supplementary Estimates should be introduced in this fashion. We have before us today I believe the largest Supplementary Estimates that have ever been presented to the House of Commons. A few years ago it was the exception to introduce Supplementary Estimates except under special circumstances. Year by year, however, an increasing number of Supplementary Estimates are being presented to the House of Commons, and it is on that point that I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman a few questions. In the discussion on the last two Votes, the right hon. Gentleman said he was not personally responsible; that one Vote had reference to the Foreign Office, and the other to the Post Office. No doubt to a certain extent the right hon Gentleman was in the hands of these, offices, but he is directly responsible for the Estimate which I now desire to criticise. The first item is Census Buildings, £2,100. The right hon. Gentleman, when we were discussing the Foreign Office Vote, said that the reason

for the Supplementary Estimate was that it could not be anticipated, inasmuch as some of the ambassadors had been moved from one place to another, and the houses had to be altered for the new occupants. That to a certain extent is reasonable, but surely the right hon. Gentleman must have known that the Census comes every ten years, and that a building for the taking of it would be required this year. We know that during the last year or two the Government have never anticipated anything, and that the expected was the one thing they were never prepared for. Here was an Estimate which could have been anticipated with the greatest ease, and there is no possible excuse for presenting the House of Commons with a Supplementary Estimate regarding it. The next item is the fitting up of Hertford House, Manchester Square. That is a matter that has been going on for some years, and which might have been fully anticipated if the right hon. Gentleman had only chosen to anticipate it. Further on, there is an item for the Royal Mint, and also for the introduction and extension of electric lighting in the principal public buildings. I ask the right hon. Gentleman how it is that all these items were not anticipated? Not only might they have been anticipated, but it was his bounden duty to anticipate them. This is a matter in which this House is very much concerned, because if Estimates are so under-estimated, as they would seem

to have been from these huge Supplementary Votes, the annual statement which the Chancellor of the Exchequer has to make is really totally misleading to the country. The only conclusion that I can draw is that the finance of last year was so bad, and the Government thinking the war was coming to an end, all these different Departments were instructed to keep back every possible Estimate and have it introduced subsequently as a Supplementary Estimate. Even to this Government, a million is a considerable item, and therefore I think we are entitled to ask the right hon. Gentleman, how it is that such items as Census buildings, Hertford House, the Royal Mint, and the introduction of electric lighting were not anticipated in the Estimates that were originally framed? I hope he will be able to give us a satisfactory explanation, but if he does not, I shall certainly vote against the Estimate.

MR. BROADHURST (Leicester) said there was one item of a very interesting nature in the Vote, and that was the alteration of Winchester House, to be adapted to the Intelligence Department of the Government. If the Government would increase that item to some extent, he was sure it would be readily passed. A larger devotion of Government resources to the Intelligence Department would have obviated many of the blunders committed by the Government during the last few years. He especially desired to request information in respect to the moiety of the further portion of the cost of site and erection of buildings for the King's Bench and Probate Registries of the High Court of Justice, of which the total estimate was £19,800. What part of that was the cost of the site, and what part was the cost of the building? There was another item, Patent Office extension, acquisition of site and erection of buildings £3,000. It would, he thought, much facilitate the passing of these Votes if more detailed information regarding them was given. The amount given for the site and the amount to be expended on the building should be given separately, and he thought

that the House of Commons was also entitled to know what class of building it was proposed to erect, what was the material to be used, and what provision had been made to see that the material agreed upon was really used by the contractor, and that the work was carried out in accordance with the specification. He asked for information on these points,

MR. FLYNN said he was surprised at the innocence of the hon. Gentlemen, above the gangway, who, however, he was glad to see were waking up to a sense of their duty as the representatives of the taxpayers. The hon. Member for Poplar spoke of the absent-mindedness of the Government. Surely it was not a matter of surprise that the Government had only now awakened to the fact that there was a census every ten years. It was only yesterday that they discovered that the 1st of April this year fell on a Sunday. There was one very remarkable sum in the Vote, and that was in connection with the Wallace Exhibition. He believed that no one would grudge money for housing such a priceless collection of ancient and modern art, but surely the buildings ought to have been provided before the collection was arranged. The gallery was opened last May, and how it was that nearly twelve months afterwards there should be a Supplementary Estimate passed his comprehension altogether. He was delighted that hon. Gentlemen above the gangway were waking up to their duty. The Government had hoped to slip all these Estimates through without protest or examination, and would have succeeded were it not for the more or less accidental presence of a large number of Irish Members. There was also an item in the Vote of nearly £10,000 for the London University. The Irish Members would certainly inquire as to how that money was to be spent. They could not get £1,000 for the Queen's College in Belfast or Cork, while £10,000 was to be given to the London University. He did not know what genius was responsible for the Imperial Institute, but everyone knew it was a dismal failure, and now, at very short notice, it was to be dedicated to the purposes of the London University. The Irish Members strongly objected to that, first of all on the general principle, and secondly because money was being spent with a lavish hand in this country, while £10 would not be given for obviously necessary purposes in Ireland. These Supplementary Estimates called for the strongest protests from hon. Members representing the taxpayers. They were now on the threshold of a new financial year, and these huge sums were asked for instead of the Estimates being submitted to the House in a businesslike manner.

MR. LOUGH said there was one point about the Estimates which he thought was possibly a mistake, but which certainly deserved the attention of the right hon. Gentleman. Only one item; item A; was explained, and no explanation whatever regarding the others was given. Item B was for maintenance and repairs; £2,000. Maintenance and repairs of what? The object to which this sum was to be devoted should be stated. The Committee ought not to be called upon to pass Supplementary Estimates which could have been fairly included in the Estimates for the year. Surely the Government knew what their rent, tithe rent-charge, and insurance would be. There was another point on which he believed the Committee would desire an explanation. A sound canon which ought to be observed in connection with Supplementary Estimates was that nothing should be included in a

Supple-

mentary Estimate which could stand over. He did not believe in such financial juggling. The new buildings mentioned in the Supplementary Estimates I could have remained over until they could be included in the finances of the; next year. Then there was a serious item with reference to the extension of the Royal Mint, which he understood had nothing to do with the new Sovereign. Why could that building not remain; over until next month? He asked the right hon.

Gentleman to explain why none of the items except item A were I explained, and, secondly, why the proposed new buildings could not have stood over.

MR. DILLON said that there was one item to which he desired to direct attention, and that was the sum of £;2,950 for additional accommodation for the War I Office. It was only two years since they were called upon to vote a sum of two millions to erect a gorgeous new palace for the War Office. He himself and other hon. Members resisted that Vote for a considerable period on the ground that the country ought not to be called upon to spend an enormous sum of money for the erection of a new War Office until they had a Department fit to put into it.

What had the War Office done during the last two years to entitle it to demand an additional sum of money? In his opinion, the performances of the War Office had been of such a character; that the Committee ought to be very slow to grant any money to it until it was reformed. When he voiced these sentiments he was not speaking the; opinion of the Irish and Radical Members, but the opinion of that large section of the public represented by the Daily Mail and The Times newspapers, who denounced the War Office as the source of all the misfortunes of this Country in the field. Why could not the War Office get along in the buildings that had been in existence for the last

twenty years? It was monstrous to I bring forward as an urgent matter suitable for a Supplementary Estimate expenditure on a temporary building for the War Office, when they were spending £;2,000,000 in erecting a new palace in Whitehall for the accommodation of that incapable. Department. He accepted the evidence of The Times; which he read every morning with great interest; and had come to a conclusion, with The Times, that there never was a more incapable Department in any country than the War Office. Let the War Office conduct its ill-omened operations in the buildings in which it had worked for the last twenty years. He considered it a scandalous waste of public money to spend the sum mentioned in the Estimates for the temporary accommodation of these gentlemen. Every page of the Supplementary Estimates bore evidence of the fact that all the Departments had adopted the policy which was preached the other day by the First Lord of the Treasury; namely, that it was not the business of the House of Commons to examine Estimates at all, and that Departments requiring money could claim it without instructing the Member of the House who represented them as to how it was to be spent. In old days when a Minister had to introduce a Supplementary Estimate he did so with an apology, but no apology was made nowadays. The items under discussion should not have appeared in a Supplementary Estimate at all, because they were not urgent, and they could have been easily anticipated, or could have remained over until the 31st March. The Vote was an instance of the slipshod and reckless way in which the Estimates were prepared.

He would move a reduction in the Vote, but did not wish to interfere with other lion. Members who might desire to adopt that course.

MR. KEIR HAEDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): said he would ask the First Commissioner of Works to explain certain of the items. He wished to know whether the Government had considered the advisability of doing its own insurance. Great municipalities were now insuring their own property, and were thereby saving in some cases as much as 75 per cent, of what they had formerly paid to the insurances companies. The insurance charges of the Government must be very heavy, and he trusted that the right hon. Gentleman would inform the Committee whether Government insurance was effected in private offices, or whether the Government had an Insurance Department of its own. Then with reference to the items for fuel and household articles, they were all aware of the tremendous increase in the cost of coal, and some of them were equally aware, that practically every penny of that increase found its way into the pockets of the employers. It would be interesting to know from the First Commissioner of Works how many contracts for fuel were placed with members of the House of Commons or with companies in which hon. Members were shareholders. It was of the utmost importance to know exactly how public funds were being spent. With reference to the item for the supply of water, he should like an explanation from the right hon. Gentleman as to the sum of £;1,200 extra which was required. They were all aware that the London water companies had that day withdrawn a most absurd proposal with regard to making cisterns-compulsory in connection with the water supply of dwellings. It might be that the £;1,200, or some part of it was required to enable the Government to comply with the demands of the water companies in regard to cisterns. If that were so, the money would not now be needed. The water cisterns which were to be made compulsory were specified in the proposal put forward by the companies, and part of the specification was that the drainage pipe should be placed a few inches from the bottom of the cistern, the reason given being that if the exhaust pipe were placed at the bottom of the cistern dead cats, etc., would find their way down the drain pipe, and the companies would have to bear the expense of cleaning out the cisterns. Therefore the pipes were to be so arranged that dead cats and so on might remain in the cisterns and improve the quality of the water. He entirely agreed with what had been said with reference to bringing forward in a Supplementary Estimate items

which ought to be included in the general Budget. It was a method of spending public money which should be censured in the strongest possible manner. He was a strong advocate of direct taxation, because if taxation had to be paid direct there would be economy, and fewer filibustering wars would be entered upon; but he was also in favour of direct account keeping. He hoped the right lion.

Gentleman would give the information he asked for.

MR. GODDARD (Ipswich) said that it was rather surprising that no amount of criticism seemed to be able to draw any reply from the right lion. Gentle man in charge of the Vote. Surely the criticism which had been advanced was sufficiently serious to warrant some kind of reply, Attention had already been directed to Item C, for which £;5,500 was asked. He thought it a very dangerous

practice for Estimates of this kind to be passed without a proper explanation. The Committee had a perfect right to demand full details, and he would give an illustration to show the necessity of having them. Last year a question was raised by the Auditor General with reference to certain items in the furniture account. Among them was an item of £;100 for the purchase and restoration of two portraits of King William IV. and Queen Adelaide for the Foreign Office, and the Auditor General reported that that item should not have appeared under the head of furniture, and should have obtained the special sanction of the Treasury. There was no information as to how the sum of £;1,325 now asked for was to be expended, and it could not be known what the items were until the Estimates came before the Public Accounts Committee; but that was simply shutting the stable door after the steed had been stolen, as the expenditure could not then be prevented. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would no longer delay giving the information asked for with reference to the various items.

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: I was waiting to reply until hon. Members had finished. First of all, I may take the point raised with regard to the explanation which is given regarding Item A and not given regarding the other items. It has always been the practice to give items for new works in detail, but not items for maintenance. Then with regard to the Census, Buildings, we have been told that we ought to have foreseen the expenditure on regard to them, and that therefore there was no necessity to bring forward, as a Supplementary Estimate. I think a sum of £;4,000 was taken last year for the preparation of buildings for the purpose of collecting the census. Since then very considerable additions to the information to be collected have been asked for by hon. Members, with the result that an extra staff has to be provided. Therefore it can hardly be said that we could have foreseen what might have been required in the year to come. Then I was asked by the hon. Member for Leicester a question with regard to the Vote for the King's Bench and Probate Registries Buildings in Manchester. He also asked me the separate cost of the site and buildings. The total estimated cost is £;19,800, of which the site cost £;11,100 and the buildings £;8,700. As against that, the old buildings are being sold for some £;4,500. He also asked me for particulars with regard to the material used in the buildings, and also as to proper supervision during their construction. The materials are properly selected and every care is taken by competent surveyors to see that the Government gets value for its money. The hon. Member for West Islington asked me a question with regard to the Patent Office Extension, and he said that at all events in this case we might have foreseen the extra expenditure. I think, however, that he will absolve us from any want of prevision when I tell him that our object is to hasten on the erection of this building in order that we may provide library accommodation for the Patent Office, and thereby set free a sum of £;700 a year now paid for the use of a temporary library. The lease for the temporary library terminates this year, and if we are unable, to give up the premises we may have to renew it. Then there was a question raised with regard to the Royal Mint. That item is required by a slight addition which is required by the Mint authorities. With regard to Hertford

House, the supplementary sum is for extra furniture which is desired by the trustees and which was not contemplated when the original estimate was prepared. Having regard to the enormous value to this country of this collection, I hope the Committee will not grudge this money, especially when the great taste shown by the trustees in the preparation of the building is considered. Then I was asked about the War Office accommodation. The supplementary sum is explained by the necessity of acquiring a fresh office in consequence of the very large amount of work which has been thrown on the War Office during the past year. I should like to point out that this expenditure will tend towards the concentration of the clerks and the offices of the Department. I do not know whether it will surprise hon. Members when I tell them that only last year the War Office was working under no less than seventeen different roofs, some of them a mile apart.

It being midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House. Resolutions to be reported to-morrow; Committee also report Progress: to sit again to-morrow.

MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

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

Clause 1.

Committee report Progress: to sit again upon Wednesday, 12th June.

PRESENCE OF THE SOVEREIGN IN PARLIAMENT.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it is expedient that a Select Committee be appointed to join with a Committee of the Lords to consider the accommodation available in the House of Lords when the Sovereign is personally present in Parliament, and the advisability of substituting Westminster Hall on such an occasion for the House of Lords:

That a Message be sent to the Lords to acquaint them therewith.";(Sir William Walrond.)

MR. FLAVIN: I object.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Sir William WALROND, Devonshire, Tiverton) said he hoped the hon. Member would not persist in his objection, as there was a general desire that the Committee should be appointed.

MR. FLAVIN said he understood, the Committee was being appointed in connection with the King's Coronation, and if the right hon. Gentleman would give him a guarantee that that portion of the King's Coronation Oath which was objectionable to Catholics would be removed he would consider the advisability of permitting the motion to pass.

SIR WILLIAM WALROND said the Committee would have nothing to do with the Coronation.

MR. FLAVIN: I object.

Motion deferred.

Adjourned at five minutes after Twelve of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 1st March, 1901.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 62 COMPLIED WITH).

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

Aldershot Gas and Water Bill.

Caledonian Railway Bill.

Gas Light and Coke Company Bill.

Gravosend Gas Bill.

Great Eastern Railway Bill.

Great Northern Railway Bill.

London, Tilbury, and Southend Railway Bill.

South Metropolitan Gas Bill.

Taff Vale Rail way Bill.

Tendring Hundred Water Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 63 COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order No. 63 has been complied with, viz.:

British Gas Light Company Bill.

Crawley Gas Bill.

District Messenger and Theatre Ticket Company Bill.

Dublin St. James' Gate Brewery Tramways Bill.

Gateshead and District Tramways Bill.

Horley District Gas Bill.

Leatherhead Gas Bill.

Wells Water Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

BEXLEY TRAMWAYS.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir William Hart Dyke and Mr. Forster.

THAMES AND SEVERN PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

Read a second time, and committed.

STANDING ORDERS.

Resolutions reported from the Committee.:

1. "That, in the case of the Cambrian Railways Petition, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill."

2. "That, in the case of the South Yorkshire Electric Power Petition, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that the powers to exempt the Company proposed to be incorporated by the Bill, and their undertaking from the provisions of Section 81 of the Schedule to the Electric Lighting (Clauses) Act, 1899, be struck out of the Bill. That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

Resolutions agreed to.

CAMBRIAN RAILWAYS.

Report [this day] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Humphreys-Owen and Mr. Bryn Roberts.

SOUTH YORKSHIRE ELECTRIC POWER.

Report [this day] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir William Hornby, Mr. Helder, and Mr. Platt-Higgins.

PETITIONS.

BEER BILL.

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

CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

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

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (HIGHER GRADE AND EVENING CONTINUATION SCHOOLS).

Petitions for alteration of Law, from Keighley; Middlesbrough; Sedgley; and Southowram; to lie upon the Table.

POOR LAW OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1896.

Petition for alteration of Law, from West Ham; Guildford; South Shields; and Bedwellty; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

Petitions in favour, from United Free Church of Scotland Temperance Union; and Southampton; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PAUPERISM (ENGLAND AND WALES) (MONTHLY STATEMENTS).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 28th February; Mr. Grant Lawson]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 69.]

PAUPERISM (ENGLAND AND WALES) (HALF-YEARLY STATEMENTS).

Copy ordered, "of Statement of the number of Paupers relieved on the 1st day of January, 1901, and similar Statement for the 1st day of July, 1901 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 136, of Session 1900)."; Mr. Grant Lawson.)

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICA; JAMESON RAID INDEMNITY; CHARTERED COMPANY'S COUNTERCLAIM.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if his attention has been called to the statement of Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, in the House, on the 13th December, 1900,* in which he said for every pound fairly due in consequence of the Jameson raid from the Chartered Company to the late Transvaal Government at least £5 is probably due to the Company from the late Transvaal Government in consequence of the war entered into by that Government against this country; if so, whether he will communicate to the House particulars of this set-off of the Chartered Company.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): What happened was this: The hon. Member for East Northamptonshire asked whether the assets of the Transvaal, which we had been discussing, included the claim of the late Transvaal Government on the Chartered Company. I said that any question on that matter should be addressed to the Colonial Secretary, but, speaking merely my

own opinion, I added the words which the hon. Member now quotes. Of course, what I meant, and what I believe I was

*See The Parliamentary Debates [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxxviii., page 753.

understood by the House to mean, was that anything due from the Company seemed to me to have been wiped out by the injury done to the Company by the war. I did not go into details, nor have I any knowledge of them, much less did I admit, or suggest, that the Company could have any claim against Her late Majesty's Government, or the present administration of the Transvaal.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether we are to understand his answer to mean that the taxpayers of this country are not entitled to have those details gone into before this question is determined?

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: It was only a general statement of my opinion, and I do not think there is any reason for going into details.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES: May I ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he means to press this claim against the Chartered Company?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; This cannot be made an occasion for general discussion about the claims of or against the Chartered Company.

GOVERNMENT'S KNOWLEDGE BEFORE THE WAR OF ALLIANCE BETWEEN THE TWO REPUBLICS

MR. C. P. SCOTT (Lancashire, Leigh): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury at what period in the year 1899 the Government were informed that if war ensued between the Transvaal and this country, as a result of the differences which were made apparent at the Bloemfontein Conference, the Free State would undoubtedly throw in her lot with the sister Republic; and whether the attention of the Government was called to a Report issued by the Intelligence Department of the War Office four months before the outbreak of the war, entitled Military Notes on the Dutch Republics of South Africa, of which copies have within the past few days been placed in the library of the House of Commons.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): All the information the Government received upon the subject dealt with in the question was either in

the nature of opinion, and therefore necessarily conjectural, or else depended upon the assurances of ex-President Steyn, which were, unfortunately, mendacious.

TREATMENT OF BOER WOMEN AND CHILDREN.

Mr. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether there has been any revocation of the policy of placing the women and children confined in the concentration camps in South Africa, whose husbands and fathers are in the field, on reduced rations; or is that policy still being carried out.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT (Sheffield, Ecclesall): Before the right hon. Gentleman answers that question will he say whether it is not a fact that the great majority of the women and children now concentrated in camps have gone there by their own desire to obtain protection from natives and Boer marauders?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): I think that the great majority of the women and children have gone into the camps by their own desire. Their motives I am not responsible for. I have not yet received full

information, but Lord Kitchener has informed me that a sufficient allowance is being given to all families in camp, and that they are satisfied and comfortable.

PROGRESS OF THE WAR.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): Has the Secretary for War any further news from South Africa?

MR. BRODRICK: No, Sir; none beyond that already published.

ARMY WATER-CARTS; GENERAL DUNDONALD'S STATEMENT.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to a public statement of General Lord Dundonald to the effect that hundreds of our soldiers are buried in South Africa today who would have been alive had proper water-carts been supplied; and can he state who was responsible for the type of water-carts selected; and what steps, if any, he intends to take in the matter.

MR. BRODRICK: I have seen the statement in question. The barrel water-carts alluded to in the statement have been superseded, after due inquiry and experiment, since 1895 by tank water-carts, and nearly all the water-carts sent to South Africa have been of the latter pattern, though a few of the former were also sent. Printed forms were sent to South Africa requesting the opinion of officers on all articles of equipment used there. This equipment, with others, will be considered in the light of the replies.

MR. DALZIEL: Do I understand that the water-carts condemned by Lord Dundonald have been changed?

MR. BRODRICK: I can give no further information.

SECRET ARMY CONTRACTS.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state how much money has been spent up to 31st December last, or other convenient date, on secret contracts or secret purchases in connection with the South African war; and can he state when purchases or contracts are kept secret from this House who determines or advises the prices to be given, particularly under the following heads ;namely, conveyance of troops, arms, ammunition, food, forage, tentage, tools and engines, railway material, clothing and bedding, hospital stores, animals, and saddlery and harness.

Mr. BRODRICK: I am afraid I cannot give the information asked for by the hon. Member in the first part of his question. Terms of contract are settled, generally speaking, by the Director of Contracts in consultation with the military authorities concerned, and subject to the concurrence of the Financial Secretary and Secretary of State where the importance of the matter requires it. The chief exceptions to the above rule are the conveyance of troops by sea, which rests mainly with the Admiralty, and the purchase of horses, which rests with the Inspector General of Remounts.

MILITARY FUNERALS; ARTHUR DODD, SHROPSHIRE YEOMANRY.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL (Armagh, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War will he say if the War Office refused to send home for interment at Berrington, near Shrewsbury, the body of Arthur Dodd, one of the Shropshire Yeomanry, who recently died of pneumonia at Aldershot, and if a subscription for

the purpose had to be collected in his native village.

MR. BRODRICK: There was no refusal on the part of the War Office to send home the body for interment. Private Dodd's friends were informed of his death, and an undertaker representing them came to the barracks and asked permission to remove the body for burial. Permission was granted and the body was removed. The undertaker asked no question as to the War Office defraying the expenses, nor has any communication been received from the man's friends on the subject. On application, the usual amount, representing the cost of burial at Aldershot, will be paid by the War Department.

YEOMANRY TRAINING.

MR. HERMON-HODGE (Oxfordshire, Henley): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can inform the House upon what terms and conditions Yeomanry regiments will this year be called up for their annual training.

MR. BRODRICK: I will deal with this question on introducing the Army Estimates.

MR. HERMON-HODGE: Will the Report of the Yeomanry Committee then be in the hands of hon. Members?

MR. BRODRICK: I cannot say. It has, however, been laid on the Table.

HAMPSHIRE YEOMANRY.

SIR BARRINGTON SIMEON (Southampton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that several members of the Hampshire Yeomanry were attested and sworn in at Winchester on 12th February, when it was intimated to them that they would be required to join in three or four days, whereas they have not been required to join yet; whether he is aware that, although several of these young men gave up their employment to join the Yeomanry and are consequently without funds to pay for their board and lodging, on their applying at Winchester for a portion of the pay due to them since 12th February they were informed that they could receive no pay before joining; and whether, considering the pecuniary difficulties in which they are involved, orders may be given that these men should at once receive the pay due to them since 12th February.

MR. BRODRICK: The officer commanding the Hampshire Yeomanry paid the men their expenses and informed them that they would be entitled to draw their pay from the 12th. Instructions have been sent to this officer to carry out the regulations under which men should be regularly paid after being medically examined and attested from the date of attestation.

LITERATURE FOR TROOPS AT THE FRONT.

*MR. MANSFIELD (Lincolnshire, Spalding): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether any information can be given as to the disposal of books and papers sent out to men serving at the front in South Africa, and especially to the wounded in hospitals, whether any further parcels can now be sent, and how and to whom they may be addressed.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): Parcels intended for individuals can be sent as heretofore, addressed to the man at his unit in South Africa. Parcels intended for distribution should be addressed to the Officer Commanding the Army Service Corps at Cape Town, marked for the use of the unit or hospital for which they

are intended. They should be sent through the Embarking Staff Officer at Southampton, carriage paid to that port.

IRISH IMPERIAL YEOMEN;FACILITIES FOR SETTLEMENT IN SOUTH AFRICA.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether any, and if so how many, of the Imperial Yeomanry raised in the midland counties of Ireland are yet at the front; whether promises were made to some of these men that their services would be rewarded when the Boer farms came to be distributed as spoils of war; and can he state whether any of these men have already left the forces to settle in the country.

LORD STANLEY: There is no information available to show how many men of the six Irish companies of the Imperial Yeomanry came from the midland counties of Ireland, or whether any of them left the force to settle in South Africa.

Nothing is known of the promises alluded to, but it is contemplated that opportunities for settlement in these countries will be afforded to eligible men.

H.M.'S RESERVE REGIMENTS OF CAVALRY;CONDITIONS OF REENLISTMENT.

CAPTAIN JESSEL (St. Pancras, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether non-commissioned officers and men of His Majesty's Reserve regiments of cavalry, on determining their engagements, will be invited to re-enlist on terms similar to those offered by the Royal Warrant of 23rd February, 1901, to soldiers now serving in the Royal Reserve battalions of infantry, or whether they will be discharged on completion of their year's service.

LORD STANLEY: The non-commissioned officers and men in question will be allowed to re-enlist under the terms of the Royal Warrant of the 31st March, 1900, issued as a special Army Order on the 28th April of that year.

PRIVATE JAMES RAMSEY, 1ST BATTALION ROYAL INNISKILLING; FUSILIERS.

MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if his attention has been called to the case of Private James Ramsey, 1st Battalion Royal Inniskilling Fusiliers, who, although the time for which he enlisted with the colours, as well as his reserve time, has expired, is still at the front in South Africa; and whether immediate steps will be taken to have him sent home; and, if not, will he explain why he is detained.

LORD STANLEY: The Secretary of State's attention has not been called to this case, nor is there any reason why it should be so called. The man in question is liable under the terms of his attestation for Section D of the Army Reserve to serve on till the 10th of July next, unless demobilisation is ordered before that date.

NAVAL ENGINEERS AND ARTIFICERS.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY (Yorkshire, W.E., Shipley): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he can state how many engine-room artificers and stokers have been induced during the current financial year to join the Navy; whether only 55 per cent, of the engine-room artificers, and only 59 per cent, of the number of the stokers, authorised by Parliament have been obtained; and whether, in view of the difficulty of obtaining proper supplies of men for these branches of the service, the conditions of employment will be revised and improved; whether the Admiralty advertised in December last for applications for assistant engineers

for the Navy, distributing such advertisements throughout the various seaports for the purpose of ensuring applications; whether more than three applications were received; how many engineers were passed into the service in consequence of such advertisements; and whether any improvement in the conditions of service of engineers is contemplated.

THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): Two hundred and fifty engine-room artificers and 1,566 stokers were entered between 1st April, 1900, and 16th February, 1901. On the 1st instant 97 per cent, of the engine-room artificers voted by Parliament, and 98 per cent, of the stokers, were borne. There is not any difficulty experienced in obtaining sufficient men of both these ratings on existing terms. During a great part of the year restrictions have been placed on recruiting in order to keep within the numbers voted and to ensure the entry of only specially desirable men. The Admiralty caused advertisements to be inserted in two papers only; namely, The Engineer and Engineering; in December last for candidates for assistant engineers for temporary service in the Navy. Several applications were received, but only three were accepted as suitable. These three passed the required examination and were entered in the service. No alteration of a special nature is at present contemplated in the condition of service of engineers, but with a view to any improvement which is desirable in the best interests of the Navy, these officers, in common with all others, have their conditions of service always under consideration at the Admiralty.

Mr. WILLIAM ALLAN (Gateshead): I should like to ask if the failure of engine-room artificers to join is due to the nature of the test applied in the dockyards, it being gauge-making rather than practised engineering?

Mr. PRETYMAN: Probably the candidates are better able than the Admiralty to say what has prevented them from joining.

INDIA; PREVENTION OF FAMINE; IRRIGATION WORKS.

Mr. H. J. WILSON (Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether any information has been obtained from the Governments of Bombay and of the Central Provinces, since the close of last session, as to any projects for the construction of reservoirs or embankments on the Nerbudda or Tapti rivers, with a view to the protection of the western part of the Central Provinces and of Gujerat from drought and famine; and, if no proposals of this kind have yet been made, will he take steps to ensure that early attention be given to this matter.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): I have received since the end of last session a Report from the Bombay Government in which it is stated that an irrigation tank is under construction which will irrigate a largo tract of country adjoining the Tapti river. The Government of India have most carefully considered the question of the extension of irrigation wherever practicable, with a view to the prevention of famine; and I will forward a copy of the hon. Member's question and of my answer to India.

CHINA; INFLICTION OF FINES BY GERMAN AUTHORITIES.

MR. NORMAN (Wolverhampton, S.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any official information to the effect that the

German authorities in China are extorting from the local authorities sums of money without consultation with the representatives of the other Powers; and, if not, whether he will make inquiries upon this point.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRANBORNE, Rochester): We under-

stand that fines have been inflicted in certain cases by the German military authorities, but this would be a matter within the discretion of the Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief.

SAMOA DISTURBANCES; BRITISH CLAIMS FOR COMPENSATION.

MR. MAXWELL (Dumfriesshire): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether all the claims for compensation for losses suffered by British subjects during the disturbances in Samoa have now been received by the Foreign Office; and whether any of these claims have been settled; and, if not, can he state the cause of delay.

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: It is not known that there are any claims for compensation for losses suffered by British subjects during the disturbances in Samoa other than those received and noted at the Foreign Office. None of these claims have been settled, the arguments of the British and American Governments in relation to the military operations in Samoa not having yet been presented to the arbitrator. With regard to claims not occasioned by the military operations His Majesty's Government are in communication with the German Government.

CRETE; PAPERS ON ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCIAL CONDITION.

MR. STEVENSON (Suffolk, Eye): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can state when the Papers relating to the administration and financial condition of Crete, promised on the 11th of December last, will be laid upon the Table.

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: I very much regret the delay that has taken place. The Papers are being prepared and laid upon the Table as soon as possible.

ELECTRIC SUPPLY BY LOCAL AUTHORITIES; RETURN OF EXPENDITURE.

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he will grant the Return showing the results of the expenditure on the supply of electricity by local authorities on the Paper this day.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): I think that the time

has come when a Return giving the expenditure on the supply of electrical energy is desirable. The form of the Return suggested by my friend is, I think, capable of improvement. I will consider the matter and communicate further with him.

CENTRAL LONDON RAILWAY; VIBRATION.

*MR. COMPTON RICKETT (Scarborough): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he has satisfied himself that the vibration of the traffic on the Central London Railway is a cause of injury and annoyance to owners and occupiers of the property adjoining the line of route; and, if so, whether he is prepared to advise Parliament to protect the property in the neighbourhood of the proposed new electric lines either by means of improved construction and traction or by compulsory purchase of such property.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: With reference to the first part of the hon. Member's question an expert committee is sitting to inquire into the matter, and until it reports I am not in a position to express any opinion. With regard to the second part, the Bills dealing with the new electric lines have been introduced in another place. I understand it is probable that a proposal will be made to refer to a joint committee the consideration of several questions affecting them.

Should such proposal be made I hope this House will agree to it.

BEER POISONING IN THE STAFFORDSHIRE POTTERIES.

MR. COGHILL (Stoke-upon-Trent): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the evidence given before the Arsenical Poisoning Commission as to the similarity of the symptoms of poisoning from arsenicised beer and from plumbism, and that Professors Oliver and Thorpe have reported that beer is largely taken in the Staffordshire Potteries as an antidote to plumbism; and whether many of the reported cases of plumbism in the four last months of 1900 were cases of arsenical poisoning.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): Having made in

quiry into this matter I find that during the last four months of 1900 three cases reported as cases of plumbism were considered by the Medical Inspector of Factories and Workshops to be really cases of arsenical poisoning, and were excluded from the Returns of lead-poisoning. The cases are always carefully scrutinised for mistakes in reporting, and there is no reason to think there were any other such cases not detected.

MR. COGHILL: Has the right hon. Gentleman received any complaint as to the character of the beer supplied by the local breweries?

*MR. RITCHIE: No, Sir.

DEFENCE OF POOR PRISONERS.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that provision is made for the defence of poor prisoners in Germany, France, Denmark, the United States, Scotland, and several of our colonies; also that the Bar council have recommended in favour of making similar provision here, and whether he intends taking any steps in the matter.

*MR. RITCHIE: I do not see my way to take any action in this matter.

FATALITY AT HOOTON'S FACTORY, NOTTINGHAM.

MR. TENNANT (Berwickshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the death of George Benton, which took place on 1st February at Messrs. Hooton's factory, Nottingham; and will he inquire whether the planing machine by which Benton was crushed to death was erected before or after 1st January, 1896, and whether, in view of the terrible nature of the accident, he will consider the advisability of applying the provisions of Section 9 of the Act of 1895 to all self-acting machines irrespective of the date of the erection of the factory.

*MR. RITCHIE: Inquiry is being made into this case.

SPECIAL RULES IN THE POTTERY TRADE.

MR. TENNANT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department at what date the proposed draft

special rules, suggested to employers in a Home Office circular of December, 1899, and put before the employees in August, 1900, which have recently been formally circulated as proposed special rules, were communicated to the workpeople employed in the pottery trade.

*MR. RITCHIE: The first draft of the rules was published in the newspapers circulating in the pottery district immediately after it had been communicated to the employers. There is no provision in the Factory Acts requiring that the rules should be formally proposed to the workpeople in the same way as to the employers; but any person interested can be (and has been) supplied with a copy for the asking, and I have directed the inspector for the district to furnish copies of the rules as now proposed to representative workpeople.

POOR LAW VALUATION.

DR. AMBROSE (Mayo, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he can state the average poor law valuation per head of population in England, and what is the highest and what the lowest valuation per head.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): In 1899 the amount of rateable value per head of the estimated population of England and Wales was £;5 10s. 8d. There are no very recent figures which would give the information asked for in the latter part of the question; but in 1894 the highest amount of rateable value per head of the population according to the Census of 1891, of any poor law union in England and Wales was;excluding the City of London, the circumstances of which are exceptional;£;14 5s. 8d., and the lowest £;2 1s. 6d.

USE OF PRESERVATIVES IN FOOD.

MR. ARCHDALE (Fermanagh, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if any Report has yet been received from the Departmental Committee appointed in 1899 to inquire into the use of preservatives and colouring matter in food.

MR. WALTER LONG: The Report has not at present been received, but I understand that it is in preparation.

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES ACTS.

MR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he will consider the advisableness of appointing a Committee of the House to consider the administration of local authorities under the various Housing of the Working Classes Acts, with the view to further assisting authorities in their efforts to deal with the problem.

MR. WALTER LONG: As I intimated in answer to the hon. Member yesterday, I am considering the whole question.

LONDON WATER INQUIRY COSTS.

MR. MACNAMARA: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the legal expenses of counsel representing the various London local authorities in connection with the recent inquiry into the abortive regulations proposed by the London water companies will have to be borne by the London ratepayers, or whether it is within the competence of the Local Government Board to give the costs of the inquiry against the water companies.

MR. WALTER LONG: The Local Government Board have no power to require the water

companies to pay the costs referred to in the question, and I may add that if I had such powers I should not consider they ought to be exercised in this case.

MR. MACNAMARA: Has the right hon. Gentleman any idea as to what the costs are likely to amount to?

MR. WALTER LONG: No, Sir; of course not.

GREAT SAUGHALL PARISH COUNCIL.

MR. HOULT (Cheshire, Wirral): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been directed to the constitution of the last parish council of Great Saughall, and to the circumstances under which the outgoing chairman was reelected, whereby a majority was given to the party defeated at the election of parish councillors; and whether he will take steps to prevent this occurring again.

MR. WALTER LONG: I am aware of the circumstances of the case referred to in the question. The matter is not one in which the Local Government Board are empowered to take action; but they have expressed their opinion that as the outgoing chairman of the parish council was a candidate for reelection he could not properly act as chairman of the meeting of the council during the election, and I trust that in future this opinion will be acted upon.

SCHOOL ATTENDANCE REGISTERS; INCLEMENT WEATHER.

MR. MACNAMARA: I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether he is now prepared to say how far it may be found practicable to carry into effect his suggestion of July last, made during the discussion in the Standing Committee on Law of the Elementary Education Act, 1900, under which schools would not be required to mark the registers for purposes of averaging attendance on occasions upon which the number of children present might be much reduced by reason of the inclemency of the weather.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): The Board of Education are now considering how far, in circumstances such as are described in the question, the managers may be relieved from the existing obligation to mark the registers and formally open the school.

COUNTY COURT FEES.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether there has yet been a reduction of county court fees, in accordance with the promises on the subject, last made by the late Secretary to the Treasury and the late Attorney General.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): A Committee has inquired into this subject, and a revised Fee Order will come into operation on the 1st April next. The result will be a considerable reduction of the fees in the class of case which the Committee considered to call for relief.

FOREIGN TELEGRAMS.

*SIR EDGAR VINCENT (Exeter): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he can inform the House of the average time of transmission of telegrams between London and New York, London and Paris, and London and Berlin.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General is not in a position to give the time of transmission of telegrams to New York, as the business is in the hands of the companies. As to the time between London and Paris and London and Berlin, he has had the telegrams of the 26th examined. The wires on that day were working well, and he finds that for the twenty-four hours the average time from the handing in of the messages at the counter to their receipt at the place of destination was thirty-two minutes in the case of Paris and thirty-five in the case of Berlin. In the busiest hours the time was longer, especially in the case of Berlin, where, however, he hopes to improve matters by the laying of an additional cable which is now being manufactured.

SORTING TESTS AT MOUNT PLEASANT.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether, seeing that the auxiliary sorters at Mount Pleasant are now being called upon to sort at the rate of 1,000 in thirty minutes, with twenty-five mis-sorts allowed, and that the majority of these men are only occupied for about forty-five minutes per week upon sorting, he will consider the advisability of modifying the test; and can he say what is the present penalty in case of failure as regards the above-mentioned test.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Auxiliary sorters are not required to sort at the rate mentioned. That rate has for many years past been regarded as the test of efficiency for the established sorting staff, but it has not hitherto been exacted from the auxiliaries. No penalty for inefficiency in sorting on the part of these auxiliaries has been imposed. It has been reported, however, that serious inconvenience involving delay to correspondence was being caused by the slow and incorrect sorting of some of them, and steps have been taken by means of additional teaching and practice to afford them an opportunity for improvement. If it should be found, however, that, notwithstanding these facilities, any auxiliary sorter is unable to attain to a reasonable proficiency, it may become necessary to dispense with his services.

LLANDRILLO (MERIONETHSHIRE) POSTMASTER.

MR. OSMOND-WILLIAMS (Merionethshire): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether his attention has been called to the fact that the newly appointed postmaster at Llandrillo, Merionethshire, is an innkeeper holding an innkeeper's licence; and whether it is in accordance with the Post Office regulations for a postmaster to be an innkeeper.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The person recently appointed sub-postmaster of Llandrillo, Merionethshire, is an innkeeper, but the appointment was made conditional on his giving up that business and providing unlicensed premises for the post office. It is not the practice of the Department to appoint to such posts persons holding a licence when other eligible candidates, equally suitable, can be found. In this instance it was not considered that, apart from the licence, any of the other candidates was: as suitable as the one appointed.

IRISH LAND PURCHASE; WHITE ESTATE, BANTRY.

MR. GILHOOLY (Cork Co., W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state, approximately, when the sale of the

White Estate, near Bantry, which was decided on some years ago, will take place.
THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The solicitors having carriage of the proceedings state that the rental for sale of the holdings on this estate will probably be settled in the course of a month. A request under the 40th section of the Act of 1896 can then be issued.

PLUMBRIDGE ASSAULT CASE;DISCHARGE OF THE PRISONERS MORRIS.

*MR. HEMPHILL (Tyrone, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the case of two brothers named Morris, who were lately sentenced to one month's imprisonment, with hard labour, at the petty sessions of Plumbridge, North Tyrone, though they themselves had been assaulted and beaten by the complainants, on the occasion which was the subject of the order; and whether he can state if a memorial on their behalf has been presented to the Lord Lieutenant; and, if so, when will his decision in the matter be made known.

MR. WYNDHAM: The discharge of the two prisoners referred to in this question was ordered by the Lord Lieutenant on Wednesday last.

LABOURERS' COTTAGES IN CO. LONGFORD.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state how much of the £;40,000 grant-in-aid for erection of labourers' cottages in Ireland under the Land Act of 1896 has been passed to the credit of the Local Taxation Account for the Unions of Granard, Longford, and Ballymahon, in the county of Longford, and at what periods are these sums paid over.

MR. WYNDHAM: The total payments to the 31st March, 1900, under Section 5 of the Land Act of 1891, as amended by the 39th section of the Act of 1896, has been as follows::to Granard Union, £;291 4s. 6d.; to Longford Union, £;494 0s. 8d.; and to Ballymahon Union, £;779 2s. 4d. The distribution of the grant in respect of each financial year takes place about the end of March.

POLICE PRECAUTIONS AT IRISH RAILWAY STATIONS.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that every railway station in Ireland is in charge of a train constable, whose duty it is to take notes of arrivals and departures of persons by train, particularly those prominently engaged in Irish political life; how long this system has been in operation; and whether it is proposed to continue it.

MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Gentleman has, I think, been misinformed. The statements in the question are devoid of foundation.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I have not been misinformed. I know it from personal observation.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY;RECRUITING.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, contrary to a promise made in this House in June, 1896, that recruiting for the Royal Irish Constabulary would be discontinued, recruiting for that force is going on again; can he state the number of men called up during 1900, and the number yet required to keep up the force; and will he lay upon the Table of the House a Return showing the general

distribution of these men throughout the country for the years 1899–1900.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am aware that recruits are being enlisted for the constabulary; this is done to fill normal vacancies occurring in the force by retirements, deaths, etc. No promise was given in 1896 of the nature indicated in the first paragraph. The number of recruits admitted in 1900 was 620; the current rate of waste is about 46 men per month. In answer to the last paragraph, I would refer the hon. Member to the table at page 76 of the volume of Irish Criminal Statistics for 1899, which has been presented to Parliament and which shows the distribution of the force at the end of September, 1899.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): Are we to understand it is the intention of the authorities in Ireland to keep up the numbers of the Royal Irish Constabulary?

MR. WYNDHAM: There has been a considerable reduction in recent years. We propose to keep the force at its present level.

IMPERIAL GRANTS-IN-AID OF IRISH LOCAL RATES.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the amount of the contribution from Imperial sources to Irish local authorities in aid of local rates for the years 1898 and 1899.

MR. WYNDHAM: I think my hon. friend will find the information he desires at pages 16 and 17 of Parliamentary Return No. 337, and page 12 of Return No. 336, both of last year.

CASTLEBAR PETTY SESSIONS DISTRICT; POLICE PROSECUTIONS.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL (Mayo, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the number of prosecutions in the Castlebar Petty Sessions District for the alleged trespass of cattle on the public roads during the years 1897, 1898, and 1899, respectively.

MR. WYNDHAM: The number of prosecutions for the offence mentioned was seventeen in 1897; fourteen in 1898; and twenty nine in 1899, resulting in fifteen, twelve, and twenty-nine convictions respectively.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the number of prosecutions in the Pontoon, Bally vary, and Turlough police sub-districts within the Castlebar Petty Sessions District for the years 1897, 1898, and 1899 respectively, and the result of each prosecution; and, whether he can also state the number of times that the police in these sub-districts made seizures of illicit whiskey, or the material for its manufacture, for which no person was made amenable, together with the date of each such seizure.

MR. WYNDHAM: The information desired in the first paragraph is being prepared, and will be sent to the hon. Member when complete. I have forwarded to him a statement in answer to the second paragraph; it contains a number of dates which could not conveniently be read in the form of a reply to a question.

LICENSING LAWS, IRELAND; EQUAL VOTING ON MAGISTERIAL BENCHES.

MR. BOYLE (Donegal, W.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland if his attention has been drawn to the decision in the King's Bench Division in Ireland, in the case of King (M'Intyre) versus The County Court Judge and Justices of the County Donegal, in which it was decided that when the voting of

the magistrates

on the bench at licensing sessions is equal no adjudication on the matter at issue has taken place; and, whether this decision applies to cases heard at petty sessions courts in Ireland when the Bench is equally divided.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): The King's Bench decided in the case mentioned that where the justices are equally decided on the question of the truth, sufficiency and validity of an objection to the granting of a licence lodged under the third section of the Licensing Act of 1883, no adjudication can take place. Whether the same result would follow in any other case will depend upon the wording of the statute on which the proceedings are grounded.

MR. T. D. GIBSON, R.M.; ALLEGATIONS OF PARTIALITY.

MR. O'DOHERTY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether representations have been received by the Irish Government from the Roman Catholic priests and people of Portadown requesting the removal of Mr. T. D. Gibson, R.M., from that district, as the Roman Catholics, owing to his decisions in party cases at Portadown petty sessions, had lost all confidence in his impartiality; and whether the Government will have him removed to some other district and appoint another resident magistrate in that district.

MR. WYNDHAM: Representations have been received by the Irish Government requesting the removal from Portadown of Mr. Gibson, the resident magistrate stationed there. These representations have received my own personal attention, and I am satisfied that the imputations of partiality brought against Mr. Gibson are not borne out by the facts. Both he and the District Inspector of Constabulary, against whom, I may mention, complaints have also been freely made, have a difficult and trying duty to discharge at times in Portadown, the great bulk of the population of which is Protestant, and I have no reason to believe that either of these officers has discharged his duty otherwise than in an impartial manner. It is not the intention of the Government to remove Mr. Gibson from Portadown.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): Did you not get this information from the police?

MR. WYNDHAM: No, Sir; I have personally gone very carefully into the whole question.

BANKRUPTCY (IRELAND) RETURN.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, S. Patrick's): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state if the Return moved for and allowed on the 16th day of last July respecting Bankruptcy, Ireland, has been prepared; and, if not, when it may be expected.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Return in question was laid on the Table on the 6th December last. If the hon. Member has not obtained a printing order in the usual way he should now do so.

IRISH BUTTER; EXCESSIVE WATER.

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Department of Agriculture is aware that prosecutions have been taken by local authorities in the north of England

against alleged excessive water in Irish butter; and whether, in view of the fact that no standard has yet been legally established to define the percentage of water in butter, the Department will take steps to protect the interests of Irish agriculturists.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Department is aware that prosecutions under the Sale of Food and Drugs Acts have been instituted by the local authorities in the north of England for alleged excess of water in Irish butter. The question of the desirability of fixing a legal standard, or standards, as to the percentage of water in butter, is engaging attention, and the Department is in communication with the Board of Agriculture in Great Britain on the subject.

MR. O'MARA: Will the right hon. Gentleman answer the last part of my question?

MR. WYNDHAM: I have done so. I have said the Department is in communication with the Board of Agriculture on the subject.

MR. O'MARA: Will steps be taken to prevent prosecutions?

MR. WYNDHAM: The percentage of water admissible appears to be a matter of doubt, and the Departments responsible for protecting the interests of agriculture are in consultation with a view to arriving at a satisfactory conclusion. No more can be said at present.

MR. O'MARA: But;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The question has been fully answered.
PROPOSED POLICE BARRACK AT EDENDERRY.

MR. O'DOHERTY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if representations have been made to the Irish Government or the constabulary authorities by the Roman Catholic priests and people of Portadown, county Armagh, requesting them to establish a police barrack at Edenderry, Portadown being an Orange quarter in the town where repeated attacks have been made upon Roman Catholics passing through that district; and will he explain why the promise of the county inspector of police for the county of Armagh to have a barrack established in that district has up to the present not been carried out; and if the Government will establish a barrack at Edenderry in the immediate future.

MR. WYNDHAM: Representations have been made to Government in favour of the establishment of a police barrack at Edenderry, Portadown. There is no suitable house in the locality at present available for the purpose. The station will be formed as soon as practicable.

MR. O'DOHERTY: Is it not a fact that no difficulty is experienced when a site is wanted for a police hut in county Donegal?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order;
COUNTY WICKLOW MACISTRACY.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state how many Roman Catholics and how many Protestants there are in the county of Wicklow, how many Roman Catholic magistrates and how many Protestant magistrates in the county; also the number of Roman Catholic and Protestant magistrates appointed for the county Wicklow since August, 1895.

MR. WYNDHAM: According to the Census Returns of 1891 there were at that time 49,238 Roman Catholics and 12,644 Protestants of various denominations in the

county Wicklow. The number of magistrates in the county is 134, of whom 108 are Protestants, twenty-four are Roman Catholics, and there are two whose religions are not known. Twenty -three Protestant magistrates, four Roman Catholic, and two whose religions are unknown have been appointed since August, 1895.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: Has the right hon. Gentlemen included in the list the justices who are ex-officio magistrates by reason of their being chairmen of local councils?

MR. WYNDHAM: I must ask for notice of that.

SECURITIES FOR GOOD BEHAVIOUR; RICE v. HALPIN.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether his attention has been called to the judgment in the King's Bench Division on 26th instant in the appeal case of District Inspector Rice, R.I.C., v. Halpin, confirming the decision but giving no costs. Is he aware that Judge Gibson characterised the power of magistrates in respect to cases in which they can impose upon defendants the obligation of giving security to be of good behaviour as unjust; and whether in view of the Lord Chief Justice's opinion that the law should be altered so as to conform to the law of England as altered by the Summary Jurisdiction Act, 1879, the Irish Law Officers of the Crown will take the necessary legislative steps for such alteration.

MR. ATKINSON: I have not as yet been able to obtain an authentic copy of the judgment of the Court, but from the daily press it would appear that the remarks of both the learned judges were applied to the inability of persons required to give securities to keep the peace and be of good behaviour in Ireland to give evidence before the magistrates on their own behalf as they are enabled to do in England under the 25th section of the Summary Jurisdiction Act of 1879. I would undertake to introduce a short Bill forthwith to assimilate the law in the two countries in this

respect if hon. Members from Ireland would give an assurance that they would treat it as an unopposed measure.

BUTTEVANT NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHER'S SALARY.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state on what grounds have the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland paid William O'Callaghan, of Churchtown National School, Buttevant, on the scale of £;64 per annum, while his predecessor's salary was £;127 per annum; and whether, if this provisional salary is increased at the final fixing of teachers' salaries, the difference will be refunded this teacher.

MR. WYNDHAM: Mr. William O'Callaghan was assistant teacher in Churchtown Male National School up to the 31st March, 1900. He was promoted to the rank of principal teacher on the 1st April, 1900, and in accordance with the rules sanctioned by the Treasury last year he was granted provisionally as his initial income as principal his former income as assistant; namely, £;64. The amount of income of his predecessor was £;129 per annum, and was based on his average income for the preceding three year's. This income was personal to the predecessor of Mr. O'Callaghan. In all cases in which initial incomes are fixed, on final revision, at rates higher than those at which they were provisionally

fixed, the difference will be paid from the 1st April, 1900.

IRISH EDUCATION GRANT.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the money known as the balance of residual grant, which teachers in Irish national schools get before 1st April each year, is meant for the financial year ended 31st March or for the year ended 31st December.

MR. WYNDHAM: The year meant is the financial year.

LIMERICK LUNATIC ASYLUM.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the sum of £1,596 6s. 7d. due for the maintenance of patients in the Limerick Lunatic

Asylum from the 1st of January, 1899, to the 31st March, 1899, and certified by the Local Government Auditor as due in respect of capitation grant for pauper lunatics maintained in the asylum for the period stated, will ultimately have to be paid out of the rates if the Treasury do not pay it; and, if so, seeing that these patients who are entitled to rate-in-aid will be entirely supported out of the local rates during the period stated, and that a similar state of things exists with regard to other lunatic asylums in Ireland entitled to this rate-in-aid, whether he will take steps for the payment of this capitation grant.

MR. WYNDHAM: The question of the payment of the grant in aid of the maintenance of pauper lunatics for the period mentioned has formed the subject of correspondence between the Irish Government and the committee of management of the Limerick Asylum. I am afraid I cannot add to the views of Government already expressed.

MR. LUNDON: Will the Gentleman take any this money paid?

MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member misunderstands. The grant is always calculated on the figures of the preceding year. What has happened is this. The financial year, which ends in March, has been substituted for the calendar year, which ends in December, and the first quarter of 1900 takes the place of the first quarter of 1899. The figures of 1900 are more favourable, and the asylum has therefore gained by the change.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): Is there not a great deal of dissatisfaction among the Asylum Boards generally on this matter, and have not financial experts;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The hon. Member is now entering on a debate.

WEXFORD COUNTY COUNCIL APPEAL.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether he will lay upon the Table of the House a copy of the judgments delivered in the Court of Appeal, on Monday last, in the case of the Wexford County Council against the Local Government Board.

MR. ATKINSON: Yes, this will be done.

MR. FLYNN: Will it be available for distribution among the Irish Members?

MR. ATKINSON: After it has been laid on the Table of the House.

CLONES RAILWAY STATION.

MR. DALY (Monaghan, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that a man was killed recently at Clones railway station, county Monaghan, owing to the state of the island platform there, and whether he

can state what course he intends to take to get this island platform improved, and thereby avert further loss of life.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I have made inquiry as to this case, and am informed that the unfortunate man's death did not occur owing to the state of the island platform. The Board are, however, in communication with the railway company as to the platform and the level-crossing at this station.

MR. DALY: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that his predecessor promised to look into this matter, and that nothing has since been done?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

IRISH LIGHTS BOARD,

MR. FIELD: I beg to Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that several harbour boards, including Dublin and Belfast, have frequently and publicly expressed their disapproval of the constitution and the working of the Irish Lights Commission; and whether, in view of those facts, the Government will consider the advisability of re-forming and reconstituting the Irish Lights Board.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Yes, Sir; such representations have from time to time been made. As I have already informed the hon. Member, His Majesty's Government do not, as at present advised, contemplate the introduction of a Bill dealing with the constitution of the Irish Lights Board.

MR. FIELD: In view of the reply of the right hon. Gentleman, may I ask why legislation is delayed when

everyone interested is anxious that the Board should be re-formed?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I cannot do that in answer to a question.

RAMELTON COASTGUARD STATION.

MR. M'FADDEN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether his attention has been directed to the proposed abolition of the coastguard station at Ramelton, county Donegal; whether he is aware that the said station has been in existence for over 100 years; that in former times a trade in contraband goods carried on through the port at Ramelton necessitated the keeping of a staff of seven officers at the station; and that a considerable trade is still carried on between Ramelton and foreign and home ports; and can he explain the reasons of the proposed abolition of the station.

MR. PRETYMAN: It is proposed to abolish this station in consequence of a report from the Board of Customs that its retention is no longer necessary from a revenue point of view, and the Admiralty do not consider it necessary to maintain it for other purposes.

POSTAL ARRANGEMENT AT EYERIES, CO. CORK.

MR. GILHOLLY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether a memorial from the priests and people of Eyerries, county Cork, has been forwarded to the Secretary, General Post Office, Dublin, showing the necessity that exists for a Sunday service to Eyerries; whether a resolution from the District Council, Castletown Be re, also has been sent; and whether, in view of the importance of Eyerries as a fishing station, he will see that this want is supplied.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: A memorial was received from the residents of Eyerries

last year asking for a Sunday postal service, and the District Council of Castletown Bere forwarded a resolution supporting the request. From the inquiry which was made it was found that the cost of the service in the district already greatly exceeded the revenue from the correspondence, so that the expense of providing a Sunday post was not warranted. The Postmaster General regrets that in the circumstances he would not be justified in complying with the request of the inhabitants.

MR. GILHOOLY: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that this is a very important fishing station which is attended by a number of American buyers? The cost would only be small.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I understand that it is a very important fishing station, but the postal business connected with the fishery is very small and, if I remember rightly, does not pay half the present cost of the service.

MR. GILHOOLY: But what about the public convenience?

SCHULL LETTER CARRIER'S WAGES.

MR. GILHOOLY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether his attention has been called to the rate of wage given to the letter carrier in the town of Schull, county Cork, and whether he will have it increased.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The attention of the Postmaster General had not been called to the rate of wage given to the letter carrier at Schull, county Cork.

According to the official records, the wages paid are in accordance with the usual scale for the duty performed, which occupies less than an hour and a half daily; but inquiry is being made into the matter.

BALLINACOR POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS.

MR. M'FADDEN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he will explain why the rural messenger between Crossroads branch post office, Killygordon, county Donegal, and the townland of Sallywood, only delivers to a few houses in the townland of Ballinacor the letters in the morning delivery, and then proceeds to serve the townlands of Portobello, Kilcaddon, and Carrickshandrum; and, after serving these townlands, returns and serves the remaining portion of the townland of Ballinacor about ten o'clock in the morning; is he aware that the said townland of Ballinacor is only a few yards from the branch office at Crossroads, and is the first townland the messenger enters in the morning; and, seeing that representations have been made to the Secretary of the Post Office at Dublin complaining of the present arrangements for delivery of letters in the townland of Ballinacor, and that school teachers have complained that they do not get delivery of their letters before ten o'clock, and are thus precluded from making returns by the next post to the Offices of National Education, and that the present postal arrangements in the district impose unnecessary labour on the messenger, whether directions could be given to him to proceed on his outward journey along the county road through the centre of the townland of Ballinacor.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The route followed by the postman from the Crossroads post office to Sallywood has been the subject of careful consideration, and the present arrangement, by which a large majority of the letters are delivered on

the outward journey, is undoubtedly the best for the general convenience of the public. The postman is not overworked, and the circumstances do not justify an alteration of the post.

ENNISCORTHY POST OFFICE.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDS (Wexford, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he can state when the building of the new post office at Enniscorthy will be commenced.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Board of Public Works report that they hope to be able to begin the new post office building at Enniscorthy in May next.

IRISH LAND PURCHASE BILL.

MR. DALY: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can state when the Irish Land Purchase Bill will be introduced.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am afraid I can give no information to the hon. Gentleman.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE; DURATION OF DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS.

MR. STUART-WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury upon how many occasions in the fourteen years 1887 to 1900 has the debate on the Address been finished to admit of the second Wednesday in the session being open for private Members' Bills.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid): I rise to order. I wish to know if this is not a question dealing with facts which appear on the journals of the House, and which are as accessible to the hon. Member who asks the question as to the Leader of the House? I wish to know, too, in regard to the insinuation it is meant to convey, whether;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The hon. Member is now commenting on the motives of the hon. Gentleman who asks the question. As to his point of order, I may say that if this question had been brought to my notice I think I should have said that the Clerk was justified in refusing it, on the ground that it asks for information not in the special possession of Ministers, and which can be obtained out of Hansard by the hon. Member himself.

SIR E ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: Are not questions of this kind constantly asked in order to draw in an easy way public attention to an important subject?

*MR. SPEAKER: I quite admit that an effort is frequently made to make a speech by means of a question, but that is irregular.

MR. STUART-WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam): Is it not true that resistance to; form of question; which is frequently used; generally comes from those who anticipate that the answer will be inconvenient to them?

[No answer was returned, and original question was not replied to.]

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

CHARITABLE AGENCIES FOR THE RELIEF OF WIDOWS AND ORPHANS OF SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.

That they concur with the Commons in their Resolution:—"That it is expedient that a Joint Committee of Lords and Commons be appointed to consider the various Charitable Agencies now in operation, and the funds available for relieving Widows and Orphans of Soldiers and Sailors, with a view to ensuring that the funds subscribed by local and private benevolence are applied to the best advantage in supplementing a scheme of Government Pensions for Widows and

Orphans of Soldiers and Sailors who have lost their lives in war;" as desired by this House.

NEW BILLS.

BOROUGH FUNDS ACT (1872) AMENDMENT (LONDON.)

Bill to amend the Borough Funds Act, 1872, ordered to be brought in by Captain Jessel, Sir Charles Dilke, Sir George Fardell, Mr. Sydney Buxton, Mr. Boulnois, Mr. Richards, and Mr. Whitmore.

BOROUGH FUNDS ACT (1872) AMENDMENT (LONDON) BILL.

"To amend the Borough Funds Act, 1872," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 24th April and to be printed. [Bill 74.]

LIQUOR TRAFFIC LOCAL VETO (SCOTLAND).

Bill to give the ratepayers a direct veto on the Liquor Traffic in their respective areas in Scotland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Hunter Craig, Mr. Colville, Mr. Cameron Corbett, Mr. Black, Sir William Dunn, Mr. Eugene Wason, Mr. Wallace, Mr. John D. Hope, and Dr. Farquharson.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC LOCAL VETO (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"To give the ratepayers a direct veto on the Liquor Traffic in their respective areas in Scotland," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 19th June, and to be printed. [Bill 75.]

CHEAP TRAINS.

Bill to amend the Law relating to Cheap Trains for the working classes, ordered to be brought in by Captain Norton, Mr. Buxton, Sir Albert Rollit, Sir Frederick Dixon-Hartland, Mr. John Burns, Mr. Scott, Mr. John Wilson (Durham), and Dr. Macnamara.

CHEAP TRAINS BILL.

"To amend the Law relating to Cheap Trains for working classes," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 76.]

LIQUOR TRAFFIC LOCAL VETO.

Bill to enable localities by a direct Veto to prevent the issue of licences for the sale of intoxicating liquors, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Caine, Mr. Henry

Joseph Wilson, Mr. Burt, Mr. Whittaker, and Mr. Channing.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC LOCAL VETO BILL.

"To enable localities by a direct Veto to prevent the issue of licences for the sale of intoxicating liquors," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 19th June, and to be printed. [Bill 77.]

LICENSING ACTS AMENDMENT (SCOTLAND).

Bill to amend the Law with respect to the Licensing Authorities in Police Burghs in Scotland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Colville, Sir John Leng, Mr. Hunter Craig, Mr. Black, Mr. Caldwell, Mr. Parker Smith, and Mr. John D. Hope.

LICENSING ACTS AMENDMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"To amend the Law with respect to: the Licensing Authorities in Police Burghs in Scotland," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 78.]

TRADE MARKS.

Bill to consolidate and amend the Law relating to Trade Marks, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Fletcher, Mr. Alban Gibbs, Mr. Butcher, Mr. Kimber, Mr. Kearley, Mr. M'Konna, and Lord Henry Bentinck.

TRADE MARKS BILL.

"To consolidate and amend the Law relating to Trade Marks," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday, 14th March, and to be printed. [Bill 79.]

HOSPITALS (EXEMPTION FROM RATES).

Bill providing for the exemption of Hospitals from local Rates, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Lawson Walton, Dr. Farquharson, Mr. Warr, and Mr. T. P. O'Connor.

HOSPITALS (EXEMPTION FROM RATES) BILL.

"Providing for the exemption of Hospitals from Local Rates," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday next, and to be printed.

[Bill 80.]

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

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

CIVIL SERVICE (SUPPLEMENTARY) ESTIMATES, 1900–1901.

Class I.

I. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £35,200, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, in respect of sundry public buildings in Great Britain, not provided for on other Votes."

*SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston) said he thought that the right hon. Gentleman who was speaking the preceding evening when the House adjourned had given a somewhat remarkable explanation in dealing with the question of the Census buildings. It would be recollected that he declared the buildings had been enlarged in consequence of the increased staff which had been necessitated by the alterations made in the form of the Census Returns. Now, he did not think that that adequately explained the additional Vote which was being asked for. The alterations made in the form of the census were comparatively small, and yet the Committee was asked for a supplementary sum of £2,100 in addition to the £4,000 voted last year. The Supplementary Estimate represented, in fact, over half of the original Estimate. The increase could not be accounted for by the removal of the very inconvenient buildings in Charles Street, Whitehall, which were used when the last census was taken. Undoubtedly those buildings were not suited to the purposes to which they were applied, and he was very sorry indeed that the money now voted was not to be used for providing proper accommodation for tin; clerks. The buildings were made of galvanised iron lined with wood and other materials, and bearing in mind that much of the work had to be done at a period of the year when great heat prevailed, it was clear that those engaged upon it had to labour under conditions injurious to their health and detrimental to the

efficiency of their work. Now, these old buildings were simply to be removed from one site to another, and a further building of the same type was to be provided for the fifty additional female clerks who were to be employed in the compilation of the census. In this matter he did not think they got good value for their money, and, in view of the enormous expenditure to which this country was committed for war purposes, he did feel that it was the duty of every Member to watch the Estimates very closely in order to see that at any rate the money was not wasted. Would it not have been better for the right hon. Gentleman, in framing the Estimate, to have considered whether the money could not have been spent more usefully, either in hiring a better building, or by making a beginning by way of providing permanent offices for census purposes? It seemed to him a very dangerous piece of economy to use buildings of that kind for the storage of documentary evidence in view of the danger of destruction by fire. A wooden house covered with galvanised iron was certainly not a suitable place in which to keep public documents collected at the cost of such enormous expenditure and trouble. It seemed to him that they were by no means getting value for their money, for the only return they were apparently to have for the additional estimate of £2,100 was the removal of three or four iron buildings from one place to another and the provision of an additional one. He really could not understand how so much money could be spent on the work, and he was driven to the conclusion that this particular Estimate afforded one more illustration of the miscalculations of which the framers of the various estimates had been guilty. He thought they were entitled to some explanation in regard to that, as well as in respect of the large Supplementary Vote asked for in connection with Hertford House and the Imperial Institute. The case of the Imperial Institute and the London University was an equally remarkable instance. In the last Estimates £8,770 were voted for the adaptation of the buildings for use by the London University, and now no less than £9,960 additional were asked for. Surely £18,000 was a large amount for adapting the buildings for the use of the university. Even if preparations were being made for a teaching university, the original estimate ought at any rate to have been much nearer the amount actually required. The London University would also come up under another Vote in regard to the preparation of a laboratory which was necessary for carrying on the examining purposes of the university. Then there was an additional Vote of £3,000 for the Patent Office. All these matters indicated a laxity of circulation which ought not to exist in public-affairs. Any private firm which carried on its business under such conditions would soon be in a condition of bankruptcy. In these times when, considering the burden the country was likely to have to bear in the near future, economy ought to be the great consideration in connection with public expenditure, he felt bound to call the attention of the Committee to these points.

*SIR ALBERT ROLLIT (Islington, S.) remarked that, with regard to the Imperial Institute, many of the acts which had had to be done were not discovered to be necessary until the University moved into the buildings. One of the chief objects of the reorganisation had been to make the University a teaching body, and for that purpose many rooms, though perhaps not exactly class-rooms at

present, were required for the examination of both the internal and external students and for the enlarged work contemplated on the part of the University. But however much the Vote had been, there were still one or two things urgently required to be done. The sanitary arrangements were not at all satisfactory, and in the case of the large hall for examinations the ventilation was so bad as to be a positive disadvantage to the students who were examined. Not only the University, but also the Civil Service candidates were affected by this, as they were examined in the same building, and for such occasions the conditions ought to be made as suitable as possible, as the tenure of this hall by the University had been an express condition of the removal to South Kensington, which had been very re-

luctantly consented to by himself and other members of the Senate. There was also a question of fees and payments to examiners at present between the Senate and the Treasury, and if the latter took the fees to the end of the financial year, it ought to bear all expenses to the same date, in order that the University might start clear with the not too liberal grant which was suggested. The attempt to get back the large hall primarily for the Civil Service, as a condition of the proposed new grant, would be very strongly resisted by the Senate. The chemical laboratory was also badly ventilated, and this should be attended to without delay.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.) pointed out, as a matter in which many Members were interested, that no provision was made in the census arrangements for a religious census. He did not agree with the complaint with regard to the money spent in arrangements for the housing of the Wallace collection. It was not easy to spend too much money on housing works of art. He congratulated the British public on having obtained this magnificent collection, but regretted that some of the pictures were not given to Ireland, seeing that very large estates, known as the Wallace Estates, used to be held in Ireland, from the rental of which estates, he imagined, a good deal of the money which purchased these pictures was provided. With regard to the adaptation of the Imperial Institute for the London University, he quite agreed that these buildings should be made convenient and comfortable for the people who used them. The Vote, however, would not excite much sympathy on the Irish benches, seeing that it provided nearly £10,000 practically as an endowment of a university in England, where there were so many universities, whereas a university for Irish Catholics was denied. If for no other reason he would challenge a division on this Vote as a protest against the continued neglect of Ireland in the matter of university education. As to the Supplementary Vote for the introduction and extension of electric lighting in public buildings in England, he hoped it would lead to a similar introduction in the public buildings of Ireland.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said that the question particularly raised was that there were a number of Supplementary Votes, the large majority of which ought not to appear as Supplementary Estimates at all, but should have been foreseen and included in the original Estimates. That was the point the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner endeavoured to meet on the previous evening, but his explanations were not altogether satisfactory. Several items

were disposed of on the ground that they were advantageous, but that was not the ground at all on which they were objected to. In reply to requests for information the right hon. Gentleman said that he could give information with regard to new items, but not with regard to old.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER of WORKS (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's) explained that the complaint was that no particulars were given on the paper in regard to anything except items appearing under subhead "A," to which he replied that it had always been the practice, not only in Supplemental Estimates but also in the original Estimates, to give the new works under subhead "A" in full, while the others were in general terms.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON was sorry he misunderstood the right hon. Gentleman. The rule was all very well when there were very few Supplementary Estimates or none at all, but there were now an unprecedented number, and it was only right and just that the information which had been given across the table should have been printed on the Estimates themselves. The reply on some of the points to which the previous evening he (the speaker) directed attention was inadequate and unsatisfactory. The expenditure for extensions of the War Office, being due to the pressure of the war, was properly made the subject of a Supplementary Estimate, because in the ordinary way it could not be foreseen, especially by the present Government. The argument with regard to the Census buildings was that since the original estimate was voted it had been determined to obtain further information in the census, involving a certain amount of additional expenditure. What were the alterations which would increase the cost by no less than one-third of the original sum? There was a great deal of force in the contention that with such large expenditure there should be something in the nature of a permanent building rather than a tin house, which was not only useless in the future, but dangerous to health. As to the £3,000 extra for the Patent Office extension, it was said that that was to provide library accommodation. If there was one thing more than another which might have been anticipated, or in which there was no possible urgency for a few months, surely it was the provision of library accommodation for the Patent Office. This was another illustration of the absolute laxity prevailing in regard to the Estimates, and of the manner in which, very largely in consequence of their strength in the House, the Government were able and willing to allow things to be done, but in which, if their majority was smaller, they would never dare to present them to the House. There was another item for the erection of a new Die and Medal Department. Was that a matter of urgent necessity? The right hon. Gentleman did not argue that point, and therefore he did not see that he had any right to put it in the form of a Supplementary Estimate. He said nothing in regard to the very large expenditure upon electric lighting, and that was a matter which ought to be provided in the original Estimate, and which might have stood over for the new Estimates. The right hon. Gentleman did not say anything in regard to the general proposition which was discussed last night as to why these Supplementary Estimates should be of such an enormous amount, covering a larger number of Votes; twenty-nine, with seventy-six sub-divisions; than any other previous Supplementary Estimates, lie thought they were entitled to have

some information from the Government why it was that there had been this laxity in regard to the Estimates, and if there had been a long discussion in regard to these different items the fault was entirely with the Government themselves. If this Supplementary Estimate had been introduced with proper information it would have been passed last night. They had to drag their information from the right hon. Gentleman across the floor of the House, and that was the reason why this prolonged discussion had taken place, and he hoped it would continue until they got fuller information in regard to those matters.

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: With regard to the general charge made by the hon. Member who has just sat down, regarding the want of information, that is a matter which does not devolve upon me. I am not responsible for the preparation of the Supplementary Estimates as a whole, but I am responsible for those items which come more particularly under my management.

As to the question raised by the hon. Member opposite in regard to the Census buildings. I gave an explanation last night which I am sorry he did not think entirely satisfactory. I pointed out that this excess was caused because when in 1899–90 this Estimate for the Census buildings was prepared, it was thought that the buildings which had been sufficient for the staff which conducted the last census would have been sufficient upon the present occasion. Since that amount was estimated the temporary buildings had been moved, and it was found that additional accommodation was required, especially for the female staff. In addition to that, in order to meet many of the objections which the hon. Member so justly pointed out with regard to the nature of the buildings, and at the request of the Registrar General, we spent money on the extra ventilation of these buildings, and fitting them with the electric light, which makes them much healthier to work in. We have, therefore, done something to meet the requirements of the people who work in those buildings, and in regard to the electric light it was not foreseen that an installation of this light would be required.

With regard to providing permanent buildings for the census, that is a very much larger question, and it is one on which I do not think the hon. Member will find I am at all averse to placing myself in line with him. That, however, is a question which we need not discuss at any length to-day, for the hon. Member has found an answer to it himself on the present occasion, for he has stated that we are spending too much money already. In the near future I should be glad to see some permanent buildings provided for the census.

The hon. Gentleman asked me a question with regard to the adaptation of Hertford House for the Wallace collection. This expenditure was incurred in order to hasten on the work, and I could not possibly have foreseen this in the the preparation of the Estimate. Neither my Department nor myself are responsible for the administration of Hertford House, for we have only to deal with the structural alterations of the building. The extra work at Hertford House was asked for by the trustees who administer that building in so excellent a manner, but they are not under my jurisdiction. A request was made for this further work to be proceeded with at once in order that no delay might take place, and that the public should have the earliest opportunity of visiting the collection. The

hon. Member for North Wexford complained that none of these pictures had been sent to Ireland, but perhaps he will remember that the bequest provides that the collection must be kept in London, and therefore it is not within the power of the Government to accede to the hon. Member's request.

Some remarks have been made in regard to the necessity of a Patent Office Library, and it is said that that charge might have been anticipated. I made an answer to that point last night. The additional sum spent to complete the buildings was incurred because we were specially desirous of hastening on this work in order to save, as far as possible, the £;700 a year which is the rent being-paid for a temporary home for the library while these alterations were going on. By this expenditure of £;3,000 we shall be able to make the library complete, and transfer the books from the temporary home, thus relieving the country of an expenditure of some £;700 a year for three years. Therefore I think it was well worth while incurring this expenditure to hurry the adaptation of the building, in order to avoid the necessity of taking on another lease for three years of this temporary home at a rental of £;700 per annum.

With regard to the alterations and arrangements at Cleveland House, I think the hon. Member expressed himself satisfied with the explanation I have already given. This expenditure was necessary in consequence of the increase of the War Office staff, and this could not possibly have been foreseen in December, when the Estimates were prepared. The same argument will also apply to the introduction and the extension of the electric light at Cleveland House.

MR. FIELD (Dublin. St. Patrick's) asked if the First Commissioner of Works would give them an explanation of the "Imperial Institute, London University," item. He thought that required some explanation.

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: The reason for this excess on the Imperial Institute has really been given by my hon. friend below me. It is really impossible in the transfer of a great institution like the London University into fresh quarters to foresee what would be required by that institution. The chief items of expenditure have been for certain structural alterations with regard to a new entrance and providing other rooms that had to be found in substitution for the rooms which were taken over by the London University. In addition there has been some unforeseen expenditure with regard to the library, and I think the Committee will agree with me that in moving a very large library like this it is almost impossible to forecast what the cost will be. I am bound to say that a large amount of this expenditure has taken place in regard to the sanitary arrangements of the new home of the London University. I agree with him that not nearly enough sanitary requirements have been provided for; and the question of the health of those who use the building is a subject which will probably be discussed when we come to the Estimates on a future occasion. But in regard to the charge that there has been any want of foresight in the planning of the additions to these buildings, I may say that they were not designed by the Government expert, but by the very distinguished and worthy architect of the original Imperial Institute, Mr. Collcutt. It is not so easy for the Department to make any accurate estimate when they do not carry out the work themselves. Some of the require-

ments of the London University were not known to us until late last year. I do not blame the University officials, because until they were able to overhaul their books, maps, etc., they were not in a position to estimate exactly the expenditure of reinstating them. I think I have met, so far as I can, the inquiries that have been made in regard to this particular Vote.

*MR. TENNANT (Berwickshire) said that the right hon. Gentleman had not mentioned, although careful attention had been given to his remarks, anything in regard to the condition of the Census buildings. The right hon. Gentleman had stated that the House had demanded that certain alterations should be made in the form of the Census Returns, and that, therefore, additional clerks would be required. They must all rejoice that the right hon. Gentleman was going to make it a rule that the clerks would work under more sanitary conditions than at the last census. He wished that the First Commissioner of Works would give the Committee some information as to the particular alterations he intended to make. MR. AKERS DOUGLAS said that this was a Building Vote, and he did not think that the work done by the clerks of the Registrar General could be discussed under it.

*MR. TENNANT said hon. Members were entitled to inquire whether additional rooms were, required for the lady clerks, or whether additional rooms and clerks were required at all. That was his first point; but his next was that it seemed to him rather peculiar that under subhead F there should be an increase of £1,200 for the supply of water. Surely that was a matter that obviously ought to have been foreseen by any Government Department.

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS said that the additional expenditure was due to new boilers for the engines which forced the supply of water, and not for the supply of water in the ordinary course.

*MR. TENNANT: What about the clerks?

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: I will find out, but that does not come within my Department.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.) said this Vote of £35,200 seemed a very large sum, and the different heads under which it was set out showed certainly a very extraordinary want of foresight on the part of the officials, whoever they were, who had made out the original Estimate. For New Works. Alterations, and Additions, the sum of £21,000 was the extra amount required. Of course, it might be necessary for architects to make variations on their plans from time to time, but it was an extraordinary thing that such a very large sum had not been contemplated in the original Estimate. It was most unfortunate if the Government desired to get the Votes through that they did not give any particulars whatever to the Committee. He quite appreciated the kindly and civil manner in which the right hon. the First Commissioner of Works had sought to meet every point raised, although he must say the right hon. Gentleman seemed rather disposed to ignore questions from the Irish benches, and to give a preference to complaints made above the gangway. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would be convinced in time that they on the Irish benches made their complaints bona fide, because he must know that every portion of the country was drawn upon to supply the money which was now being asked for, and that, therefore, the Irish representatives were as greatly interested in money matters as those from the other parts of the

United Kingdom. It should not be forgotten that one-eleventh of the whole contributions to the Exchequer came from Ireland, and they had to complain that no sufficient ground whatever had been shown for the huge increase in expenditure, particularly at a time when they were every day adding to the enormous debt of the British Empire. Of course, under this Vote he was not allowed to refer to the increase of debt due to the war in South Africa, which was being piled up at the rate of two millions a week, but he would point out that the cost of home administration was also increasing to an alarming extent, and it was time that full details should be given before they allowed the Votes to pass through Committee. There was one particular in the Vote with which Irishmen had very grave cause of complaint. They were handing over the Imperial Institute to the London University, and were spending £9,960 for the purpose of converting it to university uses. There was not a single Vote which ought to be more objectionable to Irishmen than that one. The vast majority of the people of Ireland were Catholics, and had asked over and over again that provision might be made for the establishment of a Catholic University in Ireland. Not only had their appeals fallen on deaf ears, but they had been met with contempt and scorn. Here was a large public building in London which, he understood, had been erected, not by voluntary or public contribution, or by the taxpayers of Great Britain, but by the free gift of the people of India to commemorate the Queens Jubilee in 1887. This large building was to be handed to the London University, and the taxpayers of Ireland were not only to be deprived of the Catholic University in Ireland, but to be called upon at the same time to pay their due proportion of the fitting up of the building for London University purposes. That was another illustration of the manner in which Irish claims were dealt with, and if on no other ground, he would resist the Vote. He trusted his friends on the Irish benches would seek to drive this point home more forcibly, for it was really a scandal that a Catholic University was not given to them in Ireland.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Gentleman is now discussing a subject that he himself has admitted is out of order.

MR. J. P. FARRELL said there were other items on this Vote on which he wished for some information. £2,000 was asked on account of alterations to adapt Winchester House for the Intelligence Branch. He wanted to know what the intelligence was about. Was it in connection with the war in South Africa, or for what other purpose? On the whole, he must say the Government had drawn very largely on the credulity of Irish Members in asking them to agree to a Vote of £35,200

without giving them any details. There was a sum of £3,125 for the adaptation of Hertford House for the Wallace Collection. Not a solitary picture frame from that collection was to come to Ireland. He wondered if hon. Members knew that a very large portion of the estate of the late Sir Richard Wallace was situated in the north of Ireland. There was no doubt that some of the art treasures accumulated by Sir Richard Wallace had been purchased by the money which he derived from his estates in Ireland. Of course they had no right to insist on the Government breaking the terms of the bequest. He knew himself there were

always plenty of legal difficulties to be raised about the simplest questions, but, at the same time, when they were asked to vote these large sums of money without any details, it was only fair that proper opportunities should be given them to call attention to the differential treatment, if he might so term it which was accorded to London and to Ireland. Some of the replies given by the right hon. Gentleman were, in his opinion, most unsatisfactory; and on three several items which he had endeavoured to explain he had to admit that the headings and details were misleading. He complained that although the sum asked for showed an increase of nearly fifty per cent, in one of the items, on the original Estimate, the details and particulars given were of a very meagre character, and the accounts as presented to the Committee were not satisfactory, at all events so far as he was concerned. One to which he took particular exception was the item dealing with the alterations at Winchester House, in order to adapt it for the occupation of the Intelligence Branch. If it was intended to make this a sort of appanage of the War Office Department, he thought the Committee would be wrong to pass it, for of all things, that the War Office had hopelessly broken down was most patent to the country, lie moved to reduce the Vote by the sum of £2,000.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £33,200, be granted for the said Service.";(Mr. Farrell.)

SIR BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.) asked for information with regard to the nature of the alterations said to be required in Winchester House.

According to his experience of the public service, it was a common trick of new officials to find fault with their room, to say, for example, that it was too small, and to ask the Office of Works to knock-two or three rooms into one.

Then, after a time, another new official would come in and say the room was too large, and ask the Office of Works to put up the party walls again, and incur the whole expense of restoring the place to the same condition as before. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would show a stiff front to all such demands.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.) supported the reduction, as in his opinion it was only proper when the Government brought forward a Supplementary Estimate of this kind they should give full particulars of how the money was to be expended. It had been said it was impossible to put down a complete Estimate in this ease, because it was drawn up originally in 1899; but if that were so, it was all the more important that complete details should be given now, as only those who had the opportunity of hearing the explanations were in a position to form a judgment. He thought it would be greatly to the advantage of Members of the Committee if full details were given of these Estimates.

MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.) considered the explanation given, by the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works was one that could not be accepted by the Irish Members. Upon one item;"fuel, light, and household articles";he would like to draw the attention of the right hon. Gentleman to the merits of compressed peat. That was a matter worth considering at a time when coal-owners were putting up the prices, and did not allow the workmen to participate in rooking the public. The right hon. Gentleman might try the use of peat as an experiment, at all events, and he would find that he would not only save the

public funds, but would be the means of developing a very large industry in Ireland. With regard to the amount required for the erection of a new-die and medal department at the Royal Mint, he would suggest, if it was intended to build a new department for the striking of medals for those who had taken part in the war, that there should also be a tannery attached to it, as most of the officers at the war and the whole of

AYES.

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

Ferguson, B. C. Munro (Leith)

O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)

Allan, William (Gateshead)

Ffrench. Peter

O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)

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

Field, William

O'Doherty, William

Ambrose, Robert

Flavin, Michael Joseph

O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)

Ashton, Thomas Gair

Flynn, James Christopher

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

Atherley Jones, L.

Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)

O'Dowd, John

Blake, Edward

Furness, Sir Christopher

O'Kelly, Conor. (Mayo, N.)

Boland, John

Gilhooly, James

O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, X.)

Boyle, James

Goddard, Daniel Foul

O'Malley, William

Brand, Hon. Arthur

Grant, Corrie

O'Mara, James

Brigg, John

Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.

Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson

Hammond, John

Perks. Robert William

Bryce, Rt. Hon. James

Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William

Power, Patrick Joseph
Burke, E. Haviland-
Harmsworth, B. Leicester
Price, Robert John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Hayden, John Patrick
Rea,.Russell
Caldwell, James
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Sir Chas. Seale-
Reckitt, Harold James
Cameron, Robert
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Beddy, M.
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Redmond, John E.(Waterford)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Robson, William Snowdon
Carew, James Laurence
Jacoby, James Alfred
Roche, John
Carvill, Patrick G. Hamilton
Jordon, Jeremiah
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Causton, Richard Knight
Joyce, Michael
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Cawley, Frederick
Labouchere, Henry
Sinclair, Capt. J.(Forfarshire)
Channing, Francis Allston
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Cogan, Denis J.
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Soares, Ernest J.
Colville, John
Leng, Sir John
Spencer,Rt Hn CR (Northants)
Condon. Thomas Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Stevenson, Francis S.
Craig, Robert Hunter
Lough, Thomas
Sullivan, Donal

Crean, Eugene
Lundon, W.
Tennant, Harold John
Crombie, John William
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Thomas, F. Freeman (Hastings
Cullinan, J.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Daly, James
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Tully, Jasper
Dalziel, James Henry
M'Dermott, Patrick
Wallace, Robert
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
M'Fadden, Edward.
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
M'Govern, T.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Delany, William
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Dewar, J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
M'Kenna, Reginald
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Dillon, John
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Doogan, P. C.
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Mooney, John J.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Dutty, William J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Dunn, Sir William
Murphy, J.
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Edwards, Frank
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Wodehouse, Hn Armine (Essex
Elibank, Master of

Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
Emmott, Alfred
Norman, Henry
Yoxall, James Henry
Evans, Samuel T.
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Farquharson. Dr. Robert
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Farrell, James Patrick
O' Brien, Kendal (Tipper'ry Mid
Sir Thomas Esmonde and
Fenwick, Charles
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Captain Donelan.
NOES.

Acland-Hood. Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzBoy
Beach. Rt. Hn. Sir M. H(Bristol
Agnew. Sir Andrew Noel
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Beckett, Ernest William
Allhusen, Augustus Hy. Eden
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.
Allsopp, Hon. George
Balcarres, Lord
Bignold, Arthur
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Baldwin, Alfred
Bill,. Charles
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Blundell, Colonel Hemy
Arrol, Sir William
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W.(Leeds
Bond, Edward
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Banbury, Frederick George
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bowles, Capt. H.F. (Middlesex
Austin, Sir John
Bartley,. George C. T.

Bowles, T. Gibson. (King's Lynn,
the War Office officials required, not gold, nor silver, but leathern medals.
Question put.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 144; Noes, 207. (Division List No. 27.)

Brookfield, Colonel Montagu

Greene, Sir E.W. (Bury St. Ed.

Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)

Brown, Alexander H.(Shropsh.

Guthrie, Walter Murray

Penn, John

Bullard, Sir Harry

Hain, Edward

Percy, Earl

Burdett-Coutts, W.

Halsey, Thomas Frederick

Plummer, Walter R.

Caine, William Sproston

Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G (Mid'x

Powell, Sir Francis

Cautley, Henry Strother

Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nd'rny

Pretyman, Ernest George

Cavendish, V. C. W.(Derbysh.

Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th

Purvis, Robert

Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)

Hay, Hon. Claude George

Pym, C. Guv

'Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)

Heath, James(Staftbrds., N. W.

Quilter, Sir Cuthbert

Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J.(Birm.

Henderson, Alexander

Rasche, Major Frederic Came

Chamberlain, J. Austen(Worc'r

Hermon-Hodge, Rbt. Trotter

Reed, Sir E. James (Cardiff)

Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton

Hope, J. F. (S'hef'ld. Brightside

Reid, James (Greenock)

Churchill, Winston Spencer

Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry

Remnant, James Farquharson

Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.

Howard, Cap. J (Kent, Faversh.

Renshaw, Charles Bine

Coddington, Sir William
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Rentoul, James Alexander
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Hozier, Hon. James Henry C.
Renwick, George
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Ridley, S. F. (Bethnal Green)
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Charles T.
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Knowles, Lees
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Lawrence, William F.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Cook, Frederick Lucas
Lawson, John Grant
Round, James
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Lecky, Rt. Hon. Wm. Edw. H.
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Lee, Cap. A. H (Hants., Fareham)
Russell T. W.
Cranborne, Viscount
Legge, Col. Hon. Haneage
Rutherford, John
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Leighton, Stanley
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Saunderson, Rt. Hon. Cl. Edw. J.
Dewar, TR (T'RH'mlets, S. Geo.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Long, Rt. Hon. Walter (Bristol, S
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Dickson-Povnder, Sir John P.

Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Shaw, Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Lowther, C. Cumb., Eskdale)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Smith, HC (North'mb Tyneside
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Doxtord, Sir William Theodore
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. E.
Spear, John Ward
Duke, Henry Edward
Macdona, John Cumming
Spencer, Ernest(W. Bromwich)
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Maconochie, A. W.
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir WilliamHart
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
M'Calmot, Col. J. (Antrim, E.
Stanley, Lord (Lanes.)
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
M'Killop, James (Stirlingsh.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Eaber, George Denison
Malcolm. Ian
Stroyan, John
Fardell, Sir T. George
Manners, Lord Cecil
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Fellowes. Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Markham, Arthur Basil
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Thornton, Percy M.
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Maxwell, W. J. H.(Dumfriessh.

Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John Wm.
Valentia, Viscount
Fisher, William Hayes
Milton, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose.
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Wason, John Catheart(Orkney)
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Montagu. G. (Huntingdon)
Webb, Colonel William Geo.
Flannery, Sir Fortesque
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Fletcher, Sir Henry
More, R. Jasper (Shropshire)
Wills, Sir Frederick
Forster, Henry William
Morrell, George Herbert
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Foster, Sir Michael (Lond. Uni.
Morris, Hon. Martin H. F.
Wilson-Todd. Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Garfit, William
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E.R.(Bath
Godson,Sir Augustus Fred'rick
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Wyndham. Rt. Hon. George
Gordou, Hn J.E.(Elgin & Nairn
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Murray, Col. Wyndham(Bath.)
Young, Commander) Berks, E.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Nicholson, William Graham
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;Sir
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Nicol, Donald Ninian
William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Original Question again proposed.

MR. GODDARD (Ipswich) said he thought they had some cause of complaint in regard to this Supplementary Estimate, inasmuch as there was a very large proportion of it which still remained absolutely without any explanation whatever. No doubt there were times when there were exigencies which caused the original Estimates to be exceeded, and they must pass Supplementary Estimates to make up the required amount. The practice had been growing to make these Supplementary Estimates for large sums of money, which could not be regarded as the result of a mistake in the original Estimate. The reason for this seemed to be a little difficult to understand. It either meant that there was great incompetence on the part of those who prepared the Estimates in submitting a smaller amount than was really required, or else it must mean that the Government were afraid to put in the original Estimate the full amount required for the various Departments, and hoped to smuggle through the extra amount in the Supplementary Estimates, which were not fully explained. That was very unsatisfactory indeed, and he thought it was the duty of the House of Commons to resist the attempts which were made to remove these Estimates from the fullest investigation. This item of £35,200 was no small amount. It was a large amount, and there was only £31,000 attempted to be explained. He admitted that the right hon. Gentleman had given some explanation which might justify the increased expenditure, but it did not seem that he was justified in putting it in a Supplementary Estimate. He thought that might have been brought up in a proper way. Was it right that the Committee should be asked to pass a large sum of money like this without a single word of explanation before them? In regard to the sum of £14,200 he had before asked an explanation, but the right hon. Gentleman had not vouchsafed any. He noticed that in one case £5,500 was set down for rents, insurance, and tithe rent-charges. The Government must fully know what they had to pay, and the Committee ought to have an explanation why the amount was not included in the original Estimate. He had no doubt that the extra expenditures were absolutely correct, but the Committee had no knowledge of them, and it was possible, as he showed on the previous night, even in such a homely thing as furniture, to crowd in things which were not furniture at all, and which called forth comment from the Comptroller and Auditor General. It was part of their duty to try to prevent the forcing of Estimates through the House without getting a full and proper explanation of them. He moved that the Vote be reduced by £100.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £35,100, be granted for the said Service." (Mr. Goddard.)

MR. FIELD supported the proposal to reduce the Vote. He believed the system which had now been adopted with regard to the Supplementary Estimates was altogether wrong. The Government objected to supplementary questions, but they certainly had no objection to Supplementary Estimates. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House had obtained an Order objecting to supplementary questions being asked on foreign affairs, but the hon. Member thought they should also have an Order in regard to Supplementary Estimates. In this Vote there was an increase of no less than one-tenth of the whole amount. The total was £350,000 and the Supplementary Estimate was £35,000. He held that, if any

business man conducted his affairs in the same way that the financial affairs of this Empire were conducted, he would simply be bankrupt in a very short time. Hon. Members got the Supplementary Estimates the day before they came to be considered. That was not a businesslike way of dealing with these matters. He would support the reduction of the Vote as a protest against a system which, in his opinion, was being abused not only by this Government, but by every Government which had been in power since he came into the House.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said he had again and again called attention to the practice of bringing enormous Supplementary Estimates before the Committee, and more than three years ago he was assured by the Chancellor of the Exchequer that they had seen the last of this mischievous system. He had drawn the attention of the Government not only to the inconvenience of the practice, but also to the absolute destruction of our system of national accounts which it involved. Supplementary Estimates ought to be jealously avoided when it was in any way possible. They ought to be jealously kept for occasions which, could not possibly be foreseen when the original Estimates were made. When the practice of introducing Supplementary Estimates was seen to be growing year after year, it was calculated to produce the impression that there was a set purpose of interfering with the control of the House of Commons. He did not know who might be responsible for this method of false finance, but it was a system of falsifying the accounts, because when the Chancellor of the Exchequer produced his Budget and told the House he required a certain amount of money for the expenditure of the year, it was an outrage that he should come afterwards and ask for five or six millions more. He earnestly hoped the Government would give serious attention to this matter, and in future years refrain from calling upon the Committee to consider as Supplementary Estimates matters which really and properly belonged to the original Estimates.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.) said that year after year it had been the practice of the Government to endeavour to take these Votes from the review of the Committee. First they came for Votes on Account, and then they brought in Supplementary Estimates. If the officials of the House knew that they could get a Supplementary Vote on this and that item they became very careless in the manner they framed their Estimates, and the Ministers in charge of the Votes, knowing that if they sat tight until twelve o'clock the discussion would close, were not nearly so careful as they used to be in regard to explanations. When the rules providing for the closure of Supply were first introduced, Mr. Courtney said that one of the certain results would be negligence on the part of Departments in making up their accounts, and, to a certain extent, negligence on the part of Ministers in charge of defending the Votes, and he predicted a large increase of Votes on Account and also of Supplementary Estimates. The same thing was predicted by the Irish Members, and events had justified the prediction.

*SIR EDGAR VINCENT (Exeter) desired to add his protest against the system of finance which led to these very large Supplementary Estimates. In looking through the details of the Vote under discussion he could not see any item which should not have been foreseen when the original Estimate was prepared, or which could not have been postponed until the Estimates of the current year; and those

were the only grounds upon which the inclusion of any item with a Supplementary Vote could be justified. Taking the figures of the last ten years, he found that the amount of Supplementary Votes on the Civil Service Estimates was decidedly upon the increase. It was not a party question, and he hoped the Government would take a firm stand in future against the system, as it was greatly in the interests of financial government that it should be done.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN Worcestershire, E.) said that, with regard to the general question of Supplementary Estimates, there seemed to be an impression in various parts of the Committee that they were a convenience to the Government. That certainly was not the case.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.) said the contention was that they were a convenience to the permanent officials.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN assured the Committee that it was the desire of the Government to limit Supplementary Estimates as strictly as possible. In recent years there had been, as the hon. Member for Exeter had pointed out, a tendency to increase the Supplementary Estimates, but it would be his duty, and it was the desire of the Government, to limit them as strictly as they could in future.

The circumstances under which the Estimates were framed were well known to right hon. Gentlemen opposite; they were drawn up a long while beforehand, and it was impossible in all cases to foresee all the expenditure. With regard to the remark of the hon. Member for East Mayo, that the permanent officials preferred Supplementary Estimates to the ordinary Estimates of the year, he thought there was no foundation for such a suggestion. Many of the Votes under discussion were Votes which could not possibly have been introduced at an earlier time. In the circumstances of the present year there had been peculiar conditions, which had upset calculations made with as great an approach to accuracy as was possible at the time the original Estimates were framed. The Committee doubtless would recognise the exceptional circum-

stances of the year, and understand that the fact of there being so large a sum to be obtained by Supplementary Estimates was not an indication of any desire or intention on the part of the Government to increase Supplementary Estimates unnecessarily.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) thought the Amendment was moved as a general protest against the growing system of Supplementary Estimates. The objection was not to those matters which could not have been foreseen; there were no doubt such cases, but when the Supplementary Estimates kept increasing it was necessary to oppose every item that could not be shown to have been necessarily put in the form of a Supplementary Estimate. That was the only way in which the matter could be dealt with in a practical manner. The Financial Secretary had said that special care would be exercised in the future. Promises for "the future" were always being given. "The present" was now being dealt with, and if the Supplementary Estimates were reduced in the future it would be mainly due to the fact that they were opposed now. The real reason they had increased was that the Opposition had been very remiss in its duty. During the last Parliament Supplementary Estimates went up by leaps and bounds, because, instead of there

being any real discussion upon them, the Opposition sat cowed and did not dare to do anything. They were going to adopt quite a different system in the present Parliament; they were going to fight the Government upon everything, because, although they were in a numerical minority at present, they represented the feelings of the country upon many questions in regard to finance, and they intended henceforth to do their duty. As no attempt at a case had been made for many of the present Supplementary Estimates, it was a very good opportunity to give the Government a hint of their intentions, which they were determined to carry out without fear of being accused of obstruction or anything of that sort.

MR. DILLON was glad that the Financial Secretary had admitted the justice of the complaint against these Supplementary Estimates, and promised that the Government would amend its ways in the years to come. But that promise had been given every year for the last seven or eight years, and instead of there being any sign of improvement things had got worse. The great increase in Supplementary Estimates, which was a sign of recklessness, carelessness, and indifference in dealing with public accounts, was but a symptom of a disease which was playing havoc with the public economy that the House of Commons was supposed to enforce. The reason these constant increases were brought forward was that the opinion had been growing on the permanent officials that the day had gone by when the Committee would find fault with any Estimate that was submitted. The recent statement of the First Lord of the Treasury, that it was the accepted practice of the House of Commons not to discuss any Estimate with a view to economy, was a direct invitation to every official to be indifferent in his accounts, and to have no fear of the House of Commons before his eyes, knowing perfectly well that if he made up a wrong Estimate he could put forward a Supplementary Estimate. The system betokened a fatal disease which was preying upon the whole of the spending departments of the country, and which would sooner or later cause an outbreak on the part of that most patient of all beings, the taxpayer of the United Kingdom. It was for these reasons the Opposition had taken up the position they had on that and the previous day, and that course of action had been amply justified. The Amendment might now very well be voted upon, in order that other important Votes could be discussed.

MR. MARTIN (Worcestershire, Droitwich) remarked that if Supplementary Estimates were to be done away with altogether the tendency would be for the original Estimates to be drawn up very loosely, and not at all so strictly as they should be. That was a danger which should be kept in view.

MR. GEORGE WHITELEY (Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey) felt it necessary to join in the protest against the large

Supplementary Estimates the Committee were always called upon to meet at the end of the financial year, a large proportion of which might have been included in the original Estimates of the various Departments. The Minister in charge always said that it should not occur again, but year after year the same thing happened. It seemed to be entirely beyond the power of Ministers to treat those matters in a businesslike way. No private business could conduct its financial affairs in such a fashion. The continual growth of the expenditure of the country was a matter of the gravest concern. Year by year the Committee with a

light heart voted largely increasing expenditure, the taxation of the country grew heavier, and millions were added to the burdens of the nation. These matters could not be attacked in the gross; they must be considered in detail with a determination to lop off everything that was unnecessary. Ministers themselves ought to be grateful for the protest which had been made, because it would strengthen their hands in battling against the leading officials of their Departments, and in keeping down the Estimates. The House of Commons was gradually losing its grip over the expenditure of the country, and how the Chancellor of the Exchequer looked forward to his annual statement he did not know. He did not believe the Treasury would take the Committee to be serious in its protests until some Vote had been refused, and he ventured to hope the division would be successful in bringing the matter home to them.

MR. HEYWOOD JOHNSTONE (Sussex, Horsham) said there was no doubt the system of Supplementary Estimates was a very inconvenient one, and it was almost impossible for the House of Commons to keep a proper check on the expenditure of the country so long as the Committee were subject, after the Estimates had been more or less discussed, to demands for further large sums in the shape of Supplementary Estimates. At the same time, they could not do without Supplementary Estimates for unforeseen expenses. But a Public Accounts Committee sat during the session, and he would like to suggest that no Supplementary Estimate should be presented

to the House until it had been before that Committee. If that Committee investigated the figures, and satisfied themselves that the amounts asked for were such as should properly be embodied in Supplementary Estimates, the House might proceed to vote on such matters with much more confidence than at present.

*MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) thought it would be very unfortunate if this important matter was regarded from a party point of view. The suggestion of the hon. Member for the Horsham Division would not bear much examination from the constitutional standpoint. The Government must be held responsible for the proposals it placed before the House of Commons, and he should not be at all in favour of delegating that responsibility to any Committee.

MR. HEYWOOD JOHNSTONE explained that he did not for a moment suggest that the House should accept the Estimates as sent down from the Public Accounts Committee, but simply that it would save a great deal of time if it was known that they had been thoroughly examined upstairs.

*MR. JOHN ELLIS said that would not at all do away with the constitutional objection. The Government must be held responsible from beginning to end for the demands they put before the House, and the burdens they placed upon the taxpayers. The hon. Member would see upon consideration that his suggestion would be fatal to all fixing of responsibility. These Supplementary Estimates were against all financial security, but the practice of presenting them was undoubtedly growing. He welcomed the assurance of the Financial Secretary, but the hon. Member had not a long period of official experience behind him, and his assurance must therefore be taken for what it was worth. The spirit shown on that and the previous evening with regard to the Estimates had been too long

absent from the debates, and he welcomed its return. Finance would dominate this session and this Parliament. For long, as was well known to anyone of Parliamentary experience, Ministers of the highest constitutional and financial reputations had uttered their protest against the methods involved in large Supplementary Estimates.

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)

Ferguson, R. C. M. (Leith)

O'Doherty, William

Allen, Charles P. (Glouc. Stroud

Ffrench, Peter

O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)

Ambrose, Robert

Field, William

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

Ashton, Thomas Gair

Flavin, Michael Joseph

O'Dowd, John

Atherley-Jones, L.

Flynn, James Christopher

O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)

Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)

Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)

O'Kerry, Jas. (Roscommon, N

Boland, John

Furness, Sir Christopher

O'Malley, William

Boyle, James

Gilhooly, James

O'Mara, James

Brand, Hon. Arthur G.

Grant, Corrie

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.

Brigg, John

Haldane, Richard Burdon

Perks, Robert William

Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson

Hammond, John

Power, Patrick Joseph

Bryce, Rt. Hon. James

Harms worth, R. Leicester

Price, Robert John

Burke, E. Haviland

Hayden, John Patrick

Rea, Russell

Buxton, Sydney Charles

Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Reckitt, Harold James
Caine, William Sproston
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir A. D.
Reddy, M.
Caldwell, James
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Cameron, Robert
Hope, John D. (Fife, West)
Reed, Sir Edw. James (Cardiff)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Robson, William Snowdon
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Jordan, Jeremiah
Roche, John
Carew, James Laurence
Joyce, Michael
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Lahouchere, Henry
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Causton, Richard Knight
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh.)
Cawley, Frederick
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Channing, Francis Allston
Leng, Sir John
Soares, Ernest J,
Cogan, Denis J.
Levy, Maurice
Spencer, Rt. Hn. CR (Northants
Colville, John
Lough, Thomas
Stevenson, Francis S,
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Lundon, W.
Sullivan, Donal
Craig, Robert Hunter
MacDonnell, Dr Mark A.
Tennant, Harold John
Crean, Eugene
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.

Thomas Abel(Carmarthen, E.)
Crombie, John William
M'Arthur, William(Cornwall)
Thomas, F. Freeman (Hastings
Cullinan, J.
M'Dermott, Patrick
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Daly, James
M'Fadden, Edward
Tully, Jasper
Dalziel, James Henry
M'Govern, T.
Ure, Alexander
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
Wallace, Robert
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
M'Kenna, Reginald
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Delany, William
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Dillon, John
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Donelan, Captain A.
Markham, Arthur Basil
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Doogan, P. C.
Mooney, John J.
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Duffy, William J.
Murphy, J.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Dunn, Sir William
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Edwards, Frank
Nolan, Col. John P.(Galway, N).
Williams, Osmond(Merioneth)
Elibank, Master of
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)

Ellis, John Edward
Norman, Henry
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Emmott, Alfred
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Yoxall, James Henry
Evans, Samuel T.
O'Brien, Kendal Tipperary Mid
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Farrell, James Patrick
O'Connor, James(Wicklow, W)
Mr. Goddard and Sir Brampton Gurdon.
Fenwick, Charles
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
NOES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Bignold, Arthur
Allsopp, Hon. George
Balcarres, Lord
Bill, Charles
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Baldwin, Alfred
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A.J.(Manch'r
Bond, Edward
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W(Leeds
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Arrol, Sir William
Banbury, Frederick George
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bartley, George C. T.

Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Austin, Sir John
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M.H (Bristol)
Brown, Alexander H.(Shropsh.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline EitzRoy
Beckett, Ernest William
Bullard, Sir Harry
Question put.
The Committee divided::Ayes, Noes, 211. (Division List No. 28.)
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Hain, Edward
Plummer, Walter R.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Hamilton, Rt Hn L'rd G (Midd'x
Pretymann, Ernest George
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry
Purvis, Robert
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Pym, C. Guy
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Harris, F. L. (Tynemouth)
Quilrer, Sir Cuthbert
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Reid, James (Greenock)
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
Heath, Jas. (Staffords., N.W.)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Henderson, Alexander
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Charrington, Spencer
Hermon-Hodge, Robt. Trotter
Rentoul, James Alexander
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Hope, J.F (Sheffield, Brightside
Renwick, George
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Howard, Capt J. (Kent, Faversham
Ridley, Hn. M.W(Stalyhridge)
Cochrane, Hon, Thos. H. A.E.

Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Coddington, Sir William
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Ritchie, Rt Hn Chas. Thompson
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Knowles, Lees
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Lawson, John Grant
Round, James
Corbett, A. Cameron(Glasgow)
Lecky, Rt. Hn. Wm. Edw. H.
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Cox, Irwin E. Bainbridge
Lee, Capt. AH (Hants. Fareham
Russell, T. W.
Cranborne, Viscount
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Rutherford, John
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Leighton, Stanley
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Cust, Henry C.
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Seton-Karr, Henry
Dewar, T.R. (T'r H'mlets, S. Geo.
Long, Rt Hn Walter (Bristol, S.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Dickson, Charles Scott
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Shaw-Stewart, M.H.(Renfrew
Dickson-Poynder, Sir J. P.
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)

Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Dilke, Rt Hon. Sir Charles
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Smith, H. C. (North'mb., Tynes.
Dimsdale, Sir J. Cockfield
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Spear, John Ward
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. E.
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich)
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore
Macdona, John dimming
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormsk.)
Duke, Henry Edward
Maconochie, A. W.
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool
Stanley, Lord (Lanes.)
Egerton. Hon. A. de Tatton
M'Calmont, Col.J.(Antrim, E.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M 'Taggart
Elliot, Hon. Ralph Douglas
M'Killop, James(Stirlingshire
Stroyan, John
Faber, George Denison
Majendie, James A. H.
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Fardell, Sir T. George
Malcolm, Ian
Talbot, Rt Hn J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Fellowes, Hon. A. Edward
Manners, Lord Cecil
Thornton, Percy M.
Fergusson. Rt Hn.Sir J. (Manc'r
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Fielden, Edw. Brocklehurst
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Valencia, Viscount
Finch, George H.
Milton, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)

Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Fisher, William Hayes
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Webb, Col. William George
FitzGerald, Sir R. Penrose-
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Welby, Lt.-Col. ACE (Taunton)
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward A.
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Williams, Colonel R (Dorset)
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Morrell, George Herbert
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Forster, Henry William
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Wills, Sir Frederick
Foster, Sir M. (Lond. Univ.)
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Garfit, William
Mowbray, Sir Robert (tray C.
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Gibbs, Hn A. G. H. (City of Lond.
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk,
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Gordon, Hn J. E.(Elgin & Nairn)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-
Nicholson, William Graham
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Goschen, Hon. Ceo. Joachim
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Greene, Sir EW (B'ry S Edm'nds
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)

Sir William Walrond and
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Penn, John
Mr. Anstruther.
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Percy, Earl

Original Question put, and agreed to.

2. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £13,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for Rates and Contributions in

lieu of Rates, etc., in respect of Government property."

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid) said this was one of the opportunities the Government would have of defending the principle on which the Supplementary Estimates had been made out. He wished to know why they had lumped the amount for England and Ireland together, instead of dividing them into different heads, and why there had been no explanation given as to how much was for England and how much for Ireland. Could it be said for a moment that the money required for the rates on these properties could not have been foreseen? These properties did not come into existence yesterday or since the Estimates were made out. These buildings in London were in existence and occupation, and they could easily have taken into account in the original Estimate the amount that would be required to be paid. He noticed that they had inserted a foot-note which stated;

"This additional sum is required to meet an increase in the poundage of rates in London and in many country districts; also in Ireland."

That argument might apply in the case of an individual, but in London the rates were under their own control and they were not like those levied by local authorities. The Government had their own valuers, and there could be no difficulty whatever in estimating the amount of those rates beforehand, lie washed to know how it was that these rates had been increased? Why was it that they had increased rates in respect to England and Ireland and yet they had no increase whatever as far as Scotland was concerned? In the case of England in the year 1890 the amount required for rates and contributions in lieu of rates in respect of Government property was £250,800, for Scotland the amount was £20,500, and for Ireland £41,000. Five years later, when they came to last year's Estimates, they found that the rates in England amounted to £385,000, and this was a Supplementary Estimate in addition which would bring the sum total up to nearly £400,000 instead of the £250,800 at which it stood five years ago. That was an enormous increase. How did the matter stand with regard to Ireland? In the year 1890, in Ireland the amount for rates and contributions in lieu of rates in respect of Government property was £41,000. and last year there was a slight increase, the amount being £42,000 instead of £41,000, but that was owing to the operation of the

Local Government Act. Practically speaking, so far as Ireland was concerned, for the last five years there had not been the slightest increase. As far as

Scotland was concerned, if they would look at the Appropriation Accounts they would find that Scotland only got £17,000, and under these accounts if there was a saving in one country it went to the other country, and England had been getting the benefit of what Scotland had saved. They ought to have a uniform principle of valuation for England, Scotland, and Ireland.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is now going into the general question and he must be aware that that is not in order. He must confine himself to the subject-matter of the Estimate before the Committee.

MR. CALDWELL said he was complaining, as he was quite entitled to complain, that the Government were coming to the House with Supplementary Estimates for England, whilst they had not found it necessary to make Supplementary Estimates for the other country.

*THE CHAIRMAN: That is not the point with which the hon. Member was dealing when I ruled him out of order. He was then going in to the general question.

MR. CALDWELL said that as regarded these rates they ought to have an account of the amount of valuation and the taxes of the Government property throughout England, giving the details. That would facilitate them very considerably in getting at the proportion.

*THE CHAIRMAN: As I have already pointed out to the hon. Member, this is a point with which he cannot deal. He is now discussing the general principle, and that cannot be discussed upon a Supplementary Estimate. The hon. Member must confine himself to this Estimate.

MR. CALDWELL contended that they were entitled to know how much of this increased expenditure was due to increased poundage of rates, and the conditions under which this increase had been rendered necessary, and he would leave the matter in that form.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: This is one of those items which is not open to the criticism of which we have heard a good deal in the earlier part of the debate to-day and yesterday, to the effect that this increase could have been foreseen and ought to have been foreseen. The whole of this Supplementary Estimate is required to meet the increased poundage in the rates. The sum which the Government take is sufficient to pay the rates and the contributions in lieu of rates on all Government property, and it is also sufficient provision for the new Government property which we came into possession of in the course of the year. This provision is wholly and exclusively taken to cover the increased poundage of rates over which we have no control, and which rests entirely with the local authority. I think the hon. Member for Mid Lanark must know that we have no control in that sense over the exact amount of the rates. I think it is now agreed that the valuation of Government property made by the Government valuer has given universal satisfaction. That valuation has been accepted in Scotland and placed on the valuation rolls. They have been accepted equally in Ireland as fair and reasonable, and they have met with the same approval of the local authorities. Once those valuations are fixed we pay-as a contribution the amount which would be levied if the property was not Crown property. The whole of this amount is due to the increase of the poundage of the rates over which the Government have no control, and in order to carry out the bargain made at

the request of lion. Members of this House with the local authorities, we are obliged to ask the Committee to make provision for this increased sum. The hon. Member for Mid Lanark inquires why this sum was necessary for England and Ireland and not for Scotland? That must be due to the fact that the local authorities in Scotland

are very reluctant to raise the poundage of the rates.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE said the Secretary to the Treasury was mistaken in saying that they were satisfied with the present valuation of Government property in Ireland, for the general complaint was that it was not valued sufficiently high. He was sorry that, according to the Chairman's ruling, it was not proper for them to discuss the principle on which the assessments of Government properties were made. He thought that on a matter of this great importance they ought to have some representative of the Irish Administration to give them the details of this extra sum of £3,000 which was required from Ireland. They were asked to vote this £3,000 as a Supplementary Estimate in connection with the rating of Government property in Ireland, and no information was given to them as to the way in which this £3,000 was to be expended. He presumed that the Secretary to the Treasury was not in a position to give the Committee this information, but he hoped that before this debate came to an end he would be able to give the Committee the details.

*SIR ALBERT ROLLIT said that, in regard to the rates and contributions in lieu of rates in respect of Government property, he wished to say that the Returns he had moved for and obtained were sent to all the boroughs in England, and he believed in Ireland as well, and no complaint had been made at all in regard to the assessments agreed upon. In his opinion a very great wrong had been redressed by this arrangement, though the principle of the Government being its own valuer was, of course, still open to objection.

MR. DALY (Monaghan, S.) said that the statement of the right hon. Gentleman was very loose in regard to a matter of this kind. He believed, however, the discussion that night would be of very great benefit to the hon. Gentleman, because, although he was new to his office, he must understand, if he wanted to get his Votes through Committee, he must have all the details at his fingers ends. He would feel it his duty

to move a reduction of the Vote unless a better explanation was given.

MR. CALDWELL thought that the explanation given by the Secretary to the Treasury would not hold water for a moment. Here was an increase of £2,000 in the rates and contributions in lieu of rates for Admiralty property, and of £7,000 for property of the War Department. But look at the enormous buildings of the Government; dockyards, post offices, etc.; throughout the whole of England and Ireland, and how could it be that this sum of £13,000 was simply owing to increased poundage? It was nothing of the kind. If the hon. Gentleman thought that there was not to be an increased poundage in Scotland he was mistaken. The right hon. Gentleman had said that the Scotch people were satisfied, but he could assure him that the people in that country had been complaining very much. He quite recognised that on a Supplementary Vote they could not go into the principle of a uniform system of contribution; but at the same time he was

entitled to call attention to the fact that if Scotland could do without an increased contribution to the rates, so should England.

MR. DILLON said that the hon. Gentleman had declared that they in Ireland were satisfied with the Government contribution to the rates. He was astonished at that in view of what had appeared in the Report of the Royal Commission on Local Taxation which had just been published. In that Report there was a most important memorandum prepared for the Commission by Mr. Charles Dawson, Collector General of Rates in Dublin, who said;

"Government property should be openly valued, and pay rates, not as bounty, but as duty. If it be right, as the giving of a 'bounty' allows, to pay at all, it should be done as a matter of right. The valuation of this kind of property in Dublin is quite inadequate. The Castle of Dublin, with the town palace of the Viceroy, and all its Government offices, residences, private chapels, courtyards and squares, is only valued at £;3,550. All the Government buildings in Dublin, including Castle, Law Courts, Custom House, Post Office, Barracks, are only valued at £;36,764. In London the Law Courts alone are valued at £;56,700."

Anyone who compared the Castle, Viceroy's palace, barracks, law courts, custom house, post office, and other public buildings in Dublin with those in London would acknowledge that if the same principle of valuation were applied in Dublin as in London, the valuation of the former would be at least £;120,000 instead of £;36,700. He supposed an opportunity would arise of discussing ere long the Report of the Commission which had been hatching its eggs for the last six or seven years.

*SIR WALTER FOSTER said he quite understood the difficulty of making up the amount of poundage eighteen months beforehand, but he could hardly understand why an additional £;10,000 was required for England, and only £;3,000 for Ireland, and nothing for Scotland. Some further explanation was surely required. MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that in making the original Estimates for the year allowance was made for any increase in the buildings, for the occupation of additional property, and also for increased valuation that was thought likely to arise on existing property. But a sufficient sum had not been allowed for a rise in the poundage rates, which of course affected the contributions the Government made. Hon Members would see that the increases were not likely to be the same, but would differ with each rating authority. He understood that, on the whole, the valuations had given satisfaction. He believed the Dublin valuation was an old one, but a proposal had been made for a new one.

*MR. O'DOHERTY said that the Government property in Ireland, and he took it that it was the same in England, was valued not as the property of private individuals at its net annual value, but at half the net annual rent. They had, in the city of Londonderry, protested against that system over and over again. He wished for some explanation of why the allowance for rates on Government property had been increased in Ireland since local government had been instituted there. Such was not his experience, and he felt that this Vote was a libel upon the County Borough Councils and County Councils in Ireland. Why had this slur been placed on the local bodies in Ireland by the Government?

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.) said he wanted some further explanation in regard to the

increase of £;7,000 as a contribution in lieu of rates on War Department property in England. Then an increase of £;3,000 was asked for Ireland; but there had been no general increase of rates in Ireland to justify their asking for such a large sum. On the contrary, since the new rating bodies had been elected by the people there had been all round a reduction of rates, He thought Dublin had been treated in a very unfair manner in regard to the rating of Government buildings. In London a grant of £;10,000 was given to the fire brigade in lieu of a contribution to the rates, but no grant was given to the fire brigade in Dublin.

MR. CALDWELL said that the hon. Gentleman had declared that the increase was due to the increase of poundage, but it was obvious that that was not the case, because, had it been due to increase of poundage, it would have applied equally all over the country. It was absurd to come forward in Committee and make a general assertion without giving them any particulars whatsoever.

MR. FIELD said he understood the hon. Gentleman to say that the people in Ireland were satisfied with the valuation of the public buildings there. He was not satisfied [laughter]; and all the people he had consulted declared that all the Government buildings in Ireland were entirely underrated. The valuation in England was made by the local authorities, whereas in Ireland it was fixed by Government officials.

*THE CHAIRMAN said that that was a Question of principle, which did not arise on the Supplementary Estimates.

MR. FIELD said that hon. Gentlemen who laughed at a subject like taxation would be a good deal more serious if the money came out of their own pockets. This was a serious matter, and, as a protest against the absence of details in respect, to the amount of the grant allocated to Ireland, he moved the reduction of the Vote by £;100.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. Gentleman move in respect to the £;3,000 for Ireland?

MR. FIELD: Yes, Sir.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £;12,900, be granted for the said Service."; (Mr. Field.)

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: If the hon. Gentleman wants to reduce the amount available for distribution in Ireland in lieu of rates, the Government, I am sure, have no objection, and I accept the Amendment.

MR. FIELD said the hon. Gentleman had put the matter in the wrong way. It would be perfectly obvious to anyone with a knowledge of figures that it was to the total Vote his Amendment applied.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Gentleman will remember that I asked him did he intend his Amendment to apply to the amount for Ireland, and he said, "Yes."

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, (Bristol, W.): I would point out to hon. Members that this Vote is not proposed for the advantage of the Treasury. The Treasury would be glad if none of this money went to the ratepayers either in England or Ireland; and it comes to this, that if hon. Members do not desire the Vote we will withdraw it.

*SIR WALTER FOSTER thought the Committee were unanimous in their desire to pass

the Vote, At the same time it was hoped that some further information would be given upon the subject.

MR. FIELD: I beg to withdraw my Amendment.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

3. £7,000 (Supplementary), Railways, Ireland.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said that this Vote, upon the face of it, was a brilliant example of the Supplementary Estimate, and if the Chancellor of the Exchequer was prepared to withdraw the

whole of this Vote, as he had professed himself willing to do with the Vote last before the Committee, a very good case might be made out for his so doing. Although it might be perfectly right to bring it in as an ordinary, there was no doubt it was wrong to bring this in as a Supplementary Estimate. It appeared to be an "amount required to meet the additional claims which, in consequence of the earlier discharge under the Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1898, of the local liability to the several railway-companies, will mature in the year." This was a liability which arose under an Act which received the Royal Assent on the 12th of August. 1898. The original Estimates were prepared in November, 1899; fifteen months after the Act was passed; when every liability which was likely to arise out of the Act was perfectly well foreseeable. Why was it not foreseen? How was it that in November, 1899, the Government were unable to foresee a liability which was likely to arise out of an Act passed fifteen months previously? This system of Supplementary Estimates undoubtedly put the finances of the country upon a false basis.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said it was, of course, foreseen that these sums would have to be paid. They were, as a matter of fact, repayments in respect of a guarantee given by the Government to the Local Government of Ireland. Under the new Local Government Act the county councils of Ireland had accelerated the work, and as soon as the payments had been made and vouched the Government were obliged to repay them.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES pointed out that his question had not been answered.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.) said, assuming the hon. Member for King's Lynn was right in the opinion he had formed, he did not think his remedy was equally so.

If the hon. Gentleman disagreed with the Vote, he should move to reduce the salaries of some of his hon. friends on the Government bench, and not punish the unfortunate people of Ireland by proposing the withdrawal of the Vote.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said he proposed to punish nobody. All he asked was, why was not this expenditure foreseen and provided for in the ordinary Estimates?

COLONEL NOLAN explained that the county councils of Ireland had made these payments, and unless this Vote was agreed to they would be out of pocket £1,500 for three months. It was not a very large sum, and he hoped the hon. Member for King's Lynn would raise no objection.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN admitted that the Government expected some acceleration in the matter of these payments, but it could not be provided for until it was known in which cases it was likely to occur payment had not in all cases been accelerated, and it would not be fair to take the whole amount when the whole of

the amounts had not become due.

*MR. TULLY was of opinion that some further details ought to be given for the particular sum of £;7,000 which was now exercising the attention of the Committee. There was a guarantee given for the railway in Leitrim. He asked how much was included for it.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: £;1,700 in respect to that guarantee is included in this sum.

*MR. TULLY pointed out that under the Local Government Act, when the light railway rate exceeded sixpence the Government was to pay half, but what happened in Leitrim was that, instead of the ratepayers saving something, they suffered under a heavier tax last year, as this money was not put to the credit of the county in due time. So far as Leitrim was concerned, the Estimate was not justified, because in the first instance they had not received the amount to which they were entitled. He had no faith in the figures of Supplementary Estimates. There was, he thought, always something behind them which would not bear investigation.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth) said the Vote was to give back from Government what the county councils had already advanced.

Resolution agreed to.

CLASS II.

4. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £;6,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the salaries and expenses of the Department of His Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs."

MR. DILLON said he should oppose the Vote on the two grounds that the information sent by His Majesty's Minister at Peking as to affairs in China was insufficient and misleading, and always behind date, and that the Estimate was prepared in such a way as was calculated to confuse the hon. Members of the House. He himself was able to show on one occasion that the correspondent of The Times at Peking was a week ahead with information. When His Majesty's Government were questioned as to information that had appeared in The Times, the House was told that they knew nothing about it; and then, perhaps a week afterwards, they were told that the information of the correspondent of The Times was perfectly correct. With regard to the Estimates, could anything be more objectionable than the way in which they were drawn up? This was a Supplementary Estimate of the amount required in the year ending 31st March, 1901, to pay salaries and expenses of the Department of His Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and the amount now asked for was for telegrams "consequent on the state of affairs in the Far East." If the Committee turned to page 20, they would find a Supplementary Estimate for the Diplomatic and Consular Services, under which there were these items. "E. Telegrams consequent on the state of affairs in the Far East"; "U. Telegrams consequent on the state of affairs at Lorenzo Marques"; and "E.E. Postage and telegrams consequent on the state of affairs in the Far East." Therefore it would be seen that there were no less than three separate and distinct claims all based upon the state of affairs in the Far East, and all

for telegrams in consequence of the state of affairs in the Far East. This he thought was satisfactory. He moved the reduction of the Vote by £3,000. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £3,000, be granted for the said Service." (Mr. Dillon.)

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRANBORNE, Rochester) said that the Supplementary Estimates were prepared on the same plan as the main Estimates, and that plan was of long standing. He thought that nothing would be more calculated to confuse hon. Members than that Supplementary Estimates should be drawn on a different basis to that on which the main Estimates were drawn. With regard to the other point raised by the hon. Member, he had nothing to say except to express his admiration for the energy and enterprise of The Times. Although, of course, the Government had to be a little more careful, it was always the object of the Secretary of State to lay before the House as much information as possible.

MR. LABOUCHERE thought that the House did not get the full value of the information which came to Ministers. When any specific information was asked for, not only did the Government deny any knowledge, but they did not attempt to telegraph out in order to allay the grave anxiety felt in the country. His reason for objecting to this Vote was in order to make some alteration in the preparation of the Estimates. He was perfectly aware that this amount had only reference to telegrams sent, but everybody did not know that, and anybody outside the Foreign Office reading the Estimate would be under the impression that this was for telegrams sent and received. He therefore supported the reduction.

MR. J. P. FARRELL said the noble Lord's remarks were not an answer to the observations of the hon. Member for East Mayo. The original Estimate for Foreign Office telegrams was £14,000, and they were now asked for an addition of £6,000. If the book-keeping arrangements in connection with these matters were as perfect as they ought to be, it was that the original Estimate was not more accurately made out? Complaints had been made in the discussion of the other Votes of the high percentage of the increases in the original Estimates shown by the Supplementary Estimates. In this case the increase was over 30 per cent., and no explanation had been vouchsafed of the cause, except what had been stated by the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs. He had no knowledge of the causes which led to this telegraphing, or whether it was necessary or not. He would like to hear about the contracts for this telegraphing. He understood that there were two or three lines over which cablegrams could be sent, and it was certainly a question on which they should receive some information. With whom were the contracts entered into, and what was the rate per word? The hon. Member for Northampton had referred to the fact that information had been withheld from the House, although information had been long previously supplied in the public newspapers. It appeared to him singular that any newspaper; no matter how great or how large its available

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)

O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud
Gilhooly, James
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Ambrose, Robert
Goddard, Daniel Ford
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Atherely-Jones, L.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Boland, John
Hammond, John
O'Dowd, John
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Kelly, J. (Roscommon, N.)
Burke, E. Haviland-
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
O'Malley, William
Caldwell, James
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
O'Mara, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Jordan, Jerimiah
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Causton, Richard Knight
Joyce, Michael
Perks, Robert William
Cawley, Frederick
Labouchere, Henry
Pickard, Benjamin
Channing, Francis Allston
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Power, Patrick Joseph
Cogan, Denis J.
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Reddy, M.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Redmond, J. E. (Waterford)
Crean, Eugene
Levy, Maurice
Rickett, J. Compton

Cullinan, J.
Lundon, W:
Roche, John
Daly, James
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Dalziel, James Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
M'Dermott, Patrick
Spencer, Rt. Hn C. R. (North'nts
Delany, William
M'Govern, T.
Sullivan, Donal
Dillon, John
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Tully, Jasper
Doogan, P. C.
Mooney, John J.
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Duffy, William J.
Murphy, J.
White, Patrick (Meath, N.)
Edwards, Frank
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Evans, Samuel T.
Nolan, Col. John P.(Galway, N.
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Fen wick, Charles
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Wilson, Chas. Hy. (Hull, W.)
Ffrench, Peter
Norton, Capt. Cecil William)
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
Field, William
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Flavin, Michael Joseph
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid)
Sir Thomas Esmonde and
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Captain Donelan.
NOES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Austin, Sir John
Allsopp, Hon. George
Arrol, Sir William
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRe
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Barley, James (Walworth)

capital; could be supplied with reliable information before the Government of the country. He should say that the Government of the country, which was responsible for the maintenance of the Empire, should be supplied not only with perfectly accurate but absolutely first-hand information. He imagined that the The Times should look to the Government rather than that the Government should look to that newspaper for information. He thought the hon. Member for East Mayo had rendered a distinct service to the cause of economy in moving for this reduction. The Irish Members had no means of checking before the event any action of the Government in connection with foreign relations, but when the bill came the Irish people were compelled to pay, although a Royal Commission had reported that they were already overtaxed.

Question put.

The Committee divided:; Ayes, 90; Noes, 153. (Division List No. 29.)

Bain, Colonel James Robert
Fisher, William Hayes
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Balcarres, Lord
Fitzroy, Hon Edward Algernon
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Plummer, Walter R.
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Forster, Henry William
Pretymann, Ernest George
Banbury, Frederick George
Garfit, William
Purvis Robert
Beach, Rt, Hn. Sir M.H (Bristol)
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H (City of Lond.
Pym. C. Guy
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Reckitt, Harold James
Bigwood, James
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Reid, James (Greenock)

Blundell, Colonel Henry
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Bond, Edward
Green, Walford D. (Wednesb'ry
Rentoul, James Alexander
Bowles Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Greene, Sir EW (B'ry SEdm'nds
Renwick, George
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Grenfell, William Henry
R'dley, Hn. M.W.(Stalybridge
Brigg, John
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Charles T.
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Bull, William James
Hain, Edward
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Bullard, Sir Harry
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Mid'x
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Cautley, Henry Strother
Hamilton, Marq. of (Lond'nd'ry
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lanes.)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Russell, T. W.
Cavendish, V.C.W(Derbyshire
Harris, F. Leverton (Tyuem'th
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Sadler, Co). Samuel Alex.
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Heath, James (Staffords, N.W.
Seely, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm
Hermon-Hodge, Hold. Trotter
Sinclair, Lewis (Romford)
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Charrington, Spencer

Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Smith, H. C (Northumb. Tynesd.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Knowles, Lees
Spear, John Ward
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Lawson, John Grant
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich)
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Lee, Capt AH (Hants. Fareham)
Stanley, Hon. A. (Ormskirk)
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Stanley, Lord (Lanes.)
Colville, John
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart
Cook, Frederick Lucas
Long, Rt Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Stroyan, John
Corbett, A.Cameron (Glasgow)
Lonsdale, John Browlee
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Cox, Irwin Edw. Bainbridge
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Cranborne, Viscount
Lucas, Reginald (Portsmouth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Macdona, John Cumming
Valentia, Viscount
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Wason, John Catheart (Orkney
Dewar, T.R. (T'rH'mlets S. Geo
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Webb, Colonel William Geo.
Dickson, Charles Scott
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Welby, Lt-Col. A.C. E (Taunton
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Majendie, James A. H.
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Malcoln, Ian

Williams, Col. H. (Dorset)
 Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
 Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir F. G.
 Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
 Doxford, Sir William Theodore
 Molesworth, Sir Lewis
 Wills, Sir Frederick
 Duke, Henry Edward
 Moon, Edward Rabert pacy
 Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
 Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
 More, R. J. (Shropshire)
 Wilson, John (Glasgow)
 Emmott, Alfred
 Morgan, David J.(W'lth'mst'w
 Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
 Faber, George Denison
 Morrell, George Herbert
 Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
 Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn E.
 Morris, Hon. Martin Hy. F.
 Young, Com'nder (Berks, E.)
 Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
 Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G.(Bute)
 TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
 Finch, George H.
 Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
 Sir William Walrond and
 Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
 Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
 Mr. Anstruther.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

5. Motion made and Question proposed, "That a Supplementary sum not exceeding £;7,200, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Department of His Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies."

MR. DILLON said that this Vote, so far as he could make out, was constructed on a different principle from the Foreign Office Vote. He took it that the additional £;7,200 was for telegrams sent from and to South Africa and Ashanti. If so, that was a very much better way of keeping the account than in the ease of the previous Vote. He moved the reduction of this Vote as a protest against the character of Sir Alfred Milner's telegrams, which were responsible for a considerable-waste of public money. It was nothing short of an outrage that public money should be spent on the absurd telegrams Sir Alfred Milner sent.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The substance of the telegrams cannot be discussed on this Vote.

MR. DILLON: Am I not entitled to object if public money is wasted, as it has been in this case, on useless telegrams? If Sir Alfred Milner used the wires to telegraph absurd news or articles, I am surely entitled to question his action on this Vote.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The proper time to discuss that would be on the salary of the Colonial Secretary. Sir Alfred Milner's telegrams cannot be discussed without entering into the policy in pursuance of which they were sent, and it has frequently been held that upon telegrams policy cannot be discussed. In saying that I am only upholding what has been the regular practice of the House.

MR. DILLON: I am not discussing the policy at all. Am I not entitled to discuss the question how this money has been spent? Suppose that a Governor telegraphs articles which should not be telegraphed, and a Supplementary Estimate, is presented to us for telegraphing a lot of absurd stuff perfectly unsuitable for telegraphing, surely nothing could be more pertinent than to move the reduction of the Vote, inasmuch as the money has been wasted in telegraphing that which should not have been telegraphed at all.

*THE CHAIRMAN: That involves policy ;whether the telegrams should have been sent or not.

MR. DILLON: Are we not entitled to question this Vote at all?

*THE CHAIRMAN: It is not a new decision that I am stating. It is a very old decision;that policy cannot be discussed on a telegram.

MR. DILLON: With the deepest respect for your ruling, I do not call it discussing policy to question whether money spent on telegrams has been properly spent. I think that is a matter totally apart from policy.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The substance of the telegrams cannot be discussed on the Vote now before the Committee.

MR. DILLON said it was very difficult to understand on what ground they could question this Vote at all. If an Estimate were presented for £;60,000 or for £;100,000, was the House compelled to vote for it blindly and without any reference to the discretion exercised in the spending of the money? Were they to be debarred altogether from discussing this matter? If they could not question the expenditure for these telegrams on the ground of their length or number, on what grounds were they to question them at all? In using the wires from South Africa Sir A. Milner appeared to have no regard either for the public interest or for the urgency or necessity of the matter which he telegraphed. As a protest, he moved that the Vote be reduced by £;3,000.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £;4,200, be granted for the said Service.";(Mr. Dillon.)

MR. LABOUCHERE asked whether the Secretary for the Colonies would be good enough to tell them how much of this expenditure applied to Ashanti and how much to South Africa. The Vote put the two things together. He also asked what was the price per word of telegrams from Ashanti and South Africa to England, and whether the Government received any rebate from the telegraph companies.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said he recognised that they could not discuss the general policy of the Government in South Africa on this Vote, but were they not

entitled to ask with reference to a particular telegram from a Colonial Governor, or sent by the Colonial Office, whether it was worth the money spent upon it? They had had other Votes in which furniture was included, and they had discussed the question whether the furniture was worth the money paid for it.

*THE CHAIRMAN said that involved a question of policy, and must be discussed on the original Estimate.

MR. DILLON said he had never discussed the policy of the question, but simply whether a particular communication was of sufficient importance to warrant its being sent by telegraph.

*THE CHAIRMAN said that that question could not be discussed without considering the action of the individual

sending the telegram, and that must come on the general Vote for the office of the one responsible for the action.

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

do not propose to continue the discussion with the Chair. I will only say on the subject that I take full responsibility for all telegrams that have been sent, not only to, but from South Africa. If, therefore, any exception is taken to any particular telegram being sent, I shall be perfectly prepared to discuss that telegram on the proper occasion, and to go into the whole of the details, which will, of course, be on the Vote for my own salary. As regards the question asked me by the hon. Member for Northampton, that is a question which really does not concern the Colonial Office. The hon. Member knows perfectly well that the Colonial Office does not make a separate telegraph contract. This is generally an arrangement which is made for all offices by the Post Office. But it is the fact that the cable companies give a very large reduction to the Government. I cannot myself say what the reduction is, but I think the cost per word is little more than half the charge to the general public. As regards the question of the amount respectively for the telegrams sent to South Africa and Ashanti it is quite impossible to go into detail, nor does the present Vote, which is a purely Supplementary Vote, show what is the total amount of the telegrams sent to both places. Of course, the Vote was taken originally for the whole telegraphic service of the Colonial Office. In consequence of the state of things caused by the South African War and by the Ashanti War, the number of telegrams estimated to be sent has been very largely exceeded, and I would point out to the hon. Member that it does not mean necessarily that these telegrams were sent either to South Africa or to Ashanti. For instance, there has been an immense amount of telegraphy owing to the action of the colonies in furnishing troops for the South African War. Communications have had to go between Australia and this country, between New Zealand and this country, and between Canada and this country; and owing to that the number of telegrams has been largely increased. The word "mainly" refers to the South African War, and it is in consequence of the South African War that we have had to send these telegrams to other colonies like Australia and Canada.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.) complained that the Colonial Secretary had not given the slightest idea as to the relative proportions of the cost for Ashanti and South

Africa respectively. The Committee were practically asked by the Government to vote these sums blindfold. The original Estimate had been increased by 75 per cent. Were the Committee to understand that the Colonial Office were not able to calculate the probable amount of telegraphing they would have to do in connection with affairs in South Africa and West Africa more accurately than that? In this Estimate, as in all others, there was the same feature of extraordinary and excessive expenditure, causing large discrepancies, which ought to have been avoided. It was not unreasonable to ask for the rate per telegram charged by the cable companies to the Government as distinguished from the general public, or how many hundreds of telegrams it would take to account for this sum of £;7,200. He hoped the examination of the Vote would be persisted in until a reasonable amount of information was forthcoming.

MR. CREAN (Cork, S.E.) protested against the form in which the Estimate was presented to the Committee. An excess of £;7,000 over the original Estimate was simply inexplicable without any details being given as to how, exactly, the money had been spent. The House of Commons was treated with contempt, and it would be far more decent for the Government to say, "We want this money, you will have to give it, and we will give no information whatever." It was nothing but a policy of extravagance, and information was required in order that the fault might be traced to the persons responsible.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny) said that although there were many Irish Members who wished to discuss

this subject upon the lines which had been ruled out of order, they would gladly bow to the Chairman's ruling. If there was one thing which they had a right to do, he thought it was to discuss any Estimates which were placed before them for special purposes; and although they knew that, however long these discussions might be, they would never succeed in reducing any particular Estimate at the time, they hoped and believed that healthy criticism would do something to remind Ministers that they would have to be more careful as to how they placed such matters before the Committee. He could not understand how this Estimate came to be put on the Paper at all in its present form. Why was it not put in such a way as would enable the House of Commons to exercise its right to discuss it? It was an extraordinary fact that although the original amount was £;10,000, that amount had been exceeded by £;7,200. That was a remarkable piece of extravagance. By the Chairman's ruling they could not touch upon Sir Alfred Milner, and they could not get at the Minister who was responsible for his appointment, for those were some of the particular items which the Committee would not be allowed to discuss. He wished to ask the Chairman in what way they could discuss this matter? This particular item seemed to be nobody's child, and yet it had to be paid for at a very extravagant price. They were told that they could not question the money which had been spent by Sir Alfred Milner, and that meant that he could spend what he liked and nobody here could question it. They desired to be orderly, and he wished to ask the Chairman if he could suggest any way in conformity with the ruling which he had given in which they could discuss this remarkable extravagance on the part of Sir Alfred Milner.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The answer is a very simple one. Among the Estimates which will

be laid upon the Table presently will be one under Class 3, Vote 6, Colonial Office Vote, and one of the items will be "telegrams." When the Vote comes before the Committee the whole question can be raised.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN asked, upon a point of order, if it was right for an Estimate to be placed on the Paper in such a way that it could not be discussed, and was there any other heading under which this item should have been placed?

*THE CHAIRMAN: It is not correct to say that it cannot be discussed. The Vote has now been discussed for over an hour. In what I have laid down I have only followed the ruling of my predecessors that, on a Supplementary Vote for telegrams, it is impossible to discuss the policy embodied in those telegrams. The substance of telegrams is not open for discussion upon an item which relates only to their cost.

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

MR. DALY thought the explanation which had been given was altogether unsatisfactory. It was most extraordinary that the right hon. Gentleman could not come nearer the mark in his original Estimate without having to come to the House for an additional £7,200. The Chairman had ruled that they could not discuss the words contained in the telegrams, and they had to be satisfied with the word of the right hon. Gentleman and those acting under him as to whether those telegrams were necessary or not, and also as to whether the words transmitted in them were correct or not. It was a most unfortunate thing that this Vote had been put down in such a way that it was very difficult to discuss it. The charge for telegrams was very heavy, and hon. Members around him were very anxious that full details should be given, and it would be very satisfactory if the right hon. Gentleman could see his way to tell them what number of words were placed in those telegrams, and at what rate they were charged for. Ireland had to contribute a large sum towards this extra £7,200. He hoped his hon. friends would press this matter to a division, and any support he could give them would be gladly given. He could assure the right hon. Gentleman and every member of the Government that in future they would find that every item which they brought forward in the House would be scanned and criticised

closely by hon. Members from Ireland. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman and those acting with him would conceive it to be their duty in the future to place such Votes as this in such a position that hon. Members of the House would be able to discuss them as fully as they deserved.

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.) said it had been stated in the course of the debate that this item was 75 per cent, higher than the original Estimate. They would find, if they took the trouble to look it up, that this Supplementary Estimate was 300 per cent, larger than last year's Estimate, and he wished to bring to the notice of the Committee the fact that last year's Estimate covered six months of the war in South Africa, including those long telegraphic communications relating to the Bloemfontein Conference and the negotiations which preceded it. No details had been placed before the House to show that the number of telegrams sent in the period for which this extra sum was asked was

larger than during the period he had just alluded to, and he could not under-
AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
O'Dovd, John
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc, Stroud
Hammond, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Ambrose, Robert
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.
Boland, John
Hemphill, Rt, Hon. Charles H.
O'Malley, William
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Mara, James
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Joyce, Michael
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Labouchere, Henry
Perks, Robert William
Cameron, Robert
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Pickard, Benjamin
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Power, Patrick Joseph
Causton, Richard Knight
Leng, Sir John
Reddy, M.
Cawley, Frederick
Levy, Maurice
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Channing, Francis Allston
Lundon, W.
Rickett, J. Compton
Cogan, Denis J.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Colville, John
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Roche, John
Condon, Thomas Joseph
M'Dermott. Patrick

Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Crean, Eugene
M'Govern, T.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Cullinan, J.
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh.
Daly, James
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
Spencer, Rt Hn C.R. (Northants
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Mooney, John J.
Sullivan, Donal
Delany, William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Tully, Jasper
Dillon, John
Murphy, J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Doogan, P. C.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Duffy, William J.
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
White, Patrick(Meath, North)
Edwards, Frank
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Emmott, Alfred
Norton, ('apt. Cecil William
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Evans, Samuel T.
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Wilson, Chas. Henry(Hull,W.
Fenwick, Charles
O'Brien, Kandal (Tipperary Md
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
Field, William
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Sir Thomas Esmonde and
Gilhooly James

O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)

Captain Donelan.

Goddard, Daniel Ford

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

stand why they were asked to pay at the rate of 300 per cent, more this year. He wished to join in the protest which had been made from the Irish benches against being asked to vote such large sums of money without having sufficient details. Ireland would be called upon to pay its quota to this expenditure, and therefore they had a right to examine closely every item of expenditure which was placed before the House. Supplementary Estimates required a greater amount of consideration than the ordinary Estimates, because it was money required in excess of the ordinary requirements, and for that very reason they required to be more carefully examined. He would not go into the question of the contents of those telegrams, but he would like the Colonial Secretary to tell them how it was that three times as much money had been spent this year as was spent in the previous year.

Question put.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 91; Noes, 149. (Division List No. 30.)

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne

Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)

Allsopp, Hon. George

Fisher, William Hayes

Plummer, Walter R.

Archdale, Edward Mervyn

FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-

Pretymann, Ernest George

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon

Purvis, Robert

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Fletcher, Sir Henry

Pym, C. Guy

Austin, Sir John

Forster, Henry William

Reckitt, Harold James

Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy

Garfit, William

Reed, James (Greenock)

Bain, Colonel James Robert

Gibbs, Hn. A.G.H (CityofLond.

Remnant, James Farquharson

Balcarres, Lord

Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick

Renshaw, Charles Bine

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Edon
Rentoul, James Alexander
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)
Renwick, George
Banbury, Fredk. George
Greene, Sir E.W.(BurySt. Ed,)
Ridley. Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Ritchie, Rt. Hon Chas. Thomson
Bigwood, James
Grenfell, William Henry
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Bond, Edward
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Bowles. Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Hain, Edward
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nd'y
Russell, T. W.
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Bull, William James
Harris, F. L. (Tynemouth)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Milliard, Sir Harry
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln
Caldwell, James
Heath, J. (Statfords., N.W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Hermon-Hodge, Robert T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lanes.)
Hope, J.F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Cavendish, V.C.W, (Derbysh.

Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Smith, HC (Northmb. Tyneside
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Knowles, Lees
Spear, John Ward
Chamberlain, Rt Hon. J. (Birm.
Lawson, John Grant
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich,)
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Wore.
Lee, Capt. A. H (Hants, Farehm
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Charrington, Spencer
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Stanley, Lord (Lanes.)
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Stewart. Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Stroyan, John
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (Bristol, S)
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Cook, Frederick Lucas
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Thornton, Percy M.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Lucas, R. J. (Portsmouth)
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Cranborne, Viscount
Macdona, John Cumming
Valentia, Niscount
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
M'Calmont, Col. J.(Antrim, E.)
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney
Cubitt, Hon Henry
M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.)
Webb, Colonel William George
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Welby, Lt.-Col. ACE(Taunton
Dewar, T R(T'rH'mlets, S. Geo.
Majendie, James A. H.

Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Dickson, Charles Scott
Malcolm, Ian
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Wills, Sir Frederick
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
More, R. Jasper (Shropshire)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Duke, Henry Edward
Morrell, George Herbert
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Durning-Lawrence Sir Edwin
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Faber, George Denison
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Sir William Walrond and
Finch, George H.
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Mr. Anstruther.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

6. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £;1,015, be granted to His Majesty to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of the Lord Privy Seal."

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) said it was a matter of some surprise that a proper representative of the Government had not on this motion thought it is duty to make some explanation of the Vote. It differed from other Votes which the Committee had been discussing, inasmuch as it was not a Supplementary Estimate, but practically a new Vote. He protested in the most emphatic fashion against a new Vote, embodying a new principle, and practically creating a new office, being smuggled through in the shape of a Supplementary Estimate. He objected to the manner in

which the Vote had been brought forward, and maintained that before the country was pledged to an expenditure on this new head, the permission of the House of Commons ought to have been obtained. As the result of an understanding which had been come to with the House of Commons, the Great Seal Act of 1884 was passed, and the duties in connection with the office of Lord Privy Seal were abolished. Since that time many distinguished men had filled the office of Lord Privy Seal in an honorary capacity; at any rate, they did not receive any remuneration for any services which it was imaginable they discharged. These included Lord Rosebery, Lord Cross, Mr. Gladstone, Lord Cadogan, Lord Tweedmouth, and Lord Salisbury himself. His objection to this Vote was not of a personal character in regard to the present distinguished occupant of the post. No member of the Cabinet was held in higher respect by his political opponents than the Prime Minister; and some of them were, in these later days, only beginning to realise the great debt of gratitude which they owed to the Prime Minister for carrying the country through troublous times in a peaceful and diplomatic fashion. It was in no personal sense, then, that he objected to this Vote; but he thought the Committee was entitled to some explanation. What could that explanation be? There was plenty of money in the Treasury chest, and there was no reason to reestablish this office except that explained in a letter which the Prime Minister wrote to a late distinguished colleague of his, the former President of the Local Government Board, the Member for Sleaford, in which the Prime Minister said that there were so many people to make room for that the right hon. Gentleman had to give up his post. That was the reason why they were asked to go back on a decision the House of Commons arrived at many years ago, and to re-establish an office which was purely ornamental and a sinecure. He could imagine the Prime Minister, after having listened to every claim made upon him, and having surrendered to it, sitting down in Hatfield and acknowledging to himself that he had given so much away that he had nothing left for himself. For what was his position? He was no longer Foreign Secretary; he had given that post away. He had no salary; not even an office to which his letters could be addressed. And therefore he had to make up his mind to confer upon himself some post; and so hit upon that of the Lord Privy Seal. He (the hon. Member) objected to a salary being attached to this post. It seemed to him that if the Prime Minister was to be paid; and he thought he ought to be paid, and well paid; then the salary ought to be asked for on the footing of Premiership, and that it ought not to be brought forward on a Vote of this kind for an office which had no duties attached to it. If the Prime Minister was to have a salary, then it ought to be a respectable salary. He could not understand how the noble Lord arrived at the conclusion that £2,000 a year was what he was worth. He might have sent for Whitaker's Almanack, and gone down the list of Ministers, and when he came to the Colonial Secretary he might have said, "What does that great man get for his transcendent services to the country? £5,000." And he might have said to himself, "If the Colonial Secretary receives £5,000 a year, I ought to write myself down at half that sum." He (the hon. Member) objected to the fact that the Prime Minister received only £2,000 per year when his subordinates; for,

after all, they were his subordinates ;received more than double that sum. Why, the salary of the Clerk of the House of Lords was more, and a town council engineer received more. He protested in the interest of the Prime Minister, who, it seemed to him, had been very badly treated. Lord Salisbury had been placed in a situation which appealed to the generous instincts of our nature, and if none of his friends stood up for him it was necessary for some hon. Members on that side of the House to do so. He objected also that the, Prime Minister should so undervalue himself. He did not think that he ought to be allowed to become a kind of Parliamentary blackleg. He ought to belong to the Parliamentary trade union, and should not take less than trade union wages, or less than an Under Secretary who read out answers to questions in the House of Commons and was not capable of explaining them. Therefore he thought the noble Lord was entitled to their sympathy. He did not go so far as to say that the same course should be pursued here as had been taken in some other countries. He believed that from the time the war broke out between Spain and America the Spanish Ministers went on half rations. He did not suggest that Ministers here should go on half rations, or that they should make a subscription on behalf of the Prime Minister. But some more satisfactory way should be taken of dealing with the Prime Minister. Further, a most extraordinary departure from constitutional rule had been made in the preparation of this Estimate. They were asked to vote a sum at the rate of £;400 a year for the private secretary to the Prime Minister. That was an innovation. The Constitution knew nothing of the Prime Minister; and he doubted whether there was any record of the House which spoke of the private secretary of the Prime Minister. They might just as well put down a sum for the private secretary of the parish minister. It might have been put down as salary of the private secretary to the Lord Privy Seal, but not as secretary to the Prime Minister; and some explanation was required why this item had been prepared in that particular way. The right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Vote might say, "It is all very well, but what could the Prime Minister have done? He must have some claim on the country; he must have some salary." It was very difficult to answer these questions; but he might have left some of his friends out of the Cabinet, or, at all events, he might have induced some of his present colleagues to give up their posts; the Colonial Secretary, for instance, who has had a very busy time of it for the last few years. He might have offered to take the duties of that arduous Department, and induced the right hon. the Colonial Secretary to go to another place with some seductive title. It was disgraceful that the Prime Minister should have no official office, although the Foreign Secretary had shown so much sympathy with him as to offer him a room in the Foreign Office. But that was not the way to treat the Prime Minister, who might have got a seat in the Colonial Secretary's office with a big seal stamp handy on his desk. The Committee was entitled to some explanation for this departure from a bargain solemnly passed by the House of Commons taking away all the duties and the salary of the Lord Privy Seal; and he hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would be able to tell the Committee that he would either withdraw the Tote or bring

forward a handsome sum, worthy of the great services of the Prime Minister of the country.

THE FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I do not quite understand whether the hon. Member wished to deprive the Prime Minister of his moderate salary or to increase it to the more substantial figure which some other Members of the Cabinet are fortunate enough to enjoy. The hon. Member appeared to oscillate between the two. The hon. Member commenced his speech by complaining that the House of Commons has been forced, without notice, into this new policy. Surely we did all we could to take the House of Commons into our confidence at the earliest opportunity by putting this Vote down as a Supplementary Estimate at the very beginning of the first session that has occurred since the arrangement was made. There was a meeting in December, but the object of that meeting was strictly limited, and I do not think that any discussion on this matter could arise then. This, therefore, is the first opportunity that we have had.

MR. DALZIEL: He has had the money before.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not complain of the hon. Member's raising the point on this occasion. I make some subtractions from that part of the hon.

Gentleman's speech which was really not meant to argue for an increase of the Prime Minister's salary, but was intended for the indulgence of some ingenious sarcasm at the expense of some of the Prime Minister's colleagues. As regards his comments as to the actual course pursued, it is perfectly true that there were certain incongruities and inconsistencies in the course taken, and why was it? Because, as everybody knows, the Prime Minister is not formally recognised in the Constitution, although he is the most important person in the Ministry.

That is one of the curious results of our Constitution which has slowly grown up in the course of centuries. There are these apparent inconsistencies in the Constitution, and we should be slow to interfere with them, for they do no harm to the growth of our institutions. We all know that there is a Prime Minister;

we all know that he does not appeal among the officers of the State as such. Sometimes he is called the First Lord of the Treasury, sometimes he is called Foreign Secretary or Chancellor of the Exchequer, and sometimes Lord Privy Seal, but never has he been called Prime Minister in the formal proceedings of the House. That being so, we have to fit our arrangements into this somewhat anomalous state of things. I think the plan we have adopted is not a bad one.

The office of Privy Seal was vacant, and it is one to which the duties of the Prime Minister may be attached as well as to the office of First Lord of the Treasury or Foreign Secretary; and the hon. Gentleman himself is first to acknowledge that he should not be an unpaid Member of the Government and that we must attach a salary to the office. Of course, should the present holder of the office of Privy Seal cease to be Prime Minister, his salary would cease at the same time, and should he resign the office of Privy Seal and another gentleman be appointed to the office who was not Prime Minister, he would not receive the salary. So long as the duties are associated with the Prime Minister it is quite clear that you ought to make the office a paid office. The hon. Gentleman tells us that the salary of £2,000 a year is insufficient. I am quite willing, to

agree with him that that salary is no measure, absolutely or relatively, of the services of the Prime Minister to the State; but £2,000 a year is the old salary attaching to this office of Privy Seal; it is the salary which the Prime Minister himself suggested; and, though agree that on any scale of merit it is inadequate, if the Prime Minister himself is contented I do not know that either my colleagues or the House of Commons need interfere in the matter. That is the broad explanation of the policy that has been pursued, and I feel sure it will commend itself to the House at large; and I hope the hon. Gentleman will feel that I have justified the course which the Government have taken.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): The right hon. Gentleman has dealt ingeniously with the question raised by my hon. friend; but he passed over the fons et origo of the difficulty, which was the great mistake that he has committed in recent years of divorcing the position of the head of the Ministry from the occupant of the office of First Lord of the Treasury. That office is the natural and proper one to be held by the Prime Minister; and it is peculiar that, though, as the right hon. Gentleman says, the Premiership has sometimes been associated with the Foreign Secretaryship and sometimes with the office of First Lord of the Treasury, it has only been associated with the Foreign Secretaryship in the case of Lord Salisbury himself; and nothing but evil came to the country from the combination of these two offices. I have not a word to say in depreciation of Lord Salisbury, either as Foreign Secretary or as Prime Minister; but I say it is perfectly impossible that any man can properly fulfil the functions of both offices. I will take the case of the Foreign Office. Undoubtedly Lord Salisbury devoted an enormous amount of time ;and probably prejudiced his health by his devotion;to the duties of the Foreign Minister. He has filled that great position with great success and to the great advantage of the nation, but during all that time every one can see that the proper business of the Prime Minister, which is to keep in proper coordination his own colleagues and to keep a master-eye on all their proceedings ;anyone can see that that was neglected. Taking the work of the Foreign Office alone, we lose the advantage of a second head assisting the man nominally at the head of the office. When there is a Prime Minister as well as a Foreign Secretary all the Foreign Office work, all telegrams, despatches, and so forth are submitted to the judgment of the Prime Minister; and thus there is an additional guarantee that the affairs of the country are being wisely and deliberately administered. It has often surprised me that the country and the House of Commons bore so patiently a state of things so obviously prejudicial to the public interest. At last Lord Salisbury, partly owing to his health being overtaxed, determined to give up one of these offices, lie retained the Premiership. The proper course would have been for him to take the position of First Lord of the Treasury. As we all know, the emoluments of public functionaries vary considerably, and I am not at all sure that that variance is altogether in the public interest. I think there is a great deal to be said for a rearrangement in such a way as to bring about greater equality; but that is not before us now. We have only to do with this particular arrangement, made to meet an emergency. I confess that to my mind there was a way of meeting

it which would not have involved the recreation of a sinecure office, and that was to have made the Prime Minister First Lord of the Treasury, and to have made some other arrangement of the other offices among the distinguished Gentlemen on the bench opposite. The office of First Lord of the Treasury; and I speak in the presence of one who knows it well; has this advantage, that it has little or no departmental work attaching to it. It has a certain amount of agreeable duty in the way of the bestowal of patronage and in the selection of the recipients of good things, which is always an easy, a charming, and a delightful duty. But, except for that, I do not think the First Lord of the Treasury is overworked. Therefore it is an office particularly suitable to the man who has to exercise a general supervising power over the Proceedings of the Departments of State. That is the proper arrangement, and I regret that the Government have found themselves forced to revive the salary for an office which is almost the last surviving sinecure in the public service.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said the matter was undoubtedly one of great public importance. The Committee were asked to vote a salary for an office every duty of which had been abolished by Act of Parliament many years ago, and the Committee had been told the reason. For the first time the title of Prime Minister appeared on the Papers of the House.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: No, no. If the hon. Member will look at the Estimates for past years, he will find the same words; "Private Secretary to the Prime Minister."

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said the office of Prime Minister was unknown to the Constitution, and the introduction of the title in the Estimates was another example of the slipshod English in which they were framed. But, although the title was unknown, the office was not, and it had been amply provided for ever since the time of Sir Robert Walpole, when the Treasury was put into commission in such a way, and the position of the First Lord so provided for, that although he had an office of dignity and proper emoluments, he was freed from Parliamentary duties in order that he might be able to oversee his colleagues and supporters. The proper function of the Prime Minister was to oversee his colleagues in the Government; and he was bound to say that, since the recent changes in the Government had been effected, the Government had received a great accession of strength from the circumstance that Lord Salisbury, as Prime Minister, had been restored to a position which enabled him to superintend the work of his colleagues. During the time that Lord Salisbury was both Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary each department was allowed to do what seemed best in its own eyes, and the result of this absence of control had been that mistakes of the gravest character were committed. The Duke of Wellington had said that it was impossible for anyone to exercise the office of Prime Minister unless he was also First Lord of the Treasury, because it was essential that he should have that control of the purse-strings which the latter office gave him. Why, recently Lord Salisbury in the House of Lords made a strong and determined attack on the Treasury for the manner in which it met the demands upon it for the public service. If Lord Salisbury were First Lord of the Treasury, which he ought to be as Prime Minister, that state of things could not have occurred. The

Government had; been reconstituted and strengthened; (Opposition laughter) ; well, reconstituted; and there should have been no difficulty whatever in finding for the right lion. Gentleman the Leader of the House another post, so that the office of First Lord of the Treasury might revert to the Prime Minister. He hoped the Leader of the House would not be offended when he said that the right hon. Gentleman en-

joyed the emoluments and dignities of the office without discharging any of its duties. But if the Government had had the courage of their convictions, what they should have done was to boldly propose to create the office of Prime Minister and endow it with a salary of £5,000 a year. He submitted, that it was not a proper thing to come down and ask this House to endow the Prime Minister with an insufficient salary in the name of an office which was so discredited that it had been, abolished by Act of Parliament years ago.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland) said the Committee were discussing a very important question. He believed there was one point on which all sections of the Committee were agreed: ;namely, that the change which had been made was one in many respects for the better. No one had the least objection to the Prime Minister being relieved from the terrible burden of the Foreign Secretaryship; the point on which the First Lord of the Treasury and the Committee were at variance was the method by which the Prime Minister had been relieved from the duties of the Foreign Office. By the Act of 1884; "to simplify the passing of instruments under the Great Seal of the United Kingdom"; it was enacted that it "shall not be necessary that any instrument shall, after the passing of this Act, be passed under the Privy Seal," or, in other words, the functions of the Privy Seal were practically abolished by that statute. Yet here, by a Supplementary Estimate, they were practically repealing the principal effect of that Act. The Committee would remember some time ago, when Colonel King-Harman was a Member of this House, the then Chief Secretary for Ireland attempted to establish in the Estimates a position for an Under Secretaryship for Ireland. That was opposed, and, after considerable discussion, the Chief Secretary had to withdraw his proposals, as it was found to be impossible to carry them through without

a special Act of Parliament. Yet the Committee, now, were asked to re-establish, by a Supplementary Estimate, an office which had long been abolished, when it was found impossible to establish a paltry Under Secretaryship without an Act of Parliament. He quite agreed as to the wisdom of Lord Salisbury being relieved from the duties of the Foreign Office, and he was strongly of opinion that had Lord Salisbury, being Prime Minister, coupled that duty with a less onerous office in the past, the history of the last year and a half would have been less sanguinary. The action of the Government in reviving the office of the Lord Privy Seal was simply a palinode. The First Lord of the Treasury, which was the proper office for the Prime Minister to hold, had a general control over the expenditure of the country, and was thus able to control the different heads of the Departments of the Government; but the Lord Privy Seal had no such control, and it was never intended he should. Now the Government proposed to re-establish an abolished office, and to recreate a salary which was never intended to be

recreated. His hon. friend had been more than justified in the position he had taken up in this matter.

*SIR J. FERGUSON (Manchester, N. E.) said that out of doors this would be thought one of those infinitesimal questions on which the House of Commons occupied itself to the exclusion of important business. It was as small as the question of the difference between tweedledum and tweedledee. The hon. Member for King's Lynn suggested that it would be better for the First Lord of the Treasury to resign his office so that the Prime Minister should assume it, and that he, in turn, should be Lord Privy Seal. That was a suggestion which, if acted upon, would open the door for the strongest opposition from the other side. The office of Lord Privy Seal had not been abolished, and it was not so many years ago that a Prime Minister in the House of Commons assumed it in addition to his other. He remembered

† See The parliamentary Debates [Third Series], vol. cccxxiii., pages 730, 1709; vol cccxxiv., page 725; vol. cccxxv., page 909; vol. cccxxvi., page 208.

that Lord Malmesbury, when he held the office, was extremely useful in the House of Lords, calling himself the odd man. It was an office of great dignity, ranking very high in the order of precedence, and was therefore suitable as an appanage of the Prime Minister, who had resigned the onerous office of Foreign Secretary. The unrivalled power of work Lord Salisbury had enabled him, until recently, to carry on the duties of Foreign Secretary in addition to those of the head of the Government, but it was not surprising that, with advancing age, he should wish to be relieved of the direct duties of Secretary of State. No doubt, as Prime Minister, he would exercise supervision over the foreign policy of the country, and it was appropriate that the office of Lord Privy Seal should be held by him.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) said he did not at all agree with the right hon. Baronet who had just sat down. He did not think anything that touched the office of Prime Minister or touched the British Constitution should be considered infinitesimal in that House. Without knowing it themselves, and without, he was sure, any intention on the part of the Government, they had been plunged deep into the mysteries of the British Constitution. He did not object to the specific arrangement proposed that day that this salary should be attached to this particular office so long as it was held by the Prime Minister, but questions had been raised as to the character of the office itself, and as to the existence of any duties attached to the office. He thought the time had come when, before proceeding to vote a salary for an office to which they were told no duties were attached, they should have legal advice. He asked the Attorney General to tell them what was the legal status of this officer. He had before him the Act of Parliament of 1884, to which the hon. Member for King's Lynn had referred. The Act declared that no legal instrument need, after that date, be passed under the Privy Seal. He wished to know whether that phrase included all the duties attached to the office of Lord Privy Seal?

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said it did.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON knew that the hon. Member thought so, but in a matter of

this sort the Committee ought to be guided by its legal adviser. Did the Act of 1884 sweep away all the duties formerly attached to the office, and, if not, what were the duties now attached to it?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs) said that the Committee should consider the matter in the light of common sense. Could it be supposed that before the passing of the Act of 1884 much time was actually spent by the Lord Privy Seal in passing legal instruments? The Lord Privy Seal would not personally look after matters of that kind. The office had existed for a very long time. In other days there were duties attached to the office which had now become obsolete; but the office had been retained, and it had proved extremely useful. It had generally been a Cabinet office, and he thought it was a very happy phrase which was used by the right hon. Baronet the Member for North-East Manchester, that the holder of the office had on one occasion been a sort of "odd man" in the Cabinet, ready, to do any duty. The right hon. and learned Gentleman did not pretend that the duties were onerous, but the Act of 1884 did not abolish the office altogether. The truth was that the office existed, it had been held for a long time past by a Cabinet Minister, and he ventured to think that an office of this kind, with no departmental duties attached to it, might be extremely useful.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said this question had been raised without any personal reference at all to Lord Salisbury. It was purely as a matter of expediency affecting the public service that his hon. friend had raised it. What they objected to on that side of the House was that they were asked to vote for the re-establishment of an office which was neither fish, flesh, fowl, nor good red herring; an office to which no duties

were attached. They were asked practically; and this was the complaint; to vote a salary, not for an office, but for a particular individual. The right hon.

Gentleman the Leader of the House had said that if Lord Salisbury resigned the office of Lord Privy Seal the salary would cease with his leaving the office. It seemed to him an unconstitutional proposal that they should vote a salary, not for an office, but for a person. What they desired was to have a Prime Minister with a proper salary. He certainly thought, so far as the debate had gone, that the general feeling was that the Prime Minister ought not to receive a salary from the country of lesser amount than that of any of his colleagues. He was merely looking at this question from the point of view of the public service, and he was bound to say that he agreed with the hon. Member for King's Lynn that they might to have created at tin-present moment an office for the Prime Minister in the House of Lords. He hoped the Government would take that into consideration. He knew they could not do it off-hand, but he thought that a great many Members felt very strongly that a suitable office ought to be created for the Prime Minister, as well as a suitable office for the Leader of the House of Commons.

MR. MALCOLM (Suffolk, Stowmarket) said the Prime Minister was regarded with great respect on both sides of the House. They were lucky in having got the Prime Minister so cheap. The hon. Member for King's Lynn had put forward a most unconstitutional doctrine. He actually said that the Prime Minister and the

Leader of the House of Commons should exchange their respective official positions. The hon. Member for King's Lynn brought in the Duke of Wellington as a great constitutional authority. He never thought the hon. Member would subscribe to the opinion that the First Lord of the Treasury in the House of Commons should give up control of the purse, or that he would go further and; say that Lord Salisbury should be First Lord of the Treasury in the other House. They had always understood it to be the privilege of the House of Commons to have control of the purse. The doctrine laid down by the hon. Member for King's Lynn was quite unworthy of the hon. Member.

*MR. HEMPHILL (Tyrone, N.) regretted that the Attorney General had not indicated to the Committee the duties now attached to the office of Lord Privy Seal. The Act of Parliament expressly said that no instrument need be passed under the Privy Seal; the office of Lord Privy Seal had ceased to have any utility. True in old times Privy Seal was an important office, and through the holder of it the sanction of the Sovereign was expressed in relation to many matters; but that importance no longer existed. He thought the First Lord of the Treasury should be a Member of the House of Commons, but that did not solve the question. They had now a 20-horse power Cabinet. There was no precedent in history for a Cabinet of twenty learned and unlearned Lords, and surely out of the score one might be First Lord of the Treasury and sit in the Commons. How right hon. Gentlemen and noble Lords should shift and settle their offices he would not presume to suggest, but certainly he desired the presence of the present First Lord of the Treasury so long as they were afflicted with the present Administration. In these parlous times they had no right to saddle the country with a salary of £2,000 a year for an office which had not existed since 1884. They were not in such affluent circumstances, in such golden times, in such rosy seasons that, with an income tax of probably 1s. 6d. in the £1, and an addition to the National Debt of £100,000,000, the interest for which the taxpayers must provide, they could throw away £2,000 a year. With Irish unselfishness he would not grudge the Prime Minister £2,000 if he thought he needed it, but that was out of the question, and he doubted if constitutionally the House would be justified in voting the money; but in any case, there was no reason for doing so. If the Prime Minister chose to give up the seals of the Foreign Office for the purpose of getting rid of some of the Cabinet, and replacing them by other followers, he ought to do it at his own expense.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I should have rather thought that the speech we have just heard might have been considered a worthy termination of a debate which has not been very serious or addressed to any very serious constitutional problem. So far as I can discover, three main objects have been had in view by hon. Members in the criticisms they have offered. In the first place they have repeated that rather time-worn attack upon the association of the office of Prime Minister with the post of Foreign Secretary. The Leader of the Opposition dwelt at length on that subject, and the hon. Member for Scotland Division followed his example. We do not agree with the view expressed. We think that the period Lord Salisbury was able to devote to the offices of Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary

combined was marked by great benefit to the country, and if that combination has ceased it is not because in Lord Salisbury's opinion, and certainly not in that of his colleagues, it was otherwise than beneficial, but because, unfortunately, the strength of the Prime Minister is not equal to supporting the weight of two such onerous offices at the same time. A less amiable object hon. Members have had in view is an attack on the Colonial Secretary. ["No."] Certainly three or four speakers explained at length that, had not the Prime Minister been also Foreign Secretary a year and a half ago there would not have been war in South Africa. I am surprised at the extraordinarily minute knowledge displayed of what goes on in the Cabinet by gentlemen who are not there. They speak with absolute assurance of the relations of one Minister to another, and of matters upon which they can have no knowledge, all founded on conjecture springing from party zeal and a fervid imagination. The third object of the debate appears to me to be to turn the Prime Minister into the First Lord of the Treasury, and the First Lord of the Treasury into the Lord Privy Seal. That was the amiable suggestion of my hon. friend the Member for King's Lynn. He said, as others have said, that commonly, though very far from universally, the office of Prime Minister has been associated with the office of First Lord of the Treasury; and that was justified by the right hon. Gentleman opposite on the ground that the First Lord of the Treasury had little or no administrative work to perform. Well, that is true even in a greater degree in regard to the Lord Privy Seal, and if the fact that the First Lord of the Treasury has not any Department is a good reason for very frequently associating with that office the Prime Minister ship, it appears ample justification for the course the Government has actually taken, which is that of choosing an office which has never been abolished, which is legally constituted, and has been continuously filled by some member of the Government up to the present moment, on the very ground that it has not got duties associated with it, and that therefore the holder of the office has ample leisure for carrying out the great duties of Prime Minister. Then my hon. friend the Member for King's Lynn thinks that as the Leader of the House has nothing to do, as he leads a leisured life, a life of ease and luxury, the office is not worthy of its emolument. Well, Sir. I wish my hon. friend would for a week fill the office which he is so eminently qualified to adorn; his well-known appetite for work, I think, would find ample satisfaction. Whether or not his particular style of Parliamentary oratory would be suited to the special functions of the Leader of the House, at all events I am certain he would not find it a sinecure office. But my hon. friend fell into one mistake. He said, truly enough, that the position of Prime Minister should be a position of dignity, but added that therefore he should be First Lord of the Treasury instead of being Lord Privy Seal. As a matter of fact, the First Lord of the Treasury has no technical dignity or rank, he ranks behind every Secretary of State in point of dignity, and the Lord Privy Seal ranks before every Secretary of State in point of dignity. The Lord Privy Seal is next, I think, to the Lord President of the Council and the Lord Chancellor.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: When he is a peer.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes. It is a position of the highest dignity, and is

therefore very suitable for the Prime Minister; and I can see no objection whatever to the course which the Government have pursued, except the singular objection which has been urged with kind persistency by hon. Gentlemen opposite, that the salary of £2,000 a year is not adequate for the Prime Minister of this country. I do not deny that, but this is all that has been suggested by the Prime Minister himself. If, however, I understand that, *nemine contradicente*, a larger amount would be unanimously voted, if I could receive some assurance that that would pass without debate, discussion, or the expenditure of time, it might be worth considering whether the Vote might not be withdrawn and a higher salary proposed. But, on the whole, I am inclined to think that, however generous hon. Gentlemen may be in these suggestions of increased pay when these suggestions have not the immediate effect of expediting public business, their and our would notably cool if the proposal were made; and I am convinced that we should find a remarkable and unexpected number of persons who, when it came to the point, would say that, after all, if the Prime Minister was content with £2,000 it would be perfectly monstrous in these hard times to extract from the hard-wrung British taxpayer an additional £3,000. In these circumstances I venture to suggest to the House that our policy is in accordance with constitutional usage, that it gives to the Prime Minister an office of great dignity which, outside his duties as Prime Minister, inflicts on him no extra labour and involves no expenditure of time, and that it is an arrangement which is economical to the taxpayer. I do not think any other arrangement which could be suggested could combine all those advantages, or even a majority of them. I venture to suggest, therefore, that the House might now consent to accept the arrangement, which, as far as I can judge, meets all the necessities of the case.

MR. LABOUCHERE: I do not desire to attack any hon. Member opposite. I am quite ready to admit, for the sake of argument, that right hon. Gentlemen sitting on the Treasury Bench are in the estimation of every one of their followers most fitted to sit on that bench, and I am also prepared to admit that every gentleman on that Bench is best fitted to occupy the particular office he holds; but notwithstanding the great wisdom of these gentlemen they are in my opinion now doing a thing in a very stupid manner. Their object is perfectly legitimate; namely, to give a salary to the Prime Minister. Why do they not propose a salary for the Prime Minister, instead of giving him a salary by a bye-wind and reviving the dormant office of Lord Privy Seal? No one would deny that the Prime Minister should have private secretaries, and that they should be paid. No one would wish to vote against that part of the Vote, but the reason why I intend to vote against the salary of the Lord Privy Seal is that I consider it more consistent with the dignity of this House that when we have a Prime Minister we ought to vote him a salary, and an adequate salary. It is said that the Prime Minister has no constitutional existence. He has a constitutional existence, not by statute but by usage. If the right hon. Gentleman would bring forward a motion such as he suggested, giving a salary to the Prime Minister, so far as I am concerned; and I think I speak for many hon. Gentlemen on this side of the House; we are perfectly prepared to support it. I am ready to withdraw my Amendment if the right hon. Gentleman will carry out his own proposal, withdraw

this Vote and propose an adequate salary for the Prime Minister. I beg to move the reduction of the Vote by £;758.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £;257, be granted for the said service." (Mr. Labouchere.)

COLONEL NOLAN said, as was pointed out by the hon. Member who had just-spoken, one great advantage of the Prime Minister having a salary was that it could

AYES.

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

Boland, John

Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)

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

Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson

Carew, James Laurence

Ambrose, Robert

Burke, E. Haviland-

Carvill, Patrick George H.

Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)

Caldwell, James

Channing, Francis Allston

be reduced if he went wrong. He thought Lord Salisbury was the most eminent statesman and most valuable Foreign Secretary, and he had the highest opinion of his general ability, but nevertheless he for one reason would support the Amendment. He would frankly state why. It was because on a recent occasion Lord Salisbury gave very bad advice to the Sovereign. He did not support the Amendment because Lord Salisbury was called Lord Privy Seal, but because in his opinion he very badly advised His Majesty;

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order! The hon. Member cannot on this Vote bring up a matter, of that sort.

COLONEL NOLAN said that he would bow to the Chairman's decision, and as he could not bring forward his special point he would not take up the time of the Committee. Everyone would, however, understand why he supported the Amendment of the hon. Member for Northampton.

MR. COGHILL (Stoke-upon-Trent) said he intended to vote in favour of the Amendment. It seemed to him that the Government were not proceeding in the right way in the matter, and he would oppose the motion, because it inflicted £;2,000 a year on the taxpayers. He thought that there was plenty of money, if properly distributed, to properly pay all the members of the Cabinet. The question was how was it to be allocated? If there was to be a Prime Minister, by all means let him be paid liberally and generously, but he did not think that, at a time like the present, any additional burden should be placed on the country.

Question put.

The Committee divided::Ayes. 107; Noes, 183. (Division List No. 31.)

Cogan, Denis J.

Jordan, Jeremiah

O'Shaughnessy, J. P.

Condon, Thomas Joseph

Joyce, Michael
Pickard, Benjamin
Craig, Robert Hunter
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Power, Patrick Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Cullinan, J,
Levy, Maurice
Rea, Russell
Daly, James
Lloyd-George, David
Reckitt, Harold James
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Lough, Thomas
Reddy, M.
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
London, W.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Delany, William
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Dillon, John
M'Dermott, Patrick
Roche, John
Donelan, Captain A.
M'Govern, T.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Doogan, P. C.
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
Sullivan, Donal
Duffy, William J.
Markham, Arthur Basil
Tennant, Harold John
Dunn, Sir William
Mooney, John J.
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings)
Edwards, Frank
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips

Emmott, Alfred
Murphy, J.
Tully, Jasper
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Evans, Samuel T.
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Ure, Alexander
Fenwick, Charles
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Field, William
Norman, Henry
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Flavin, Michael Joseph
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Md
White, Patrick (Meath, North
Furness, Sir Christopher
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Gilhooly, James
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Goddard, Daniel Ford
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Huddersf'
Haldane, Richard Burden
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
Hammond, John
O'Dowd, John
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
Mr. Labouchere and Mr.
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
O'Malley, William
Dalziel.

Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
O'Mara, James
NOES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F
Charrington, Spencer
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Allsopp, Hon. George
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Goschen, Hon. George J.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Archdale, Edwin Mervyn
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Graham, Henry Robert
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Green, Walford D. (Wedn'sbr'y
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Greene, Sir E. W. (Bury St. Ed.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Cook, Frederick Lucas
Grenfell, William Henry
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Cranborne, Viscount
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Balfour, Rt. Hon. Gerald W. (Leeds
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Hain, Edward
Banbury, Frederick George
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Hall, Edward Marshall
Beach, Rt. Hon. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord G. (Mid'x
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Dewar, T. R. (T'rH'mlets, S. Geo
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'ndnd'r'y
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.

Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Bigwood, James
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Harris, F.Leverton(Tynem'uth
Bill, Charles
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Doxford, Sir WilliamTheodore
Heath, Jas. (Staffords., N.W.)
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Duke, Henry Edward
Helder, Augustus
Bond, Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Henderson, Alexander
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Hermon-Hodge, Robert T.
Bowles, Capt. H.F.(Middlesex
Faber, George Denison
Hope,J.F. (Shef'ld, Brightside
Bowles, T.Gibson(King'sLynn
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Howard, Cap. J (Kent,Faversh.
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Mane.
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Bull, William James
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Bullard, Sir Harry
Finch, George H.
Knowles, Lees
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Lawrence, William F.
Butcher, John George
Fisher, William Hayes
Lawson, John Grant
Cautley, Henry Strother
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose-
Lee,Cap. A. H.(Hants, Fareh'm
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward A.

Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Cavendish, V. C. W(Derbyshire
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Flower, Ernest
Leighton, Stanley
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Forster, Henry William
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Chamberlain, Rt.Hn.J.(Birm.
Gibbs,Hn. A. G. H. (CityofLond
Long Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
Gordon,Hn. J. E. (Elgin&Nairn
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Plummer, Walter R,
Stanley,HonArthur(Ormskirk
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmo'th
Pretymann, Ernest George
Stanley,Edward.Jas.(Somerset
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. E.
Purvis, Robert
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Macdonald, John Cumming
Pym, C. Guy
Stroyan, John
Maconochie, A. W.
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool
Reid, James (Greenock)
Talbot,Rt Hn.J.G.(Oxf'd Uni.)
M'Calmont, Col. J.(Antrim,E.)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Thornton, Percy M.
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinb., W.)
Rentoul, James Alexander
Tollemache, Henry James
Majendie, James A. H.
Renwick, George
Tomlinson, Wm. E. Murray
Malcolm, Ian
Ridley,Hon.M. W(Stalybridge
Valentia, Viscount

Martin, Richard Biddulph
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Ritchie, Rt Hn. Chas. Thomson
Wason, John C. (Orkney)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Webb, Col. William George
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Welby, Lt-Col A. C. E. (Taunton).
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Royds, Clement, Molyneux
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Russell, T. W.
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)
Morgan, David J. (Walthamst.)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Wills, Sir Frederick
Morrell, George Herbert
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Wilson, A. S. (Stanley, E. R.)
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Wilson-Todd, W. H. (Yorks.)
Murray, Rt. Hn A. Graham (Bute)
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Nicholson, William Graham
Skewes Cox, Thomas
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Nicol, Donal Ninian
Smith, H. C. (N'th'mb, Tyneside)
Sir William Walrond and
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks).

Mr. Anstruther.

Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)

Spear, John Ward

Percy, Karl

Spencer, Ernest (W.Bromwich)

Original Question put, and agreed to.

Resolutions to be reported.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £;110,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for Stationery. Printing, Paper, Binding, and Printed Books for the Public Service".

MR. FLYNN said that during the course of the discussion on these Supplementary Estimates they had had very extravagant sums to deal with; but the sum now asked for was sufficient to take away the breath of an ordinary Member of the House of Commons. A sum of £;110,000 was asked for printing and binding books. One would have thought that all the books in the British Museum could have been printed and bound for that sum. It was time to realise the condition of things to which the House of Commons had been reduced under the present Administration. Apparently the war was to be made the scapegoat for every extravagance, possible and impossible. It was to be made the excuse for Supplementary Estimates absolutely without precedent. He defied the Chancellor of the Exchequer or the Financial Secretary to the Treasury to furnish a precedent for Supplementary Estimates of such magnitude as they were now considering. They had only recently discussed a Vote of over £;17,000 for telegrams, which, however, might be accounted for by the high rates charged for telegrams to South Africa and West Africa; but, in his opinion, it was a most extravagant demand on the common sense of the country to ask for £;110,000 for such a comparatively inexpensive article as paper, which, in the present days of cheap production, could be produced for a moderate sum. Was the Committee to be merely a body for registering the decrees of the Government? Ten years ago the Estimates were diligently, conscientiously, and carefully examined, but the House of Commons now had reached such a parlous condition ;partly owing to the manner in which the Opposition had abrogated its functions as the guardian of the rights of the tax-payer; that all the Committee appeared able to do was to cheerfully vote the sums asked for by the Government. In the Vote before the Committee the amount asked for for printing for public departments was £;233,000, the original Estimate being. £;216,000. That was an increase of £;17,000. The next item; paper for public departments; showed an increase of £;53,000, which certainly called for an explanation from the Secretary of the Treasury, without which he hoped the Committee would not have to vote it. He recognised that a somewhat exceptional condition of things existed, and that a demand had been made on the public service which would not have been made in ordinary circumstances, but he could not understand how a Supplementary Estimate should be so excessive as to be a fifth of the original Estimate, especially when such a comparatively cheap article as paper was concerned. The item for binding showed an increase of £;8,500, although there

was no information as to whether wages had increased. One of the disadvantages of the present position was that in previous Parliaments there was a Secretary to the Treasury who was competent to fill the position, and who had some knowledge of accounts. That position was now filled by a Minister, if he might call him so, who, from the condition of things, was a neophyte and an amateur, and could not give any explanation as to why the Estimates had been so extravagantly increased. He thought the Committee were entitled to something more than the scant courtesy and the bald explanation which had been given on previous Votes. He did not suppose there was any increase in the cost of material or labour, and surely there could not be such an enormous increase in the consumption of paper. An increase of £110,000 might be a small matter to hon. Members opposite, who displayed only the smallest Interest in the Estimates, and many of whom could not tell the difference between a Supplementary and an ordinary Estimate, but hon. Members from Ireland were very much concerned in the swollen Estimates which had been presented, and also in the unsatisfactory manner in which they had been submitted to the Committee. He trusted that they would have a satisfactory explanation from the Treasury as to how such an enormous increase had been incurred.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said he thought that such a large increase required more explanation than was given

on the Paper. The only explanation on the Paper was that the large increase was caused by the war, but the war was going on when the original Estimate was prepared. Why was not provision then made for the stationery required in South Africa, and if such provision were made how was it possible that such a large increase in the Estimate was now necessary? This Supplementary Estimate suggested to him what he thought was really the explanation of all the increased Votes they were considering. He believed that they had not had fair Estimates presented to them at the beginning of the financial year, and that every Estimate was squeezed in order to make up for the cost of the war.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I think there is one point which might give rise to misapprehension unless I deal with it at once. This is a Vote for the Stationery Office, but the whole of it is not required for articles ordinarily included in this Vote. Provision was made for the war when the original Estimate was framed, but the hon. Member for West Islington forgets, when he suggests that the war was in progress when we made the original Estimate, that that Estimate was framed in the last months of 1899, when it could not be anticipated that the war would last so long, and no one can therefore be surprised that the provision which was then made for what is called stationery has proved insufficient for a war which is still going on. There are other items in the Vote which are not connected with the war, and which could not have been foreseen when the original Vote was framed. For instance, the Estimate was framed on the assumption that the census paper would be of the same quality as was used at the last census, but the Registrar General represented that a better class of paper would be required.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Would the hon. Gentleman say how much of the increase is due to the better census paper?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Yes, Sir; £;600. If I may give another instance, I would mention the new forms of discharge required in the mercantile marine. The Stationery Office has to supply the demands of the other offices. I understand that a book instead of a loose paper is now required for the better protection of the mercantile marine, and that accounts for a sum of £;1,300 of the extra Supplementary Estimate. I only mention these facts to show how the Estimate is made up, and also to show that these sums are sums which the Stationery Office could not have refused. With regard to the war, an enormous supply of paper is required for packing purposes as well as for stationery. There has been an increased expenditure for stationery in the ordinary sense of the word, and there has also been an increased demand for books of various kinds required on military service, as well as an increase in the printing for the Army in consequence of its increased size. Up to 1899 the War Office itself supplied all the paper it required for packing purposes, but since then the Stationery Office has been called upon to supply it. The items I have mentioned, and other items of a similar kind, account for the increased Vote, and I think there is very little in it that could have been foreseen. I cannot therefore accept the blame which the hon. Member for West Islington casts on the Stationery Office for not having foreseen this expenditure.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE said the Vote gave him an opportunity of raising a question which he had long been anxious to raise, but which he was unable to bring forward before owing to the peculiar way in which the Estimate had been presented in recent years. Ireland would have to pay a large proportion of the Vote, and he should like to know what value she was to get for her money. He should like to ask the Secretary for the Treasury where the paper provided for in this Vote came from? He had seen some specimens of the paper on which the War Office did their correspondence, and certainly it

could not be much worse. He did not know whether it was made in Germany, but it was extraordinarily bad paper. He wished to know whether any of the paper purchased by the Stationery Office was made in Ireland, and whether Irish firms were given any facilities for tendering for contracts for paper. Extraordinarily good paper was made in Ireland. He did not know whether the paper used in the House of Commons was of Irish manufacture, but certainly quite as good paper was made in that country. He should like to receive an assurance from the hon.

Gentleman that if Irish contractors had not been given an opportunity of tendering in the past, such opportunity would be given to them in the future.

With reference to binding, that was one of the few arts still preserved in Ireland, and he would make the same request with regard to that. It seemed to him that a certain amount of the public expenditure such as was mentioned in the Estimate might be spent in Ireland with great advantage.

MR. TULLY said he thought that the Secretary to the Treasury when he was explaining the Vote forgot that the total Estimate for 1900–1 was over £;600,000, whereas the Estimate for 1889–9 was only £;498,000. There had therefore been an increase of over £;100,000, exclusive of the increase which had been put down to the war. The total amount now to be voted for printing and stationery was nearly three-quarters of a million. When the President of the

Board of Agriculture was Secretary to the Treasury, he boasted in 1898 that he had reduced the figures for that year by £50,000, but instead of any decrease being effected in the present year there was an increase of £110,000, without any adequate explanation. The hon. Gentleman said that the Stationery Office was getting a better class of paper, but the better quality of paper had not fluctuated very much in price. It was the cheaper qualities of paper that were affected by the war. The war interfered with wood pulp paper, because steamers were taken for transport purposes, and also because there was a rise in the price of chemicals. When the President of the Board of Agriculture was Secretary to the Treasury, he went direct to the mills instead of going to contractors, but he could not get any tenders from the mills, because they were warned that if they tendered they would be boycotted by the contractors. Owing to transactions such as that, the Government were unable to obtain paper from the mills, with the result that £110,000 had to be added to the Estimates in one year. When the President of the Board of Agriculture was striving to reduce these enormous figures, all sorts of difficulties were put in his way. He attempted to get the reporting of the House of Commons done cheaper, and the plan was adopted of slinging a cheap contract at his head. He went in for getting a low tender, and got a very bad contractor, who made a complete mess of the printing and publishing the debates of the House. By that means discredit was sought to be cast on the President of the Board of Agriculture because of his efforts to reduce the expenditure of the Stationery Office. He thought some explanation should have been given as to why £110,000 had to be added to the original Estimate, information should also be given as to who were the contractors for the supply of stationery used in the public Departments. Had the hon. Gentleman the present Secretary to the Treasury attempted to follow in the footsteps of his predecessor? Did he go to the mills for paper; and if he went to the mills, did he secure tenders; and if he did not, did not that prove that the ring which existed in the old days still existed? Although nearly three-quarters of a million was expended in printing and stationery, if the public wanted a Blue-book an almost prohibitive price was put upon it. A Blue-book which now cost 6s. could, if produced in a sufficient quantity, be obtained for 3d. or 4d. If the hon. Gentleman would put Blue-books at a low price on the market, the result would prove very remunerative. A daily newspaper might cost £1,000 to produce, but it was sold at a 1d. or 2d., whereas the Vote Office put on a Blue-book the price they thought it cost to produce. They sold perhaps 500 books at one shilling, whereas if they offered 1,000 or 1,500 books at 6d. they would realise a substantial profit. He asked the hon. Gentleman whether he would not go in for such a system. He did not think there was any justification for the enormous increase now asked for. The better quality of paper used had very little to do with it, and if the money was not spent on paper, did it go as wages? The rate of wages for compositors had not increased in London. On the contrary, an effort was made to reduce it, and therefore no part of the increase went to the working man. He noticed that "Small Stores" were responsible for £29,000 of the increase. It was very convenient in drawing up an Estimate to cloak a lot of

things under the title of "Small Stores." He did not think such an item could justify an increased expenditure of £;29,000. Then there was an increase of £;1,000 for parchment, and an increase of £;53,000 for paper. He could not accept such items.

It being midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House. Resolutions to be reported upon Monday next; Committee also report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR.

Mr. FLAVIN: Can the right hon. Gentleman say whether there is any truth in the report published in an evening paper that Lord Kitchener has been captured by De Wet?

The PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Sir WILLIAM WALROND, Devonshire, Tiverton): I have heard nothing about it.

Adjourned at three minutes after Twelve of the clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 4th March, 1901.

Two other Members took and subscribed the Oath.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 62 COMPLIED WITH).

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

Devonport Gas and Coke Bill.

Glasgow and Renfrew District Railway

Transfer Bill.

North British Railway Bill.

Thames Deep Water Dock Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

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

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

London, Tilbury, and Southend Railway Bill.

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

BEXLEY TRAMWAYS BILL.

"To empower the Urban District Council of Boxley to construct and work tramways; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

CAMBRIAN RAILWAYS BILL.

"To authorise the Cambrian Railways Company to extend their railway at Pwllheli; to construct a fixed instead of an opening bridge over the River Dovey; to grant further powers to that company in respect of the use of steam vessels; and for other purposes," read the first time:.. and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

SOUTH YORKSHIRE ELECTRIC POWER BILL.

"For incorporating and conferring powers on the South Yorkshire Electric-Power

Company; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

ALDEBURGH CORPORATION (WATER) BILL.

BINGLEY URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL BILL.

BLACKBURN CORPORATION BILL.

BRADFORD CORPORATION BILL.

BRIGHTON CORPORATION BILL.

BURY CORPORATION BILL.

BURY CORPORATION TRAMWAYS BILL.

BURTON UPON-TRENT CORPORATION BILL.

CALEDONIAN ELECTRIC POWER BILL.

CARDIFF CORPORATION BILL.

CLEVELAND AND DURHAM COUNTY ELECTRIC POWER BILL.

CLYDE VALLEY ELECTRICAL POWER BILL.

COLWYN BAY AND COLWYN URBAN DISTRICT GAS BILL.

DERBY CORPORATION BILL.

DERBYSHIRE AND NOTTINGHAMSHIRE ELECTRIC POWER BILL.

DEVONPORT CORPORATION (GAS) BILL.

DERWENT VALLEY WATER BOARD BILL.

ECCLES CORPORATION BILL.

HARTLEPOOLS GAS AND WATER TRANSFER BILL.

HECKMONDWIKE GAS (TRANSFER) BILL.

HONLEY URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL (GAS) BILL.

HUMBER COMMERCIAL RAILWAY AND DOCK BILL.

ILKESTON AND HEANOR WATER BOARD BILL.

IRISH PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH BILL.

Read a second time, and committed.

KETTERING URBAN DISTRICT WATER BILL.

KINGSTON-UPON-HULL CORPORATION BILL.

LLANDRINDOD WELLS URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL WATER BILL.

LONDON BRIDGE WIDENING BILL.

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (GENERAL POWERS) BILL.

MANSFIELD CORPORATION BILL.

NEATH HARBEUR BILL.

NEWRY PORT AND HARBOUR TRUST BILL.

PAISLEY POLICE AND PUBLIC HEALTH BILL.

PEMBROKE URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL (COUNTY OF DUBLIN) BILL.

PETERSFIELD AND SELSEY GAS BILL.

RHYL IMPROVEMENT BILL.

SHANNON WATER AND ELECTRIC POWER BILL.

SHIREOAKS, LAUGHTON, AND MALTBY RAILWAY BILL.

SOUTHAMPTON AND WINCHESTER GREAT WESTERN JUNCTION RAILWAY BILL.

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

SWANAGE GAS AND WATER BILL.

TEES VALLEY WATER BOARD BILL.

THAMES PIERS AND RIVER SERVICE BILL.

WALLASEY IMPROVEMENT BILL.

WELLS CORPORATION WATER BILL.

WOLVERHAMPTON AND CANNOCK CHASE RAILWAY BILL.

YORKSHIRE ELECTRIC POWER BILL.

Read a second time, and committed.

MORTON CARR DRAINAGE.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir Frederick Milner and Mr.

Faber.

PETITIONS

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (HIGHER GRADE AND EVENING CONTINUATION SCHOOLS).

Petitions for alteration of Law, from Kingston-upon-Hull; Ipswich; Enfield;

Shipley; Ilford; Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Wellingborough; and Kettering; to lie upon the Table.

GABINDDAS.

Petition from Gabinddas, for redress of grievances; to lie upon the Table.

POOR LAW OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1896.

Petitions for alteration of Law, from Barnes; Ham; Heston and Isleworth;

Ipswich; and Kingston-upon-Hull; to lie upon the Table.

SAHU, JUGRUP.

Petition from Jugrup Sahu, for redress of grievances; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

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

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Leighton Buzzard; and Rotherham; to lie upon the Table.

VACCINATION ACTS.

Petition from London, for repeal lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

MILITIA ACT, 1882 (DEPUTY LIEUTENANTS, IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Return of descriptions of qualifications of Deputy Lieutenants lodged during 1900, as furnished to the Secretary for Ireland [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW.

Copy presented, of Abstract of Accounts of the University of Glasgow for the year ending 30th September, 1900 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 70.]

COMMONS ACT, 1876 (SKIPWITH, EAST RIDING OF YORK).

Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Agriculture upon an application

Petitions for alteration of Law, from for Provisional Orders for the Regulation

Common and for the Inclosure of

the Open Fields, respectively, at Skipwith, in the East Riding of the county of York [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 71.]

COMMONS ACT, 1876 (SUTTON, NORTHAMPTONSHIRE).

Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Agriculture upon an application for a Provisional Order for the Inclosure of the Open Fields and the Heath and Wastes in the parish of Sutton, in the county of Northampton [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 72.]

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (INCLOSURE, ETC., EXPENSES ACT, 1868).

Copy presented, of Fees to be taken in respect of Transactions under the Agricultural Holdings Acts, 1883 to 1900, in accordance with the provisions of The Inclosure, etc., Expenses Act, 1868 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSION.

Copy presented, of Fifty-third Report from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for England, with an Appendix [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PAUPERISM (ENGLAND AND WALES) (HALF-YEARLY STATEMENTS).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 1st Mareh; Mr. Grant Lawson]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 73.]

WOODS, FORESTS, AND LAND REVENUES.

Abstract Accounts presented, for the year ended 31st Mareh, 1900, together with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 74.]

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS IN RECEIPT OF PUBLIC MONEY.

Return ordered, "showing the names of present Members of the House of Commons who are in receipt of Public Money from any public source, whether in the form of Salary, Pay, Pension, or Allowance of any kind, or who have received Commutation in respect thereof under the Commutation Acts; the amount they receive or have commuted, with the amount of the Commutation Money; and the name of the Office or nature of the

Service for which the Money is or has been paid (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 197, of Session 1897)."; (Mr. Fenwick.)

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR;ALLEGED BOER RECRUITING IN BELGIUM.

MR. THOMAS DEWAR (Tower Hamlets. St. George's): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is aware that Beer agents are actively engaged throughout Belgium enlisting recruits for the Beer forces; and whether the Government have taken or intend to take any steps by friendly representations to the Belgian Government, or otherwise, to prevent a continuance of same.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I have to say that we have received no information which leads us to think that recruiting of the kind referred to by my lion, friend is being carried on.

JAMESON RAID;CHAPTERED COMPANY'S LIABILITY.

*MR. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonics whether he can inform the House if the claim of the late Transvaal Government against the Chartered Company in respect of; the Jameson raid is a British asset; and, if so, whether he intends taking action against the Company for its recovery and, if no action is to be taken, will he explain the ground for so acting.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.) rose to answer the question.

*MR. ALFRED DAVIES: May I rise to order, Sir? I should like to postpone this question until to-morrow, when, I trust, the Secretary of State for the Colonics will be here. I do not want a repetition of last week.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: If the hon. Member will allow me to explain, I think I can

satisfy him. My right hon. friend is unable to be here to-day; [An IRISH

MEMBER: He is in the smoke-

room]; but he has sent me his answer. Will that satisfy the hon. Gentleman?

*MR. ALFRED DAVIES: Yes, that will do.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The claim of the South African Republic against the British South Africa Company was for £1,677,938 3s. 3d., including one million for moral and intellectual damage. This claim Her Majesty's Government declined to entertain as not being reasonable. The question whether the direct loss proved to have been suffered by the South African Republic in consequence of the raid can now be recovered from the British South Africa Company by His Majesty's Government or by the Government of the Colony, as successor to the South African Republic, is a question on which I am seeking the advice of the law officers. On receipt of their opinion His Majesty's Government will take the whole matter into consideration, and will communicate, if necessary, with Sir Alfred Milner and with the British South Africa Company.

*MR. ALFRED DAVIES: May I ask why the Secretary for the Colonies is not here?

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I will tell the hon. Gentleman. Because it was necessary for my right hon. friend to consult the Prime Minister on a matter of great importance.

*MR. ALFRED DAVIES: But as a matter of fact is not the right hon. Gentleman in the smoke-room now?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order—

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): May I ask;

*MR. SPEAKER: The question on the Paper has been fully answered.

Sir JOHN BRUNNER (Cheshire, Northwich): May I ask whether the right hon. Gentleman will be good enough to be careful not lightly to give up this claim for the reason;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order—

FALSE ANNOUNCEMENTS ON NEWSPAPER CONTENTS BILLS.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General whether his attention has been called to placards published by a London paper on 28th February, to the following effect: "Surrender of Botha, Official, Sun"; and whether, as news-vendors are prosecuted for crying false information, he proposes to take any steps against the proprietors of this paper.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (MR. RITCHIE, Croydon): I have been asked by my hon. and learned friend to answer this question. Newsvendors can only be prosecuted for obtaining, or attempting to obtain, money by false pretences, which is the case when it is proved that they knowingly call out news not contained in the paper they are trying to sell. I am advised that it is not likely that proceedings, if taken against the proprietors for obtaining or attempting to obtain money by false pretences, would be successful in this case. I may add that I have received from the editor of the Sun a letter, in which he expresses his deep regret for the occurrence, and says that;

"The news came to the Sun on authority which has never before failed us." The addition of the word 'official' was the result of a stupid misunderstanding among the staff, one of whom is now no longer in the service of

the Sun."

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny)

: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that these "spots" on the Sun are very common in London papers?

[No answer was returned.]

BRITISH REVERSES; COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF'S REPORTS.

*MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, and, if so, when, he will inform the House what were the actual circumstances of the surrenders at Nicholson's Nek, Reddersburg, and other unsuccessful actions in South Africa; and what is the report of the Commander-in-Chief thereupon.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): The Commander-in-Chief does not consider it desirable to make a special report on each of the unsuccessful actions in South Africa, but he has taken steps to deal suitably in each case with the officers in fault.

*MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL: On what ground was an exception made in the case of the action at Sanna's Post?

MR. BRODRICK: A special report was made in regard to that action, and in his original despatch Lord Roberts alluded to that as a separate despatch which he would publish.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): Are we to understand that we are not to take the answer just given as going back in any sense from the promise made lately in debate on this subject?

MR. BRODRICK: Certainly not.

PAARDEBERG OPERATIONS.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been directed to the concluding paragraph in Lieut.-General Kelly-Kenny's Report to Lord Roberts, dated 20th February, 1900, on the operations at Paardeberg; whether, as a matter of fact, Lord Kitchener did direct the operations at Paardeberg Drift on the 18th February by suggestions to General Kelly-Kenny; and who is held responsible by the War Office and the Commander-in-Chief for the conduct of those operations.

MR. BRODRICK: Yes, Sir. I had that paragraph in my mind in the answers I gave last week, and I have nothing to add to them. General Kelly-Kenny is directly responsible for these operations, but the Commander-in-Chief takes full responsibility for what occurred.

MR. DILLON: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that, according to the statement of The Times correspondent, General Kelly-Kenny telegraphed to Lord Roberts and received a reply from Lord Roberts to the effect that if more than one brigade were engaged Lord Kitchener was in command and he must take his orders from him?

MR. BRODRICK: I have explained the exact position of General Kelly-Kenny and I have nothing to add. Lord Kitchener was empowered by Lord Roberts to offer advice. He thought fit to do so from time to time, and General Kelly-Kenny accepted the advice.

BLOEMFONTEIN HOSPITALS.

MR. BURDETT-COUTTS (Westminster): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War

whether he is aware that No. 8 General Hospital, one of the two largest hospitals at Bloemfontein, has remained on the same site for over ten months, the ground being thoroughly infected with enteric poison in consequence of the number of enteric cases treated there during and since the epidemic of last year; whether, in view of the increased rate of mortality from enteric in South Africa, immediate inquiry will be made as to why this hospital camp, in accordance with recognised principles of sanitation, should not have been long since moved to an entirely new site; and whether he can give the number of cases admitted to this hospital and the number of enteric deaths in it during each of the six months ending 31st January.

MR. BRODRICK: I am informed that this hospital has remained on the same site for ten months, but there appears to be no reason for anxiety as the site has been reported to be perfect, and the sanitary reports up to the 18th January state that the general sanitary conditions were good. The figures of this hospital are as follow;;

Admissions.

Deaths.

August

220

3

September

154

;

October

26

1

November

49

5

December

61

3

January(to 25th) (to 25t

93

12

The admissions in January are mostly of transfers from out-stations. The type of enteric fever is reported in January as severe, many of the cases being practically hopeless from the first. If any doubt is found to exist as to the sanitary condition I will undertake that the situation shall be changed.

CIVIL SURGEONS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

MR. BURDETT-COUTTS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state with regard to the last fifty civilian surgeons and physicians engaged by the Royal Army Medical Staff Corps for employment in South Africa the length of time for which each had been legally qualified before being sent out.

MR. BRODRICK: Ten were qualified in 1901, ten in 1900, and nine in 1899. The remaining twenty-one have been qualified for varying periods going back as far

as 1876.

SOLDIERS' PENSIONS.

MR. REGINALD LUCAS (Portsmouth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will consider the propriety of placing non-commissioned officers and private soldiers who have been rendered wholly or partially incapable of earning a livelihood by disease, clearly due to active service in the field, on the same footing for pension purposes as those who have been similarly incapacitated by wounds or injuries.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): All such cases will be specially considered with a view to the grant of a pension on the scale contemplated. The scale is under consideration.

COST OF TRANSPORT OF HORSES TO THE CAPE.

MR. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether he will state the cost per head of transporting horses to the Cape from Great Britain, United States, Canada, Hungary, Australia, and Argentina respectively.

LORD STANLEY: The average prices of freight for horses to South Africa are as follows: ; From Great Britain, £;24 13s. 6d.; United States. £;22 4s. 6d.; Canada, £;23 14s. 4d.; Hungary, £;21 5s. 7d.; Australia, £;18; Argentina, £;14 5s. 3d. The cost of conveying horses in transports to South Africa cannot be given.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): Does the Return for Great Britain include Irish horses?

LORD STANLEY: Yes, Sir.

REST FOR HORSES LANDED AT CAPE TOWN.

DR. SHIPMAN (Northampton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether any steps are now being taken to insure sufficient rest being given to the horses landed at Cape Town, or other South African port, before they are sent on to the front, or otherwise employed in the service of the war.

MR. BRODRICK: I can assure the hon. Member that every care is being taken to secure the horses as long a rest as possible before going to the front. Lord Kitchener has recently informed me that he has got his supply of horses well in hand.

COMMISSIONS FOR THE YEOMANRY.

SIR JOSEPH LEIGH (Stockport): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether a Yeoman wishful to obtain a commission in the Regular Army can do so on the same terms as are allowed to the Militia, and whether active service at the front would be reckoned as of equal value in both cases.

MR. BRODRICK: Yeomen who have served in South Africa are eligible for any direct commissions which may be granted for service in South Africa. They are not, however, qualified to go up for the Militia competitive examination. Some commissions will be placed at Lord Kitchener's disposal for the benefit of Yeomen.

IMPERIAL YEOMANRY;ACCOMMODATION FOR RECRUITS AT ALDERSHOT.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the men who have recently joined the Yeomanry and are now at Aldershot,

holding themselves ready to proceed to the front, are without proper military boots and coats, and are rapidly developing pneumonia, and becoming generally unfit for service owing to the accommodation to which they have been subjected.

MR. BRODRICK: I must refer my hon. and gallant friend to a full reply on this subject which I gave to a question put by the hon. Member for the Basingstoke Division of Hants on Thursday last, the 28th ultimo. I have since visited Aldershot, and in my opinion the authorities there have housed and equipped the very large number of Yeomanry who have arrived with a promptitude which deserves every commendation. The supply of men with all necessaries is proceeding at the rate of over 500 a day.

THE DUKE OF CAMBRIDGE'S YEOMANRY.

MAJOR RASCH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the stamp of men enlisting for the Duke of Cambridge's Yeomanry at 5s. per day; and whether this class of recruits justifies the additional rate of pay given.

*MR. BRODRICK: Those men who have been accepted for the Duke of Cambridge's Yeomanry are fully qualified according to the standards, and justify the additional rate of pay given. A large number of the persons who offered themselves for enlistment have been rejected. It should be remembered that the men are as a rule some years older than ordinary recruits, and therefore are at the best military age.

ENGLISH PURCHASE OF ARTILLERY IN GERMANY.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state on what Vote the field guns ordered from Germany will be charged.

*MR. BRODRICK: These have been charged to Vote 9 for 1900-1. WOOLWICH ARSENAL; "EXERTION MONEY."

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether his attention has been called to a statement with reference to certain irregularities at Woolwich Arsenal in connection with the payments to principal foremen under the head of exertion money, and whether he will consider the advisability in the public interest of exercising increased supervision in order that sufficient money may be saved to raise the wages of the lowest paid Government labourers.

†See page 32.

*LORD STANLEY: I have seen no statement of the kind, and those responsible in the Arsenal report that there are no grounds for the allegations in question in their respective departments. Special payments of exertion money will cease in the Ordnance Factories on the 31st instant.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER: What is "exertion money"?

[No answer was returned.]

ARBER HILL BARRACKS, DUBLIN; CONTRACTS; FAIR WAGES CLAUSE.

MR. FIELD (Dublin. St. Patrick's): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether he is aware that the contractor for extensive works at Ashurst Hill Barracks, Dublin, has subcontractors who do not carry out the Fair Wages Resolution or observe the hours of labour in preparing cut granite required for the work; and whether he will inquire into the complaint.

*LORD STANLEY: The contractor for the works at Arbor Hill Barracks; which are presumably those referred to by the hon. Member; buys his granite direct from a quarry in County Wicklow. On reference to the quarry in question, the General Commanding in Ireland is informed that the rate of wages current in the district where the stone is cut and dressed is duly paid.

ROYAL ARMY MEDICAL STAFF CORPS ; RECRUITING STANDARDS.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, if a man offers himself as a recruit for the Royal Army Medical Staff Corps, he cannot be accepted if over 5 feet 5 inches in height, although he may be eligible in all other respects; and whether he is eligible for the Militia Medical Staff Corps and the St. John Ambulance Brigade if above that height.

*LORD STANLEY: A man if over 5 feet 5 inches in height could be accepted as a special recruit for the Royal Army Medical Corps, and, if he was a good and desirable man in every other way, would probably be accepted. A man of 5 feet 6 inches is not over standard for the Militia Medical Staff Corps, and would be accepted if found fit. I am not aware of the standards required for the St. John Ambulance Brigade.

ARMY TRAINING; RESPONSIBILITY OF ADJUTANT GENERAL.

COLONEL WELBY (Taunton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the Adjutant General, who by Orders in Council of 29th November, 1895, and 7th March, 1899, has been charged with the military education and training of the officers, warrant officers, non-commissioned officers, and men of the Regular and Reserve Forces and Militia of the United Kingdom, is responsible for the due performance of those duties direct to the Secretary of State, and whether general and other officers are forbidden to practise any system of training which has not received the sanction of the War Office.

*MR. BRODRICK: The Adjutant General is charged with the military training of all ranks subject to the supervision of the Commander-in-Chief, who signs all orders regulating exercises. It is essential that one system of training should be in force throughout the Army. If, therefore, general or other officers consider that any change from the existing system is desirable, it is their duty to submit it for the consideration of the Commander-in-Chief, and not to put it into practice until it has received his sanction.

COLONEL WELBY: Then am I right in understanding that the responsibility of the Adjutant-General is through the Commander-in-Chief, and not direct from the Secretary for War?

MR. BRODRICK: My hon. and gallant friend is fond of propounding questions in a debateable manner. The responsibility of the Adjutant-General in the performance of his duties is, no doubt, direct to the Secretary of State, but he acts under the supervision of the Commander-in-Chief in such military questions, and, of course, carries out the directions of the Commander-in-Chief.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Berougs): May I ask whether, as a matter of fact, such a plan for the training of officers as has been indicated was submitted by the Adjutant-General to the Secretary of State for War; and whether that plan has been neglected both by the

right hon. Gentleman and his predecessor?

MR. BRODRICK: No, Sir; I am not aware of anything of the kind. Any plan submitted by the Adjutant-General through the Commander-in-Chief would be carefully considered.

COLONEL WELBY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in the event of the proceedings of courts-martial or courts of inquiry on surrenders in South Africa, showing those surrenders to have resulted from defective or ineffectual training of officers and men despatched from the United Kingdom, steps will be taken to fully judge the system of training, and to hold those who have laid it down as sharing equally with the officers and men who have had to put it in practice the responsibility for those surrenders.

MR. BRODRICK: It would be very difficult to draw any conclusions such as the hon. and gallant Member suggests from the courts-martial or courts of inquiry which have reported. The question of the training of the troops is being carefully considered by the Commander-in-Chief.

DECEASED SOLDIERS' SAVINGS; SERGEANT-MAJOR GARNER.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD: I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether a man's regimental savings bank account is shown in his non-effective account, and has this item been rendered by the battery in the case of Sergeant-Major Garner; and whether the savings bank account of the battery has been submitted for audit since 1899.

At the same time, may I ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether the remainder of Sergeant-Major Garner's estate has been issued, as stated by the Financial Secretary; and, if so, has the non-effective account also been received, and on what date was the remainder of the estate issued; and, considering that eighteen months have elapsed since Sergeant-Major Garner's death, in justice to his widow, can inquiries be made by telegraph at the battery which is in standing camp at Natal.

LORD STANLEY: It appears that at the end of June, 1899, Sergeant-Major Garner had about £135 to his credit in his savings bank account. His non-effective account has not been received owing to the fact of his battery, which was engaged at Dundee, being unable to furnish the details. Enquiry has been made by telegram and every endeavour is being made to clear up the matter. The balance of money due to the Sergeant Major, with his war and discharge gratuities, has been provisionally issued, and although it is against all regulations I have authorised the payment of half the amount shown to be in the savings bank according to our last return.

IRISH LINEN KHAKI.

MR. DALY (Monaghan, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that at a recent meeting of the linen merchants of Belfast disappointment was expressed because the Government would not take linen khaki for the making of soldiers' clothing, and that linen is only one farthing per yard more than cotton khaki, although linen wears three times as long as cotton; and whether he will see that Irish linen gets the preference from this time forward for making soldiers' uniforms.

*MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.): May I ask the Government to take this

matter into their most favourable consideration, as it is one which excites great interest in Belfast?

LORD STANLEY: The attention of the Secretary of State has been drawn to this matter. The preference for cotton over linen khaki is due not only to the fact that the latter is more expensive, but also colder and less absorbent than the former. In view of the recent adoption of woollen drab serge for the service dress of the Army, it is very improbable that any large quantity of either cotton or linen khaki will be required hereafter by the War Department.

MR. DALY: Is it a fact that if Irish linen were used in the manufacture of soldiers' uniforms the constituents of the First Lord of the Treasury at Manchester would suffer?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

ADMIRALTY CONTRACTS AT BARROW-IN-FURNESS.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether portions of the work for the furnishing and upholstering of the four ships building at Barrow-in-Furness for the Government has been sub-let, whether any of the work executed by some of these sub-contractors is of an unsatisfactory character, whether he is aware that the work have been carried out by boys and under-paid labour, and whether he will appoint an inspector to supervise and pass the work before paying for it; and whether subcontracting is allowed by Government Departments in view of the Fair Wages Resolution of the House of Commons.

*THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): The work of furnishing on these ships has not been sub-let. The upholstering work, included in the contract, comprises only a few cushions and curtains, and is sub-let to a local firm who have previously done similar work for His Majesty's ships. The answer to the second and third questions is in the negative. All such work is invariably supervised and passed by Admiralty overseers before it is paid for. Subcontracting is allowed subject to Admiralty approval, and on condition that the responsibility of carrying out the work in a satisfactory manner, and that the wages paid shall be those generally accepted as current in each trade for competent workmen, remains with the principal contractor.

ROYAL VISIT TO THE COLONIES; PRESS ACCOMMODATION.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is yet in a position to say what arrangements are made for the accommodation of representatives of the press on the ships of war that will accompany the Royal Mission to Australia, and to state what news agencies or newspapers will be allowed to send representatives.

*Mr. PRETYMAN: The First Lord much regrets that it was not possible to find accommodation for all applicants; but careful inquiry showed that five berths at the utmost could be made available on the two cruisers. These places have accordingly been apportioned among the applicants. A decision could not be postponed, as the cruisers sail on Thursday next.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: Will you kindly say what agencies or papers are to get places?

*Mr. PRETYMAN: Perhaps the lion. Gentleman will allow me to answer that question

on the Supplementary Navy Estimate. I may, however, say that combinations have been arranged.

INDIA;PROPOSED NEW PROVINCE.

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether the sanction of His Majesty's Government has been given to a scheme by which it is proposed to join four or five provinces peopled with Pathan tribes, all outside the Indian border, under the same military, political, and revenue administration as now obtains in four of our own British districts within the borders of India; and will the full Papers relating to this scheme be laid before Parliament at an early date.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): The Papers relating to this subject will be in the hands of Members in a few days, and they will show that the assumptions in the first question of the hon. Gentleman are erroneous.

CHINA;RUSSIA AND MANCHURIA.

*SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT (Sheffield, Ecclesall): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Governments of Great Britain, Germany, and Japan have protested against the ratification by the Chinese Government of the agreement lately concluded between the representatives of Russia and China in Manchuria; whether that agreement, if carried out, would give Russia control of Manchuria to the exclusion of all other nations, would prevent the subjects of any other Power from obtaining concessions in Manchuria, and would place the trade and customs there under Russian control.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRANBORNE, Rochester): The question to which the hon. Member refers is engaging the earnest attention of His Majesty's Government, and has been the subject of diplomatic communications between the Powers. In the opinion of His Majesty's Government, any statement or discussion on the subject at the present moment would be inexpedient.

"KOWSHING" ARBITRATION.

SIR MARK STEWART (Kirkcudbrightshire): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he can give to the House any information as to the British steamer "Kowshing," sunk by the Japanese in their war with China; whether the Chinese offered to refer the case to arbitration; whether arbitration was accepted, and, if so, whether anything came of it before the commencement of the present hostilities; and whether he can give the House any assurance that the case will not be lost sight of, but that it will be included in the Bill of Indemnity to be paid at the end of the present war by the Chinese Government to this country.

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: The Chinese Government accepted the offer of Her Majesty's Government to refer the case to arbitration, and the terms of reference to the arbitrator were under discussion when the disturbances broke out in China. In the actual circumstances further delay is inevitable, but the case will certainly not be lost sight of. As it is to be decided by arbitration it is clear that there can be no question of payment until the arbitrator has given a decision.

ARABI PASHA.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether Arabi Pasha is to be allowed to return to Egypt from Ceylon.

*Viscount CRANBORNE: No petition has recently been received from Arabi Pasha for leave to return to Egypt. If he were to make such a request the matter would be referred to the Egyptian Government for consideration.

METROPOLITAN STIPENDIARIES.

MR. EUGENE WASON (Clackmannan and Kinross): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will explain why he does not act upon the recommendation of the Report of the Departmental Committee of his predecessor in office and appoint an additional magistrate for the North London and South Western Police Courts; and whether he is aware that, as a consequence of there being only one magistrate appointed to these police courts instead of two, as in all other Metropolitan police courts, justice is frequently delayed by reason of the frequent demands that are made, consequent on the necessity of the same case having to be heard by a magistrate who can only attend the court occasionally.

*MR. RITCHIE: This is a question which has been repeatedly under the consideration of my predecessors and of the Treasury. It has not hitherto been considered that the total number of days on which Metropolitan magistrates sit during the year are sufficient to justify the imposing on Imperial funds the cost of two additional magistrates. I am aware that considerable inconvenience arises of the nature referred to in the question. Provision has been made to lessen this as much as possible by an arrangement that the magistrates attached to other courts, who sit in turn at the two courts in question, shall, as far as possible, do so in consecutive weeks, and on the same day in these weeks.

THAMES POLICE;CHRISTMAS BOXES.

MR. NANNETTI: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the recent reduction of ten third-class inspectors of the Thames Division of the Metropolitan Police to the rank of constables for a breach of the regulations will affect the pensions of the men, some of whom have been in the service for nearly a quarter of a century; and whether, in view of the severity of the punishment, he will order a fresh inquiry, with a view to a mitigation of the punishment.

*MR. RITCHIE: The amount of these men's pensions will, of course, be contingent on the amount of their salary immediately previous to their retirement. Having made inquiry into the matter I see no reason at all for a reconsideration of the decision in their case.

MR. NANNETTI: What was the actually committed by these men?

*MR. RITCHIE: Certain constables, on one pretence or another, went along the river collecting money from various wharfingers. They were punished for it, and in the course of the inquiry it transpired that ten third-class inspectors had connived at the action and shared the spoils. They confessed to it. They were punished, and, I think, not too severely.

METROPOLITAN POLICE PAY.

MR. LOUIS SINCLAIR (Essex, Romford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the

Home Department whether he is aware that the recent increase in allowances to the men of the Metropolitan and other borough police forces is causing dissatisfaction among the men of county police forces serving in many cases actually on the other side of the street, and who, although they have as great expenses and live under practically the same conditions, are yet debarred from the advances that have been made; and further, whether he will recommend county authorities to grant these special allowances to men serving in populous urban areas under the same conditions which prompted an advance to the Metropolitan and borough forces.

*MR. RITCHIE: The existence of the dissatisfaction indicated has not come to my knowledge. But I may say at once that the matter is not one in which I could take the action suggested.

UNDERGROUND RAILWAYS IN LONDON.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, in case His Majesty's Government propose the appointment of a Committee to consider, in conjunction with a Committee of the other House, the best lines of route for underground railways in London, it will be proposed that all Bills for underground railways introduced in the present session shall be referred to such a Committee and

whether, in the case of the appointment of such a Committee, His Majesty's Government will consider the desirability of letting the reference to it be sufficiently wide to allow the Committee to report upon the whole question of so arranging and connecting underground lines as to enable such lines to afford the maximum of relief to surface traffic, and to secure rapid, transit from the central parts of London to the suburbs.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): Yes, Sir, I hope that the reference to the Committee will be so framed as to ensure that all the Bills of this session dealing with underground railways in London shall be laid before it, and also that the Committee shall be invited to report whether the lines of route proposed are best calculated to afford facilities for present and probable future traffic, and, if not, what modifications of those lines of route are desirable.

SKATING FATALITY ON COMPENSATION DAM, GREENOCK.

MR. JAMES REID (Greenock): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if he is aware that a young man named John Kennedy was drowned on the 16th instant while skating on the reservoir known as Compensation Dam, Greenock; that the said reservoir is the property of the Water Trust of Greenock, but is within the police jurisdiction of the authorities of the county of Renfrew; that no police were present; that no life-saving apparatus was available; that those present who gallantly endeavoured to save the young man's life stated that if such apparatus had been available his life could have been saved; and that the said reservoir is largely used in time of frost by the inhabitants of Greenock and district; and if he will give such instructions as may probably prevent a recurrence of similar accidents.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): As regards the lamentable accident referred to by the hon. Member, I understand, from a report which I

have received from the Chief Constable, that two life-belts are kept in a sluice-house adjoining the dam, provided by the Water Trust officials, and there also is a rope. All the employees of the Water Trust have a key to this sluice-house, as also the constable of the district. Although the constable had been in the neighbourhood of the dam on the two previous days, he was unfortunately not there on the day of the accident, having been detailed for special duty at a funeral at Wemyss Bay. As a heavy thaw had set in, he thought no one could possibly venture on the ice, and therefore did not apply for a constable to take his place. It would, as the hon. Member can understand, be impossible for the police to watch all the many reservoirs and dams within their jurisdiction and be responsible for warning persons against their own foolhardiness; a duty which is not imposed on them by any Statute. But the chief constable proposes to communicate with the engineer of the Water Trust of Greenock, to the effect that if he will at any time notify to the county police that in his opinion there is danger of accidents to venturesome people at the reservoirs within their jurisdiction, a police constable will be detailed to warn them of their danger.

PREVENTION OF STEAM TRAWLING OFF SCOTLAND.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if he can state how many gunboats have been placed each year for the last five years at the disposal of the Scotch Fishery authorities by the Admiralty, with the view of preventing steam trawling on the Scotch coast in the prescribed waters.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I am informed by the Fishery Board that during the last five years H.M.S. "Jackal" or a substitute has been at their disposal for fishery superintendence under the Herring Fisheries (Scotland) Acts. The Board have also received occasional assistance from an Admiralty cruiser for the investigation of certain specific complaints of illegal trawling. It must be borne in mind, however, that the help given by the Admiralty is rendered in connection with the duties imposed upon them by the Sea Fisheries Act, 1883, and that these duties do not wholly refer to waters in which trawling is prohibited.

MR. POWER: Did not the right hon. Gentleman last year state distinctly that two or three gunboats had been placed permanently at the disposal of the Fisheries Board?

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I remember giving an exact account of what had been done, and if the hon. Member refers to Hansard he will see what I said, no doubt.

MR. POWER: In view of the fact that so much damage is done in Ireland, where so little of the gigantic expenditure on the Navy takes place, will the right hon. Gentleman take steps to impress on the Admiralty the desirability of sending a gunboat for the protection of the Irish fisheries?

[No answer was given.]

MR. TENNANT (Berwickshire): Have not the Admiralty now a gunboat on loan to the Scottish Fishery Board?

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I must ask for notice.

POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS IN NORTHUMBERLAND.

MR. FENWICK (Northumberland, Wansbeck): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he has received any

communication from the inhabitants of New York and Murton, in the township of Murton, Northumberland, praying for further postal facilities; if so, can he state now whether he is able to make any improvement in this respect.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): A communication was received on the 20th ultimo from the chairman of a meeting of the inhabitants of the township. The necessary inquiries are not yet completed, but as soon as a decision has been arrived at it will be communicated to the hon. Member.

TELEGRAPH OFFICES IN RURAL PARISHES.

MR. BRYCE: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing
† Refer to The Parliamentary Debates [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxxv., page 871.

the Postmaster General, whether, under the provisions of the Post Office Acts, and particularly of the Post Office Guarantee Act, 1898, any parish is entitled to require the establishment within its limits of a telegraph office, if the parish council considers that it would be for the benefit of the parish to have such an office, and is prepared to furnish the guarantee required by those Acts.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Post Office Guarantee Acts do not confer on a parish council the right to require the establishment of a telegraph office in the parish. They merely empower the, council to pay to the Postmaster General any loss he may sustain by reason of the establishment of such office. It is left to the Postmaster General to decide whether the office shall lie established, and I need hardly say that ho is always ready to give careful consideration to any case that may be brought before him.

SOUTH ARMAGH MAGISTRACY.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL (Armagh, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the number of Roman Catholics, and the number of non-Roman Catholics, in the population of the Parliamentary Division of South Armagh, and their respective representation on the Bench.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): There is no official information on the religious distribution of the population, or magistracy, by Parliamentary divisions, but, according to the census returns of 189] there were at that date in the County Armagh 05,900 Roman Catholics and 77,028 Protestants of various denominations. The number of justices of the peace in the county, exclusive of resident magistrates and chairmen of councils, is 108, of whom twenty-three are Roman Catholics and 145 are Protestants.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL: Will the right hon. Gentleman take steps to get rid of that disproportion?

MR. WYNDHAM: I have answered that question more than once.

SMALL DWELLINGS (ACQUISITION) ACT; PURCHASES AND LOANS.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether ho can state how many houses in Ireland have been acquired by workmen under the provisions of the Small Dwellings (Acquisition) Act.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Local Government Board are unable to say how many purchases have been completed in Ireland under the provisions of this Act. As already stated by me, the Board has sanctioned one loan to enable the Dublin Corporation

to make advances for the purchase of five dwellings.

IRISH LAND; REDEMPTION OF CROWN AND QUIT RENTS.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he can state how much money has been paid out of Irish estates in respect of the redemption of Crown and quit rents since the passing of the Land Purchase (Ireland) Acts.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: Since the passing of the Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1881, up to 31st March, 1900, the money paid out of Irish estates in respect of the redemption of Crown and quit rents was £156,441.

LORD CLANRICARDE'S ESTATES.

MR. DUFFY (Galway, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether Lord Clanricarde's agent refused recently two years rent, offered by the widow M'Doagh, in order to be allowed to enter into possession of her house and farm, in the parish of Woodford, county Galway; whether he is aware that the same house and farm was handed over since to a man named Lyons without any fine or compensation, who was unable to hold his own farm, the interest of which he sold about six months ago; and whether he will state the number and the cost of the extra police drafted into the district for the purpose of protecting Lyons.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have no official information as to the accuracy of the statements in the first and second paragraphs, though I am informed that it is true that the holding in question has been taken by a man named Lyons. No extra police have been drafted into the district for the purpose of protecting Lyons, and no extra cost has, therefore, been incurred in his protection.

MR. DUFFY: Will the right hon. gentleman say how many police are actually needed for the protection of this man?

MR. WYNDHAM: No extra police have been drafted into the district for the purpose, but I cannot say how many of the ordinary force there are engaged on the duty.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: Cannot the right hon. gentleman obtain the information asked for in the first paragraph?

MR. WYNDHAM: I cannot say what terms have been offered.

DAIRY INSTRUCTION IN MUNSTER.

MR. FLYNN (Cork County, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the proceedings at the last meeting of the Minister Dairy and Agricultural Institute at Cork on the 26th ultimo; and, in view of the fact that the governors of that institute communicated with the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction some months ago asking for a definite decision as to the establishment of an agricultural school in connection with that institute and the continuation of the system of itinerant dairy instructresses for the province of Munster, whether he can state what is the cause of the delay in sending a definite reply to the governors of the institute; and, seeing that the Cork County Council voted a grant of £1,000 a year in February 1900 in aid of the establishment of an agricultural school, can he say what steps the Department is going to take in this matter, and how soon?

MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member has been good enough to send me a newspaper report of the meeting referred to in the question. I am advised that the governors of the Munster Institute have been fully informed of the views of the Department of Agriculture, which were to the effect that the Department would recommend no change in the position of the Munster Institute until all the county councils of the province had had time to consider the question adequately, pending which consideration the work of the institute would continue as heretofore. It is true the county council of Cork passed a vote of £1,000 for the purposes of the Munster Dairy School, but the schemes of the Cork County Council under the Agriculture and Technical Instruction Act are as yet in a very immature state, and the other county councils of Minister are equally interested in the question involved. It would be most undesirable for the Department, by precipitate action, to take any steps which might adversely influence the character of agricultural education in the country generally.

MR. CREAN (Cork County, S.E.): Cannot the right hon. gentleman, out of last year's grant, now lying idle, do something to help this matter forward?

MR. WYNDHAM: I would do nothing against the advice of the Department of Agriculture for Ireland.

WEXFORD COUNTY COUNCIL'S APPEALS.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will grant the two Returns entitled Wexford County v. Local Government Board and Local Government (Ireland) Officials standing on to-day's Paper.

•The following are the Returns referred to in the question; Wexford County v. Local Government Board.; Return giving the Report of the Judgment delivered in the Irish Court of Appeal on Monday, 25th February last, together with the Pleadings and Affidavits on both sides, in the ease of the County Wexford County Council against the Local Government Board for Ireland.

Local Government (Ireland) Officials; Return giving the cases in which the Salaries of County Council, District Council, Urban Council, and Union Officials have been increased or attempted to be increased by the Local Government Board for Ireland since the passing of the Local Government (Ireland) Act, together with the amount of the former Salary and of the increased Salary in each case, and the total addition to Irish Local Taxation consequent upon these increases; and giving also Copies of the protests of the local bodies concerned against these increases or attempted increases.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: At the same time may I ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the comments of the Judges of the Court of Appeal in Ireland on the letter of the 30th April, 1900, addressed by the Irish Local Government Board to the County Council of Wexford; and whether he will lay upon the Table of the House the letter referred to and the affidavits of Sir Henry Robinson, Vice-President of the Local Government Board, in reply to the case made by the Wexford Council against the sealed orders of the Board which have been quashed by the Court of Appeal.

MR. WYNDHAM: In respect of the first of these Returns there is no objection to giving the report of the judgment of the Court of Appeal, with the affidavits

attached. I do not quite gather what is meant by the pleadings. It would be impossible to give, officially, reports of speeches made by counsel. There is no objection to giving the information asked for in the second Return, excepting only the protests of local bodies. There are, in all probability, protests upon minutes which have not been communicated to the Local Government Board in the form of resolutions. I should be unwilling, by publishing those received, to expose the Board to the charge of having withheld any protests. On the other hand the task of obtaining access to, and of searching all the records of all the bodies concerned over so long a period, would involve a greater labour than I feel could fairly be thrown on a heavily worked Department. The form of this Return is now under consideration in connection with a somewhat similar notice recently moved for by the hon. Member for North Donegal, and I will communicate with the hon. Baronet on the subject in the course of a couple of days.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): The right hon. Gentleman speaks of the great labour which would be thrown on the Department in searching the records for protests. Could he not issue a three line, circular to each council, asking if any such protest has been made, and thus get the information?

MR. WYNDHAM: I have no objection to taking any reasonable steps, but there might be some difficulty in following this plan. We might be charged with omitting some.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: That would not be your fault.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Have the Local Government Board any objection to giving county councils a copy of the judgment?

MR. WYNDHAM: No; perhaps the best plan would be to print it as a Parliamentary Paper.

GOREY LICENSING CASE.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been called to the case of the Crown v. Boyan, in which the Gorey bench of magistrates refused to convict the proprietress of the Railway Hotel, Gorey, of a breach of the licensing law for allowing money to be played for on her billiard table; whether this case has been returned from the King's Bench to the justices of Gorey for rehearing with a view to a conviction, and with what remit; and if he will instruct the police in Ireland to prevent the playing for money on billiard tables in hotels in Ireland in future.

MR. WYNDHAM: The answer to the first paragraph of the question is in the affirmative. The case has been returned to the justices, who have convicted the proprietress of the hotel, fining her one penny and costs, with a direction in conformity with the suggestion of the Queen's Bench Division that the conviction should not be endorsed on the licence. The police are aware of their duty in such matters. No special directions are necessary.

CLARE COUNTY COUNCIL; DIRECT LABOUR.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the proceedings against three Clare county councillors, Messrs. Halpin, Lynch, and M'Inerney, in reference to a matter arising out of the direct labour question, and whether, as the Irish Government has drafted a Provisional Order dealing

with that question, he will take steps to have the defendants released from the order to enter into sureties to be of good behaviour.

MR. WYNDHAM: The answer to the first paragraph is in the affirmative and to the second in the negative. The Provisional Order can have no bearing on the prosecution to which the hon. Member refers.

SURETIES OF THE PEACE; HALIN v. RICE.

MR. MTADDEN (Donegal, E.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland if his attention has been drawn to the decision of the judge of the King's Bench in Ireland in the case of Halpin v. Rice, and to the observation of the Lord Chief Justice as to the difference in the law affecting persons in England and Ireland on application before the magistrates for sureties to keep the peace and be of good behaviour, and if, in view of the opinion of the judge that persons in Ireland called upon to give sureties to be of good behaviour have a grievance in being precluded from giving evidence on their behalf, he will introduce a Bill assimilating the law on the subject in both countries.

MR. FLYNN: At the same time may I ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, in reference to the judgment in the King's Bench on the 26th ult. in the case of Deputy-Inspector H. Rice, Royal Irish Constabulary, v. Halpin, and in connection with his promise to bring in legislation with a view to carry into effect the recommendation of the learned judges, whether he will undertake to introduce a Bill before Easter.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): In answer to the question of the hon. Member for East Donegal, I must refer the hon. Member to my reply to a similar question put to me on Friday last, when I stated that if the Members for Ireland would be good enough to give me an assurance that they would facilitate the assimilation of the law in the two countries in this respect I would forthwith introduce a short Bill for the purpose. The hon. Member for North Cork asks me if I will introduce the Bill before Easter. I can only repeat that, provided I receive the assurance I have asked for, the Bill will at once be introduced.

MR. FLYNN: How can we give the assurance until we see the Bill?

MR. ATKINSON: I have said that the Bill will assimilate the law in the two countries.

FAIR RENT APPLICATIONS IN COUNTY KILDARE.

MR. CAREW (Meath, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state how many fair rent applications are pending in the union of Naas, county Kildare; when will they be listed for hearing; what was the date of the last sittings of the sub-commissioners there; and when the next sittings may be expected to take place.

MR. WYNDHAM: The hearing of a list containing eighteen fair-rent applications from the Naas Union will be commenced at Naas on the 19th inst. The list includes all applications received from the union save two. A sub-commission last sat at Naas in January, 1900.

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

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Government intend to compensate the traders of Roundwood and

Lara for the loss they sustained in their business in consequence of the police order to keep their shops closed on Saturday, 2nd February; if not, what remedy have the traders for the injury done to their business by the illegal action of the police.

MR. WYNDHAM: The reply to this question is in the negative. I am unable to advise the hon. Member upon the point raised at the conclusion of the question.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: Then am I to understand that the people who have suffered by the illegal action of the police have no remedy?

MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member must understand that I cannot advise whether they have a remedy or what it is

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: If they institute legal proceedings against the inspector will the right hon. Gentleman take care that;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The right hon. Gentleman has already said he cannot advise a remedy.

BIRR AND PORTUMNA RAILWAY.

MR. REDDY (King's County, Birr): On behalf of my hon. friend the Member for East Galway I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, as the International Railway Corporation, Limited, London, have agreed to comply with conditions laid down by the Irish Office in reference to the restoration and reopening of the Birr and Portumna line of railway, he will state what is the cause of any further delay.

MR. WYNDHAM: The proposals of the International Railway Corporation were brought by the Irish Government before the Treasury, who did not see their way to hold out any expectation that they will consent to a grant of £12,000 in aid of the reconstruction of the line.

IRISH NATIONAL TEACHERS' SALARIES.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state when the Code of Instruction for Irish National Schools, an extract from which was presented to this House last July, will be ready, and what is the special scale of salaries for each grade which this extract states is arranged.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Commissioners of National Education cannot, at present, fix a date for the issue of the Code, as they are still in correspondence with the Treasury. It will, however, be issued without avoidable delay, and will include the special scale of salaries.

LAND LAW ADMINISTRATION IN EAST TYRONE.

MR. DOOGAN (Tyrone, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state whether the Agent of the Commissioners of Education has taken, or is instructed to take, proceedings to evict a tenant named Joseph Magennis, who resides in Derry-trisk, near Coalisland, county Tyrone, for a technical breach of one of the provisions of the Land Act, which took place in ignorance of the law two years ago; and what steps, if any, it is proposed to take in this matter.

MR. WYNDHAM: In this case I am informed that the tenant committed a breach of one of the statutory conditions of his tenancy by opening a house for the sale of intoxicating liquors without the consent of the Commissioners. The

Commissioners, in consequence, have directed proceedings to be taken for the determination of the tenancy. They are willing to waive proceedings if the tenant surrenders his licence as required by them.

IRISH PRE-UNION STATUTES.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether effect will be given to the suggestion of the Deputy Keeper of Public Records in Ireland in the last Report, and the publication of the original statutes of the Irish Parliament in Norman French be carried out.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am informed that the Treasury are in communication with the Statute Law Revision Committee on this subject. In the meantime the actual work of editing and preparing the statutes for press is being proceeded with.

WESTMEATH MAGISTRACY.

MR. SULLIVAN (Westmeath, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state how many Roman Catholics and how many Protestants there are in the county of Westmeath; how many Roman Catholic magistrates and how many Protestant magistrates there are in that county; and how many Roman Catholics and how many Protestant grand jurors have been summoned by the present High Sheriff of that county to serve as grand jurors at the spring assizes.

MR. WYNDHAM: The number of Roman Catholics and Protestants of various denominations in the county of Westmeath at the time of the Census of 1891 was 59,904 and 5,123, respectively. The number of justices of the peace in the county, exclusive of resident magistrates and chairmen of councils, is 146, of whom ninety-six are Protestants, forty-eight Roman Catholics, and there are two whose religions are unknown. There are no official statistics of the religious denominations of gentlemen summoned by the High Sheriff to act as grand jurors.

SHROPSHIRE LIGHT INFANTRY; OUTRAGES IN TIPPERARY.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the series of outrages in the shape of house wrecking, robberies, and burglaries recently committed in Tipperary by soldiers of the Shropshire Light Infantry stationed there; whether any action was taken by the officer in command to prevent such conduct; and whether the persons suffering loss will be compensated by the Army Department.

MR. WYNDHAM: Two burglaries and a malicious injury to property were committed last month by soldiers belonging to this battalion in Tipperary. In each case the accused was arrested and committed for trial at assizes. Neither the officer in command nor the police anticipated such conduct, and no special steps were taken, therefore, to prevent it. The inquiry in the last paragraph should be addressed to my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War.

MR. CULLINAN: Can the right hon. Gentleman say why the commanding officer took no steps to stop this series of outrages?

MR. WYNDHAM: One can hardly call two burglaries a series.

MR. CULLINAN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the regiment has been transferred to Templemore, and that on arrival there the men smashed windows?

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

MR. FLAVIN: Are these men acting under the proclamation of Lord Roberts?

PROTECTION OF IRISH FISHERIES.

MR. POWER: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state how many gunboats have been placed by the Admiralty at the disposal of the Inspectors of Irish Fisheries each year for the last five years, with the view of preventing steam trawling in the prescribed waters off the Irish coasts.

MR. WYNDHAM: The number of occasions on which gunboats have been employed for the purpose stated during the past five years was; in 1896, twice; in 1897, twice; in 1898, once; and in 1899, three times. Last year no gunboat was employed. I would refer the hon. Member to my reply on the 21st February to the question of the hon. Member for Galway as to the special steps now being taken by the Department of Agriculture with a view to the suppression of illegal trawling within the prescribed limits off the Irish coast.

PROSECUTION OF THE TUAM NEWS EDITOR.

MR. DUFFY: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether he is aware that Mr. John M'Philpin, editor and proprietor of the Tuam News, Tuam, county Galway, has been summoned by the Crown to give evidence in respect to resolutions and newspaper reports published in his paper, and alleged to have been furnished to him by persons awaiting their trial at Athenry on 14th March next; and whether, in view of the announcement made recently in respect to similar summonses issued in the city of Waterford, he will direct the immediate withdrawal of the summons against this newspaper editor.

MR. WYNDHAM: The cases of Mr. Redmond and Mr. M'Philpin are not identical, as the latter has only been summoned to produce reports sent to him for publication. While I cannot admit that he has any special privilege exempting him from the liability to produce these documents,

See preceding volume of Debates, page 698.

I will undertake that, unless it should be absolutely necessary in the interest of justice to examine him, he will not be produced as a witness.

HORSE-BREEDING IN QUEEN'S COUNTY.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state how many premiumed stallions (thoroughbred and agricultural) have been allotted to Queen's County under the Royal Dublin Society's scheme; and whether any grant of public money goes in aid of this scheme; and, if so, what amount.

MR. WYNDHAM: As already stated by me, one-half of the annual grant of £5,000, paid to the Royal Dublin Society under the Probate Duties Act of 1888, is applied in aid of the Society's scheme for thoroughbred stallions. Of the twenty-five premiums paid under this portion of the scheme, one thoroughbred stallion has been allocated to Queen's County. The three premiums of £50 for agricultural stallions are not paid out of public funds, but out of the private funds of the Society.

LABOURERS' DWELLINGS IN MOUNTMELICK.

MR. DELANY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received a resolution passed by the Town Commissioners of Mountmellick in favour of further legislation enabling corporate bodies to provide suitable house accommodation for the labouring classes at reasonable rents, and suggesting that a yearly grant, similar to that made under the Land Purchase Acts of 1891 and 1896 in aid of the erection of labourers' cottages in Ireland, should be made to towns commissioners and urban councils in order to lighten the burthen of the rates and facilitate the removal of hovels; and whether the Government propose dealing with this question during the present session of Parliament.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have seen the resolution referred to in the question. It is not proposed to introduce legislation on the subject during the present session.

FERMANAGH RENT APPEALS.

MR. JORDAN (Fermanagh, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the number of appeals from the Sub-Commission now pending for rehearing by the Chief Commission in the county of Fermanagh; and whether he is aware that some of these appeals have been lodged over four years, and will he state how many cases were reheard by the Chief Commission at their last sitting at Enniskillen, and when the Chief Commission will next sit in Fermanagh.

MR. WYNDHAM: There are 314 cases in county Fermanagh in which appeals are pending for upwards of two years, but there is no case unlisted in which the notice of appeal was lodged prior to June, 1898. One hundred and fifty-one cases were listed for the last sitting of the Commissioners at Enniskillen; of these, only sixty-four cases went to an actual hearing in court, the remainder being either withdrawn or settled by the parties. The date of the next sitting of the Land Commission at Enniskillen for the hearing of appeals has not yet been arranged.

WICKLOW MAGISTRACY.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the fact that the Roman Catholics of county Wicklow are three-fourths of the population, and that the Roman Catholic magistrates are twenty-eight and the Protestant magistrates 135 in the county, he will take steps, either by suggestion to the Lord Lieutenant of the county Wicklow, or otherwise, to reduce the preponderance of Protestant over Roman Catholic, magistrates.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am afraid I can only repeat what I have already stated, that recommendations for appointments to the Commission of the Peace are made by the Lieutenant of the county to the Lord Chancellor, and that it is not within the province of the Executive to intervene in the matter, as suggested.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: Is it as necessary to pack the magisterial bench as to pack the jury box?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

FAIR RENT APPLICATIONS.

MR. CULLINAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the practice of the Land Commission

of postponing indefinitely the hearing of fair rent applications in cases where negotiations for sale are pending, and whether he will take steps to secure a more speedy hearing of such cases in future.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Commissioners inform me that the hearing of fair rent applications is only postponed in cases of the kind mentioned upon the application, and with the consent of both landlord and tenant, and that either party can apply at any time to have the fair rent applications proceeded with.

BELTURRET POST OFFICE.

MR. M'GOVERN (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether his attention has been called to the unsuitability of the present post office in Belturbet, both in its position and structural arrangements; and is it the intention of the Department to provide a proper building or build a new post office in Belturbet.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The present post office at Belturbet, to which the business was moved after the late fire, is a, temporary one, and inquiries are being made as to the best means of obtaining better accommodation. A scheme for buying a site and building specially is under consideration.

COUNTY TYRONE POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS.

MR. DOOGAN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he is aware that the residents of the district in county Tyrone, known as Stewartstown to Aughinderg, which comprises eleven townlands, have petitioned the authorities for a daily delivery of letters, and can he state whether the prayer of that petition will be granted.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Yes, Sir, the residents applied for a more frequent delivery of letters. Some little time ago the frequency of the service was increased from three to four days a week, and the Postmaster General has now sanctioned a delivery every weekday. The improved service will be commenced as soon as possible.

IRISH RATING VALUATIONS.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can explain why in England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales the local authorities are the rating authorities, but the Irish Valuation Commissioner and officials are Government employees; and whether measures will be taken to have the law assimilated for the three kingdoms by amending the Local Government (Ireland) Act.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The difference of practice is the result of a difference in the law in the two cases. I am not prepared to propose any change in the Irish Act in this respect.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, seeing that when the Irish Valuation Commissioner issues his valuation it becomes law subject to appeal, he can state whether the new valuation of the county boroughs of Dublin, Belfast, Cork, Limerick, and Waterford will increase local and Imperial taxation; and whether, in view of the Financial Relations Report, care will be taken that the valuation shall be lowered, in order that the Imperial taxation of those county boroughs may be reduced, as the local rates can be met by increased poundage.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I cannot say what will be the result of new valuations

if such are applied for in the towns named. But there is no power under the Valuation Acts to lower the valuation as suggested.

Mr. FLYNN: Does the valuation occur if the local authorities object?

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: No valuation can take place unless the local authorities ask for it.

Mr. FIELD: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, in view of the fact that rating is based on rental, and that rentals include the annual value of the land upon which premises are built whether it has been considered, or will be considered, by the Commissioner of Valuations in Ireland that the payment of taxation by the land-owning class has been transferred to the occupiers, as that which was formerly assessed as land is now assessed under the description of buildings being included in the rent of houses.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I am not quite certain that I understand the hon. Member's question; but I can assure him that, generally speaking, land in county boroughs is valued on its letting value, like other rateable property, and that wherever the amount of land attached to a building is more than a mere curtilage, a separate valuation of it will be made.

IRISH LIGHTS; MAIDEN ROCK, KENMARE BAY.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he will state who is responsible for the system of buoying in force on the Irish seaboard, and whether he will inquire as to the buoy at present marking a rock known as the Maiden Rock in Kenmare Bay, which is only an ordinary buoy, with a view to having it replaced by a bell buoy, so that vessels navigating those waters at night may have a means of knowing the situation of this rock.

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: Except where there are local lighthouse authorities, the superintendence and management of all lighthouses, buoys, and beacons throughout Ireland and the adjacent seas and islands are vested in the Commissioners of Irish Lights. The Commissioners inform me that no application has been received by them for a bell buoy at Maiden Rock, Kenmare, in place of the first class buoy by which the rock is at present marked.

Mr. JOYCE: Is it necessary that an application should be made?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: I think it very desirable.

KINSALE WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. CREAN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that a distinct understanding was arrived at between the Kinsale Urban District Council and the War Office, with the approval of the Local Government Board, by which it was arranged that the War Office would advance the money required for providing a supplemental water supply in excess of the sum reached by the borrowing powers of the council and contract to take a water supply for the use of the military, recouping themselves for their outlay by an annual sinking fund covering principle and interest, to be taken credit for by them out of the amount to be annually paid for the water supply. Will he explain on what grounds, after the council had been put to an expense of about £200, the military authorities informed them that they had changed their mind and could not see their way to carry out the

arrangement; and, if, under these circumstances, the matter will be re-considered with the object of enabling the district council to carry out the proposed work.

LORD STANLEY: No, Sir. No such understanding was arrived at with the council. The council made a proposal to supply water to the barracks at Kinsale which would have involved an estimated advance of £5,000 from War Department Funds. It was not considered desirable to agree to it, and no arrangement whatever was made with the council.

DEFENCE OF GIBRALTAR.

Mr. O'KELLY (Roscommon, N.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether His Majesty's Government will open negotiations with the Spanish Government for the cession of Tarifa and the territory adjoining the western shore of Gibraltar Bay before expending any more public money on the harbour works at Gibraltar.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: His Majesty's Government have no intention of opening negotiations of the kind proposed.

ANGLO-PORTUGUESE TREATY; M. DELOASSE'S SPEECH.

Mr. O'KELLY: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether his attention has been called to a speech in the French Senate by M. Delcassé, and whether in the event of hostilities there is any Anglo-Portuguese treaty which would compel the British Government to intervene in a dispute between the French and Portuguese Governments.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: His Majesty's Government have received the textual report of the speech by M. Delcassé; to which reference is made. They do not think its effect is properly described in the question.

Mr. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): Will the Government lay on the Table of the House copies of any communications that have passed between the Government and Portugal?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: They are on the Table.

THE ROYAL DECLARATION AGAINST ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

Mr. JOYCE: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he has received information from various public bodies, by resolution and otherwise, expressing their disapproval at the words which His Majesty the King had to make use of at the opening of Parliament with regard to the Roman Catholic religion; and if he will give the matter his consideration.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, Sir, I have received information of the kind to which the hon. Gentleman refers. I have nothing to add to the statement I have already made in answer to a similar question on the Paper.

Mr. JOYCE: I should like the right hon. Gentleman to answer the last paragraph of the question.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I think it clear from the answer that I have given it consideration.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he has seen the resolution which was passed by the Canadian Parliament on the subject?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir, I have not.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman if he is interested in the subject?

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. DILLON: May I ask, with reference to the order of business today, whether it is proposed to take the Estimates in the order in which they appear on the Paper, or to go on with the Civil Service Estimates from the point at which we left off on Friday?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir; I propose to take the Estimates in the order in which they are on the Paper.

Sir J. FERGUSSON (Manchester, N.E.): What will be the course of business to-morrow?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: As I have already stated, the business to-morrow will be the Vote on Account, and, in accordance with the practice which was introduced a year or two back, I have made such inquiries as I can from authorised sources and I find the discussion which is most desired is that on the Education Vote, which will accordingly be placed first.

SIR J. FERGUSSON: In case the Speaker is not got out of the Chair on Friday, will the debate be continued on the Monday following?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I must not be understood to pledge myself a week in advance, as unforeseen necessities for taking other business may arise. But I hope the discussion on the Army Estimates will be continued on Monday.

*SIR CHARLES DTLKE: Is it the intention of the Secretary of State for War to make his statement first on Friday?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, I hope so. I think it will be the most convenient course. On Thursday the first business will be the motion of the Chancellor of the Exchequer for the Committee on the Civil List, and after that is disposed of we shall go on with the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: Is it not a departure from the practice of the House for the Minister for War to make his statement on the question that Mr. Speaker leave the Chair?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: No; I think that has been the practice for some years. The hon. Gentleman is perfectly right in saying it was not the old practice. It is a new one, and I think it has been found to be most convenient.

NEW MEMBER SWORN.

Sir Francis Henry Evans, K.C.M.G., for the Borough of Maidstone.

PROCEDURE OF THE HOUSE-AMENDMENT OF STANDING ORDERS.

Standing Order No. 51 read.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I rise to move the motion which has now been for some days on the Notice Paper of the House. The effect of the amendment of our Standing Order would be to place the House in relation to Committees of Ways and Means precisely in the position in which it ordinarily stands with regard to Committee of Supply. As the House is aware, it was formerly possible for private Members to move resolutions whenever one of the Orders of the day was to the effect that "Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair for the purpose of going into Supply." That practice has led to certain evils which it is not necessary for me to deal with now, and it was found to be intolerable. But up to last year no similar inconvenience has been felt with regard to the power of moving Amendments on going into Committee of Ways and Means. That power has always been open to

private Members, but it has seldom been taken advantage of; and, before last year, I think I am not wrong in saying that there were only five cases in the last twenty years in which any hon. Member thought it necessary to take advantage of this privilege. With the exception of the occasions when the Consolidated Fund Bill or the Appropriation Bill were before the House, I do not think that for the past twenty years hon. Members have ever thought it necessary to interpose by putting down a motion upon going into Committee of Ways and Means. But it is evident that

a practice once started will continue. There are, I think, two motions down already on going into Committee of Ways and Means, and it is perfectly certain that the way having been once shown by some bold pioneer, like my hon. friend behind me, he would find plenty of imitators, and the House would no longer be sure, when the Order for Committee of Ways and Means is put down, that it might not be occupied by some quite different and possibly totally irrelevant discussion upon some other matter. It is very instructive to bear in mind what happened in a parallel case on going into Committee of Supply. It was a superstition very prevalent when I first came into the House, and it has not yet been wholly dissipated, that the power of moving resolutions on going into Committee of Supply is a modern relic of the old privilege possessed by the House of Commons of dealing with grievances before granting Supplies. I understand that very careful investigation was made into this question some years ago, and it was then discovered that the first time a resolution had been moved on going into Committee of Supply was in the year 1811, by a gentleman who seems to be the predecessor of my hon. friend in Parliamentary inventiveness, and who first saw the opening that this Standing Order left to private Members. But although that privilege was started in 1811, it was only used three times in the course of the succeeding ten years. But the practice grew, and it grew apace, until the time came when the House felt that it was impossible to deal with Supply if, whenever the business of Supply was put down, some totally different question was raised and discussed for an indefinite time. I suppose that there are Gentlemen on both sides of the House who regard this as one of a long series of tyrannical interferences with the rights of private Members, and who think the proposed amendment of our Standing Order, like all previous amendments, is really due to the inordinate greed and ambition of successive Governments, who wish to grasp unduly the time at the disposal of Parliament to carry out their own nefarious or, at all events, undesirable schemes. I think that is an extremely shallow view to take of a process which I quite admit has been going on now for a century. The real truth of the matter is that a great many causes have been at work which make it perfectly impossible for the Government to do any work at all, or to carry on the business of the country, without modifying the rules of the House. It is not the fault of the Government, or the fault of the House, but it is due to circumstances over which the House has really no control, for it is due to the increased perplexity of modern Governmental work, to the press and the telegraph; and due, perhaps, to one other cause as much as any other, and that is the fact that a very much larger number of hon. Gentlemen desire to take part

in our debates than was the case one hundred, or eighty, or even sixty years ago. I am not one of those who believe that the level of Parliamentary ability in this House has in the smallest degree fallen; I rather take the other view. But assuming that what I say is true and that Parliamentary ability in this House is very much higher than it was, it is not surprising that the great mass of Members are now, being forced by their constituents, far less content than they were to allow the work of discussion in this House to be carried on by a relatively small number of selected and favoured individuals. While that process has been going on unfortunately the day still consists of only twenty-four hours, and only a certain number of Parliamentary days occur in six months, and sessions which last more than six months are rightly considered as inflicting too great pressure upon hon. Members of this House. Therefore, if you are going to treat your business in a common-sense way, and see that during this six months there shall be a fair amount of time given to those who desire to criticise matters, and a fair amount of time to those who want to discuss the Bills of the Government, and also a fair amount of time to the Government in order to carry out the work of legislation which the country requires, it is absolutely necessary that you should, from time to time, so modify your rules that that fair division of time shall not be interfered with on one side or the other. It may be; and my friend thinks that it is a fact; that under our existing system the time allotted to Members of the Opposition and to private Members of this House for the purpose of Parliamentary criticism is inadequate. I think that forty-three days out of one hundred days, roughly calculated, which are given up to the work of criticism, is more than sufficient. That, however, in my judgment, is a matter for entirely separate discussion from the motion which I have placed before the House, and if the time allotted is insufficient, by all means let us increase it. We might increase the twenty-three days given to Supply to twenty-five days, or make any other change which is thought desirable, but do not let us re-introduce with regard to Committee of Ways and Means a system which has been productive of nothing but confusion and evil in connection with Committee of Supply. If hon. Gentlemen will look back at the debates which took place in this House when the privileges of private Members were gradually being curtailed in the matter of resolutions going into Committee of Supply, they will find that the evil most universally complained of, not merely by the Government, but by independent Members themselves, was that this system of moving resolutions produced the utmost uncertainty as to the period at which important business would come on. If that is true; and it certainly is true; of the resolutions moved on going into Committee of Supply, still more is it true of resolutions on going into Committee of Ways and Means. I may remind the House that almost the most important occasion on which this House goes into Committee of Ways and Means is when the Chancellor of the Exchequer has to explain to the House and to the public his financial scheme for the year; which is an occasion of the profoundest interest both inside and outside of these walls, an occasion always looked forward to by every class of the community interested in it, and it would be of the utmost inconvenience should it be postponed at the will of one single

individual, which it might be, because on going into Committee of Ways and Means there is not even that limited safeguard which we now claim for a motion for the adjournment of the House. A motion for the adjournment of the House cannot be moved unless, at all events, forty Members agree to it. But a single Member, acting in concert with nobody else and representing nobody else, has it in his power to put down a subject I for discussion on the motion "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" on going into Committee of Ways and Means, which may last nearly the whole night, and which may throw the Budget speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer into the dinner hour, and may cause in other ways the utmost confusion in our business, and inflict the utmost inconvenience both upon the House and the public. In a lesser degree the same objection applies to any other occasion in which the House is asked to go into Committee of Ways and Means. Those other occasions are really confined to the occasion on which the House goes into Committee of Ways and Means for setting up the Consolidated Fund Bill, by which we terminate our financial year, and again when the House goes into Committee of Ways and Means upon the Appropriation Bill, which winds up the financial business of the session. It is competent under our existing rules for an hon. Member to put down what motion he likes upon these occasions. But observe the great inconvenience of even this. At the present time the Consolidated Fund Bill is the last work we do; or almost the last work we do; before the Easter rising, and if you allow private Members to bring in these motions upon the introduction of the Appropriation Bill then you will have to finish off the business of Supply a day earlier than at the present time. It is hard enough at present to get our Supply through so as to enable the Government to comply with the law, but that difficulty will necessarily be increased if you add one more day to the time given up to Supply by allowing hon. Members to put down a motion on going into Committee of Ways and Means when we introduce the Consolidated Fund Bill. A parallel argument applies to the Appropriation Bill at the end of the session. We fix our holidays to run at the time when the Appropriation Bill passes its Third Reading, and we have to arrange to get through the work of Supply before the Bill is introduced. But unless this Amendment is accepted a notice may be interposed on going into Committee of Ways and Means, which would render our financial machinery, already cumbrous in certain parts, still more cumbrous.

There is another argument to put before the House in support of this motion. It is directed against the peculiar privilege which allows the House to discuss any subject which any hon. Gentleman chooses to bring forward on the motion to go into Committee of Ways and Means. But there are two occasions given, on the Consolidated Bill and the Appropriation Bill, ready to hand, within two or three days of the Ways and Means motion, upon which hon. Members have this opportunity. As everybody is aware, it is open to any hon. Gentleman on the Second and Third Readings of the Consolidated Fund Bill and the Appropriation Bill to raise questions; I will not say on any subject whatever, but any question which is relevant to any Estimate; and to add to these two occasions another occasion within three days appears to me to be adding to the difficulty and

confusion of our Parliamentary proceedings, which is wholly uncalled for. I hope the House will see, therefore, that we are not interfering by this rule with the practice of the House, but are only seeking to perpetuate the practice of the House, the practice of going into Committee of Ways and Means without motion interposed, and a practice only interfered with five times during the past twenty sessions. In these circumstances I venture to say that a full case has been made out for assimilating our Standing Order relating to Ways and Means to the Standing Order which has worked with such excellent results in regard to Committee of Supply.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Standing Order No. 51 be amended, in line 4, by leaving out the words 'or of Ways and Means.'"; (Mr. A. J. Balfour.)

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

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): It seems to me that the right hon. Gentleman in this motion is carrying rather too far the inroads and encroachments that have been made recently upon the privileges of independent Members. The right hon. Gentleman has himself, by his own action through several years, done a great deal to cure an evil which existed in the experience of many of us, in the irregular manner in which proceedings on going into Committee of Supply were conducted, and in preventing the proper business of the House, which the House was entitled to expect to come on, from being interfered with at the caprice of an individual Member. But I do not agree with the right hon.

Gentleman in putting these few opportunities on going into Committee of Ways and Means at all on the same footing as Committee of Supply. After all, as the right hon. Gentleman has stated with perfect accuracy, there are in ordinary sessions only three occasions on which this opportunity occurs; the Consolidated Fund Bill, at the end of the financial year; the introduction of the Budget, and the Appropriation Bill at the end of the session. Well, I think on the face of it there could not be a more legitimate occasion for bringing forward various questions, if it were necessary to bring them forward, than on either of these occasions. The right hon. Gentleman said that the Appropriation Bill and the Consolidated Fund Bill afforded large opportunities for discussing general questions; but I am under the impression that in going into Committee on the Consolidated Fund Bill, the discussions must be confined to matters involved in the Supplementary Estimates, and which are dealt with in the Consolidated Fund Bill; but in any case I do not think that even these opportunities are at all too much to be afforded to Members of the House for bringing forward numerous miscellaneous questions, if they choose to raise them, which they may be prevented from raising when bound by the strict rules governing debate in Supply.

The right hon. Gentleman says, if you wish to facilitate criticism, increase the number of days for Supply; but, after all, these discussions are confined to the particular Votes brought forward in Supply. What is wanted is that there should be these more general opportunities of raising questions which would otherwise not come immediately into the view of the House. I quite admit that this is a rule which, in practice, might be employed in an embarrassing way not

only to the Government, but to the House itself. For example, a motion might be made which would have the effect of delaying the introduction of the Budget resolutions, and the prospect of such inconvenience last year led to a special arrangement being made to avoid it. In the case of the Budget resolutions I quite recognise that it may be necessary to guard against such intervention, but that can be done by a special motion made for the occasion. The Government have this weapon at their hand if they wish, and could thus avoid the great inconvenience to public business as well as to themselves; and if they adopted that method it seems to me they would not be driven to make such an inroad upon the rights of private Members. We can carry the curtailment of the rights of private Members too far. I am not one who has ever been a champion of those rights above my neighbours; I rather lean to the other view of the question. At the same time, the private Member is like Nature: you may turn him out with a fork, but he will always come back. If he does not get a legitimate way of airing his eloquence and giving his views to the House, he will find another. If you shut all the doors the result will be a multiplication of motions for the adjournment of the House, which are most inconvenient to everyone, and which are all the more objectionable because they are entirely inconclusive, and which, therefore, we ought not to encourage. Here are these little escape holes, these little vents for the soul of such Members as my hon. friend the Member for King's Lynn. Seeing that the privilege has not been abused hitherto, and seeing that the Government have it in their power, by special resolution on particular occasions when public inconvenience might arise, to protect themselves and the House against an abuse of the privilege, I do not see any necessity for the further restriction proposed by the motion of the right hon. Gentleman,

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): My right hon. friend the First Lord of the Treasury has been pleased to talk of me as having introduced something novel in the practice of this House. But it is he that is the innovator, he is the revolutionary it is he that has carried the flaming torch and not myself. What does his motion really mean? He said that his object was to put the House in the same position in going into Committee of Ways and Means as in going into Committee of Supply; and at the end of his speech he said that his object was to assimilate the practice on these two occasions. But this motion will not do that at all. This motion is to leave out the words "or of Ways and Means." If the House will permit me, let me read the Standing Order;

"That whenever an Order of the Day is read for the House to resolve itself into Committee (not being a Committee to consider a Message from the Crown, or the Committee of Supply, or of Ways and Means, or the Committee on the East India Revenue Accounts), Mr. Speaker shall leave the Chair without putting any question, and the House shall thereupon resolve itself into such Committee unless Notice of an Instruction thereto has been given, when such Instruction shall be first disposed of."

The House will see the effect of that Order. The Speaker leaves the chair without question put, except in the case of going into Committee of Ways and Means. Committee of Supply is dealt with by another Standing Order, No. 50, and that provides that there also Mr. Speaker shall leave the chair without question

put, "unless on first going into Supply on the Army, Navy, or Civil Service Estimates respectively," when an Amendment may be moved relating to the Estimates proposed to be taken in Supply. My right hon. friend does not recognise that his motion would not leave us in the same position as regards Ways and Means as we are in as regards Supply. If he were going to give us something instead of what he proposes to take away; if he were going to give us something in Ways and Means corresponding to what we already have in we might consider the motion gives us nothing in return for the opportunities for discussion which now exist. And then the right hon. Gentleman characterises our objection to that as "revolutionary"; [Mr. Balfour dissented.] Well, the right hon. Gentleman used the word "revolutionary" in reference to a motion which I made on a former occasion; a motion I had a perfect right to make. It is a privilege which the house has exercised for centuries; that, namely, of moving an Amendment to the motion that the Speaker leave the chair and the House takes go into Committee of Ways and Means. The right hon. Gentleman says that it is a superstition to presume that this right represents the old constitutional doctrine of discussion of grievances before Supply. But what does Sir Erskine May say? In the 1879 edition of his work he says;

"The ancient constitutional doctrine that the redress of grievances is to be considered before the granting of supplies is now represented by the practice of permitting every description of amendment to be moved on the question that the Speaker leave the chair before going into Committee of Supply or of Ways and Means."

What, therefore, my right hon. friend calls a superstition, Sir Erskine May calls the representative of an ancient constitutional doctrine. I need not remind the House of the restriction which the right hon. Gentleman has placed on the right of moving an Amendment to the motion for going into Committee of Supply; but no restriction has ever yet been asked for by any Minister, unless it be a Conservative Minister, on raising Amendments on the motion to go into Committee of Ways and Means.

I cannot help thinking that his proposal rests upon a misconception of the functions and duties of the Government, and the duties and functions of this House. His Majesty's Government seem to consider that this House cannot be regarded as a creator, a destroyer, or a critic; a creator of themselves, a destroyer of their opponents, and a critic of the Estimates. I think the right hon. Gentleman has too low and mean an opinion of the functions of this House. There are many Members not on the Government Front Bench capable not merely of creating a Government, of destroying the Opposition, or of criticising the Estimates, but of suggesting great improvements in the administration of the country, and of initiating new departures in high politics. I remember Mr. Gladstone bearing the highest testimony to the success of the efforts of private Members in introducing improvements in some of the Departments in this House. It is possible that even the most humble private Member might have some suggestion to make which may not have struck the Olympian imagination of a Minister. It is conceivable that he

might even suggest that mistakes had been made which might be recognised by the Government. Why, then, should the Government cut themselves off from all opportunities of profiting from, the intelligence of those private Members who come here not merely to criticise, but to suggest? New Members have come here full of such suggestions. There is not one of them but has come with some important motion or some important Bill in his pocket, and with the firm conviction that he would be able to bring it before a full House and have it thoroughly discussed. No doubt every Member has referred to the Standing Orders, which have informed him that out of the five Parliamentary days in the week three days, or six-tenths, of the Parliamentary time belong to private Members, and that only two days, or four-tenths, of the time belongs to the Government. Therefore he comes here filled with a desire to engage in public service, and a conviction that he will be able to do it; but he has scarcely arrived at the House when he discovers that the practice is altogether contrary to the Standing Orders, and that instead of the Government having only four-tenths of the time of Parliament and the private Members six-tenths, the Government take nine-tenths and leave only one-tenth to the private Members. Now, that is discouraging to the private Member; but that is not all. He is still more discouraged when he finds that the little time left to the private Member is disposed of not by any reasonable arrangement according to the importance of the subject; and of course every private Member regards his as the most important subject in the universe; but

by blind lot, And, by the way, how the Irish Members manage to secure such a large share of that luck I never could understand. The private Member, therefore, finds himself deprived of all opportunity of bringing before the House those great and important national subjects which have seized his imagination. There are five such opportunities nominally available to independent Members. One is an Amendment to the Address; but an Amendment to the Address means a vote of want of confidence in the Government, and a new Member, at least on this side of the House, has full confidence in the Government; for he is a new Member. Then there is the opportunity, of putting questions; but questions lead to nothing. They are not always answered, or if they are answered the replies are not always explicable, and he sometimes finds that he cannot get answers to supplementary questions meant to elicit the meaning of the first answer. Then there is the Amendment on the motion for going into Committee of Supply; but that must relate to the Estimates to be taken in Supply. Moreover, the only thing the new Member can do there to assert his own importance to his constituents is to move the reduction of somebody's salary; but he does not care to do that; he would rather increase the salary, hoping to get it himself some day. Finally, he may move the adjournment of the House; but he does not want the House to adjourn, he wants it to go on sitting until it comes to his subject. These are the five only opportunities on which an independent Member can raise a discussion, and they are altogether inadequate. But there is this sixth; this ancient power of moving an Amendment to the motion that you, Mr. Speaker, do leave the chair, that the House may go into Committee of Ways and Means, a power which it is now sought to abolish.

Now, this Amendment implies no want of confidence in the Government, and it affords an ideal opportunity to a new-Member for bringing forward subjects in which he is interested. I beg the Government to ask themselves whether this proposal does not show a certain want of foresight. The Conservative party will not always be on this side of the House. A Conservative Ministry will not always sit on these benches, and when we cross to the other side and find proposals made by our opponents which we consider revolutionary, or perhaps fatal to the country, then, I think, Conservative Members will bitterly regret the reduction of the opportunities for bringing forward such matters before the legislature and the country. I hardly need adduce many authorities in support of the importance of this rule, but there is one which I would ask the permission of the House to quote, if I am not wearying it. A Committee sat on the procedure of the House in 1861. It was composed of most eminent men, its members comprising Mr. Disraeli, Lord Stanley, Sir John Pakington, Mr. Bright. Sir George Cornwall Lewis, and Lord Palmerston. Now that Committee reported as follows;

"In strict conformity with the ancient usage of the House;"
mark "ancient";

"a motion for going into Committee of Supply or of Ways and Means has offered a legitimate opportunity for full discussion on every variety of subject."

Having laid that down, the Committee proceeded to show the spirit in which the rules of the House should be dealt with, and I say that their words are absolutely admirable.

"On all these occasions;"

when the rules of the House are considered;

"the House and its Committees have proceeded with the utmost caution. They have treated with respect the written and unwritten laws of Parliament which for ages have secured good legislation, perfect freedom of debate, and a due regard for the rights of minorities. This respect for tradition and this caution in making changes have proceeded on the principle that no change is desirable which experience has not proved to be necessary, and that the maintenance of the old rule is preferable to speculative amendment."

No experience has yet proved the necessity for this change, which abolishes, as I have said, an absolutely ideal opportunity for raising the most important of questions. It has been admitted that the power of moving such Amendments has only been used four or five times; on two of them, I think, by myself; during the last twenty years. That is proof itself that there has been no considerable abuse of the right. If this remnant of power left to private Members was so necessary as the Committee said it was in 1861, how much more is it necessary now, when, time after time, something has been taken away from the opportunities of private Members of bringing matters before the House The Chancellor of the Exchequer went one better when he said that this power had not been used for forty years until it had been rediscovered by myself. I do not know whether it was rediscovered by me or not, but if it was, I think I ought to have had better treatment from the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Instead of praising me for unearthing this forgotten arm of the Constitution, he denounced

me for being the author of an abuse. I must say he showed an ingratitude almost appalling; for on each occasion upon which I have taken advantage of the rule, I have, solely for the convenience of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, cut short my speeches so as to deprive them, if not of all power, at any rate of all finish. If he speaks to-night, I expect from him a handsome acknowledgment of this, and if he does not give it to me, I shall be very much disappointed. Now, has there ever been any abuse of this rule? If it has only been taken advantage of five times during the last forty years, and I have availed myself of two of these. What were the subjects brought before the House? My first subject was the interception of the public taxes and their diversion from the public Exchequer. That was, I submit, a subject of first-rate, of the very highest importance, involving something like twenty millions a year being withdrawn from the purview of the House. The second occasion was one on which I introduced a very serious subject; no less than the confessed insolvency of the Post Office Savings Bank. I could not have dealt with either of these subjects adequately upon any one of the other opportunities left to private Members. It cannot be denied that they were subjects of very considerable importance and quite worthy of some debate in this House. Moreover, as I pointed out at the time, the Chancellor of the Exchequer had to wait a very short time before bringing in his Budget. There is no shred of ground for accusing me, nor so far as I know for accusing any one else, of an abuse of this right. If indeed, this motion had been used irregularly; if instead of being used as a legitimate method of bringing on an important debate; if it had been used as an arm of coercion, and caused some Minister to make a doubtful and secret bargain behind the Chair, then it might have been called an abuse, and it might have been open to the animadversion of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. I have not abused the rule; I have only used it for a legitimate purpose; and if I propose to use it again it is with the object of calling attention to most serious treaty engagements for which this country is liable; a subject which cannot be adequately discussed on any other opportunity. I had hoped that Ministers would have had some regard for the traditions, character, and efficacy of this House, even if these do come into competition with their convenience. I beg them to leave to the House some opportunities of showing that it is capable of useful discussion, and I do assure them that it will be safer for them to leave untouched the very few opportunities private Members still possess for earnest discussion of important subjects than to go on shutting down, one by one, the safety valves until there is an explosion. I do implore them to seek rather to limit their own convenience than to silence and suppress private Members. If they would only use a little more care and dexterity in handling the business of the House, Ministers will find that both the House and the Government would gain in every way. The Government are masters of big battalions, and may use them to crush out this last and most important right of the private Member, but if they do that; and I say it with regret; I will not be a party to it. If this motion is pressed, I must inevitably, as having striven to champion the right of private Members, vote against it. I regard the dignity and the efficacy of this House as far

beyond the convenience of Ministers or the interests of party, and I believe that on the dignity and efficacy of this House depends to a very large extent the continued freedom and independence of the British people.

MR. LOUGH (Islington. W.): The right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury made a statement at the beginning of the session that within the past forty or fifty years the power and dignity of the Crown had been an increasing and not a diminishing factor in the Constitution. I think the right hon. Gentleman might have stated that the rights and privileges of Members of this House had during that period greatly diminished, and certainly not increased. Independent Members are slowly being shorn of every privilege which they formerly enjoyed. I think everyone will feel sonic astonishment at the reasons given for the change proposed. I made a note of one or two of the points which were put to us by the right hon. Gentleman. The first statement he made was that this privilege had only been used five times in twenty years. Now, it seems to me that this is not a reason for taking away the privilege, but rather a reason for continuing it. The hon. Member for King's Lynn says that the Chancellor of the Exchequer puts the occasions on which this privilege was exercised as more rare than the First Lord of the Treasury said, but at any rate both of the right hon. Gentlemen agree that it has very seldom been used. The right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury did not give us a single instance in which it was abused. Having been used on five occasions in twenty years, and no occasion whatever of abuse having been stated. I ask, Is it not a, strong measure to take to ask us to sign away this great privilege?

I want you to look at this from another standpoint. The hon. Member for King's Lynn spoke as if only he had made use of this privilege in modern times. I remember a case in which Mr. Knox, who was until lately a Member of this House, moved a resolution with regard to the treatment of Ireland, and he only got the opportunity of making that most interesting motion by giving notice of an Instruction to the Committee of Ways and Means. Then what took place; because this circumstance is very

relevant to our debate; was that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, with his usual courtesy, met the hon. Member and said it would be inconvenient to put off the Budget, but if he would take another day an opportunity would be given him to bring forward his motion. The hon. Member readily agreed, and when he brought forward his motion this House discussed it for a whole day, having had ample notice about it. An hon. Member on the opposite side, who I am sorry to say is not with us now, Mr. Horace Plunkett, supported the motion, with the result that a revolution was brought about in the treatment of Ireland.

I believe the right hon. Gentleman who has brought forward this motion to-day has shown a want of the sense of proportion in his treatment of the subject. We may have one thing done within twenty years in this House that will leave its mark in the history of this country, and if we accomplish one such thing as that by one of the Standing Orders or rules, I think Ministers should have what I will venture to call a reverent feeling for that portion of our procedure which enables the subject to be dealt with. But, as my hon. friend says, the Leader of

the House complains that this right is a very inconvenient one. I would like to ask what he means by inconvenient. He only means inconvenient to himself.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I beg the hon. Gentleman's pardon. I said it might inflict the utmost inconvenience both on the House and the public.

MR. LOUGH: I want to put it argumentatively. I think I can make a stronger point against the right hon. Gentleman if I say that he thinks it inconvenient to the Government.

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

MR. LOUGH: Well, I put it from my standpoint. This right is inconvenient to him. It is a great convenience to me and to every private Member who wants to bring forward important subjects, and every Member ought to guard this right as one of the few he at present possesses. The right hon. Gentleman went on to say that it was peculiarly useless; but it was not useless to Ireland on the occasion to which I referred. That was not a useless occasion of the exercise of privilege. How does he prove that it is useless? Because he says we have the Consolidation and the Appropriation Bills brought before us, and in the discussion of these Bills we can do all that we could do with a special motion. I deny it. When notice is given of the motion, it has to be discussed in an orderly way, and hon. Members come down prepared to give attention to it. That is better than the irrelevant, heartbreaking discussion which we have on the Appropriation Bill. What takes place? You find one Member competing with another to be heard. One Member says to his friend, "You won't be long, as I have something to say," and it is impossible to take more than one division. I believe that if hon. Members would give their attention to the point, they would see that these opportunities do not in the least meet the great opportunity which is given us by this privilege which we have retained so long.

There is one other point. The right hon. Gentleman said that the opportunities for criticism are sufficient. I agree that perhaps the opportunities for criticism are sufficient, and by all we make of our criticism, I think a little less would be quite as useful. A Minister stands up and gives a perfunctory reply or an amiable reply to the criticism. But that is not what we want. We want something done with the subject, and we want to have the opportunity of bringing forward something. I came here to-day to listen with attention to what could be said with regard to the rule, and I have not found a scrap of a word to alter my opinion that this is an infringement of rights which Members on both sides of the House should resist. I am glad that the hon. Gentleman opposite quoted the high authority of Sir Thomas Erskine May. This is really depriving us of the ancient right of bringing forward a grievance before Supply is granted. Generally speaking, we know something of the complaint before it is brought forward, and surely the right of putting down a motion before entering the Committee is one we ought to guard most carefully. This is one of a series of infringements of our rights, particularly by the present Government, and for which the right hon. Gentleman is mainly responsible. The one-clause Bill is another method of infringing our rights. We have Bills introduced to which it is almost impossible to move an Amendment.

Everyone who has watched the course of affairs in South Africa during the last four or five years, will admit that the Government have used all their influence to prevent criticism in this House. Have things gone well with us since Parliamentary criticism was suppressed by the Government? [An HON. MEMBER: Yes.] I do not think that things have gone well with us. We have felt the kindly appeals made to us by the right hon. Gentleman and his colleagues not to prolong debate. We have had them going on steadily since the Jameson raid. It has been stated that negotiations are going on, that the Army is engaged in the field, that there was a Committee appointed, that the matter was sub judice, and that the matter must not be discussed here. On the most important national affairs for the last five or six years we have hardly had one free, full, and effective discussion.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: On a point of order. May I ask whether the hon. Gentleman is in order in what he is now saying? It has nothing whatever to do with the Standing Order we are discussing.

*MR. SPEAKER stated that the hon. Member was not in order in the line he was now taking.

MR. LOUGH: I will strictly observe the riding you have laid down. I feel that it is not unreasonable. I only desired to give one or two examples of the way in which our debates have been restricted. It appears to me a most unfortunate time to make a change in the procedure of this House. Let us look at it for a moment from the standpoint of what the duties of the Committee of Ways and Means are. Its duties are to provide the necessary money;

*MR. SPEAKER: I must remind the hon. Member that the duties of the Committee of Ways and Means are not in the least affected by the motion.

MR. LOUGH: I did not intend to go into detail as to the duties of the Committee of Ways and Means. It seems to me a most inappropriate time to restrict the right of Members who desire to put down Instructions when going into Committee of Ways and Means. I was going to give an illustration to show that, but your ruling makes it inexpedient for me to do so. I am quite sure that Members will see my point. At a time when the national expenditure is so much swollen, and when delicate questions are being dealt with as regards Great Britain and Ireland, it is most inopportune to suggest any restriction of our privileges. I cannot help thinking that the right hon. Gentleman is depending on his majority to get this restriction approved. I am very glad that some protests have already been made by Members on the other side. I would appeal to them to remember that they may not always be sitting behind the Government as they are to-day. They may some day change places with us, and I would ask whether they do not owe a greater allegiance than that of party in this matter. No doubt the Whips will try to make them support the Government, but I think a small advantage gained for the party in power, at the expense of the privileges of the House of Commons, is one which they will afterwards regret.

MR. ELLIOT (Durham): I have heard the appeal the hon. Gentleman has made, that we on this side of the House should not listen to the voices of the Whips. I can only say that, having some little independence. I believe the interests of the country require us to make this small Amendment on the rule under discussion.

There is an extraordinary fallacy underlying the arguments of the hon. Member for West Islington. He seems to think that a gigantic gulf lies between the business of the Government and that of the country. He seems to consider that Members are wanting in true loyalty to the House of Commons because they are anxious to advance the business of the Government. It happens to be the case at the present time; the beginning of a new session of a new Parliament; that the most important business the House of Commons has to do is business which is in the hands of the Government. I support the motion of the light hon. Gentleman not so much on account of the rights of the Government as the rights and privileges of the House of Commons. There is no matter so important as that the House of Commons should reserve to itself full time to discuss the great questions brought before it; but the great questions likely to be brought before it are questions which will be introduced by the Government of the day. I would ask hon. Members, with all sincerity, on the other side of the House, whether the liberties of debate, whether the fulness of debate which we ought to have on all important questions, are not infinitely more in danger, not so much from the Government of the day as from the continual overpressing of the rights of debate by private Members. The real danger to the rights of the House of Commons is to be found in the excessive pressure of individual Members of individual rights, and the forgetting altogether of what is due to the House of Commons itself. I should be out of order if I gave some of the reasons which greatly limit our powers as a House of Commons, and greatly injure the repute in which we are held.

I should like to say one or two words as to the length to which Members have pressed the right of putting questions, whereby an hour of valuable time at the best part of the day is taken away, not, I venture to say, in the interest of the public, and not in the interest of the House of Commons itself. That is one example of the way the House of Commons is injured in its repute. I must say that without any pressure from the Whips I shall go into the lobby without the slightest hesitation in support of the resolution before us. We must remember that the times are serious, and that the business we have to consider is that which it is the duty of the Government to treat as its own, and to defend fearlessly and boldly before the House.

MR. CAINE (Cornwall, Camborne): I listened with the greatest possible attention to the speech of the Leader of the House, but as far as I am concerned he failed to make out the least case for this alteration. One of his chief arguments was that this opportunity which he is now seeking to take away from private Members has been very seldom used. I have no doubt he has brought this motion forward because he fears that this session it will be very often availed of. Why does he fear that? Because almost every opportunity hitherto available for private Members has been swept away. There is the motion to take away our Tuesdays before Easter. Does anybody suppose, if that motion is carried, we shall get those Tuesdays back? No; they will be gone for the session. In consequence of this ruthless seizure of their opportunities, the private Members are thrown back upon the method aimed at by this resolution. I hope the motion will be defeated, and defeated by the help of the independent Members on the

other side of the House. There are many, especially the Liberal Unionists, who come here pledged as independent supporters of the Government. I hope that they will not be content with cheering the excellent speech of the hon. Member for King's Lynn, but that they will by their votes let the Government see that this constant encroachment on the time of private Members is resented on both sides of the House.

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.): The remarks of my hon. friend the Member for Durham seem to suggest really that we had better wind up all discussion and all questions, and simply come here to register the decrees of the majority of the House for the time being. I must protest against any such view. I have always been a supporter of the rights of unofficial Members. I agree they must use their rights with discretion; but the question we are now discussing seems to be somewhat unfortunate. The Leader of the House stated that this right has been exercised so very rarely during the last twenty years that he now proposes to take it away in perpetuity.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That observation of mine has been so often misused during this debate that perhaps the House will allow me to repeat what I did say. I said that before last year the opportunity had not been used more than five times in the twenty years, but that last year it was used, and this year it is being used, in my judgment, to the great inconvenience of the House and the country.

MR. BARTLEY: That is very easily explained. The tendency to increase the use of this method is simply because the means by which unofficial Members can act are becoming every year fewer. What have we left now? After the Address is voted, the only way, practically speaking, in which any subject can be brought forward is by moving the adjournment of the House. That is a measure hostile to the Government, and one requiring the support of forty Members. It is a step very few Members care to take, except in a matter of extreme importance, and it is a movement almost entirely limited to the Opposition side. The real secret of the objection to this change is that the semi-official Member is becoming less and less a means of raising those questions for which he is sent to this House. The question of importance is a matter really which the House itself must decide. I can conceive that this session there may be many questions arise which certainly would be very fairly brought up under this rule; but if this opportunity is taken away there will be no possible way for any of us to raise any question, except by moving the adjournment of the House. The whole reason of the present trouble is that Parliament ought to have met a little earlier. It is all very well to say that everything is left and that there is great pressure. The real thing is that the Government met so late, and now desire to make up for it by depriving unofficial Members of the small amount of time left at their disposal. It is rather hard upon us that we should be thus treated. The hon. Member for King's Lynn appears to be the chief offender in this matter in having ventured to take advantage of this rule. I very much regret if the rule has been improperly used, but I have not heard a single suggestion that any frivolous or unimportant matter has been brought forward. It is a pity, especially at the present time, when this rule has not been abused, but has been

used, as all agree, only for the purpose of bringing forward very important matters, that the Government, which has such an enormous majority, should use its power to curtail our rights. I am afraid we are becoming a very despotic nation. We are ruled with a rod of iron. We give our allegiance to the Government, and are very glad to support it in every way we can, but it is somewhat hard that when it has unlimited power it should deprive unofficial Members of the one last remnant of the powers we used to enjoy.

MR. GEORGE WHITELEY (Yorkshire, W.E., Pudsey): The Leader of the House contended that this practice was an inconvenience to the House and the country. I venture to ask the right hon. Gentleman how and in what way it is so. Is it an inconvenience to the country to read in its morning papers debates in this House upon matters that are of very great interest to it, and of very much greater interest than many of the propositions placed before the House by the Government? With regard to the House itself, wherein lies the inconvenience to private Members, who, after all is said and done, are the bulk of the House at present? I venture to say that if the right hon. Gentleman would take away the crack of the party whip, or if the division upon the point were by ballot, a very large majority of the party opposite would object to this alteration of the rule, and it would be defeated by a very large plurality. Five motions have been made under this rule during the last twenty years. Can the right hon. Gentleman conscientiously say that a right which has been practised only five times in twenty years has been an inconvenience to the House, the country, the Government, or anybody else? The hon. Member for Durham told us that the great questions of the day were introduced by the Government. I refer the hon. Member to the King's Speech, in order that he may see and judge for himself what are the great questions of the day. Is the question of the alteration of the law with regard to;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The hon. Member is straying from the subject under discussion.

MR. GEORGE WHITELEY: I will simply ask, what opportunity has the House for dealing with the great questions of the day? Even in regard to Amendments to the Address, a Member who puts down a motion is frequently precluded from bringing it on, because, in the first place, Bills are introduced dealing with the subject, or, in the second place, the debate is closed at a very early period. So far as the private Member is concerned, he has now hardly any rights whatever. A time will come when the liberal party will be in a majority in this House, and it will be in the interest of hon. Members opposite to bring forward motions dealing with various matters in order, I will not say to obstruct, but, at any rate, to cry a halt to legislation which they think injurious to the country. Hon. Members will then look back to this afternoon and regret that they made such a fundamental alteration in the regulations of the House. If this were made a temporary or sessional, instead of a permanent alteration, it would be better; at any rate, we should have some experience of its working before it was stereotyped. Could the motion not be moved in such a form as to give it a six months trial before the alteration becomes a fundamental part of the constitutional rules and regulations of the House which cannot be altered?

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): On behalf of the Irish party, I desire to join in the protest against this new inroad on the rights of private Members. The First Lord of the Treasury made, absolutely no case for the proposed alteration. He unquestionably left the House under the impression that the effect of the alteration would be to place us in the same position as regards the motion for going into Committee of Ways and Means as we now stand in with regard to the motion for going into Committee of Supply. But, as the hon. Member for King's Lynn pointed out, the proposed alteration places us in a much worse position. The only really substantial ground the right hon. Gentleman attempted to give against the right now enjoyed was, that it gave private Members the opportunity of throwing the Budget speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer into the background, and that it imported an element of uncertainty as to the night upon which the Budget would be introduced. To anybody who follows the proceedings of the House that objection is utterly absurd, because the motions complained of are made only after notice has been given, generally after notice of long standing. If such a notice appears on the Paper everybody knows that the first business will not be the Chancellor's statement. That, therefore, is a very frivolous ground on which to seek to justify a serious departure from the practice of the House as it has existed for three centuries. The right hon. Gentleman knows perfectly well that these matters are matters of arrangement, and it would always be easy to arrange so that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would not be called until half-past eight or nine o'clock.

I object to this resolution as part and parcel of a system which has been enforced since this Government came into office with far greater stringency and disregard of the rights of the House than at any previous time during my recollection of the House. That system has been gradually and steadily to contract the area of the rights of private Members. It is all very fine for the right hon. Gentleman to spring up and indignantly deny that he had spoken of the convenience of Ministers or of the Government. Everybody knows the object of these successive invasions of the rights of private Members. There is really no other ground on which they are based than the convenience of Ministers and those who have the conduct of the business of the House. We are told that things are in such a condition now, that times are serious, and that the number of days before the end of the financial year is limited. Who is responsible for that? The condition of the country is the work of the Government. The limit of the time at our disposal is the work of the Government, because they, with a fuller knowledge than anybody else, could have of the business to be done, fixed the date of the meeting of Parliament. Therefore the only substantial justification put forward is the convenience of Ministers in carrying through Government business. The logical conclusion of that argument is that private Members should have no rights whatever, that the House of Commons should be simply a voting machine, and that the proposals of the Government should be explained by Ministers and forthwith voted upon.

The right hon. Gentleman referred to the various opportunities still left to private Members to bring forward their views, especially pointing to the Second and Third Readings of the Appropriation Bill and the Consolidated Fund Bill. But

he forgot to tell the House that, as I believe, for the first time in its history, he and the Ministry last session, in pursuance of this system, put in front of the Second Reading of the Consolidated Fund Bill three Government measures. That course of action was protested against by members of the party opposite, but their protest was futile. It is perfectly open to the Government, by an extension of the policy of last year, to deprive us altogether of that opportunity also. What security have we that that course will not be pursued, and that the next thing will be to take away the right of discussing the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill, which would require no alteration of the Standing Orders, but an act of discretion on the part of the Government? This is a proposal which I believe is unparalleled in the history of the House, and which threatens private Members with the destruction of their rights and privileges. For these reasons I most strongly protest against this innovation of our rights, which, I take it, is only a symptom and a sign of what we are to expect.

*MR. DISRAELI (Cheshire, Altrineham): I desire to appeal to the Leader of the House to limit the period of this change to the present session. Like my hon. friend the Member for Durham, I consider that the times are serious, and I think that is a very good reason why this rule should be passed. Experience in the past has shown that this privilege has never been much abused, and I hope my right hon. friend will be able to see his way to make it apply only to this session.

MR. FIELD (Dublin. St. Patrick): As a private Member I desire to protest against the introduction of this rule, either as a sessional or a permanent order. My experience has been that since the Conservative Government came into power private Members have been deprived almost of all their private rights in this House. Private Members can now only move Amendments to the Address and ask questions, and for the remainder of the session they seem to have no other legislative functions. If this process goes on much longer private Members will have absolutely no rights at all. It will come to this, that Members of Parliament will come here simply to vote Supplies and sit in Ways and Means, and take up such Government Bills as may be proposed by the party in power. I would ask the right hon. Gentleman to seriously consider this question, and to remember that in the past history of this Parliament many of the most important reforms which were passed into law were introduced by private Members, and not as Government measures.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The question of legislation by private Members does not arise.

MR. FIELD: I bow to your ruling. Mr. Speaker; but my point is that, according to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman who introduced this motion, it is proposed to take away the time of private Members and the right to bring in legislation. It appears to me, if this motion is allowed to pass, that undoubtedly in the future private Members' rights will be much less than they are at the present time, and as an Irish Member, coming here with certain instructions from my constituents, undoubtedly my sphere of usefulness will be considerably shortened by this proposal. Some right hon. Members and hon.

Members on the other side, including the hon. Member for King's Lynn, have spoken in a satirical way of private Members; but what do we come here for? Private Members are elected by constituents, and they are generally charged by them with the conveying of certain distinct grievances to this House, and if this process goes on what opportunity will be left for a private Member to bring forward his grievances? We are now being closed and suppressed, and the result is that private Members might as well stay at home as come and sit in this Parliament. Every hon. Member who comes to this House is charged by his constituents to bring forward some measure or other to remove a grievance in his Division, and when he gets here he finds out that there is no means of bringing the matter before the House. He may put down a private Bill, but, according to the system adopted by the present Government, the rights of private Members are being gradually extinguished, and unless they take part in the debate on measures brought forward by the Government they have absolutely no power of making themselves heard in this House of Commons. Many of the questions brought forward by the Government are of immense importance as a rule, but the measures brought forward by private Members;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; I must remind the hon. Member that the question of measures brought forward by the Government or by private Members has nothing whatever to do with this Amendment.

MR. FIELD: I know that the closure which it is sought to inflict upon us by this motion confines us very much in this discussion, but I thought the point I was raising was relevant. I will simply wind up by saying that as a private Member I protest in the strongest possible way against the extinction of the right of free speech which ought to belong to every Member of this Assembly. We are sent here to exercise the right of free speech with respect to whatever grievance may apply to our constituents, and I enter my protest against this closure motion being accepted either as a sessional or a perpetual order.

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS (Glasgow, Camlachie): I cannot hope to add a single argument to what has already been said upon this question, but I must say that I have some sympathy with the Gentlemen on the front bench upon this occasion. I know that there are some hon. Members of this House, who can hardly be described as private Members, who take every opportunity afforded them of talking, and I think that is mainly the reason why it has become necessary, in the public interest, to curtail some of those opportunities afforded to private Members in this House. What weighs with me on an occasion of this sort in voting away a privilege and a right of ancient standing is the consideration of what may be before us in times to come. No doubt there are some Members on this side of the House who have a regard for ancient traditions of this kind, and who bear in mind that there may come occasions upon which it may be necessary for private Members on this side to avail themselves of occasions like those to which this rule applies. I venture again to express my expectation that possibly the right hon. Gentleman and the Front Bench may content themselves with making this a sessional order, which would allow us to see how it worked, and which might enable us to find some other arrangement by which a restriction less extreme than this might come into force. I will not venture to

add one word about the privileges of private Members, with which I sympathise very much. There are many questions which may be raised by private Members, and which when pressed upon the attention of the Front Bench give us a chance of bringing forward legislation, whereas if this alteration is made permanent we may be deprived of that chance.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.): Having in former times occupied a similar position, I can naturally sympathise with the Gentlemen on the front bench opposite, and especially with the Chancellor of the Exchequer, on the present occasion. I feel almost bound to say a word or two to explain why it is that I intend to vote against the motion which my right hon. friend has brought forward. Governments representing both sides of the House have, in former times, often been hard pressed in this respect, but it has never before been found necessary to ask for this reduction in the time which is left to the unofficial Members of the House. I feel that the objection which has been taken to this practice arises out of the delaying of the Budget last year, and I certainly would, in the interests of all, ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer to take any remedy which is necessary to prevent

that occurring again. I am not surprised at the amount of irritation that was caused by the course taken by the hon. Member for King's Lynn in delaying the Budget statement last year, but I do think that when particular incidents of that kind arise they ought not to govern our action in dealing with the general principle of this Amendment. I would remind the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury and the Chancellor of the Exchequer of the old proverb which says; "Those who play bowls must expect to meet with rubbers." The persons who are entrusted by the majority of this House with conducting the business of the country ought not to be treated at all as the antagonists of any class of Members in this House, and if, as in the case of Supply, I saw that things had been abused, or likely to be abused, I should certainly support this motion. But it is admitted that this motion can only affect three occasions in the course of the session, unless we come to some extraordinary demand in the midst of the session, like the war loan or any other unexpected expenditure. If the Government is called upon to make some extraordinary demand upon this House, then it is quite right that the House should have an opportunity of discussing not only that particular Vote, but also the policy which rendered it necessary, and the opportunity which you get upon such an occasion for discussion is totally different to the opportunity which is given in Committee of Supply.

Discussions on Votes of Supply are naturally limited in character, and are very properly confined to the limitations which belong to those particular Votes. I think that the most important occasion upon which unofficial Members are offered opportunities by this rule is the power of challenging general policy. In regard to the interposition of unimportant matters which might threaten to delay the introduction of the Budget resolutions, the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Government can always protect themselves by a resolution giving precedence to the Budget over any other motions, and that will secure for the Government all that they require. By this means you will obviate that inconvenience, which I am sure everybody wishes to avoid, and you will not part with this

general principle, which I think is to the advantage of the House of Commons, for it gives you the opportunity of opening and discussing large questions which you could not otherwise discuss. I confess myself that I was always extremely reluctant to use the closure in reference to financial questions. When we had a very fierce debate upon financial questions, I flatter myself that I never used the closure once. I do not believe that the House will gain any power or advantage by making this alteration. I think the Government have all the security which they need in regard to the two occasions upon which we can raise a general debate upon the policy of the Government; at the end of the financial year, in the month of April, and again at the end of the session, when you can review all that has taken place; and therefore I am not willing to deprive hon. Members of the House of an opportunity which they have enjoyed from time immemorial.

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): I am very reluctant to detain the House, but as this matter specially affects the Department over which I preside, I hope I may be permitted to say a few words. In the first place, I can assure the right hon. Gentleman opposite and the House that in proposing this amendment of the Standing Order we have not any idea of depriving hon. Members of opportunities of discussing general questions of policy which ought properly to be discussed. My right hon. friend the Leader of the House has during the course of the last three sessions, whenever he has been asked to give an opportunity of this kind, afforded it to the House by giving preference to some Vote connected with the subject on the Notice Paper. Of course, I am speaking of questions in which the country is generally interested. My right hon. friend has constantly, by putting down some Vote of Supply on a particular night, and by making arrangements of that sort, afforded those opportunities, and I am sure the right hon. Gentleman opposite will at once admit that in this respect he has fairly met the desire of the House. But this is not all, for my right hon.

friend has altered the rule with regard to the number of days to be devoted to Votes in Supply, so as to give additional facilities during the present session for the discussion of a Vote of an important military character. That, I think, is another instance of the way my right hon. friend has constantly endeavoured to meet the desires of the House. But what we are dealing with now is a matter of a very different character. The hon. Member for King's Lynn has taken me to task for protesting against the manner in which he used his power under the existing rule of moving an Amendment on the order for going into Committee of Ways and Means. I did find fault with the hon. Gentleman, and I do so now, for I do not think it is quite fair to say that no instance of any abuse of that rule has been alleged to the House, for the hon. Member himself has admitted that the rule was abused. What happened? I remember perfectly well that towards the close of last session the House was expecting to hear a statement from me upon the mode of finding additional means for the prosecution of the war, and the hon. Member for King's Lynn intervened with a motion upon a subject which may have been a matter of importance in regard to receipts being intercepted without being paid into the Exchequer. He made a speech on that subject, and although he

said it was a matter of importance and a matter of great interest to those who take an interest in financial questions, no other Member of the House took any part in that debate. I made a short reply, and there the matter ended. The hon. Member himself must have felt that his motion was ill-timed, because he has admitted that he did not and could not do justice to his subject under the circumstances, because he felt that the House was not prepared for a long speech. If that was the case, what was the good of the privilege to him if he could not do justice to the subject?

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Simply because I did not press my right under that rule. Had I done so, I could have driven the Budget into the next day.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: It has been said that motions of this sort have been made only five times during a long period of years. If this is true how can we by proposing to repeal the existing power seriously curtail the rights of private Members, who have so seldom taken advantage of these opportunities of raising a debate? It is because this power has been discovered and exercised that the Government are anxious to prevent it becoming a gross abuse and a serious interference with the proper conduct of business in this House. This House has felt it necessary, with the general consent of both sides, to curtail the opportunities for moving amendments on the motion that the Speaker do leave the chair on going into Committee of Supply. Is it seriously contended that this power, which has been restricted in relation to Supply, should remain unlimited in connection with the Committee of Ways and Means? My light hon. friend in moving this motion referred to the small number of occasions in the course of the session on which we have to place on the Paper the order for Committee of Ways and Means.

I will endeavour to explain to the House, if I am not detaining it, precisely what happens. I think the occasions when such power may be exercised have been somewhat underrated by my right hon. friend and others. First of all there is the invariable motion after the passing of the Supplementary Estimates. This has always been taken, ever since I can remember, as a matter of course, until this year, when two notices of Amendments to the motion that the Speaker leave the chair have been placed on the Paper. Now it is proposed that our proceedings at the close of the financial year, when every day and every hour is always important, in order that financial business may close within the legal time, should be interfered with by motions of this kind. Then the next occasion is the annual Budget. The right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down entirely agrees with me that to interpose with a motion such as my hon. friend the Member for King's Lynn placed on the Paper, relating perhaps to the foreign affairs of the country generally, upon the Budget night would be an abuse; and it is proposed that this possibility shall be met by a special resolution which, I suppose, will enable the Budget resolutions to be taken before the Amendment can be moved. What would that motion be? I suppose that it would be that the hon. Member who had placed a notice of Amendment on the Paper should not be heard, or that the Speaker should leave the chair without question put on that particular occasion. But, whatever the motion was, there would be nothing to prevent it being debated the whole evening. It is not because I happen to be

Chancellor of the Exchequer that I say that nothing more inconvenient to the House, or even to the country, could take place. The whole course of the business of the session might be upset by the postponement in this manner of the Budget resolutions. I remember that on one occasion, when Mr. Gladstone was Chancellor of the Exchequer, some loquacious and industrious Member had put a notice of motion of this kind on the Paper. Mr. Gladstone made an appeal to the hon. Member, and he did not press his motion. [HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!] Yes, but hon. Members are not all so anxious that the business of the House should be conducted. Mr. Gladstone said on that occasion that if the hon. Member had not given way he would have been compelled to make his Budget statement with the Speaker in the chair. What would have been the result of that? After the statement had been made some hon. Member might have got up and moved a motion, which might have been debated all night, with the result that there would have been no time for the Budget resolutions to be taken. No one knew better than the right hon. Gentleman opposite how utterly the whole finance of the country might have been disorganised by such a procedure. I venture to say that by no means except by passing some general resolution such as that proposed, can you possibly prevent a thing of that kind from taking place.

But I go on to a further case. Throughout the consideration of the Budget by the House every year cases might arise in which it would be necessary again to set up the Committee of Ways and Means, so that there might be many occasions during the progress of an important Budget on which these motions might be interposed. Finally, the same thing might happen at the end of the session, when the Appropriation Bill had to be founded on a resolution in Committee of Ways and Means. The hon. Member for King's Lynn referred to the Committee of 1861, but, contrasting the conduct of business in those days with the manner in which we are now forced to conduct it, I am certain that if those gentlemen who passed the resolutions of 1861 had had to deal with the difficulties that any Government has to deal with nowadays they would have been compelled to take steps to secure greater facilities for the conduct of business than they thought necessary then. Many hon. friends on this side of the House appear to think that by passing this Amendment we would be depriving ourselves of some very important weapon which might be used against hon. Gentlemen opposite should they ever get into power again. Although at one time I attached some importance to views of that kind, I have seen enough now of the proceedings of the House to be perfectly certain that no party, however anxious to stop legislation, can do so by mere obstruction of this kind. This means of bringing forward Amendments, which has been rediscovered by the hon. Member for King's Lynn, has been abused already, and unless the House, in the interest of the proper conduct of business, is prepared in some way to deal with it, it will be abused much more seriously in future.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs): The right hon. Gentleman has made a very interesting speech in support of the motion, but I confess that he has not convinced me that the Government are justified in the course they are taking. There are two things obvious: first, that this is a party motion to be carried by a party majority, and, second, that even the party which supports the right

hon. Gentleman is by no means unanimous in favour of his motion, because of the five hon. Members who have spoken, four have condemned it. The result is that the right hon. Gentleman comes forward with a motion for amending the Standing Order, and that he is using his overwhelming majority to make a fundamental alteration in the rules of the House. But that is not all. The very case which the right hon. Gentleman puts forward for his resolution is, in my opinion, the best case against it. The right hon. Gentleman says that the rule has not been abused. It is true that the right hon. Gentleman intimated that there was an occasion when it might have been abused; when an hon. Member put down a motion the evening on which Mr. Gladstone was about to introduce his Budget; but that motion was withdrawn when the hon. Member was appealed to. The only other case was when the hon. Member for King's Lynn had a motion on the Paper, but in deference to the wishes of the House, and on an appeal by the right hon. Gentleman himself, that debate was kept so short that only one hon. Gentleman spoke. I maintain, therefore, that no case has been brought forward by the Government which tends to show that there has been any abuse of the rule. It would be impossible on a Budget night for any hon. Member to bring forward a motion on a frivolous pretext to interfere with the business which the House and country were waiting to hear. It seems to me that a case has not been made out by the Government for a resolution which should only have been brought forward for sound reasons. It is a curious thing that this motion should be brought at a time when private Members have hardly any privileges left, and it is not very difficult for the House to see that there may come a time when we shall not have so courteous a Leader of the House or Chancellor of Exchequer as we have now; it is quite conceivable that a time may come when, by means of this motion, the whole of the privileges of private Members will be taken away. It is because this is one of the last few remaining privileges possessed by private Members; one of the only opportunities we have of bringing motions before the House; that I object to this motion being passed. The motion now before the House simply means that on the Budget night or on Budget resolutions the Speaker will leave the chair without question put, which will preclude any subject arising on Budget night being discussed. Therefore the Opposition would, in my opinion, be

neglecting their duty in supporting this motion. It seems to me that the Government have not made out their case in favour of this proposal, and they have shown no urgency whatever; and, as no ground has been shown, I think it is a case where independent Members on both sides of the House should join in making an emphatic protest.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): I wish to call to the recollection of the Government what took place with regard to the Agricultural Rates Act and the application of its principle to Ireland by this very privilege. It will be within the recollection of Members that in the last Parliament Mr. Vesey Knox, Member for Londonderry at the time, moved that the principle of the Rates Act should

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork N.E.

Dunn, Sir William
M'Kenna, Reginald
Allan, William (Gateshead)
Ellis, John Edward
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud
Emmott, Alfred
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
Ambrose, Robert
Evans, Sir F. H. (Maidstone)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert H.
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Atherley-Jones, L.
Fenwick, Charles
Mooney, John J.
Bartley, George C. T.
Field, William
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Morton, Edw. J.C. (Devonport)
Blake, Edward
Flynn, James Christopher
Moulton, John Fletcher
Boland, John
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Murphy, J.
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Furness, Sir Christopher
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Boyle, James
Gilhooly, James
Newnes, Sir George
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Brigg, John
Grant, Corrie
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Brown, Geo. M. (Edinburgh)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Norman, Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Haldane, Richard Burdon

O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Burke, E. Haviland-
Hammond, John
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'ry Mid
Burns, John
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Burt, Thomas
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
O'Connor, James(Wicklow, W)
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Caine, William Sproston
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Caldwell, James
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.
O'Dowd, John
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Hobhouse, C.E.H.(Bristol, E.)
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Carew, James Laurence
Holland, William Henry
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon, N
Causton, Richard Knight
Horniman, Frederick John
O'Malley, William
Channing, Francis Allston
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
O'Mara, James
Cogan, Denis J.
Jones, David B. (Swansea)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Jones, Win. (Carnarvonshire)
Partington, Oswald
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Jordan, Jeremiah
Perks, Robert William
Craig, Robert Hunter
Joyce, Michael
Pickard, Benjamin

Crean, Eugene
Kearley, Hudson E.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Crombie, John William
Lambert, George
Price, Robert John
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Rea, Russell
Cullinan, J.
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (Accrington)
Reckitt, Harold James
Daly, James
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Reddy, M.
Dalziel, James Henry
Leng, Sir John
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Levy, Maurice
Renwick, George
Delany, William
Lloyd-George, David
Rickett, J. Compton
Dillon, John
Lough, Thomas
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Lundon, W.
Russell, T. W.
Donelan, Captain A.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Doogan, P. C.
M'Dermott, Patrick
Schwann, Charles E.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
M'Govern, T.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Dully, William J.
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
Shipman, Dr. John G.

be applied to Ireland. That was rejected when the Bill was before the House.
Next session his attention was called to this rule, and he put down a motion.
The Government, in order to get rid of the difficulty, gave him a night, and,
although he was beaten in the division upon the application of the principle of

the Agricultural Rates Act. the Government, a fortnight afterwards, came down and applied the principle of the Rates Act to Ireland, and gave Ireland £;600,000; so that on that occasion at any rate this privilege resulted in a benefit to Ireland. It is a privilege I am not going to part with if I can help it.

Question put.

The House divided:;Ayes, 161; Noes, 255. (Division List No. 32.)

Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire

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

Whiteley, George(York, W. R.)

Soames, Arthur Wellesley

Trevelyan, Charles Philips

Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)

Soares, Ernest J.

Tully, Jasper

Whittaker, Thomas Palmer

Spencer, lit. Hn. C. R(N'thants)

Wallace, Robert

Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)

Sullivan, Donal

Walton, John L. (Leeds, S.)

Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)

Taylor, Theodore Cooke

Warner, Thos. Courtenay T.

Yoxall, James Henry

Tennant, Harold John

Wason, Eugene(Clackmannan

Thomas, A. (Carmarthen, E.)

White, George (Norfolk),

TELLERS FOR THE AYES;

Thomas, A. (Glamorgan, E.)

White, Luke (York, E. R.)

Mr. Herbert Gladstone and

Thomasm Freeman-(Hastings

White, Patrick (Meath, North)

Mr. M'Arthur.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Cranborne, Viscount

Howard, J. (Midx., Tottenhm)

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Cubitt, Hon. Henry

Holder, Hon. James Hy. Cecil

Aird, Sir John

Cust, Henry John C.

Hudson, George Bickersteth

Allhusen, Augustus Hy. Eden
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)
Allsopp, Hon. George
Dewar, T. R(T'r H'm'l'ts, S. Geo.
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Johnstone, Hey wood (Sussex)
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Kenyon, Hn. G. T. (Denbigh)
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred. D.
Kenyon, James (Lanes., Bury)
Atkinson, Kt. Hon. John
Douglas, Kt. Hon. A. Akers-
Keswick, William
Bagot, Capt. Josceline Fitz Roy
Duke, Henry Edward
Kimber, Henry
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Win. Hart
Knowles, Lees
Baird, John George Alexander
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Lambton, Hon. Frederick W.
Balcarres, Lord
Elliot, Hn. A. Ralph Douglas
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Baldwin, Alfred
Fardell, Sir T. George
Lawrence, William F.
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A.J. (Manch'r
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Lawson, John Grant
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W(Leeds
Fielden, Edw, Broekle hurst
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Balfour, Maj K R(Christchurch

Finch, George H.
Leighton, Stanley
Banbury, Frederick George
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Leveson-Gower, Fred. N. S.
Banes, Major George Edward
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. K.
Barry, Sir Francis T.(Windsor)
Fisher, William Hayes
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose-
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (Bristol, S.)
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Lowe, Francis William
Beach, Rt. Hn. W. W. B(Hants
Flower, Ernest
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Beckett, Ernest William
Forster, Henry William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Foster, Sir M. (London Univ.
Lucas, Col. Francis(Lowestoft
Bignold, Arthur
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H(City of Lond.
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Bigwood, James
Gordon, Hn. J. E.(Elgin & Nairn
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Bill, Charles
Gordon, Maj. Evans-(TrH'mlts
Macdona, John Gumming
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-
Maconochie, A. W.
Bond, Edward
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
M'Calmont Col. J. (Antrim, E.
Boulnois, Edmund
Goulding, Edward Alfred

Majendie, James A. H.
Bousfield, William Robert
Graham, Henry Robert
Malcolm, Ian
Bowles. Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St, John
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Greene, Sir E W (Bry S Edm'lids
Max well, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Brown, Alexander H.(Shropsh.
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Grenfell, William Henry
Milton, Viscount
Carlile, William Walter
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Milward, Colonel Victor
Cautley, Henry Strother
Hain, Edward
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lanes.)
Hall, Edward Marshall
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derby shire
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott(Hants.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Hambro, Charles Eric
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Lord G.(Mid'x
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J(Birm.
Hamilton, Mar(i of (L'nd'nderry
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Chamberlain, J. Austen(Wore.
Harris, F. Leverton (Tyuemth.
Morgan, David J (Walth'mstow
Chapman, Ed ward
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Morrell, George Herbert

Charrington, Spencer
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Heath, J. (Staffords, N.W.)
Morrison, James Archibald
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Heaton, John Henniker
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Cochrane, Hon. Trios. H. A. E.
Helder, Augustus
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Coddington, Sir William
Henderson, Alexander
Murray, Rt. Hon A. G. (Bute)
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Hoare, E. Brodie (Hampstead)
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Hobhouse, H. (Somerset, E.)
Nicholson, William Graham
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
Hogg, Lindsay
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Hope, J. F. (Sheff'ld, Brightsde.
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Cook, Frederick Lucas
Horner, Frederick William
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Parkes, Ebenezer
Cox, Irwin Edw. Bainbridge
Hoult, Joseph
Pemberton, John S. G.
Penn, John
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Tufnell, Col. Edward
Percy, Earl
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Valentia, Viscount
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.
Plummer, Walter R.

Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Wason, JohnCathcart(Orkney
Pretymann, Ernest George
Seton-Karr, Henry
Webb, Colonel William George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E(Tauntn
Purvis, Robert
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Pym, C. Guy
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Whiteley, H.(Asbton-under-L.
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Remnant, James Farquharson
Spear, John Ward
Wills, Sir Frederick
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Rentoul. James Alexander
Stanley, Lord (Lanes.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Staly bridge
Stewart. Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Ridley, S. Forde(Bethnal Green
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Wilson, J. W.(Worcestersh. N.
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Stock, James Henry
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Stone, Sir Benjamin

Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Stroyan, John
Wylie, Alexander
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Round, James
Talbot. Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES;

Royds, Clement Molyneux
Thornton, Percy M.
Sir William Walrond and
Rutherford, John
Tollemache, Henry James

Mr. Anstruther.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (FINANCIAL BUSINESS).

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think the House is already familiar with all the reasons for the motion which I now move. They are substantially the same as those we offered to the House last week when a similar motion was before it, although they are now of greater urgency. On the present occasion I would remind the House exactly how our financial business stands so far as the principle is concerned. If my motion is agreed to there are only twelve days for effective Supply before Monday, the 25th inst. On that day we must introduce the Consolidated Fund Bill in order to comply with the law. In two days we obtained ten Supplementary Votes out of twenty-nine, not a very promising beginning. We have to take large Supplementary Estimates, and we have to take, both as regards the Army and the Navy, but perhaps especially as regards the Army, a most important discussion upon the Speaker leaving the chair; and my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War proposes on Friday next to make his speech on the Army Estimates. I do not see how it is possible to get through this mass of work before the 25th unless the privileges which we ask for are granted. On the present occasion the House will see we ask for no privileges except as regards finance. We do not ask for privileges for legislative work of any kind outside the necessities of the law, and we do not ask for Wednesdays, though, if the House insists upon discussing the Estimates at great length, I may be driven, much against my will, to ask for privileges as regards Wednesdays before the 25th.

I make this request with great reluctance. I have been attacked on both sides of the House by Gentlemen who seem to think I am an enemy of the privileges of unofficial Members. That is entirely untrue. I have always done my very best as Leader of the House to give private Members the fullest opportunity of criticising the Government, and I think my action in that respect will compare

favourably with that of my predecessors. I take it it is a fact that at present we lose something materially by not having those opportunities on Tuesdays of general discussion upon subjects outside the business of Supply, or the Budget, or the business of legislation. And it is also perfectly true that when the House retains its privilege in this respect it usually shows its appreciation by a count out; but something might be done, though I make no promise, to secure a certain number of days, at all events, in the session on which abstract resolutions may be brought before the House. In the meantime, having regard to the necessities of the hour, if the House intends to comply with the law, it should take Tuesdays for financial business.

We have been told that this is a state of things for which the Government is responsible in not having called Parliament together earlier. That is a most unjustifiable statement on the part of hon. Members, seeing that the House had an autumn session. [A VOICE: A very short one.] Not a very long autumn session; but if these days which are now asked for had been added it would have made it abnormally long, and I saw no reason, and see no reason, why this House should be asked to meet earlier than it did. If the question had been put to them, and hon. Members had been allowed to vote according to their inclinations, as to whether the House should be called together on the 14th February or a week earlier. I wonder how the division would have gone. I am tolerably certain that the most officious of my critics would have said they were directly opposed to not giving the House a holiday. I am myself indifferent to the criticisms as to whether or not the House ought to have been called together earlier. As regards the present, we are bound to obey the law, and if the exhibition which we have had for the last two days continues we may have to ask not only for Tuesdays but for Wednesdays also. But I take no right to interfere with Tuesdays, except for Supply, and, therefore, if the House decides to dispose of Supply, the Tuesdays will be restored to private Members, and have no doubt, if the House is offered the plain choice of either discussing and passing the Estimates, or breaking the law, which they will choose. Under these circumstances I hope the resolution I now beg to move will be accepted.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, until Easter, Financial Business do have precedence on Tuesday whenever set down by the Government, and that the provisions of Standing Order No. 50 be extended to that day.";(Mr. Balfour.)

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am one of those who, as the right hon. Gentleman rightly says and suggests, that the House should have met earlier, and whose suggestion he treated with no little ignominy and scorn, and upon that ground I cannot agree to this proposal. I quite admit that the right hon. Gentleman, having placed himself in the position in which he stands, can make out a strong case for taking Tuesday, Wednesday, and every other day in the week. But this is not the way to conduct important business of this House, above all the business of Supply, where everything that has to be done is to be done with a sort of Damocles' sword hanging over one's head. We are told that we have to pass these Votes, however large they may be, on a certain day, to do which we must curb our inclinations to discuss them in the manner in which we consider they ought to be discussed. This is not the first time the House of Commons has

been asked to take a similar course, but I have never known an occasion such as this in which it was so obvious beforehand what the result would be. There is no novelty whatever in it; the only novelty is the unusual size of the Supplementary Estimates; we knew they would be excessive, but we never had the slightest idea that, at a time when we were to be asked to meet great demands for war expenditure, the Civil Service Estimates would exceed by a million the normal Estimates. In my humble judgment it was the Government's business to have foreseen that the present state of affairs would arise, and to have provided for it by calling Parliament together sooner. Being in this dilemma, the Government are reduced to taking these strong measures. But that does not make me regard the strong measures with the less dislike, and as a protest against them I shall certainly vote against the motion.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.) felt bound to protest against the course which had been taken by the Government. The Government would, he thought, get through their financial business much more quickly and much more satisfactorily if they showed some disposition to meet the views of hon. Members, and allowed them to have, retained Tuesdays for discussing subjects in which they were interested. There was no reason why the Government should not get through their financial business without special procedure, and he was bound to protest against the motion.

MR. DALY (Monaghan, S.) expressed his great surprise at the proposals before the House. He thought it was hardly worth the while of the right hon. Gentleman to make the suggestion that he would only interfere with Tuesdays in order to take financial business, because after that was disposed of hon. Gentlemen would no doubt find the Government Whips at
AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex F.
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Cust, Henry John C.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Aird, Sir John
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Kenyon, James (Lanes., Bury)
Allhusen, Augustus H. Eden
Dewar, T. R. (T'rH'ml'ts, S. Geo.
Keswick, William
Allsopp, Hon. George
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Kimber, Henry
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph C.
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph

Knowles, Lees
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Duke, Henry Edward
Lawrence, William F.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Lawson, John Grant
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. H.
Lecky, Rt. Hn. William Edw H.
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Faber, George Denison
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Fardell, Sir T. George
Leveson-Gower, Frederiek N.S.
Baird, John Geo. Alexander
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Balcarres, Lord
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Finch, George H.
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (Bristol, S)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Lowe, Francis William
Balfour, Maj. K. R. (Christeh'ch
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Banes, Maj. George Edward
Fisher, William Hayes
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Bartley, George C. T.
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsm'th)
Beach, Rt Hon Sir M. H. (Bristol)
Forster, Henry William
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred

Beach. Rt. Hn. W.W.B. (Hants
Foster, Sir M. (London, Univ.)
Maconochie, A. W.
Beckett, Ernest William
Gibbs, Hr A.G. H. (CityofLond.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.
Gordon. Hn. J.E. (Elgin&Nairn
M'Calmont, Col. J.(Antrim, E.)
Bignold, Arthur
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'rH'ml'ts
Majendie, James A. H.
Bigwood, James
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Malcolm, Ian
Bill, Charles
Goschen, Hn. Geo. Joachim
Manners, Lord Cecil
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Bond, Edward
Graham, Henry Robert
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Boulnois, Edmund
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Maxwell, W.J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Bousfield, William Robert
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)
Milton, Viscount
Bowles, Capt. H.F.(Middlesex)
Greene. Sir E. W (B'ry S. Edm'ds
Milward, Colonel Victor
Bowles. T. Gibson (King'sLynn)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Brodrie, Rt. Hon. St. John
Grenfell, William Henry
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Hain. Edward
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Burdett-Coutts, W.

Halsey, Thomas Frederick
More, Robert J. (Shropshire)
Carlile, William Walter
Hambre, Charles Eric
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow
Cautley, Henry Strother
Hamilton, Rt Hn. Lord G (Mid'x
Morrell, George Herbert
Cavendish, B. F. (N. Lancs.)
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'donderry
Morris, Hon Martin Henry F.
Cavendish, V.C.W (Derbyshire
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Morrison, James Archibald
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Morton, Arthur H.A. (Deptford
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Heath, James (Stallbrds., N.W.
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc.
Heaton, John Henniker
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Chapman, Edward
Helder, Augustus
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Charrington, Spencer
Henderson, Alexander
Nicholson, William Graham
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Hoare, EdwBrodie(Hampstead
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Hogg, Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Parkes, Ebenezer
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Horner, Frederick William
Pemberton, John S. G.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry

Penn, John
Colomb, Sir John Charles R.
Hoult, Joseph
Percy, Earl
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Pilkington, Richard
Cook, Frederick Lucas
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Plummer, Walter R.
Cox, Irwin Edw. Bainbridge
Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Cranborne, Viscount
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Pretymann, Ernest George
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward

the doors persuading them not to come in to make a House. He hoped private Members would vote against the motion.

Question put.

The House divided:;Ayes, 237; Noes, 144. (Division List No. 33.)

Purvis, Robert
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Pym, C. Guy
Simeon, Sir Harrington
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Webb, Colonel William Geo.
Bandies, John S.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Whiteley, H.(Ashton-under-L
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset
Reid, James (Greenock)
Smith, James Parker(Lanarks.
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Remnant, James Farquharson
Smith, Hon. W. E. D. (Strand)

Wills, Sir Frederick
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Spear, John Ward
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Rentoul, James Alexander
Stanley, Lord (Lanes.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Staly bridge
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Ridley, Samuel F.(BethnalGrn
Stock, James Henry
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Ritchie, Rt Hon. Chas. T.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Stroyan, John
Wylie, Alexander
Round, James
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Rutherford, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Talbot, Rt Hn. JG. (Oxf'dUniv.
Sadler. Col. Samuel Alexander
Thornton, Perey M.
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Samuel, Harry S.(Limehouse)
Tufnell, Col. Edward
Sir William Walrond and
Sandys, Lieut. -Col. Thos. Myles
Valentia, Viscount
Mr. Ansiruther,
Seton-Karr, Henry
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Gilhooly, James
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)
Allan, William (Gateshead)
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. Herbt. J.

O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Allen, Charles P (Glouce., Stroud
Goddard, Daniel Ford
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Ambrose, Robert
Grant, Corrie
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Asquith, Rt. Hon Herbert Henry
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
O'Dowd, John
Atherley-Jones, L.
Haldane, Richard Bunion
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Barlow, John Emmott
Hammond, John
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon N.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Harmsworth, K. Leicester
O'Malley, William
Blake, Edward
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Mara, James
Boland, John
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Boyle, James
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Partington, Oswald
Brown, George M.(Edinburgh)
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Pickard, Benjamin
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Hobhouse, C, E.H.(Bristol, E.)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Burns, John
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Price. Robert John
Burt, Thomas
Holland, William Henry
Rea, Russell
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Horniman, Frederick John
Reckitt, Harold James
Caine, William Sproston
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Reddy, M.

Caldwell, James
Jones, David Brynmor (Swans'a
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh'e
Russell, T. W.
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Jordon, Jeremiah
Schwann, Charles E.
Caustor, Richard Knight
Kearley, Hudson E.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh
Channing, Francis Allston
Lambert, George
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Cogan, Denis J.
Layland- Barratt, Francis
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Soares, Ernest J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (North'nts
Crean, Eugene
Leng, Sir John
Sullivan, Donal
Crombie, John William
Levy, Maurice
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Cullinan, J.
Lloyd-George, David
Tennant, Harold John
Daly, James
Lough, Thomas
Thomas, A. (Carmarthen. E.)
Dalziel, James Henry
Lundon, W.
Thomas, A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Delany, William
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Dillon, John

M'Dermott, Patrick
Tully, Jasper
Donelan, Captain A.
M'Govern. T.
Wallace, Robert
Doogan, P. C.
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
Walton, John L. (Leeds, S.)
Douglas. Charles M. (Lanark)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Duffy, William J.
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Dunn, Sir William
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
White, George (Norfolk)
Ellis, John Edward
Markham, Arthur Basil
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Emmott, Alfred
Mooncy, John J.
White, Patrick (Meath, North
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidst'n
Morley, Charles (Brecknocksh
Whiteley, George (York, AY. R.
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Fenwick, Charles
Murphy,, T.
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Field, William
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Newnes, Sir George
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
Flynn, James Christopher
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Yoxall, James Henry
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
TELLEES FOR THE NOES;
Filler, J. M. F.
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)

Mr. Herbert Roberts and
Furness, Sir Christopher
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
Mr. Soames.

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

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

NAVY (SUPPLEMENTARY) ESTIMATES, 1900–1901.

1. Motion made, and Question put, "A. That an additional number of men and boys, not exceeding 600, be employed for the Sea and Coastguard Services for the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901."

*THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge), in the absence of the Financial Secretary, desired to say a few words in explanation of the Vote. The 600 men now asked for comprised the colonial contingent in China. New South Wales provided 262; Victoria, 197; and South Australia, 120, with the "Protector," gunboat. It was necessary under the Colonial Naval Defence Act of 1865, Section 9, to obtain the sanction of Parliament in order to bear those men on the Votes. He did not ask the House to believe that these men were necessary in order to give effect to the naval strength of the mother country in China. It was not the actual force, but the moral force which lay behind which was in question. The value in the eyes of the Empire and of the world of that small body of 600 men, side by side with our own sailors, soldiers and marines, was such that he did not think there would be any difference of opinion in the House in regard to the Vote. All the Members of the House were familiar with the services rendered by those men. The Colonial contingent had been most honourably mentioned by the commanding officer on the station. Their services were most valuable and were most highly appreciated, and their gallantry was conspicuous upon all occasions.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport) was sure that they all agreed with what had been said by the hon. Gentleman as to the good effect that must accrue from the services of those men. They had served side by side with our own seamen, and nobody would doubt at all the value of

their services. He asked whether the hon. Gentleman could tell the Committee what the arrangements were in regard to the pay of those men.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The question of pay falls to be considered on the next Vote. It will be better to discuss one Vote at a time.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.) said the hon. Gentleman in charge of the Vote was entirely mistaken if he supposed that it was going to pass with the unanimity of all sections of the Committee. For his part, he had for a considerable period of years resisted on every occasion additions to the Navy, whether they appeared in the shape of a Vote for men and boys, or an increased money grant, because he was convinced; and every year that passed added strength to the conviction; that the policy inaugurated by this country six years ago of enormous increases to the Navy was a policy calculated to destroy the finances of the country, and greatly calculated to plunge the country sooner or later into a terrible war.

When a few Members commenced to oppose this policy a few years ago they were denounced, of course, as enemies of the country. They were laughed at as enemies of the Empire for venturing to prophesy that the increase commenced five or six years ago was only a small portion of what was coming. He remembered, five years ago when the First Lord of the Admiralty, now in another place, brought in one of the vast Navy Estimates and announced that they were undoubtedly of a startling character, but required by the necessity of the time. The House was startled, but it voted the Estimates under the illusion, which had now been dissipated, that by so voting it was placing the country in a position of security and defence, and that if there was not finality in them there was some thing approaching finality. Every year there had been a large increase in the Vote for men and boys, and the expenses of the Navy. He asked where this was going to stop. He believed it would not stop until the taxation of the country was raised to such a point that the people would rebel and revolt against it. He desired to say that those who had banded themselves into an organisation called the Navy League were primarily responsible for this mad career along which the country was now being driven. What did they find these gentlemen saying after five years of inflation and enormous additions to the size of the Navy? They were now declaring that England was in a worse position at sea, and a worse mistress of the seas than five or six years ago. The more they spent on the Army and Navy the more they would be told that the state of the country was alarming, and they would have to go on increasing the size of the Services. He felt bound at every stage to resist any increase of armaments. He would vote against the proposed increase.

MR. DALY (Monaghan, S.) had great pleasure in joining his voice to what had been said by the hon. Member for East Mayo. The hon. Member for the Wood-bridge Division had referred to the fact that 600 Colonial troops had come to help England in a difficulty. Considering that from so large an extent of country only 600 troops could be raised, he thought the hon. Member should not have mentioned that. It seemed to him that the colonies gave them very little sympathy if, when England was in trouble, only 600 men could be got to come to the help of the country. He asked how these troops were to be paid as compared with the troops of this country, because it struck him that if a very great inducement had not been offered to these men from the colonies it was quite possible that they would not have come to the help of England at all. It seemed to him that the amount of money in this Vote was extraordinary.

*THE CHAIRMAN: There is no money in this Vote.

MR. DALY admitted that, but at the same time he expected that the men did not come without money, and one of the points which Members from Ireland had to watch was the money point. He had no sympathy, he was proud to say, with this matter at all, and he thought the colonies had almost as little when the trifling number of 600 was all they could beg, borrow, and, he might say, steal to join the forces. It would be his duty to go into the division lobby against this Vote.

*MR. CORRIE GRANT (Warwickshire, Rugby): said he understood from what was stated by the hon. Member for Woodbridge in introducing the Vote, that it was desirable

to give the colonies an opportunity of taking part in the operations in China, and therefore these men were selected to go, and charged on the Estimates. If so, why should the hon. Member for South Monaghan talk of sweeping the gutters to get men? He would go into the lobby in support of the Vote, as he believed a great many Members on that side of the House would, because they desired, along with hon. Members opposite, to do everything they could to strengthen the bonds between the mother country and the colonies.

MR. ALLEN (Gloucestershire, Stroud) entirely concurred with the hon. Member who had just spoken, and he intended to vote for the number of men stated. He did not think that, being a new Member, he should have got up to speak if one of the Members from Ireland had not attacked the Navy League, with which he had been more or less intimately acquainted since the commencement. He thought the Navy League had done a great deal of good in bringing home to the country the necessity of having a strong and large Navy. A great number on that side of the House would agree with him that it had been a distinct advantage to have the Australian and other Colonial forces fighting by our side.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.) said his hon. friend had a perfect right to condemn the policy of the Navy League. He concurred with the hon. Member for South Monaghan that it spoke badly for the sympathy of the colonies when they could only find 600 men. The Nationalist Members looked at this question in relation to the taxes they were going to put on their country, and he claimed that they had a perfect right to object to the Vote, on which no information had been supplied.

MR. WILLIAM ALLAN (Gateshead) said he was surprised at the paucity of the number stated in the Vote. He was afraid that 600 was a misprint, and that there should have been another 0 added. He failed to see how 600 could supply the deficiency required. It had always been the fault of the Navy administrators of this country to ask for too few men. In this case he felt sure that they were committing the same blunder again, and when the proper Navy Estimates came on they would be asking for more men. He had always advocated that it was the duty of the Government broadly and honestly to put down the number they required, so that the House and the country would know what they required. It was well known that they would require ten times the number now put down.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick) said he desired to raise his voice against this Supplementary Estimate of a million and a quarter of money for 600 men. ["Order."] If he was out of order in referring to the amount, the Chairman was there to put him in order. [Laughter.] He would not take any laugh from Gentlemen on the other side. If he committed any breach of the rules he would bow to the ruling of the Chairman at once. He desired to say that this Supplementary Estimate for 600 men would cause the expenditure of a large amount of money. It appeared to him to be an anomaly when he looked at the fact that if they required a Catholic chaplain for the British Navy;

*THE CHAIRMAN: That cannot be discussed on this Vote.

MR. JOYCE: I bow to your ruling at once, Mr. Lowther, and I have just to say that when I am a little better acquainted with the business of the House I will

interfere oftener and with more effect
AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Brookfield, Col. Montagu
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Balfour, Hon. G. W. (Leeds)
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Aird, Sir John
Balfour, Maj K. R. (Christch'rch
Caine, William Sproston
Allan, William (Gateshead)
Banes, Major George Edward
Caldwell, James
Allen, C. P. (Glouc, Stroud)
Bartley, George C. T.
Carlile, William Walter
Allhusen, Augustus H. Eden
Bathmst, Hon. A. Benjamin
Cautley, Henry Strother
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Beach. Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lanes.)
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Beach, Rt. Hn. W.W.B. (Hants.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert H.
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Blundell, Col. Henry
Cecil, Lord H. (Greenwich)
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Boulnois Edmund
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J.(Birm.
Bain, Col. James Robert
Bousfield, William Robert
Chamberlain, J. A. (Worcester)
Baird, John George Alexander
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Chapman, Edward
Balcarres, Lord
Bowles, T. G. (King's Lynn)
Charrington, Spencer

in the debates. There is one portion of this Supplementary Estimate on which I
desire to be a little more enlightened before I allow it to pass. [Laughter.]

Perhaps I may know a little more about it than the hon. Members who laugh on the other side of the House. I want some information as to the policy of towing His Majesty's ships;

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order; The hon. Gentleman is discussing the wrong Vote. We are now discussing Vote A. Will he confine himself to that?

MR. JOYCE: Am I in order in discussing any portion of the orders given in connection with this Vote?

*THE CHAIRMAN: These are not the Navy Estimates. When we reach the Navy Estimates that will, of course, be in order. These are the Supplementary Navy Estimates. This Estimate is for 600 men, and that is the only matter that can be discussed now.

MR. JOYCE: I desire to ask your ruling on Section C, page 3. Can I speak on that matter at present or not?

*THE CHAIRMAN: We are discussing Vote A, and not the other one.

MR. JOYCE: I bow to your ruling at once.

MR. McGOVERN (Cavan, West) thought the Committee should be told for what purpose these 600 men were required.

Question put.

The Committee divided: Ayes, 235; Noes, 67. (Division List No. 34.)

Churchill, Winston Spencer

Button, John (Yorks., N.R.)

Rasch, Major Frederic Carne

Clare, Octavius Leigh

Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick

Ratcliffe, R. F.

Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.

Johnston, William (Belfast)

Rea, Russell

Cohen, Benjamin Louis

Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)

Reid, James (Greenock)

Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse

Jones, William (Carnarvon.)

Renshaw, Charles Bine

Cook, Frederick Lucas

Kearley, Hudson E.

Rentoul, James Alexander

Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)

Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)

Renwick, George

Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge

Keswick, William

Ridley, Hn. M.W. (Stalybridge)

Cranborne, Viscount

Kimber, Henry

Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)

Crombie, John William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Charles T.
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Kitson, Sir James
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Knowles, Lees
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Labouchere, Henry
Round, James
Dewar, T.R. (T'rH'mlets, S Geo
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Lawson, John Grant
Russell, T. W.
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Rutherford, John
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Duke, Henry Edward
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Dunn, Sir William
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Sandys, Lieut. -Col. Thos Myles
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Leng, Sir John
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Fardell, Sir T. George
Levy, Maurice
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Fenwick, Charles
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r

Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Macdona, John Gumming
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Finch, George H.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Soares, Ernest J.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Maconochie, A. W.
Spear, John Ward
Fisher, William Hayes
M'Arthnr, Charles (Liverpool)
Spencer, Rt Hn C R(Northants.)
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Stanley, Lord (Lanes.)
Forster, Henry William
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart
Foster, Sir Michael (Lond. Univ
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
Stock, James Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Majendie, James A. H.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Furness, Sir Christopher
Malcolm, Ian
Stroyan, John
Gibbs, Hn A. G. H. (City of Lond.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin&Nairn
Markham, Arthur Basil
Thomas, F. Freeman (Hastings)
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'rH'ml'ts
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Thornton, Percy M.
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Milton, Viscount
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Mil ward, Colonel Victor
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Molesworth, Sir Lewis

Valentia, Viscount
Graham, Henry Robert
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Wallace, Robert
Grant, Come
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
More, R. Jasper (Shropshire)
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Greene, Sir EW (B'rySEdm' ds.
Morgan, D.J. (Waltbamstow)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.
Money, Charles (Breeonshire)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Morrell, George Herbert
Webb, Colonel William Geo.
Hain, Edward
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
White, George (Norfolk)
Hambro, Charles Eric
Morrison, James Archibald
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G.(Mid'x
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Whiteley, H. (Asbton und Lyne
Hamilton, Marqof (L'nd'nderry
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th.
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Murray. Charles J. (Coventry)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Wills, Sir Frederick
Heath, James (Staffords, N.W.)
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Helder, Augustus
Palmer, Waller (Salisbury)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)

Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Parkes, Ebenezer
Wilson. John (Glasgow)
Henderson, Alexander
Partington, Oswald
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Hobhouse. C.E.H. (Bristol, E.)
Pemberton, John S. G.
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Holland, William Henry
Pilkington, Richard
Wylie, Alexander
Hope, J.F (Sheffield, Brightside
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Horniman, Frederick John
Plummer. Walter R.
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Hoult, Joseph
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Yoxall, James Henry
Howard. J.(Midd., Tottenham
Pretymann, Ernest George
TELLERS FOR THE AYES.;
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Purvis, Robert
Sir William Walrond and
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Randles, John S.
Mr. Anstruther.
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.
Boyle, James
Cogan, Denis J.
Ambrose, Robert
Brigg, John
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Atherley-Jones, L.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Crean, Eugene
Blake, Edward
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Cullinan, J.
Boland, John
(banning, Francis Alston
Delany, William

Dillon, John
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Donelan, Captain A.
Mooney, John J.
Pickard, Benjamin
Doogan, P. C.
Murphy, J.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Duffy, William J.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Reddy, M.
Field, William
Newnes, Sir George
Redmond, John E.(Waterford)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Nolan, Col. John P.(Galway, N.
Schwann, Charles E.
Flynn, James Christopher
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Gilhooly, James
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Sullivan, Donal
Goddard, Daniel Ford
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Md
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Hammond, John
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Connor, James(Wicklow, W.
Thomas, A. Glamorgan, E.)
Hutton, Alfred F. (Morley)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Tully, Jasper
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Lundon, W.
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Wilson, Henry J.(York, W.R.)
M'Dermott, Patrick

O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.)
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
M'Govern. T.
O'Malley, William
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;Mr.
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
O'Mara, James
Daly and Mr. Joyce.

2. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That an additional sum not exceeding £;1,250,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for additional Expenditure on the following Navy Services, viz.:

Vote 1. Wages, etc., of
£;

Officers, etc.

500

Vote 2. Victualling and Clothing for the Navy

84,000

Vote 8. Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, etc.:

Section I. Personnel

98,500

Section II. Material

630,000

Section III. Contract Work

207,000

Vote 11. Miscellaneous Effective Services

230,000

Total

£;1,250,000."

*MR. PRETYMAN: in asking for this Vote it will probably be convenient to the Committee that I should make a short statement on the different heads under which the money is required. With regard to the Vote of 600 men just passed, the actual cost of their services was about £;25,000. The contingent are paid by us at the same rate of pay and allowances as our own sailors, and they are calculated to serve for about seven months. Besides that, we are giving to the South Australian Government a sum of £;2,500 for the services of the "Protector," because we have not only these 600 men, but also the "Protector," which is the property

of the South Australian Government. For repairs to that vessel during the time it was in the Imperial service we are paying £;2,500 to its owners. The next head is the increase in the victualling charges. It will be recognised by all that since the time these Estimates were originally prepared there has been an enormous rise in the prices of all kinds of produce, and that rise has caused an increase of no less than £;114,000, but against that there is an appropriation-in-aid of £;30,000, reducing the actual Vote to £;84,000. I might give one or two instances showing how prices have risen. Cloth has risen from 6s. 11d. to

8s. 11d., and serge from 11s. 3d. to 1s. 3d., and so on, and the prices of provisions have increased in the same way. These increases have in nearly all cases come about and been largely augmented since the time the original Estimates were prepared. There was at the time some indication of a rise in prices, but the Estimates were prepared fifteen months ahead of the time at which they were voted, and it was impossible to say when the rise would take place. The same remark applies to the question of coal in Section 2 of Vote 8. It is a very difficult question to decide whether a rise in price is going to be permanent, and the question also arises as to the latest date on which it is possible to disturb a Vote once prepared. It is very difficult when a complicated Estimate has been prepared on the basis of prices then existing to go into it and revise all the items, and there is the further point that the rise in price may be only temporary. So far as we are concerned, the increase in prices of

coal, provisions, and clothing material, has been not temporary but permanent, and that is really the reason of the large increase in the victualling Vote, and, to some extent, the coaling Vote. The next head is shipbuilding and repairs, the amount there being £98,500. That increase is caused partly by more rapid construction and partly by repairs. Construction has been hastened, and I think the Committee will agree that that is not a cause for complaint. To-morrow an event will occur which is almost unique in the history of the British Navy. Four first-class vessels will be launched, and it is largely on account of the expenditure on these four vessels that this excess is asked for. £30,000 is for new construction, most of which has been spent on the "Montague," the "Albemarle," and the "Kent." The amount expended upon these three vessels during this financial year is no less than £629,000, so that an excess of £30,000 on that large sum will not appear very great. At the same time, I think the Committee would prefer that we should have an excess of £30,000 and succeed in turning these vessels out than that the vessels should have been delayed and £30,000 less spent. That is the real ground on which the money is asked for. Included in that £98,000 is a further sum for repairs to a large number of ships. There are two reasons why the repairs have exceeded the Estimate. One is a reason which will naturally occur to every hon. Member; namely, that during the year we have had this unforeseen trouble in China, and nobody knew at what moment the services of the Navy might be required in all directions. It therefore became imperative to execute all repairs immediately, and that every vessel which could be brought at short notice into a fit condition for service should be put into that condition. That naturally involved the working overtime, and that accounts to a large extent for this increase. The other reason is that it is not advisable in the interests of economy to allow a larger estimate for repairs than the lowest sum which really appears necessary, as whatever is allowed is pretty certain to be spent. It is desirable that the full sum anticipated to be required should be estimated. It is very undesirable that it should be necessary to come here for Supplementary Votes at all. We should very much prefer to be able to state fifteen months beforehand exactly how much we are going to spend and exactly what we are going

to do with the money. But if hon. Members will put themselves into the position of those who have to administer this great Department, look at the enormous number of items over which this work has to be spread, and conceive the difficulty of looking fifteen months ahead and estimating exactly how much will be required to be spent on repairs, for instance, which may be owing to accidents or breakdowns which nobody can foresee, it must be evident to them that, however much experience may be brought to bear or time given to the matter, such Estimates must to a large extent be guesswork, based partly upon the experiences of the past as well as upon the possibilities of the future. On that ground the Admiralty has perhaps more excuse than almost any other Department for coming to the Committee with a Supplementary Estimate, which is not very large in relation to the amount of work done, and all of which has been expended in putting our Navy into a state of efficiency such as the House of Commons is always impressing upon us as absolutely necessary.

The next item is one for which I need not apologise at all; namely, contract work. We have succeeded in getting more work to the extent of £270,000 out of the contractors than we estimated we could do. That is not increased, but merely anticipated expenditure. We are paying £270,000 more to contractors in this financial year for work they had in hand, and therefore shall have that much less to pay at the end of the contract. Really, the contract is being executed more rapidly than had been anticipated.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): In respect of what ships?

*MR. PRETYMAN: I am afraid I have not that information, but possibly I shall be able to supply it later in the debate.

The last head is for miscellaneous services, the larger part of which is in consequence of the services of the naval contingent and the fleet in connection with the trouble in China. It is perfectly clear that the China trouble was an unforeseen event in regard to which we are perfectly justified in asking for a Supplementary Vote, and therefore no excuse is needed for bringing this Estimate forward. Sub-head A is for the passage money and conveyance of the Australian contingent both by water and by land, and also of the additional officers who were sent to China. Sub-head C, for piloting and towing, is largely and principally due to extra charges incurred by the extra number of vessels going through the Suez Canal on their way to China. "Telegraphic communications" refer to the extra telegraphic services in connection with South Africa and China. The hire of steam vessels for communications in China is in connection with two vessels which were hired to keep up communications between different places. The next head is expenditure in connection with the seizure and detention of vessels in South African waters. In that matter the Navy was merely obeying its orders and doing its duty, and the matter has already been discussed. "The hire of distilling vessels for manœuvres" was an experiment. Two vessels were fitted as distillers, and valuable experience was gained. The vessels were somewhat too large, they had not sufficient pumping power, but at the same time they supplied a considerable quantity of water for the fleet, and the experiment was well worth trying.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): Was there distilling of spirits in these vessels, or was

the experiment confined to water?

*MR. PRETYMAN: Although it was off the Irish coast, the experiment was confined to water. The last sub-head is in connection with the steamship "Ophir," which is to convey their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York on their tour to Australia and round the world. The only question of importance, I think, which has been raised in connection with that is with regard to the accommodation to be provided for the press. Questions have been asked upon this matter in the House, and some hon. Members seem to be under the impression that Sir Donald Mackenzie Wallace, who is to go with this vessel, has been, by the sanction of the Admiralty, allowed to go on board as the correspondent of The Times, to the exclusion of other newspapers and other press correspondents. That is not so. Sir Donald Mackenzie Wallace has had no communication with the Admiralty whatever in regard to his position on the tour, and he has not been appointed with the knowledge of the Admiralty as the correspondent of any newspaper whatever. But entirely apart from that, the First Lord has felt that it is most desirable, in the interest of the public and of the press, that some representation should be allowed, and that as far as possible some accommodation should be provided for the gentlemen of the press to accompany this expedition, and he has received a very large number of applications. He answered all these applicants, and they were informed that there were very great difficulties in the way of providing accommodation at all, but that everything that could be done would be done. The First Lord felt that it was very desirable that all the applications received should be considered equally, and not only did he wait until the last moment, but those important newspapers that had not applied for accommodation were communicated with and asked if they desired to be represented. That being done, every effort was made to induce the various newspapers and press agencies as far as possible to combine so that one press representative might serve two or three newspapers or agencies. That having been done, the First Lord found that he could provide accommodation for five press correspondents, and those five have been allotted as fairly as possible between the press agencies and the principal newspapers by combination, so that there has been absolute fairness. Those five gentlemen will be accommodated, and five berths have been prepared for them, and they will sail on Thursday.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): Will the hon. Gentleman kindly name the agencies and the newspapers?

*MR. PRETYMAN: I think it would be better not to, for it would be rather invidious to do that. I believe the press are perfectly satisfied, and every effort has been made to show no favouritism of any sort or kind, and I do not think the hon. Gentleman would wish that any invidious statement should be made. I will endeavour at the close of this debate to answer any further questions put to me, but I thought that I might save the time of the House by intervening at this stage.

MR. WILLIAM ALLAN said he had listened with the greatest degree of pleasure to the remarks of the hon. Gentleman who introduced the Supplementary Estimate of £1,250,000. He had no desire to traverse all the headings of the hon. Gentleman's remarks, but would confine himself to the third.

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

MR. WILLIAM ALLAN (continuing) said that there came under the heading of "Coals for Steam Vessels" the sum of £;700,000; but the hon. Gentleman gave the Committee no explanation whatever as to when, how, or where this £;700,000 extra was required over and above the original Estimate. It was all very well for the hon. Gentleman to say that the price of coal had risen, but his point was, when was the contract made by the Admiralty for coals? He was fully aware that in October, 1899, no contract was made for coals, although that was the time when every ship-owning firm, such as the Transatlantic General Company, the Royal Mail Steamship Company, etc., were making their contracts. The Admiralty could have bought coals then at 13s. per ton. Two or three months later the Admiralty went into the market and bought a small quantity at 19s. a ton, but made no contract. Then they had to go again into the market and paid 29s. a ton, but they bought more coals at the big price than they had any need for then, and which they would not need for a long time to come. Was that business? Why, the Director of Contracts knew no more about his business or the markets than the man in the moon; The hon.

Gentleman smiled. He (Mr. Allan) had for seven or eight years been treated to laughter in the House over naval matters, but he challenged the hon. Gentleman to deny that he could have bought those coals at 13s. a ton for which he had paid 29s. a ton. The hon. Gentleman tried to put off this enormously increased expenditure on the ground of the rise in the price of coal, but he wished the hon. Gentleman would find out something about the coals and where they went to. The hon. Gentleman did not tell the Committee why this excess of coals was required, or that some of his boats were burning twice as much coal as others. That was the reason why the taxpayers' money was being squandered in a haphazard, un business like manner.

He had listened with attention to every word the hon. Gentleman had said about repairs, but no proper explanation had been given. What boats were repaired, where were they repaired, and what did the repairs of each cost? What did this sum of £;98,500 include? The repairs to the "Hermes," the "Europa," or the "Powerful," which was lying in Portsmouth Dockyard with her boilers nearly out of her? Then, he was sorry to say that this huge sum did not include repairs to the new Royal yacht, which indeed was not afloat yet. It was not fair to the House of Commons or to the taxpayers of the country that they should be called upon to vote money for repairs without the responsible Minister stating to the House what was the nature of the repairs. He did not want to use strong terms to any Minister or head of the Department, but the Minister ought really to be able to give a lucid, frank, and complete explanation of the Vote he was submitting to the Committee.

*MR. PRETYMAN said, if the Committee would allow him, he might state that he had given a short statement of the headings of the Vote and a general explanation; but he would be most happy to answer any further questions that were put to him in the course of the debate. He thought that the hon. Member had scarcely been fair in accusing him of want of courtesy or a desire to

withhold information from the, Committee.

MR. WILLIAM ALLAN said he was very glad to hear that the Committee was going to have a full explanation of why all this money was required for coals and repairs, and he sincerely hoped they would have the names of the boats and the reasons why the repairs were, necessary. The Paper did not show how much had been spent on the new Royal yacht. Did that come under repairs? The House and the country wanted to know that. He wished to refer also to one item under the head of "Miscellaneous Effective Services." Under Sub-head XX. very un business like phraseology was used; namely, "Hire, etc., of s.s. 'Ophir.'" Now that word "hire" had no right to be there at all. There was not a shipowner in the House who did not know that the word should have been "charter." He asked how much the charter of the "Ophir" was to be per month; what did the owners get? There was £43,000 down for the "Ophir," and what he wanted to know was not only the amount of the charter per month, but what was spent in refitting all the cabins, saloons, and berths, and on the accommodation for the crew, and also on the equipment of the vessel. To come here with a brief, condensed statement, like that put into the hands of hon. Members, was not taking the House into the confidence of the Government in the whole of this transaction. This was a matter of ship-owning and ship-management, and the Government ought to have been able to convey their Royal Highnesses the Duke, and Duchess of Cornwall on this tour on the new Royal yacht, instead of being compelled to charter another ship. It was their duty to tell the Committee every penny of expenditure on that chartered ship, instead of coming there with the word "hire," as if it were a cab-horse or pianos and bands of music, lie for one protested earnestly against the Minister responsible coming to the Committee with such flimsy pretexts, and he would at all times raise his voice against squandering the public money in such large sums without the slightest explanation.

MR. FLYNN said that no one could have listened to the hon. Member for Gateshead without being forcibly impressed with his striking arguments. They all recognised the improvement in the manner of the hon. Gentleman responsible for the Vote compared with that of some of his predecessors; but they would await with interest the further explanations which had been promised. As to the matter of principle, before going into details he took it that this increased expenditure the Committee were asked for was bound up with the reckless expenditure on which the country had launched in regard both to the Army and Navy. We were formerly supposed to be in a position to meet a combination of any two foreign naval Powers, but now we were going to meet any combination of any three Powers; hence the increased Estimates year after year. They had been told in the language of metaphor that a large portion of this expenditure was in the nature of insurance money for the protection of the commerce and trade of the Empire; but if that were so, Irish Members had a right to protest, seeing that they had no commerce to protect, against being compelled to pay their proportion of the insurance money. What guarantee had the Board of Admiralty in constructing these big battleships at such a rapid rate that they would not be obsolete and useless five or ten years hence; just as our artillery had been found of no account against modern "Long Toms" and "Pom-Poms" in South Africa.

These ships might, in fact, in a few years be broken up and sold for old scrap iron. That was a danger which naval constructors should lay to their mind, considering the marvellous skill now being applied to modern artillery and projectiles, and to submarine boats and torpedo boats. His motto, indeed, would be *festina lente* when they remembered that a naval engagement, which only lasted a few hours, between an Austrian and an Italian man-o'-war in the Adriatic had revolutionised the system of naval construction of the whole world. The hon. Member for Gateshead, who had compelled the Government to reconsider the whole question of the adoption of Belleville boilers, had given very alarming figures as to the purchases of coal, which showed the imprudent, the improvident, and slatternly manner in which the Admiralty conducted their business, and some further explanations were demanded from the hon. Gentleman in charge of the Estimate in regard to this matter. If such things had occurred fifteen or twenty years previously, when the Government was confronted with a vigilant and active Opposition, no Board of Admiralty would have held their position for six months. With regard to the royal yacht, this vessel was not fit to carry the person of the King, and yet £400,000 had been spent upon it. The Estimates were brought before the House without any details, but these were questions the Admiralty were bound to answer, they were matters upon which the country would require information. In the good old times, in circumstances such as these, the First Lord or the Civil Lord of the Admiralty would have been impeached, and dismissed as being incapable of doing public service. The right of free search for contraband of war was a right which should only be exercised with the greatest possible prudence and discrimination, and only when there was overwhelming proof that vessels under neutral flags were carrying contraband of war; otherwise every country with a powerful navy like that of England would become nothing less than a highway robber. All they would have to do would be to point their guns, claim the right of search, take all the food-stuffs they discovered, and then go before a court and get the ship condemned, and the taxpayer would have to pay. If such a power was attempted to be exercised by Germany, France, or the United States, the whole press of the country would howl with indignation against such high-handed tyranny. Yet the country had to pay £30,000 for this little diversion of the Admiralty. Another point upon which some information would be required was the item of £2,500 under Sub-head A.A., for the use of the South Australian gunboat during service in Chinese waters. Was that for the purpose of protecting the Colonial Volunteers, of which the House had heard so much, because they were so loyal? The Government would not give Ireland a gunboat for the protection of her fishermen, but for this boat, which belonged to the colony, and which we used for the transport of the colonists, the country was asked to pay this amount. The loyalty of the colony was not so great, after all, and he could quite conceive that the Government might have greater loyalty in Ireland under similar conditions. With regard to the item under Sub-head XX., Hire, etc., of ss. "Ophir," in connection with the visit of their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York to Australia, etc., "hire" was not a very elegant word. It was not the proper way to treat Royalty, and it gave a very bad

impression in the country to talk of such a vessel in the same way as one would of a row-boat on the Thames. Another question upon which the hon. Gentleman might be able at some future time to give some information was with regard to the policy of construction which at present was being so strongly advocated. Was it a wise and prudent policy to build these ships, as to the strength of which they knew nothing, when other nations were turning their attention to submarine vessels? He thought not.

COMMANDER YOUNG (Berkshire, Wokingham) said he was unable to follow the last speaker in his suggestion that the policy of the Admiralty in constructing battleships was not wise, having regard to the fact that other nations were keeping pace with us. There was no doubt that France was building submarine vessels, and it was possible that those boats might revolutionise the Navy; but it was not with the submarine boat alone that we should have to compete. We had to compete with the range of guns, and the speed of ships on the billows. No doubt the Admiralty would keep their eye on these submarine boats, and, if they built any, all he would ask would be that he might not be ordered to serve on one. As an up-bolder of the Government, he did not desire to detain the Committee. He desired to see the Votes go through. When the Naval Estimates came forward would be the proper time to discuss these matters. But as a naval officer he would like to have a satisfactory answer to one question, which was, whether the hon. gentleman could give any information as to when the Report of the

Committee now sitting on the question of rations and, victualling of seamen was likely to be laid on the Table of the House. Every day was of importance in this matter. A great deal of money was spent, especially by the young and growing bluejackets, on provisions, which clearly showed that they required a great deal more food than was supplied by the Admiralty. He hoped the Report would be laid on the Table shortly, and that the result would be satisfactory. With regard to the item of pilotage under Sub-head C, he hoped the hon. Gentleman would be able to inform the House that there was no falling off in the pilotage qualities of the naval officer. Pilotage was a responsible duty, requiring care and nerve, which would have to be performed by the naval officer in time of war, and the Admiralty should give as much encouragement as possible to naval officers to perfect themselves in this duty.

MR. KEARLEY said he did not think the Government ought to take a Vote of this character unless they were prepared to give the Committee the fullest opportunity of discussing it in every way and were prepared to answer every question which was put. Whatever might be said about the difficulty in contracting for coal, was the Committee to understand that the Admiralty had not sufficient foresight to make forward contracts for clothing and provisions for their sailors? It appeared to him that if these departments were properly managed the Admiralty ought not to have to come to the Committee and say that owing to the rise in the price of provisions and cloth they had had to pay £14,000 more of the taxpayers' money. If any private business was conducted in that way it would spell bankruptcy in a very short time. The fact of the matter was that neither the Navy nor the Army was run on a commercial basis. The

gentlemen who managed these Departments were no doubt excellent men, but they had no commercial knowledge, and no one who had commercial knowledge to assist them. If they had had commercial training they would have saved their salaries over and over again. Everybody was aware from the debate in the previous year that the food was inadequate, the meal-times out of joint, and the canteen arrangements unsatisfactory. A Committee had been sitting on this question for some time, and possibly the Committee might be told now whether any decision had been arrived at, and if so, what. No doubt the most important of the items on the Estimate was that dealing with construction, but there was an idea, abroad that although the Admiralty made a great display of shipbuilding it was only on paper. What the country wanted to know when they provided the money was that there would be in due course ships in commission and not upon paper. One serious cause of delay arose no doubt out of the contract work. There were four ships built in Government yards which would instance this. The "Ocean," the first ship laid down, was launched seventeen months after it was laid down, and it was not commissioned until some three years after. The "Implacable" was launched thirteen months after being laid down, and almost three years had elapsed since that time, and yet she was not commissioned. She had had some difficulties, and she had not yet passed her steam trials; that was the fault not of the Government, but of the contractor, but the Committee ought to be informed what steps had been taken or were contemplated by the Government for the purpose of dealing with the contractors who were responsible. The "Bulwark" was launched seven months after being laid down, the quickest launch on record, and she was not yet in commission; whilst in the case of the "Montague," which was launched sixteen months after being laid down, it was impossible to say when she would be commissioned. He drew attention to the different times at which the ships were launched to show that there was no plan in the building of these ships. It had been stated over and over again by experts that it was quite possible to commission a ship within twenty months of her being laid down, but in any case two years should be ample time. That time should also be ample to obtain the machinery, but one mistake the Government made was not to give out their contracts for

machinery until months after the ship was laid down. Our difficulty was that the Admiralty rarely laid down more than two ships of a type, so that the contractors had no opportunity of duplicating the machinery. He thought he had heard the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Forest of Dean urge the advantage of having half-a-dozen ships projected at a time. Whether he suggested it or not, the hon. Member thought it was a practical suggestion. The public were anxious to have these ships delivered in a reasonable time. Some ships which were being built by contract had been in course of construction three or four years, but as they were voted upon every year the public outside fancied that we were adding to our battleships every year. He was glad to see, therefore, from these Supplementary Estimates that there was some evidence that the Admiralty were alive to their responsibilities. He hoped the Admiralty would tell them something that night as to their intention of expediting both in the Government yards and the contractors' yards the completion of the various ships already

voted.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY (Yorkshire, Shipley) said he could not agree with the lion. Member for Devonport in his somewhat ungenerous attack upon the hon. Gentleman who introduced the Estimates.

MR. KEARLEY interrupted the hon. Member, and was understood to deny that he had made an attack.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY said it appeared to him to be a somewhat ungenerous attack. He ventured to say that the statement which the hon. Gentleman made to the Committee would commend itself generally to them. It would not be in order to discuss the whole sphere of naval policy on these Estimates, but he thought he might remark that the greater part of the million and a quarter which was asked for had been spent on coal. The note of explanation suggested that the expenditure was for the purpose of replenishing the stock of coal at certain places, and, if rumour were correct, that

replenishment had not taken place a moment too soon. They had heard rumours of one of the ships of the Mediterranean Squadron towing another ship in consequence of the deficient quantity of coal and the difficulties of replenishment. He did not know if these rumours were correct, but if they were, the state of affairs showed a want of foresight on the part of the Admiralty as regards the provision of coal. They were now apparently performing the duty of replenishing the stocks wherever necessary. The Vote for coal expenditure appeared to be £;607,000, and if the Admiralty would make the stocks sufficient throughout the Mediterranean and elsewhere, they would make one of the best possible preparations for naval operations. The 600 men referred to in the Votes were only nominally added to the Navy. They were only nominally transferred from the Colonial Navy to the Imperial Navy, and he was glad that reference had been made that night to the patriotic services of the Australians, because the country had been going into patriotic fervour over the services which the colonials had rendered on land. Notwithstanding the somewhat unkind remarks which had fallen from the hon. Member opposite with regard to the subsidy, he ventured to say that the country at large would welcome the services which the colonies had given and were still giving to the naval as well as the military forces of the country. The most salient point was the fact that the Committee were asked to vote £;207,000 more for contract expenditure. If there was one duty which the Admiralty had been neglecting more than another in the past, it was the duty of pushing on with naval construction. They had had explanations from the late First Lord of the Admiralty, whose loss to that House and the Admiralty they all deplored, of the causes of the arrears in naval construction. Year after year the House voted money, and year after year it had been spent without any reasonable excuse whatever. Now they found the Admiralty waking up to a sense of their duty, for they had actually expended more than had been voted. He said, as one who took the deepest interest in these matters, let them go on

with Supplementary Estimates for expenditure on new construction beyond that which had been voted by the House. They had not made sufficient naval preparations. The country understood that upon the Navy alone the security of

the country from invasion depended. Without anticipating what might be in the Naval Estimates shortly to be introduced, he ventured to say that the House and the country were amply prepared for a considerable increase in the naval expenditure. [A Nationalist Member: No, no.] He referred to those who had the good of the country at heart, and not those who desired to see His Majesty's ships at the bottom of the sea. He well remembered the right hon. Baronet the Member for Forest of Dean made a speech in the House eleven or twelve years ago in which he called attention to the fact, which was then imperfectly recognised, that we were a hated nation. On that occasion the noble Lord the Member for Ealing moved that the naval preparations were insufficient. His right hon. friend suggested that the standard should be set up that the Navy of Great Britain should be equal to the navies of any two Powers that could be brought against it. If that was considered a sufficient standard then, was it a sufficient standard now? He asked those who had knowledge of the naval preparations in Europe, and a knowledge of the hatred with which we were regarded by many European nations, whether that was so or not? [Nationalist cheers.] Hon. Members opposite cheered because they recognised that his statement was true. If it was true, was it not wise that they should make preparation for any attacks that might possibly result from that feeling? Since that time what had happened? In Germany enormous naval preparations had been made, and millions of money had been voted. Germany, which was not then a naval Power at all, had since become and still intended to become a naval Power of the first rank. The United States of America had established already, and were extending, a navy. Japan at that time had only the beginning of a navy. To-day she had one of the most powerful in the world. He asked whether in these circumstances it was not of the utmost importance that the standard of comparison as regards the Navy should be raised. He ventured to say that naval opinion and the opinion of all those who had thought on this subject had led them to the conclusion that the standard ought to be in comparison with any three Powers that might be brought against it. [AN HON. MEMBER: Six Powers!] No, he was content with three. All he wanted was fair preparation. He hoped this discussion would at least have the effect of encouraging the Admiralty in the belief that the people of the country and the House in particular were prepared to endorse every reasonable proposal the Admiralty might bring forward for the naval defence, and therefore the safety, of the country.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said he did not imagine they would be in order in following the last speaker in the discussion of the naval standard proper for this country. That was a matter which, of course, must be discussed on the first Vote of the Navy Estimates. On the present occasion they had to confine themselves to the Supplementary Estimate now before the Committee. The last speaker, and also his hon. friend the Member for Devonport, both dealt in much the same way with the retardation of the naval programme, and although his hon. friend opposite criticised the words with which the hon. Member for Devonport opened his speech, he nevertheless used even stronger language with regard to the total inadequacy of the statements which were made last year to explain the retardation of the

programme. His hon. friend the Member for Devonport had given credit to the Government for showing some signs in this Supplementary Estimate of a desire to overcome the retardation which had recently taken place. They had no facts before them to show how the money was to be expended. The hon. and gallant Member the Civil Lord, in making his statement that night; and he made it with conspicuous ability; told them what the expenditure in the dockyards was, but the contracts item, except for coal, had not been explained to the House. He ventured to throw an interrogation across the House, and he had since had a private reply that it was for armour on the contract ships. He asked what contract ships were to be pushed forward in this way, because the delays had been extraordinary, even as compared with those they were led to anticipate in the debates last year. The Civil Lord took credit to the Admiralty, and congratulated the country on the fact that four launches were to take place at once. In addition to the one battleship which the hon. Member for Devonport described, there were a number of private contract ships which had been delayed to an extraordinary extent. His hon. friend opposite would admit that the reasons given last year by Mr. Goschen for that delay were altogether inapplicable in the circumstances. The "Albion" was in the programme of 1896, she was launched in 1898, but was not yet in commission, while there were three Japanese battleships larger than the "Albion," which were begun after that ship, which were first announced by the Japanese Government long after the programme in which the "Albion" was announced, all built in England, and all of which were in commission at the present time. These Japanese ships received their armour and guns from English sources. Two of them were in commission in the Far East, and the other was about to proceed thither. These were tangible facts. They could not be disputed. He mentioned also the "Formidable" and the "Irresistible," both of which were in the 1897 programme, and launched in 1898, and neither of which was yet in commission. The "Implacable" and the "Vengeance" were in the 1897 programme, and launched in 1899, but not yet ready. The "London" had been more delayed than all the others. He asked specifically with regard to these ships what was the cause of the delay compared with the more rapid completion of ships for foreign Governments in the shipbuilding yards of this country? Mr. Goschen impressed upon the House the necessity for four new armoured cruisers as part of the 1897 programme. When would these cruisers; "Cressy," "Hogue," "Aboukir," "Sutlej"; be ready for service? The delay in the completion of the ships he had spoken of had been greater than was anticipated.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth) associated himself entirely with what had been said by the hon. Member for Devonport and the right hon. Baronet the Member for Forest of Dean. He trusted that the Admiralty would realise that there was a strong feeling throughout the country that we could not complete ships within the time specified for their completion or a reasonable time at all. The Admiralty should be able to fulfil its requirements with regard to certain ships within the necessary time in relation to the production of foreign nations. Unless the Government were prepared, when the Navy Estimates were introduced, to take the House and the country into their confidence, explain the causes of

delays in the completion of ships, and satisfy the House that they had taken measures to remove those causes, they would fail in their duty. No party ties would induce any supporter of the Government to vote for them if the Admiralty showed they were not alive to the consequences of delays, and took no steps to remedy them. His hon. friend the Member for the Shipley Division had stated that the British Navy should be equal to any three others that might be brought against it. He had always protested against these rule of thumb standards. The real test of naval strength was not a matter merely of counting ships. It was necessary to take many other things into consideration.

*MR. PRETYMAN: I am conscious that the short time I have served the country at the Admiralty does not enable me to deal as the House would wish with the grave questions that have been raised. Although it is only right and proper that the questions which have been raised should be discussed, I think hon. Members will realise that within a very few days a statement will be made on the main Estimates by the Financial Secretary. I think the Committee will share the view that it would be more fitting for me to answer briefly, as far as I can, the questions which have been put to me, and to leave the general question of the efficiency of the Navy to

be dealt with, as it will be more properly, on the main Naval Estimates. Let me say a word or two with regard to the delay in construction. I think I may claim that the fact of there being a supplementary estimate for about £;300,000 for money spent more than was anticipated a year ago is a proof that we have made some advance. It should never be lost sight of that in regard to this question of construction our main difficulties began with the great engineering strike, and we have never really reached the point of rapidity at which we then stood. Another point is that in regard to the time in which a ship can be constructed the governing factor is the machinery. The time of launching is, after all, only an incident, and it is not a fair statement to say that because one ship is launched in eight months, another in seven, and another in seventeen months, and yet are all commissioned about the same time, it shows a varying practice and a varying amount of supervision on the part of the Admiralty. The time of launching is not an indication of the state of progress in the construction of a ship. When a ship is launched largely depends upon whether the slip is immediately required for laying down another ship. The Admiralty fully recognise the justice of the criticisms which have been delivered with regard to the delays in shipbuilding, and there is as keen a desire and as firm an intention on their part as have been expressed by hon. Members here to do everything in their power to accelerate the progress of construction and to turn out the ships within the least possible time. The measures which will be taken to that end will more properly be put before the Committee by the Financial Secretary, and unless any further specific questions are put to me I would leave the general question there.

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.): You have not explained why Japanese boats can be built so much more rapidly than our own.

*MR. PRETYMAN: Well, I think it is perhaps hardly fair to take one or two particular ships. The Japanese have not ordered so many ships in England as we

have. We have a very large number under construction, and perhaps it is not difficult to take out our slowest and show that the Japanese have been turned out more rapidly. We have many contractors at work, and it is impossible that all the contracts can be executed within the time. We have no doubt been unfortunate in the delay of some of our contracts. I do not wish to be taken as complaining of the criticisms of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Forest of Dean. The Japanese ships were turned out quickly, but we have had ships turned out quickly also. The particular ships mentioned by the right hon. Gentleman certainly were rather backward. With regard to the question of repairs, I was asked whether I could name the actual ships on which the extra expenditure had been incurred and the amounts. I can do so. It is a long list, but the ships mentioned by the hon. Member for Gateshead, namely, the "Burmese," the "Europa," and the "Powerful," are not in it. The total extra amount incurred was £34,000, in amounts varying from £1,000 to £3,000 per ship. In regard to the individual ships upon which the extra contract sum was spent, I regret I can make no further statement at present other than that it was almost all for armour, which was delivered for various contract ships under construction in different parts. The Admiralty officials are at the present moment unable to specify upon which particular ships the amounts were incurred, but it is sufficient, I think, that the general programme of shipbuilding has been advanced. The point second in importance raised to-night has been, I think, the question of coal contracts and the increase in price. The hon. Member for Gateshead has vigorously attacked the Admiralty on that matter, and he told us that commercial firms were in the habit of making the contracts beforehand.

MR. WILLIAM ALLAN: In October.

*MR. PRETYMAN: But we have heard complaints from all the great railway companies, and engineering and ironwork firms, that the high price of coal has reduced their dividends and made it almost impossible for them to carry on their businesses. I have not heard of a single great firm throughout the country whose business involves any large expenditure on coal which has not had to incur increased expenditure and pay reduced dividends in consequence of the increased price of coal. The Admiralty wish to be placed on the same footing as a business firm. As business firms have had to go to their shareholders and complain that their expenses have increased and their dividends diminished, so the Admiralty have to come to the Committee and say they have spent more money than they expected to do. The only difference between the Admiralty and a business firm is that the latter is at liberty to make contracts when it likes. If a director of a company, from information received, was able to inform his colleagues that coal would shortly go up in price and remain at that increased price for fifteen months, that company would be able to make contracts, if anybody would enter into them, to cover those fifteen months. But the Admiralty have to come to Parliament for a vote, and a great deal would be said by hon. Members if the Admiralty were to enter into huge contracts for coal three months before the money was voted by Parliament. Then we are told that instead of buying coal at 13s., when we might have done, we preferred to buy at 29s. In that matter we are

in exactly the same position as a business firm. We provide for our foreseen requirements at what appears to us to be the best price. But when unforeseen demands arise we have to make the best arrangements we can. I must apologise for not having stated this in my original statement. The whole of this increase in regard to coal is not on account of the rise in price. Practically one half is due to that factor, but the other half is due to the increased quantity that had to be bought in consequence of the trouble in China. That is the point upon which I am at issue with the hon. Member for Gateshead. He says we might have bought last October twelvemonth all the coal we required to see us through the China trouble, which did not break out until eleven months later.

MR. WILLIAM ALLAN: You could have covered yourself for twelve months, the same as any business firm does.

*MR. PRETYMAN: I do not know of any firm which does so cover itself.

MR. WILLIAM ALLAN: Every ship-owning firm does.

*MR. PRETYMAN: It covers its ordinary foreseen requirements.

MR. WILLIAM ALLAN: No.

*MR. PRETYMAN: A firm that is carried on on business lines has ordinary annual requirements, and it makes its contracts on the lines of the quantities required in the ordinary way of business for the year. But if an entirely unforeseen occurrence takes place halfway through the year, and there is a large demand for coal, that firm, will have to buy at the then price. That is exactly the position in which the Admiralty found themselves when the China trouble broke out. They were brought face to face with the question, Are we to buy coal which is necessary for the service of the country, not only for the supply of the Navy during this crisis, but also, as is essential when such a trouble occurs, to increase the stocks at our foreign stations, which it might be difficult to do after war had broken out? Could we hesitate for one moment in answering such a question, even if the price of coal was as high as 29s a ton? In regard to the victualling, a question was asked incidentally as to when the Report of the Committee might be expected. In answer to that I would say that the Committee are now considering their Report, but as it has not yet been presented it is impossible for me to say when it will be laid before the House. The hon. Member for Wokingham asked a question as to piloting. There is no question whatever of there being any less efficiency on the part of naval officers so far as their qualifications for piloting are concerned. This sum is almost entirely due to extra canal dues on vessels going through the Suez Canal on their way to China. The hon. Member for Gateshead asked what was the sum per month we are paying for the ss. "Ophir," and great fault was found because the word "hire" instead of "charter" was used. It is a charter, of course. The "Ophir" is a vessel of 6,910 tons. She is perhaps one of the most suitable vessels existing at present for the services for which she has been chartered. The sum we are paying is £;1 per ton per month.

MR. WILLIAM ALLAN: Then you are paying £;6,910 per month?

*MR. PRETYMAN: We are paying £;1 per ton per month, and the tonnage is 6,910. She will be manned with a crew from the Royal Navy and Royal Marines, with the exception of the engine-room staff, stewards, and cooks, who are being provided

by the owners. The fitting of the ship has been carried out by the owners. I think I have now answered all questions of general importance which have been put to me, and I must ask the indulgence of the Committee for any deficiencies on my part. Nothing will more encourage the Admiralty in their endeavour to carry on this work to the satisfaction of the House and the country than to see that the House takes a real interest in the matter. I do not think the benches have always been very well filled during the discussions on the Navy Estimates, but the Admiralty certainly have no wish to slur the matters through without discussion. It is through what transpires here that we shall feel we have the support of the House, and through the House the support of the country, in using every endeavour to accelerate the progress of construction and to make the Navy, not on paper, but in actual fact, one of which the country may be proud, and which will be able to discharge its duties in the manner in which they have always been discharged up to the present.

SIR JAMES JOICEY (Durham, Chester-le-Street): I congratulate the hon. Gentleman the Civil Lord on his appearance in this debate, and I am sure the great ability he has exhibited augurs well for the successful management of Admiralty affairs in this House. But I confess I am not quite satisfied with one or two of his replies. With regard to the delay in building our battleships. I was much surprised when he said that it was quite a usual thing, after a ship was launched, for her to have to wait at least six months for her machinery.

*MR. PRETYMAN: I did not state that.

SIR JAMES JOICEY: Perhaps the hon. Gentleman will explain, but that was my impression.

*MR. PRETYMAN: I think the hon. Member for Devonport said that.

SIR JAMES JOICEY: If that be the case I am at a loss to understand why Japanese vessels; some of which were built on the Tyne; have been delivered so much more quickly than those intended for His Majesty's Government. When a vessel is arranged to be built it is provided that the machinery has to be put on board as soon as she is ready for it after launching, and I do not understand why there should be this delay in connection with His Majesty's ships. I believe that contracts could easily be made with any of the largest shipbuilding firms to deliver any class of vessel the Government might require within two years. These delays are a great disappointment, but I have been told by contractors that the great difficulty they have to contend with is, that the Admiralty inspectors go down to the yards, presumably to inspect the building; which is a very proper thing to do; but the contractors say that after they have received the designs and plans little or big alterations are continually being made, and these alterations are the means of seriously delaying the work and considerably adding to the cost. The result is, that many of the best shipbuilding firms refuse to contract with the Admiralty, because, as they say, they do not know what the contract means. When they take a contract from a private firm they know exactly what they have to do, but in dealing with His Majesty's Government they never know what the inspectors will expect them to do, and often after the work has been done in a manner satisfactory to any reasonable person, they have to pull it to pieces and do it over again. I hope His Majesty's Government will take

more care in making their contracts and fixing their data, because, as a practical man who has had some experience of these matters, I feel that these delays are unnecessary and could be avoided. The hon. Member said that the fact that they were spending more money proved that they were pressing things forward more rapidly,

and almost in the same breath he stated that the reason of the delay in delivering the vessels was the engineering strike. Everybody who has had anything to do with shipbuilding during the engineering strike knows that instead of increasing the cost it considerably decreased the expenditure in a particular year, because if the ships were not delivered a very much smaller sum had to be paid, so that the one argument is practically destructive of the other. Another question with which the hon. Gentleman did not deal satisfactorily was with regard to the "Ophir." I understand that something like £;400,000 was fixed as the expenditure upon the Royal yacht in the last Estimates. There must have been at least £;100,000 or £;150,000 expended in connection with that vessel, and why does it not appear in this Estimate? I presume we shall see it when the general Estimates are presented; therefore I shall not press that question now. I was glad to hear the reply to the hon.

Member for Wokingham. I was not startled that there should be a considerable sum for pilotage. There are cases when it is better to have a skilled pilot, one who knows the particular port or the coast-line of the particular district to which a large battleship has to go, rather than take the risk of running such a vessel, costing £;1,000,000 or £;1,500,000, ashore. It is a common practice with ordinary shipowners, when a ship goes to a port with which the captain is not very familiar, to employ skilled pilots, and I think the Government should do the same. When the sea is so rough that the skilled pilot is unable to get out to the ship, the owner, of course, has to rely upon the captain's own guidance in the matter. The Government would be well advised to give expert assistance to some commanders of our naval vessels if they thought it advisable to have it, but, naturally, in time of war they would have to rely upon themselves.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB asked, in reference to his hon. friend's statement that all the ship's complement for the "Ophir," with the exception of the engineering staff, was to be furnished by the Royal Navy, and that the engineers would be furnished by the owners,

whether the charge for the engineers was included in the Vote.

*MR. PRETYMAN: No, Sir.

SIR JOHN COLOMB said that then there would have to be another Vote. He also wished to know whether all the men would be Navy Reserve men, and also how discipline was to be maintained, as part of the crew would belong to the Royal Navy and part be under the Merchant Shipping Act.

MR. E. J. C. MORTON (Dovonport) said he recognised that there was not now time to deal with several questions relating to the men in the naval dockyards, in which he was interested, and therefore he would postpone them until another occasion. After the courteous and able way in which the Civil Lord of the Admiralty had treated the Vote he did not wish to add to his difficulties. There

was one question, however, which he should like to put to the hon. and gallant Gentleman. As late as last August Mr. Goschen appointed a Committee to inquire into the question of water-tube boilers. That was an extremely intricate question from the point of view of persons who were not experts. A rumour had found its way into the press that the Committee was about to make an interim Report shortly. He wished to know whether that was a fact, and also whether the Report would deal with the question as to the distinction between the Belleville boilers and other forms of water-tube boilers. They all understood the difference between water-tube and fire-tube boilers, both as regarded advantages and disadvantages, but he for one did not understand the difference between one form of water-tube boiler and another.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I do not see how the hon. Member can connect a Report of a Committee on the Belleville boiler with the Vote now before the Committee.

MR. E. J. C. MORTON: Would it not come under the Contracts Vote?

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member would be entitled to object to certain boilers in ships, but cannot see how he can connect an interim Report of a Committee now sitting with the present Vote.

MR. E. J. C. MORTON: I suppose I am entitled to ask whether there is to be an interim Report, as the answer would affect the way in which I should vote?

*CAPTAIN PRETYMAN: If the question does not arise on this Vote it would be more convenient to put down a question.

MR. DILLON said he had listened to the debate for a long time, and every hon. Member who had spoken had spoken in encouragement of the Admiralty in their wild career of extravagance. That was a most lamentable condition of things, and it appeared to him that it was time that the voice of economy should be heard, and that, after the eloquence to which the Committee had been treated by experts anxious to see more millions expended, someone should speak on behalf of the taxpayer, who would have to find the money. He proposed to move the reduction of the Vote by £1,000,000. They were now called upon to give a supplementary sum of £1,250,000 towards the Naval Estimates for the current year. That was not only a Supplementary Estimate, but it was a Supplementary Estimate in addition to what had been described as an additional Estimate. Of course they knew to their cost that during a time of war they were called upon to vote Supplementary Estimates for the Army or the Navy, as the case might be, but the war in South Africa had no effect on the Navy, and the Navy had not been called upon for any unusual exertions. Therefore they might treat the Navy as being on a peace footing. But, besides the sum now asked for, they were called upon in July last to vote what was described as an additional Estimate of £1,269,000. Therefore the whole additional Supplementary Estimate asked for the Navy during the current year was over £2,500,000. If hon. Members would look at the history of the British Navy they would find nothing to equal such a condition of things as that. The First Lord of the Admiralty, in making his Naval statement for 1900-1, announced that the total Estimate for that year was £27,522,600, an increase of £928,100 over the Estimate for 1899-1900. They were now called upon to make a further increase of over two and a half millions, or, in other words, the cost of the Navy for the

present year, without any additional expense attributable to the war or to warlike preparations, was three and a half millions over the cost of the previous year.

That was only the beginning of the story. The Committee had listened to the speech of the hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite, who gave expression to the sentiments held by the patriotic gentlemen who constituted the Navy League, and who were continually clamouring for increased armaments. He declared that what was wanted was a large and continuous increase in the cost of the Navy, and therefore the Committee had the pleasant prospect of having to consider a still further increase next year. He asked himself where that policy was going to stop. Some years ago an hon. Member announced the proposition that the British Navy should be kept always equal to the navies of the next two greatest Powers in the world. The effect of that was, as he and other hon. Members ventured to prophesy at the time, that the navies of the two great Powers specified were enormously increased, and the argument used in Russia and France in support of the increases was the very statement made in the House of Commons that the British intended to be masters of the sea. Tonight an hon. Gentleman announced that the standard, as he called it, for the future should be that the British Navy should be kept up to a point of equality with the navies of any three other Powers. He ventured to describe that as a career of madness. When Mr. Gladstone retired from public life they were led to believe, and he for his part did believe it, that one of the motives which induced him to retire at that particular moment was that his own friends insisted upon a substantial increase of the Navy, and Mr. Gladstone, with his immense experience, dating from the early years of the century and from the days of Sir Robert Peel, was convinced that if he consented to that increase, it would be impossible to tell where such a policy would end. What had happened? When the Naval Estimates were introduced in 1895 the

then Civil Lord of the Admiralty said that ten years previously the total Naval Estimates were just over twelve millions, and that they were then asking for eighteen millions for that year, it was that increase which contributed to the retirement of Mr. Gladstone from public life. They had now reached a figure of over thirty millions, or an increase of twelve millions within the last five years. Those were figures which ought to make the Committee pause and reflect on the course they were asked to pursue. As Mr. Gladstone prophesied in 1895 would be the case, the increase then voted was a geometrical increase, and increased more rapidly in every succeeding year. During the debates on the Navy Estimates in the last few years there had never been a hint or a sign that they were reaching the limit.

Some hon. Members appeared to be under the delusion that England had such boundless resources that she could arrogantly take up the position of standing against the world in arms, and that she could hold the seas against the world. Such language was the language of madness, and would inevitably lead to the national ruin. If hon. Members continued to talk such preposterous language, and if they could get their views carried into effect, it could lead to nothing but national ruin. They could not bold the seas against the world in arms, and what

had happened during the last few years had shown that such boasts were weak and foolish. They had encouraged the United States in a mad career of building a fleet and engaging in what was called an Imperial policy. He believed that the people and the statesmen of England would bitterly rue the day in which they excited and encouraged the United States. If the United States were to take up that wild idea of naval armament it would put England to the pin of her collar to hold her own. Then there were the Japanese fleet and the German fleet, which formerly amounted to almost nothing, but which, largely owing to the boasts and insults of England, had been doubled and quadrupled during the last few years. It was absurd for England to attempt to maintain that world-wide supremacy of the seas which she maintained for many years. If England sought to be mistress of the seas, then he

prophesied that the day was not far distant when the British taxpayer would be crushed under a burden which he was no longer able to bear. He and other hon. Members had in recent years fought doggedly against increases in the Navy and in the Army, though he confessed he never thought expenditure would increase at such a rate as would satisfy hon. Gentlemen on the opposite side, who were continually clamouring for money, and whose appetite grew on what it led on. The more money that was voted the more they wanted. A gentleman, describing himself as Chairman of the Navy League, made a prophecy in The Times newspaper in December last which had been borne out in a most remarkable manner. He denounced Mr. Goschen, and stated he had been for a long time incapable of mastering the difficulties which confronted him at the Admiralty. He pointed out how the universal antipathy of the German people had found expression in the doubling of their fleet, and he said that the conclusion was irresistible that the management of marine affairs during the five years of the late Government had been incompetent, with the result that England had lost command of the seas. It was the opinion of the Chairman of the Navy League that, after twelve millions had been added to the expense of the British Navy, the result was that England had lost command of the seas. That was nice encouragement for the taxpayer. The Times newspaper, commenting on that conclusion, spoke of the Navy League as possessing an energetic policy, but it seemed to him as if it were suffering from the malady known as "political hysterics." Unless the Admiralty took the man who shouted the loudest, and made him their head, they would not satisfy the Navy League. Instead of applying themselves to remedy the evils and defects which experts were continually pointing out, the Admiralty seemed to have set themselves the impossible task of satisfying the cry of the Navy League for more money without any regard as to how it should be spent. They could not satisfy the Navy League, and they were now pursuing a career which, if continued much further, must end in absolute bankruptcy or a revolt on the part of the taxpayers. There was

no assurance that the money was to be spent in such a way as that value would be had for it. No hon. Gentleman had spoken in stronger terms on the subject than the Chancellor of the Exchequer himself. He delivered a speech about a year ago in Bristol, in which he defended the Government from the attacks of the Navy League. He said that the year before his Government came into office the

expenditure of the Navy was fifteen millions, and that they had raised that expenditure in five years to twenty-five millions. The Chancellor of the Exchequer regarded twenty-five millions as a great achievement, but now they were asked to vote thirty millions, and with every prospect of a still higher figure being demanded. He therefore, would take, that opportunity of protesting against the increased expenditure now proposed.

There was one item in the Supplementary Estimate; namely. £;30,000, for the seizure and detention of vessels on the South African coast; to which he wished to refer. The Civil Lord of the Admiralty did not give an explanation of that, and he thought it very hard that the taxpayers should be called upon to pay £;30,000 for proceedings which were a flagrant breach of the usages of war. He should like to know what reprimand had been addressed to the officers for the seizure of vessels engaged in carrying food to Lorenzo Marques. He begged to move the reduction of the Vote by one million.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That an additional sum, not exceeding £;250,000, be granted for the said Services."; (Mr. Dillon.)

MR CREAM (Cork. S.E.) said he desired to support the reduction. It was not necessary for him to add anything to what had been stated by his hon. friend, but he wished particularly to bring before the Committee the treatment meted out to Ireland in connection with naval expenditure. He had the honour of representing a Division in which a shipbuilding yard was located, which, however, for many years had been boycotted. The men had either to walk the streets idle, or cross over to England to seek employment. The Civil Lord of the Admiralty stated that the cause of the delay in executing shipbuilding work was that the shipyards were not able to cope with it. There were many shipyards which had not had a pound's worth of work from the Admiralty, and they would get it were it not that the Admiralty had pet yards. Why should the work be confined to the pet yards of the Admiralty? Even if other yards got work, the inspectors were on the pounce, and watched carefully every man working on a boiler or fitting a plate on the vessel. He would not complain if that course were also carried out in other dockyards, but it was not. In the yards to which he was referring the work contracted for had not only to be completed, but every whim of every official had also to be carried out. That was the reason why some of the best yards in Ireland; which were some of the best in the world; would not take Navy contracts. Why were not Navy contracts taken, in Belfast? He objected on that ground to the Supplementary Estimates. He believed that 50 per cent, of the Estimate was dishonest, though, of course, he did not accuse the hon. Gentleman opposite of doing anything dishonest or dishonourable. What he intended to convey was that proper supervision was not exercised over the work executed in the pet yards of the Admiralty. In his own constituency they dreaded to take a contract from the Navy, not that they could not turn out the work well, because they had been already complimented by the Admiralty. He asked for no favours, but that his constituents should get the common right of taxpayers who were contributing to the present extraordinary expense. They at least might be allowed to compete with English firms on equal terms. The action of the Admiralty in asking for such a large Estimate was not

surprising, because hon. Members connected with the Navy League were prepared to encourage them in their extravagance. The Admiralty were encouraged not to economise, and they were given to understand that they would get what they wished to ask for. The Irish Members protested against such conduct, He was very glad that the reduction had been moved, and he would vote for it. He pitied England if her boast that she

would meet the world in arms was as poor as her boast about her Army. If England could do with her Navy only what she had been able to do with her Army, it would not be much. The other day he read of ships in the Navy, supposed to be fitted to undertake any emergency, which had to be docked for repairs, He believed that nine-tenths of the ships in the British Navy were in the same condition, and were not in any sense as well equipped as the ships of the mercantile marine. The British mercantile marine was the best in the world, but he doubted very much if the British Navy would be capable of meeting the navies of any two other Powers.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think it is open to discuss the general condition of the Navy on this Vote.

MR. GREAN said it was the efficiency of the Navy they were discussing, and his point was that the money was wasted because it was not efficiently expended. If they were to judge the efficiency of the Navy by the efficiency of the Army they would have to remodel their naval system completely, not only with regard to supervision of extravagant expenditure, but also as regards construction. At present vessels were not built in accordance with the original design, and no actual Estimate could therefore be framed for them. When a contractor got it into his head that the work was not to be completed according to specification, and that the design might be changed a hundred times over, he did not mind, because it put extra money into his pocket. The hon. Baronet who spoke recently stated that a commercial firm wishing to build a steamship entered into a contract which was carried out to the letter, and in accordance with the designs, and the result was that the ship was built for the price originally fixed. Ships for the Navy were never contracted for on proper lines, and were never built within 25 per cent, of the original estimate. The result was that extravagant expenditure was called for every year, and that extravagant Supplementary Estimates were brought forward without any details being given. Even the present Estimates were not final, because the Civil Lord of the Admiralty said that there would have to be another Estimate for the engineering staff of the "Ophir." He had great pleasure in supporting the reduction moved by his hon. friend.

MR. JOYCE said he desired to make a few remarks on some of the sub-heads of the Supplementary Estimates. He entirely agreed with what the hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite said with regard to the sub-heads dealing with the wages, provisions and clothing of seamen. He would not object to any money spent in making the seamen more comfortable, but those sub-heads were very small indeed, whereas the amounts under other sub-heads had been enormously increased. After the very able and lucid speech of the hon. Member for Gateshead, he would merely content himself with recording his protest against the enormously increased

expenditure of £700,000 for coal. He thought the hon. Member had proved his case with regard to that, and although the Civil Lord of the Admiralty made a very nice and a very pretty speech he did not answer it. Then there was a sub-head for piloting His Majesty's ships. The hon. Gentleman said that, as a matter of fact, the large amount of money mentioned in the sub-head was not all for piloting. If it were paid for canal dues or otherwise, it should be placed in its proper position. He ventured to submit that piloting did not cost a fifth of the money.

*MR. PRETYMAN:£11,000.

MR. JOYCE said there was only one other matter he desired to deal with, and that was a supplementary sum of £8,000 for telegraphic communications. Many Parliaments had been known by peculiar names. He had read of the Long Parliament, and the Short Parliament, and the Rump Parliament. Now they had the Parliament of Telegraphic Communications. In every Estimate that was brought before the Committee the amount of money that was expended on telegraphic communications was simply enormous. He thought his hon. friend the Member for East Mayo was acting in the interests of the taxpayers when he moved to reduce the Vote, and he would support him.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.) said that the hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite, in his friendly criticism of the proposals of the Government, stated that in connection with the Navy, England was not exceeding the expenditure of other European countries, and was simply following their lead. From a recent Parliamentary Return, it would, however, appear that His Majesty's Navy had been increasing, was and would continue to increase, and that England was leading other countries in naval expenditure. Was the Committee justified in voting the huge amount of money spent on the Navy? Were the condition of the Navy bad, were its ships in such a rotten condition that they would not be seaworthy, then they might be justified in incurring a reasonable expenditure, but the question they had to consider was whether the present expenditure was reasonable or just, and whether it was in proportion to revenue, and in proportion to the naval expenditure of other countries. He would quote for the information of the Committee a few figures from the Parliamentary Return to which he had referred. It would appear from that Return that the naval expenditure of the United Kingdom in 1897-8 was twenty-two millions out of a total revenue of 108 millions, or twenty percent. He should like to know if there were any European countries that had such a large naval expenditure as compared with its aggregate revenue. The information he had led him to believe that there was no such country. In Russia the naval expenditure was only six millions as compared with an aggregate revenue of 147 millions, or only four per cent. In Germany the naval expenditure was six millions, as compared with seventy millions of revenue. With reference to France, many Englishmen appeared much afraid of that country, and seemed to think that her naval power was not second to that of England, although that was a question of trial between the two nations. And he believed that the day was not far off when the issue would be fought out. [An HON. MEMBER laughed.] hon. Gentlemen might laugh, but they knew down in the bottom of their hearts that for the last two years naval experts had been

declaring that the British Navy was bad. Two years ago an hon. Member who stated that the British Army could not take away the freedom of a farming community in South Africa would not be listened to, but he would be listened to now. What did he find as regards the naval expenditure of France? It was only nine millions as compared with a revenue of 102 millions. He found that the naval expenditure of Great Britain was in one year equal to that of France. German) and Russia combined. The question which hon. Members from Ireland had to consider was not whether these sums were necessary for the purpose of protecting the Empire, because they were not there to protect the Empire. They came there with the courage of their convictions, and told lion. Members what they thought about them. They came to demand justice for Ireland, and they knew that ever since the Union the contributions of Ireland had always been excessive. According to a Royal Commission appointed by hon. Members opposite;a jury empannelled by themselves;a verdict of guilty was brought home to them. It was the bounden duty of hon. Members from Ireland to protest against the increased expenditure in connection with the Army and Navy. The present revised Estimate in connection with the Navy was £;30.419,000. He had shown, according to the Parliamentary Return for 1897–8. that the naval expenditure was then only twenty-two millions. The Irish Members wanted to know who was getting value for that greatly increased expenditure. Ireland received no benefit from it, directly or indirectly. Their shipbuilding yards were idle, and the British Government would not even give a gunboat to protect Irish fisheries which were at the mercy of the foreigner. Ireland had to pay part of this increased taxation not only in money, hut even in blood shed in South Africa. The Irish Members protested against the war when it began, and told the Government what the consequences would be. Irish Members now told the Government unhesitatingly that if through some foreign complication England came into conflict with her neighbour across the Channel, the British Navy would be as inferior to the French navy as the British Army was to the Boer army. [Laughter.] Hon. Gentlemen might laugh, but the Irish Members told them the same about the Army. He believed that if the issue had to be fought out in the morning. France would show a superiority over the British Navy. There were very large questions affecting Ireland which arose out of the Vote before the Committee, because Ireland had to contribute a sum of more than £;3,000,000 a year beyond her just proportion. What did Ireland get in return? The Irish Members had endeavoured to elicit information in regard to contracts for the Navy and Army. The Government was generous enough

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Dewar, T. R (T'rH'mlets, S. Geo.)
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Kitson, Sir James
Allen, Charles P(Glouc., Stroud)
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield

Knowles, Lees
Allhusen, Augustus H. Eden
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Lambton, Hon. Frederick W.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Atkers-
Lawrence, William F.
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Lawson, John Grant
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Faber, George Denison
Lecky, Rt. Hon. William E. H.
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (Accrington
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Leighton, Stanley
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Finch, George H.
Leveson-Gower, Fred. N. S.
Balcarres, Lord
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Lock wood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J.(Manch'r)
Fisher, William Hayes
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)
Balfour, RtHnGeraldW,(Leeds
Fitz Gerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Balfour, Maj K R.(Christchurch)
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Banbury, Frederick
Flower, Ernest
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Hartley, George C. T.
Forster, Henry William
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsm'uth)
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Fuller, J. M. F.
Macdona, John Gumming

Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H.(Bristol)
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H (City of Lond.)
Maconochie, A. W.
Beach, Rt. Hn. W. W. B.(Hants.)
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin&Nairn)
M'Arthur, Chas. (Liverpool)
Beaumont, Went worth C. B.
Gordon, Maj Evans (T'rH'mlets)
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim,E.)
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-
Majendie, James A. H.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Gorst. Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Malcolm, fan
Bignold, Arthur
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Manners, Lord Cecil
Bill, Charles
Graham, Henry Robert
Markham, Arthur Basil
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Grant, Corrie
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Bond. Edward
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Maxwell, W. J. H.(Dumfriessh.)
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Green, Walford D (Wednesbury)
Melville. Beresford Valentine
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Brassey, Albert
Groves, James Grimble
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Fredrick G.
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Brook field, Colonel Montagu
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Bull, William James
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Burdett-Coutts, W.

Hambro, Charles Erie
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropsh.)
Carlile, William Walter
Hamilton. Rt Hn. Ld. G (Midd'x)
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Cautley, Henry Strother
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nderry)
Morrell, George Herbert
Cavendish, R. F.(N. Lanes.)
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)
Morris, Hn. Martin Henry F
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Hay. Hon. Claude George
Morrison, James Archibald
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley)
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Cecil. Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Heath, James (Staffords. N. W.)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm).
Helder, Augustus
Nicholson, William Graham
Chamberlain, J Austen(Worc'r)
Henderson, Alexander
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Chapman, Edward
Holland, William Henry
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Charrington, Spencer
Hope, J. F.(Sheffield, Brightside)
Partington, Oswald
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Hoult, Joseph
Pemberton, John S. G.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Hutton, John (Yorks. N. R.)
Percy, Earl
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jessse
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Pilkington, Richard
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Johnston. William (Belfast)
Platt-Higgins. Frederick
Cook, Frederick Luoas
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)

Plummer, Walter Lt.
 Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
 Joicey, Sir James
 Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
 Cranborne, Viscount
 Kenyon, Hon. G. T. (Denbigh)
 Pretymann, Ernest George
 Cubitt, Hon. Henry
 Keswick, William
 Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
 in giving huge coal contracts at the enormous price of twenty-nine shillings per
 ton. When contracts could have been entered into at thirteen shillings per ton;
 MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place and claimed to move, "That the Question be
 now put."
 Question put, "That the Question be now put."
 The committee divided:;Ayes, 221; Noes, 82. (Division List No. 35.)
 Purvis, Robert
 Schwann, Charles E.
 Webb, Colonel William George
 Randles, John S.
 Seton-Karr, Henry
 White, Luke (York, E. R.)
 Ratcliffe, R. F.
 Sharpe, William Edward T.
 Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne)
 Reed, Sir E. James (Cardiff)
 Simeon, Sir Barrington
 Whitmore, Charles Algernon
 Reid, James (Greenock)
 Skewes-Cox, Thomas
 Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
 Remnant, James Farquharson
 Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
 Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
 Rentoul, James Alexander
 Smith, HC (North'mb Tyneside)
 Willox, Sir John Archibald
 Renwick, George
 Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
 Wills, Sir Frederick
 Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge)
 Spear, John Ward
 Wilson, A. Stanley (Yorks. E. R.)
 Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)
 Stanley, Lord (Lanes.)
 Wilson, John (Falkirk)

Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Charles T.
Stock, James Henry
"Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Stroyan, John
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H.(Yorks.)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Sturt. Hon. Humphry Napier
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Rothschild, Hn. Lionel Walter
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ)
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Round, James
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings)
Wylie, Alexander
Royds, Clement Molyneun
Thornton, Percy M.
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Russell, T. W.
Tollemache, Henry James
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Rutherford. John
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Tufnell, Col. Edward
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alex.
Valentia, Viscount
Sir William Walrond and
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.
Mr. Anstruther.
Sandys, Lt.-Col Thos. Myles
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
NOES.
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)
Hammond, John
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Ambrose, Robert
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Boland. John
Hayden, John Patrick

O'Kelly, J. (Roscommon, N.)
Boyle, James
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
O'Malley, William
Brigg, John
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
O'Mara, James
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Jones, William (Canarvonsh.)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Jordan. Jeremiah
Power, Patrick Joseph
Caldwell, James
Joyce, Michael
Rea, Russell
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Kennedy, Patrick James
Reckitt, Harold James
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Lambert, George
Reddy, M.
Cawley, Frederick
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Redmond, J. E. (Waterford)
Cogan, Denis J.
Levy, Maurice
Rickett, J. Compton
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Lundon, W.
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Craig, Robert Hunter
Macdonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Crean, Eugene
M'Dermott, Patrick
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Cullinan, J.
M'Govern, T.
Sullivan, Donal
Daly, James
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Thomson, F. W. (York.W.R.)

Delany, William
Mooney, John J.
Trevelvan, Charles Philips
Dillon, John
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Tally, Jasper
Doogan, P. C.
Murphy, J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay, T.
Duffy, William J.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
White, P. (Meath, North)
Elibank, Master of
Nolan. Col. J. P. (Galway, N.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Field, William
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Flavin, Michael Joseph
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Furness, Sir Christopher
O'Connor, Jas. Wicklow, W.
Captain Donelan and Mr.
Gilhooly, James
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Patrick O'Brien.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Question put accordingly, "That an additional sum, not exceeding £;250,000, be
granted for the said Services."
AYES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Cogan, Denis J.
Doogan, P. C.
Ambrose, Robert
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Duffy, William J.
Boland, John
Crean, Eugene
Field, William
Boyle, James
Cullinan, J.
Flavin, Michael Joseph

Burke, E. Haviland
Daly, J.
Flynn, James Christopher
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Delany, William
Gilhooly, James
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Dillon, John
Hammond, John
The Committee divided::Ayes 52; Noes, 248, (Division List No. 36.)
Hayden, John Patrick
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Jordan, Jeremiah
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Joyce, Michael
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Reddy, M.
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'ry Mid)
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Lundon, W.
O'Connor, James(Wicklow, W.)
Sullivan, Donal
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Tully, Jasper
M'Dermott, Patrick
O'Donnell, John (Mayo. S.)
White. Patrick (Meath, North)
M'Govern, T.
O'Donnell. T. (Kerry, W.)
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Mooney, John J.
O'Kelly, J. (Roscommon, N.)
Captain Donelan and Mr.
Murphy, J.
O'Malley, William
Patrick O'Brien.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
O'Mara, James
NOES.
Acland-Hood,Capt.SirAlex. F.

Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T.(Denbigh)
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Dewar, T. R.(T'rH'mlets, S. Geo)
Keswick, William
Allen,Chas. P. (Glouc. Stroud)
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Allhusen, Augustus Hy. Eden
Dimsdale, Sir JosephCockfield
Kitson, Sir James
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Knowles, Lees
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Lambert, George
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Elibank, Master of
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Atkinson, lit. Hon. John
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Lawrence, William F.
Bailey,James (Walworth)
Faber, George Denison
Lawson, John Grant
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Layland- Barratt, Francis
Balcarres, Lord
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r)
Lecky, Rt. Hn. William Edw. H.
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J (Manch'r)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Leese, Sir. Joseph F. (Accrington)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds)
Finch, George H.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Balfour, Maj. K. R. (Christch'ch)
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Leighton, Stanley
Banbury, Frederick George
Fisher, William Hayes
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.

Bartley, George C. T.
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Levy, Maurice
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)
Flower, Ernest
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Beach, Rt. Hn. W. W. B. (Hants)
Forster, Henry William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.
Gibbs, Hn. A. GH (City of Lond
Lucas, Reginald J. (P'rtsmouth)
Bignold, Arthur G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Rill, Charles
Gordon, Hn. J. E (Elgin & Nairn)
Macdonald, John Cumming
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Gordon, Maj Evans - (TrH'ml'ts)
Maconochie, A. W.
Bond, Edward
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Brand, Hon. Arthur
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Majendie, James A. H.
Brassey, Albert
Graham, Henry Robert
Malcolm, Ian
Brigg, John
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Manners, Lord Cecil
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Green, Walford D. (Wedn'sb'ry)

Markham, Arthur Basil
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Groves, James Grimble
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire)
Bull, William James
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Caldwell, James
Hambro, Charles Erie
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Carlile, William Walter
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Mid'x)
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Cautley, Henry Strother
Hamilton. Marq of (L'nd'nderry)
More, R. Jasper (shropshire)
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lanes).
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
More, R. Jasper (Shropshire)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Harris, F. Leverton (Tyn'mouth)
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Cawley, Frederick
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Morrell, George Herbert
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Morris, Hon. M. Henry F.
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Heath, Artbur Howard (Hanl'y)
Morrison, James Archibald
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm)
Heath, James (Staffords. N. W.)
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Chamberlain, J Austen (Wore'r)
Helder, Augustus
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Chapman, Edward

Henderson, Alexander
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
Charrington, Spencer
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol,E.)
Nicholson, William Graham
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Holland, William Henry
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Hoult, Joseph
Partington, Oswald
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Hutton, Jolin (Yorks. N.R.)
Pembertort, John S. G.
Cook, Frederick Lucas
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Percy, Earl
(Corbett,A.Cameron(Glasgow)
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Pilkington, Richard
Craig, Robert Hunter
Johnstone, Hey wood (Sussex)
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Camborne, Viscount
Joicey, Sir James
Plummer, Walter R.
Cubitt. Hon. Henry
Jones, William (Carnarv'nshire)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Warner, Thomas Courteny T.
Purvis, Robert
Seton-Karr, Henry
Wason, John C. (Orkney)
Randles, John S.
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Webb, Colonel William Geo.
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Rea, Russell
Simeon, Sir Barrington

Whiteley, H (Ashton-und. L'ne)
Reckitt, Harold James
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Reed, Sir E. James (Cardiff)
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Whitmore, Charles Algenon
Reid, James (Greenock)
Smith, H.C (North'mb>.Tynesd.
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Remnant, James Farquharson
Smith, James P, (Lanarks.)
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Rentoul, James Alexander
Soames, Arthur Wesleyan
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Renwick, George
Spear. John Ward
Willox, Sir John Archibald
RicKett, J. Compton
Stanley. Lord (Lanes.)
Wills, Sir Frederick
Ridley,Hn. M. W. (St'ly bridge)
Stock, James Henry
Wilson, A. S. (York, E. R.)
Ridley, S F. (Bethnal Green)
Stroyan, John
Wilson; John (Falkirk)
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. C. Thomson
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Sturt, Hon. Huniphry Napier
Wilson, J W (Worcesterhire,N.)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Talbot, Rt Hn J G (Oxford Univ.)
Wilson-Todd, W. H. (Yorks.)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Ropuer, Colonel Robert
Thomas,F. Freeman-(Hastings)
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Rothstchild, Hon. L. Walter
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Wylie, Alexander

Round, James
Thornton, Percy M.
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Tollemache, Henry James
Young, Commanded (Berks, E.)
Russell, T. W.
Tomlinson, W Edward M.
Rutherford, John
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Tufnell, Col. Edward
Sir William Walrond and
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alex.
Valentia, Viscount
Mr. Anstruther.
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.
MR. A. J. BALFOUR claimed, "That the Original Question be now put."
AYES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Flower, Ernest
Andrew, Sir Andrew Noel
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lanes.)
Forster, Henry William
Allen, Chas. P. (Gloucester, Stroud)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.
Cawley, Frederick
Furness, Sir Christopher
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (City of London)
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birmingham)
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worcester)
Gordon, Maj Evans (Troms)
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Chapman, Edward
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Charrington, Spencer
Gorst, Rt. Hon Sir John Eldon
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Bain, Col. James Robert
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Graham, Henry Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J.(Manch'r)
Colomb.Sir John Charles Ready
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds)
Cook, Frederick Lucas
Green, Walford D. (Wednesb'y.)
Balfour, Maj. K R(Christchurch)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Banbury, Frederick George
Craig, Robert Hunter
Groves, James Grimble
Bartley, George C. T.
Cranborne, Viscount
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H.(Bristol)
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Beach, Rt. Hn. W. W. B (Hants.)
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Hambro, Charles Eric
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Dewar, T. R. (T'rll'mlets, S Geo.)
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Mid'x)
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'd'nderry)
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Bignold, Arthur
Dorington, Sir John Edward

Harris, F. Leveiton (Tynem' th.
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Douglas, Rt. Hn A. Akers-
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Bond, Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley)
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Elibank, Master of
Heath, James (Staffords. N. W.)
Brassey, Albert
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Helder, Augustus
Brigg, John
Faber, George Denison
Henderson, Alexander
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. Sir John
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Hobhouse, C. E.H. (Bristol, E.)
Brookfield, Col. Montagu
Fergusson, Rt Hn Sir J. (Manc'r.)
Holland, William Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Bull, William James
Finch, George H.
Hoult, Joseph
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Hutton, John (Yorks. N. R.)
Fisher, William Hayes
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Caldwell, James
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Carlile, William Walter
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Johnstone, Hey wood (Sussex)
The Committee divided:; Ayes, 246; Noes, 49. (Division List No. 37.)
Joicey, Sir James
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)

Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Smith, H C (North'mb Tyneside)
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T.(Denbigh)
Nicholson, William Graham
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Keswick, William
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Spear, John Ward
Kitson, Sir James
Partington, Oswald
Stanley, Lord (Lanes.)
Knowles, Lees
Pemberton, John S. G.
Stock, James Henry
Lambert, George
Percy, Earl
Stroyan, John
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Pilkington, Richard
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Lawrence, William F.
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G.(Oxf'd Uni.)
Lawson, John Grant
Plummer, Walter R.
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings)
Lecky. Rt. Hn. William Edw. H
Pretymann, Ernest George
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Leese, Sir Joseph F.(Accrington)
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Thornton, Percy M.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Purvis, Robert
Tollemache, Henry James
Leighton, Stanley
Hendles, John S.
Tomlinson, Wm. E. Murray
Leveson-Gower, Fred. N. S.
Ratcliffe, R. F.

Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Levy, Maurice
Rea, Russell
Tufnell, Col. Edward
Lockwood, Lt-Col. A. R.
Reckitt, Harold James
Valentia, Viscount
Long. Rt. Hn Walter (Bristol, S.)
Reed, Sir Edw. James (Cardiff)
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Warner, Thomas C. T.
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Remnant, James Farquharson
Wason, J. Cathcart (Orkney)
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Rentoul, James Alexander
Webb, Col. William George
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Renwick, George
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Macdona, John Cumming
Rickett, J. Compton
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-und.-L.)
Maconochie, A. W.
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Majendie, James A. H.
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Williams. Col. R. (Dorset)
Malcolm, Ian
Roe, Sir Thomas
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Manners, Lord Cecil
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Markham, Arthur Basil
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Wills, Sir Frederick

Martin, Richard Biddulph
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Wilson, A. S. (York, E. R.)
Maxwell, W. J. H.(Dumfriessh.)
Round, James
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Russell, T. W.
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh., N.)
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Rutherford, John
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H.(Yorks.)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Wylie, Alexander
More, Robt Jasper (Shropshire)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos Myles
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Seton-Karr, Henry
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Morrell, George Herbert
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Morrison, James Archibald
Simeon, Sir Harrington
Sir William Walrond and
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Mr. Anstruther.
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Ambrose, Hubert

Gilhooly, James
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Boland, John
Hammond, John
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Boyle, James
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Burke, E. Haviland-
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Malley, William
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Joyce, Michael
O'Mara, James
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Cogan, Denis J.
Lundon, W.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Mac Donnell, Dr. Mark A.
Reddy, M.
Crean, Eugene
M'Dermott, Patrick
Redmond, John E.(Waterford)
Cullinan, J.
M'Govern, T.
Sullivan, Donal
Daly, James
Mooney, John J.
Tally, Jasper
Delany, William
Murphy, J.
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Dillon, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Doogan, P. C.
Nolan, Col John P(Galway, N.)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Dully, William J.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Captain Donclan and Mr.
Field, William
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid).
Patrick O'Brien.

Flavin, Michael Joseph
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)

It being after midnight, the Chairman left the chair to make his report to the House.

Resolutions to be reported to-morrow. Committee to sit again to-morrow.

Adjourned at twenty-five minutes before One of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 5th March, 1901.

Several other Members took and subscribed the Oath.

KING'S SPEECH (ANSWER TO ADDRESS).

The COMPTROLLER OF THE HOUSEHOLD reported His Majesty's Answer to the Address, as followeth::

"I have received with great satisfaction the loyal and dutiful expression of your thanks for the Speech with which I opened the present Session of Parliament."

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

LONDON WATER (PURCHASE) BILL.

Order for Second Heading read.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid) proposed to take the Second Reading on the 25th instant.

SIR F. DIXON-HARTLAND (Middlesex, Uxbridge) protested against a date being thus fixed upon without first extending to him, as an opponent, the courtesy of consulting him. He had not been approached in any way.

*MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. Baronet objects, the matter stands over until tomorrow, and then he will have an opportunity of consulting the promoters.

MR. JOHN BURNS (Battersea) said the Local Government Board, the London water companies, and other interests concerned were all agreed that 25th March would be the most convenient day,

MR. CALDWELL said it was impossible for the promoters to know every opponent.

SIR F. DIXON-HARTLAND: But I have given written notice of opposition.

MR. JOHN BURNS: The hon. Member for West Marylebone agreed with the members of the London County Council that 25th March would be a suitable day.

SIR F. DIXON-HARTLAND: Very well; I will offer no objection then.

Debate adjourned accordingly.

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.::
Burgess Hill Water Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

FAIRFORD AND CIRENCESTER RAILWAY BILL.

MOND GAS BILL.

Read a second time, and committed.

PETITIONS.

CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

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

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (HIGHER GRADE AND EVENING CONTINUATION SCHOOLS).

Petitions for alteration of Law, from Derby; New Mills; Blackburn; Fenny Stratford; Shepley; Thornton in Craven; Steeton with Eastburn; Sutton in Keighley; Walmersley and Ramsbot-tom; Acton; and Dewsbury; to lie upon the Table.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (SCOTCH CODE).

Petition from Leith, for alteration; to lie upon the Table,

OFFICERS OF THE INDIAN STAFF CORPS.

Six hundred and fourteen Petitions from Officers of the Indian Staff Corps, for redress of grievances; to lie upon the Table.

POOR LAW OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1896.

Petitions for alteration of Law, from Epsom; Ashton-in-Makerfield; and Acton; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

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

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Govan; Aberdeen; Windermere; Glasgow; Newcastle on-Tyne; and Kilmalcolm; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Three Petitions from Gourrock, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC

BANKRUPTCY (IRELAND).

Return [presented 6th December, 1900] to be printed. [No. 75.]

POST OFFICE (TELEGRAPH MONEY ORDERS).

Copy presented, of Additional Articles to the Convention of the 7th, 12th September, 1881, relative to the exchange of Money Orders between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and the Kingdom of Sweden, dated 1st to 8th September, 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1887.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 21st February, 1901, granting a retired allowance to Mr. W. H. F. Crock-shank, a Second Division Clerk, Money Order Office, General Post Office, under the Act [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

NAVY (DOCKYARD EXPENSE ACCOUNTS, 1899–1900).

Annual Accounts presented, for 1899–1900, of Shipbuilding and Dockyard Transactions, etc., with Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 76.]

ROYAL UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND.

Copy presented, of Nineteenth Report of the Royal University of Ireland, being for the year 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

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

1. Controverted Elections, Further Return.; Copy of Minutes of Evidence and Judgment in the Borough of Islington (West Division) Election Trial [ordered 22nd February; MR. Attorney General].

2. Bridlington Piers and Harbour.; Copy of Abstract of the General Annual Account for the year ending 26th July, 1900 [by Act].

UNFUNDED DEBT.

Return ordered, "of the amount of the Unfunded Debt on the 27th day of February, 1901, showing upon what terms and for what period it has been raised.";(Sir Edgar Vincent.)

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

WEST ISLINGTON ELECTION PETITION.

MR. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received from the Judges appointed to try the several Election Petitions the following Certificate and Report relating to the West Division of the Borough of Islington: ;

The Election Petition for the West Division of the Borough of Islington, 1900.

The Parliamentary Elections Act, 1868.

The Corrupt and Illegal Practices Acts, 1854–189,).

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

We, Sir William Rann Kennedy, Knight, and Sir Charles John Darling, Knight, Judges of His Majesty's High Court of Justice, and two of the judges on the rota for the time being for the trial of Election Petitions in England and Wales, Do hereby, in pursuance of the above written Acts, Certify that we duly held a Court at the Royal Courts of Justice, Strand, London, on the 14th, 15th, 16th, 17th, 18th, 19th, 20th, 21st, 22nd, 23rd, 24th, 25th, 26th, 27th, 28th, 29th, 30th, 31st, and 1st days of January, 1901 (the last day the Court was occupied with the question of costs only), for the trial of the Election Petition for the West Division of the Borough of Islington, between Francis Hastings Medhurst, Petitioner, and Thomas Lough, M.P., and Charles Gasquet, Returning Officer, Respondents. And, in further pursuance of the said Acts, we report that at the conclusion of the said trial we determined that the said Thomas Lough, the Member whose election was complained of, was duly elected and returned, and We Do Hereby Certify in writing such our determination to you. And we report that no charges were made in the said petition of any corrupt or illegal practices within the meaning of the Corrupt and Illegal Practices Prevention Acts.

Dated this 4th day of March, 1901.

W. R. Kennedy.

Charles Darling.

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICA;JAMESON RAID;LIABILITY OF THE BRITISH SOUTH AFRICA COMPANY.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER (Cheshire, Northwich): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will undertake that the Government shall not formally give up the claim of the late South African Republic against the British South Africa Company in case of a proposal being made for the purchase by the Government of the undertaking of the Company.

The CHANCELLOR of THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. Hicks Beach, Bristol, W.): I can only refer the hon. Member to my answer of yesterday;that this claim has been submitted to the law officers and that until we have received their opinion we can say nothing more.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER: I asked the right hon. Gentleman whether he would, on behalf of the Government, give an undertaking that this claim should not be formally abandoned. I have not understood that he has given me an answer to that

question.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I am not bound to answer the question as to what the Government might or might not do in a hypothetical case.

EXPENDITURE OF THE COLONIES FOR THEIR CONTINGENTS.

MR. CAUSTON (Southwark, W.): On behalf of the hon. Member for Dundee, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state approximately the expenditure incurred by the various colonies for pay of troops, equipment, or otherwise, in connection with the South African war.

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

I am not in a position to make such a statement at present. I could only obtain it by application to all the colonies, and as the accounts are not yet closed I think the hon. Member will agree with me that it would be premature to make the inquiry.

PRESS PROSECUTIONS IN CAPE COLONY.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeenshire, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will inform himself and state to the House by whom proceedings have been taken against Mr. Albert Cartwright, editor of the South African News, and what these proceedings ate; whether he is charged with reprinting in his paper treatment a, letter alleging that on a, particular February occasion Lord Kitchener had given instructions that General De Wet's force when surrounded should not be allowed to surrender; and, if so, whether he is aware that the letter making this charge had already appeared in the Freeman's Journal of 15th January, and the part of

it conveying this charge in the London Times of 10th January.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I received a despatch yesterday from the Governor of the Cape Colony, from which it appears that proceedings were taken by the Attorney General of the Cape Colony on the charge of publishing a defamatory and seditious libel. The answer to the second and third questions is in the affirmative.

MR. H J. WILSON (Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth): Is it proposed to take similar proceedings against the London Times and the Freeman's Journal?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: That is not a question which should be addressed to me.

PRECAUTIONS AGAINST PLAGUE AT CAPE TOWN.

*SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can state the number of cases of plague that have occurred at Cape Town, according to his latest advices, distinguishing the number of Europeans and the number of natives attacked; whether at the time of the outbreak of the malady the authorities at Cape Town had an adequate supply of Haffkinine (prophylactu vaccine) and of Yersius curative serum for dealing with an outbreak; whether a supply of these materials has since been sent out; and whether he will lay upon the Table any reports received from Dr. Edington or Professor Simpson on the relation of the disease in rats to that in human beings.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: My information is not complete, but, as stated in the telegraphic bulletins which have been supplied by the Cape Government and published, there was a total of twenty cases for the week ending 16th February

and twenty-nine cases remaining under at that date; on 23rd there were twenty-one remaining under treatment. So far as I am aware there has been one European case. As to the second question, I have no information; the matter is one for the responsible Government of the Cape Colony. In reply to the third question, I have not seen these reports, which I

understand are being prepared for the information of the Cape Government, and I am not aware that they have been published by that Government.

*SIR WALTER FOSTER: Will the right hon. Gentleman make inquiry as to the second paragraph?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: It is beyond my province to inquire into a matter for which the Cape Government is solely responsible, but if the hon. Gentleman will speak to me privately I will try to get the information he wants.

CONCENTRATION CAMPS; TREATMENT OF BOER WOMEN.

MR. C.P. SCOTT (Lancashire, Leigh): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can now state whether the wives and children of Boers in the field are placed on precisely the same rations in the concentration camps as the other women and children, or whether a distinction is still maintained; and, in the latter case, whether he will give instructions that all shall be treated alike.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): I have nothing to add to the reply I gave on Friday, the 1st instant, to the hon. Member for the Rushcliffe division of Nottinghamshire.* Lord Kitchener is taking all possible steps to secure the humane treatment of refugees.

MR. C. P. SCOTT: Will the right hon. Gentleman obtain the information?

MR. BRODRICK: I do not think any more information can be obtained. I leave Lord Kitchener a free hand in the matter.

MTLITARY COURTS OF INQUIRY.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the cases of the officers who have been removed from the Army, or their resignations enforced, for failure in South Africa, have been the subject of courts of inquiry; if so, have all such officers been accorded the opportunity of attending and defending themselves.

MR. BRODRICK: Officers who have failed in the field, or otherwise, in South

* See page 180.

Africa have been removed either on evidence given before courts of inquiry or on the recommendation of their superior officers. In such cases the general officer commanding satisfies himself that the officer's case is fully before him before he makes any recommendation to the War Office.

MR. LAMBERT: May I ask whether, when cases have been under consideration by courts of inquiry, the officer concerned have been allowed to attend.

MR. BRODRICK: As I told the House the other day, when an officer is summoned before a court of inquiry the court is bound to hear him if he desires to be heard. Of course cases might come before courts of inquiry in which are mentioned the names of officers whose attendance may not always be available.

*SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT (Sheffield, Ecclesall): Is it possible for an officer to be condemned and removed as the result of a court of inquiry without having an opportunity of being heard?

MR. BRODRICK: An officer cannot be condemned by a court of inquiry, but circumstances might come before the authorities consequent upon an inquiry on which they might require to be satisfied. An officer's case is fully gone into before a decision is come to.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: Has he an opportunity of defending himself?

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield): Has it ever happened that an officer has been condemned without going before the court of inquiry?

MR. BRODRICK: There may be cases in which an officer's name is mentioned whose attendance it is not possible to ensure.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER: What hon. Members desire to be assured upon is whether an officer can suffer by the finding of a court of inquiry without he himself having been heard.

[No answer was given.]

NEGOTIATIONS WITH GENERAL BOTHA.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he has any information to the effect that General Botha has intimated to Lord Kitchener his readiness to surrender on certain specified terms; and, if so, whether there is any prospect of a successful issue of the negotiations.

MR. BRODRICK: I have no statement to make on this subject.

BRITISH SURRENDERS; COURTS-MARTIAL.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state what cases of surrender of troops in South Africa have been tried by courts-martial, and when he proposes to make the findings and sentences public.

MR. BRODRICK: The question of the time and manner of the publication of the courts-martial referred to is under consideration.

CIVIL LAWS IN THE TRANSVAAL.

SIR CHARLES DILKE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state what body of laws is being enforced in the civil affairs of the Transvaal.

MR. BRODRICK: The laws now being enforced in the Transvaal are the statute laws of the Transvaal, subject to such alterations as the present abnormal state of the country renders necessary,

TREATMENT OF COLOURED PERSONS IN THE TRANSVAAL.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, by the Transvaal Pass Law, the rigid enforcement of which was asked for by the Rand Chamber of Mines, lashes at discretion may be inflicted for every second violation of its minute regulations, and whether by a clause introduced into the latest Transvaal Gold Law by the second Volksraad, every coloured workman who is found to be negligent may be punished by lashes not exceeding twenty-five; while coloured includes every Indian or African British subject; and if the attention of the Governor of the Transvaal will be called to such provisions, with a view to the better treatment of coloured persons.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The penalties referred to in the question are prescribed by the Pass Laws of 1895 and

1890, and by the Gold Laws for many years past. The definition of "coloured"

undoubtedly includes British Indian and African coloured subjects. Sir Alfred Milner is already alive to the need for considering the revision of such legislation, and I will call his attention to the special points referred to in the right hon. Member's question.

COMFORTS FOR TROOPS AT THE FRONT.

MR. RENSCHAW (Renfrewshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the approach of colder weather in South Africa, the Government will give the same facilities as they did last year for the transmission of extra comforts for men on service; and whether any information is available at the War Office which would indicate the sort of extras which would be most acceptable, and the localities in which they are most needed.

MR. BRODRICK: The same facilities for the transmission of extra comforts will be granted as last year. I will give my hon. friend a copy of the Departmental Memorandum detailing suitable articles for the troops in South Africa. Lord Kitchener, in reply to a telegram which I addressed to him on the subject, says that such extra comforts will be much appreciated, but I have no guidance as to localities.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): Is it not the fact that many cases of comforts sent last Christmas never reached the unfortunate soldiers?

MR. BRODRICK: Yes; there was a great congestion of traffic on the railway.
RETURN OF TROOPS.

MR. PIRIE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, with reference to the Return of Military Forces in South Africa 1899–1901, where it appears that the number of officers who left South Africa for England, not invalids, was 1,214, and the number of men and noncommissioned officers and men was 11,109, a proportion of 1 to 9, whereas the proportion to the strength of the Regular forces in South Africa on 1st February, 1901, under the heads of the Return, is about 1 to 32, whether he will state the reason of this disproportion of officers returning, not invalids, allowance being made for the staff officers who have returned with their generals; and whether he could state the number of this latter and of the staffs accompanying them.

MR. BRODRICK: The preparation of this Return would entail very considerable labour, which I am not prepared to throw upon the department concerned.
INDIAN RELIEFS.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state what steps, if any, are being taken with reference to the reliefs for India upon the close of the war in South Africa, and also whether anything will be done to compensate the 15,000 men now serving in India beyond the term of their engagement.

MR. BRODRICK: Men serving in India who are due for transfer to the Reserve will be replaced by men having four years unexpired colour service from South Africa and home. It is not proposed to compensate soldiers retained with the colours under the Royal Proclamation of 7th October, such retention being part of the liability which they accepted in their engagement.

COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF IN IRELAND; H.R.H. THE DUKE OF CONNAUGHT.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can give the date of the appointment of H.R.H. the Duke of Connaught to the position of Commander-in-Chief of the Army in Ireland, and how many days since his appointment has His Royal Highness been at his post.

MR BRODRICK: His Royal Highness was appointed to the command in Ireland on the 9th January, 1900, and has exercised the command since that date. I am not aware on how many days His Royal Highness has been at his office in Dublin, but in this, as in the commands he has previously held, His Royal Highness has discharged his duties to the complete satisfaction of the Commander-in-Chief.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: Cannot the right hon. Gentleman give the House the information I asked for as to the number of days he has been at his post in Ireland?

MR. BRODRICK: I cannot give the number of days, nor do I intend to ask for it.

MR. FLYNN: Ts the right hon. Gentleman aware that the Commander-in-Chief in question is never in Ireland?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

SOLDIERS' WIDOWS' PENSIONS.

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the sum of £56,000, taken on the War Office Estimates and stated in the memorandum of the Secretary of State for War to be to cover the grant of pensions from 1st April next to the widows and children of non-commissioned officers and men who have died as the result of active operations, is the whole sum contemplated to be granted for that purpose: and whether as stated in Return [Cd. 462] 1901, up to 1st February, 1901, 12,354 have actually been killed or died, and that 28,630 others have been wounded or are still in hospital, and if this sum of £56,000 is to provide for all the widows and orphans thus created as well as any additions that may yet be made to the list before the war is over.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (LORD STANLEY,Lancashire, Westthoughton): The sum referred to was taken as the charge likely to accrue during the year for pensions to widows and children of non-commissioned officers and men who have died. My hon. friend will realise that only a proportion of the army is married and the number of those wounded docs not affect the charge, as they are otherwise provided for.

BIRMINGHAM POLICEMEN SERVING IN SOUTH AFRICA RATE OF PAY.

MR. MANSFIELD (Lincolnshire, Spalding): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the fact that members of the Birmingham Police Force were engaged to go to the front in Africa at 3s. per day, that when they got to the front they were paid 5s. per day, that the Treasury on finding this out ordered the men home, but on their return to this country engaged them to return at 3s. 6d. per day; and whether the cost of transport per man is about £40; and, if so, can he say what was saved by bringing

the men home in order to secure a reduction in their pay.

LORD STANLEY: Nothing-whatever is known at the War Office or the Treasury of the circumstances named by the hon. Member.

ARMY MEAT AND FORAGE CONTRACTS; PROPOSED IRISH DEPOT.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick's): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he has received resolutions direct, and copies of resolutions passed by local authorities in various parts of Ireland, complaining of the importation of foreign meat and forage into a meat-producing and agricultural country; whether the War Office has been asked to provide a depot for the reception of tenders from Irish manufacturers; and whether it is intended to inquire into those matters, and provide a remedy.

LORD STANLEY: Various resolutions from Ireland in connection with the supply of foreign meat and forage to the troops there have been received at the War Office. As I have already explained to the House, the whole question of the supply of meat to the troops in the United Kingdom is being thoroughly considered.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork County, E.): Will the War Office consider the advisability of inserting a clause in future tender forms prohibiting contractors from supplying foreign meat?

[No answer was given.]

YEOMANRY EXERCISE AT HERTFORD.

MR. M'LAREN (Leicestershire, Bosworth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the field exercises on Saturday of the Yeomanry and Volunteers near Hertford; whether such exercises are intended as instructional manœuvres, and as such are in any way supervised by the War Office, or any regular military authority; and, whether any reports are made to the War Office on the tactics adopted by the Volunteer commanding officers; and, if so, whether he will communicate such reports to Parliament.

MR. BRODRICK: Exercises such as those referred to by the hon. Member are not supervised by the War Office and reports concerning them are not received at headquarters. Nor do I think that such centralisation would be desirable, but the whole question of Volunteer and Yeomanry field training is under the Commander-in-Chief's consideration.

SHROPSHIRE LIGHT INFANTRY; TIPPERARY RIOTS.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can give an undertaking that the persons suffering losses from the house wreckings and burglaries committed by privates of the Shropshire Light Infantry, in Tipperary, will be compensated by the Army Department and thus save the local ratepayers from being mulcted for those acts.

LORD STANLEY: Any offences by soldiers against life or property are dealt with by the civil power, and it is not proposed to alter the usual procedure.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): Will the Government consider the advisability of sending this regiment out to South Africa, where looting is allowed?

MR. CULLINAN: Are Militiamen sent to Ireland to be allowed the same latitude as their fellows in South Africa?

COMMITTEE ON WATER-TUBE BOILERS.

MR. E. J. C. MORTON (Devonport): I beg to ask the Civil Lord of the Admiralty whether the Committee on Water-tube Boilers is about to issue an interim Report; and, if so, when it will be presented to Parliament.

THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (MR. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): The Committee have made an interim Report which it is proposed to present to Parliament shortly.

H.M.S. "BRITANNIA"; OUTBREAK OF PNEUMONIA.

MR. NORMAN (Wolverhampton, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether a second term cadet died at one of the shore establishments of the "Britannia" on the 26th ultimo from complications following upon pneumonia; whether this is the second cadet who has died within eight days from the same cause; whether others are ill; and, if so, how many; whether the hospital is full whether one of the instructors has died from a similar complaint; and whether he can say what is the cause of so much pulmonary disease upon the "Britannia."

MR. LAMBERT: May I also ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether one of the naval instructors on board the "Britannia" has recently died, and two cadets are seriously ill; whether the remainder of the cadets have been granted three weeks leave; and, what steps the Admiralty are taking to secure for the future the health of officers and cadets.

MR. PRETYMAN: It is true that two cadets and one of the instructors of the "Britannia" have recently died from complications following upon pneumonia, and on Sunday last there were sixteen cadets ill, two seriously. The cause of the large amount of pulmonary disease is the prevailing epidemic of influenza of a severe type. The hospital is by no means full. The cadets have been granted three weeks leave, and the ship will be thoroughly purified and disinfected while the cadets are away.

MR. LAMBERT: Has the hon. Gentleman's attention been drawn to a statement in the press that the "Britannia" is thoroughly rotten and unfit for the cadets?

MR. PRETYMAN: We are building an establishment on shore to replace the "Britannia" as quickly as possible.

DEPTFORD VICTUALLING YARD.

MR. ARTHUR MORTON (Deptford): I beg to ask the Civil Lord of the Admiralty if he will state the number of labourers employed in the Deptford Victualling Yard, and the rates of wages paid, distinguishing the number of men employed at each separate rate.

MR. PRETYMAN: The total number of labourers employed in the Deptford Victualling Yard is 307, with rates of pay ranging from 19s. to 30s. a week. I shall be happy to hand the detailed particulars to the hon. Member if he will speak to me after Questions.

*SIR. CHARLES DILKE: How many are still employed at 19s.?

MR. PRETYMAN: Nine.

THE INQUIRY AS TO NAVAL WORKS AT GIBRALTAR.

MR. CAUSTON (Southwark, W.): On behalf of the hon. Member for Dundee (Mr. Edmund Robertson), I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if it is intended to communicate to the House the results, whether separate or collective, of the proposed inquiries into questions connected with the naval works at Gibraltar.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E): I understand that no Report is to be presented, but if any changes are decided on they will

be explained on the Estimate.

INDIAN STAFF CORPS.

SIR SEYMOUR KING (Hull, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, whether any provision has been made for assisting officers of the Indian Staff Corps who are engaged in the operations in China to meet the extra expenses entailed upon them by having to organise messes at Tientsin and elsewhere, and provide warm clothing for themselves and their servants, and by the higher price of all stores as compared with India; and whether he will represent to the War Office the similarity of the case of these officers with that of their comrades who were engaged in the Chitral and Tirah campaigns and received a special field allowance of 5s. per diem.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (LORD G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): There was no special field allowance of 5s. a day to Staff Corps officers engaged in the Tirah and Chitral campaigns. As regards China, Staff Corps officers receive Indian rates of pay and allowances in that country, which compare favourably with the English rates paid to British units in the expedition. But General Gaselee was informed on the 10th of January in reply to a question received from him a few days earlier, that if he would submit proposals for reasonable lodging, fuel, and lighting allowances, they would be transmitted to the War Office for consideration.

COOPER'S HILL COLLEGE.

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he can say how long the Board of Visitors took to consider and adopt Colonel Ottley's suggestions to remodel the studies and dismiss the professors of Cooper's Hill College; and what expert advice did they receive and consider before reporting.

LORD G. HAMILTON: Colonel Ottley's suggestions for the rearrangement of the course of study at Cooper's Hill are dated 13th June, 1900, and the Report of the Board upon them is dated the 24th of the same month. The Visitors who signed the Report are, with scarcely an exception, experts of the highest authority upon the technical questions submitted to them, and they are selected in order that they may advise as experts.

MR. O'MARA: Were the conclusions come to by the Committee at a single sitting?

LORD G. HAMILTON: The Committee had the memoranda some time before them. The Report was a long and exhaustive one, but I cannot say whether its consideration only occupied one sitting.

MR. O'MARA: Was not the meeting to consider the Report called for the 24th, and did not the Committee report the same day?

[No reply was given.]

MR. O'MARA: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he can state how many visits the Board of Visitors made to Cooper's Hill College during 1900.

LORD G. HAMILTON: Several visits were paid to Cooper's Hill in 1900 by members of the Board, but I cannot give the exact number.

MR. BARTLEY: Is not a visitors' book kept?

LORD G. HAMILTON: I cannot say.

MR. O'MARA: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he can inform

the House who requested Colonel Ottley to prepare a new curriculum of studies and a new time-table for Cooper's Hill College; and what special qualifications did he have for this work.

LORD G. HAMILTON: Colonel Ottley was informed when he became President that the existing system of instruction was not considered to be satisfactory and required remodelling. Colonel Ottley has an unbroken experience of twenty-five years service in India in almost every department of civil engineering, and the special knowledge he thus obtained of the training and capacity of the young engineers working under him from Cooper's Hill pre-eminently qualified him to advise as to the special technical training required for the Public Works Department in India.

MR. O'MARA: Am I to understand that the code of regulations, which provides that the President shall be assisted by the teachers in regulating the course of studies, is not carried out by the present President?

LORD G. HAMILTON: I understand that Colonel Ottley has been in frequent communication with the teachers.

INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES CONFERENCE.

MR. NORMAN: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether His Majesty's Government has the intention of taking any steps towards the reconvention of the International Fisheries Conference of Stockholm.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRANBORNE, Rochester): It is not at present proposed that the conference should reassemble.

As the House was informed on the 22nd ultimo in reply to the hon. Member for South Islington, His Majesty's Government had inquired when the Provisional Committee consisting of experts, the meeting of whom had been postponed, would be called together. His Majesty's Government have since been informed that the Provisional Committee will meet at some date in May not yet fixed.

CHINESE TARIFFS.

EARL PERCY (Kensington, S.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any Report was drawn up by the Commission appointed in 1899 by the Chinese Government to consider the question of the abolition of likin and the substitution of a revised tariff; and whether His Majesty's Government have been furnished with a copy of such Report; and, if so, whether they intend to publish its contents.

*Viscount CRANBORNE: In December, 1899, Her Majesty's Minister reported that an Imperial Decree had been issued appointing two Chinese Commissioners to consider the question of tariff revision in consultation with Sir R. Hart. The decree, however, contained no reference to the abolition of likin. We have not heard that the Commission have made any report.

IRISH TAXATION.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can state the ratio of direct and indirect taxation in Great Britain and Ireland respectively.

SIR; M. HICKS BEACH: I would refer the hon. Member to House of Commons Paper 336 of 1900 (Revenue and Expenditure ; England, Scotland, and Ireland), which contains full particulars of the amounts and proportions of the various heads of revenue. I should not like to bind myself to any statement of the precise ratio

between direct and indirect taxation in the two countries respectively, because, as I have often explained, the division between them of the proceeds of indirect taxation cannot be considered statistically accurate.

MR. FIELD: But is it not the fact that the ratio of indirect taxation in Ireland is much higher than it is in Great Britain?

SIR. M. HICKS BEACH: That I have no doubt of.

MR. FLYNN: Will the right hon. Gentleman bear that fact in mind in preparing his Budget?

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I think hon. Members take very good care that we shall not forget it.

POLICE PENSION STATISTICS.

MR. PARKER SMITH (Lanarkshire Partick): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can state (1) the total amount of the income of the police pension funds in England and Wales (excluding the metropolis) for the financial year] 1898–9; (2) how much of this was derived from stoppages of pay; (3) how much from Exchequer contribution; (4) and how much from other sources; and (5) what was

the total expenditure for the same year; and (6) what was the deficiency.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): The figures respectively: -(1) £;363,602 ls. 4d. £;59,777 18s. 3d.; (3) £;160,944 14s. £;141,279 9s. Id.; (5) £;370,217 12s. (6) £;7,615 11s. 3d.

HOUSE PAINTERS AND LEAD POISONING.

MR. COGHILL (Stoke-upon-Trent): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the death of Richard Edwards, a house painter, of 33, Pinnox Street, Tunstall, caused, as a coroner's jury found, by lead poisoning: and whether he proposes to introduce any legislation for the protection of house painters from lead poisoning.

*MR. RITCHIE: I have inquired into the case and find that it does not come within any Acts which I have to administer; and I do not see my way to proposing any such legislation as is suggested.

LONDON SCHOOL BOARD; REHOUSING POLICY.

MR. HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the fact that the London School Board has acquired houses occupied by persons of the working class in Gopsall Street, New North Road, and has thereby displaced 350 persons of the poorer labouring class; and whether any provision has been made, or is proposed to lie made, for the rehousing of the persons displaced.

*MR. RITCHIE: The displacement to which I understand my hon. friend refers took place several years ago. It is included amongst the displacements in respect of which my predecessor placed upon the School Board an obligation to rehouse by a special clause which he secured in a Provisional Order Confirmation Bill in 1899. The question of the amount of accommodation to be provided is the subject of correspondence between my Department and the School Board. I may add that the number of persons mentioned by my hon. friend does not tally with the best estimates at my disposal.

RAILWAY RATES FOR AGRICULTURAL PRODUCE.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that one ton of potatoes delivered in London (Borough) Market from Germany costs 6s., whilst one ton of potatoes from Bexley, Kent, costs from 9s. to 10s.; whether he will inquire into this preferential treatment to foreign importers; and whether the same ratio is preserved in through rates for foreign goods imported into Ireland.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (MR. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): No, Sir; I doubt much the accuracy of the figures quoted by the hon. Member. I should be surprised if the cost of a ton of potatoes were lower than 70s. a ton in the London market whatever their origin. As regards railway rates I have intimated before that the Board of Trade would be happy to deal with any specific complaint if it were laid before them in accordance with Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1888, but it is not the business of the Department to make any general inquiry.

CARRIAGE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCE TO LONDON BY ROAD.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that a movement is being promoted to have agricultural produce carried by road to London on account of the railway rates now imposed; and whether he will inquire into this matter.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I have not heard of any new proposal of this kind. I should have thought it was common knowledge that large quantities of agricultural produce are daily brought into London by road. The practice appears to me to involve a healthy form of competition with railways and no inquiry is necessary.

BREACHES OF THE COMPANY LAW

SIR SEYMOUR KING: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been drawn to the cases in which directors of public companies have failed to hold an annual meeting as provided by the articles of association of their companies; whether he is aware that apparently no penalty attaches to the omission, and the only method left to an aggrieved shareholder is an action at law; and whether he will take some action to prevent these breaches of the law.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I think my hon. friend correctly states the position of the law and I am not at present prepared to amend it. I should like to say, however, that the Board of Trade put some indirect pressure upon companies by proceeding under Section 27 of the Companies Act, 1862, to enforce compliance with the law as to filing Returns.

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL WATER BILL.

MR. M'LAREN: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the Government intend to persist in their opposition to the Water Bill of the London County Council.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (MR. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): I see no reason to alter the views which I have already expressed with regard to this matter.

MILK INSPECTION.

MR. BRIGG (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board that, as there is a want of uniformity in the existing

regulations now in force respecting the sale of milk, he will, on behalf of the Government, bring in as soon as possible a general Bill giving equal powers to all local authorities, obliging them to examine the milk sold within their respective areas, and to take uniform measures to ensure its purity.

MR, WALTER LONG: I cannot give any pledge on this subject at the present time, but the matter is receiving my consideration.

SECONDARY EDUCATION.

MR. PYM (Bedford): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education if he will state what practical steps have been taken since August, 1899, under the Board of Education Act, to organise the inspection of secondary schools or to set on foot a

register of teachers under Section I (a): and has the recent decision in Regina Cockerton had any effect on the action of the Board of Education in respect of re straining the teaching of science in higher grade schools; and, if so, of what kind.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): The inspection of secondary schools can only take place under the Act on their application: seven have been inspected, eighteen others have been arranged for, and thirty-eight applications are still under consideration. The duty of framing regulations for registration of teachers is entrusted by the Vet to the Consultative Committee, who, I understand, have been continuously engaged since their appointment in the performance of this task. The answer to the third question is in the negative.

MR. PYM: How often does the Consultative Committee meet?

SIR J. GORST: Pretty frequently; sometimes twice a week. I cannot say definitely without notice.

IRISH GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether, in view of the fact that £;9,000 per annum is granted for the support of the geological survey of England and Wales, and that the respective areas are England and Wales thirty-seven million acres, and Ireland twenty million acres, and seeing that instead of the £;5,000 which Ireland should receive every year the average allowance for the past ten years has been under £;2,500, this sum will be at once increased and supplemented by the balance due.

SIR J. GORST: No; as the Government survey in Ireland has in the main been completed, whereas in England and Wales it has not, the sum required for England and Wales is necessarily larger than that required for Ireland.

PALACE YARD;LIGHTING ARRANGE MENTS.

SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether he can improve the system of lighting the inside of Palace Yard in the same manner as that adopted on the, frontages to Parliament Square and Bridge Street ; namely, incandescent lamps.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): I should be glad to improve the lighting of Palace Yard, but the introduction of the incandescent system would involve certain alterations, for the cost of which there is no provision in the Estimates. I regret, therefore, that the matter

must be postponed.

VENTILATION OF THE DIVISION LOBBIES.

COLONEL WELBY (Taunton): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether he can see his way to placing fan ventilators driven by electricity in the Division lobbies, especially in the portions of them between the Division Clerks' desks and the exits.

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: I propose to fix two fans as suggested in the Division lobbies, and, if possible, I will carry out the work during the Easter recess.

MEMBERS' ACCOMMODATION.

MR. HARWOOD (Bolton): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works what increased accommodation has been given to the general body of the Members of this House out of the additional premises made over to the use of this House, and whether some improvement can be made in the Leading, Tea, and Smoking Rooms.

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: As I stated in answer to a similar inquiry during the discussion on the Supplementary Estimates on Thursday last, the allocation of the vacant rooms on the Terrace front will be referred to a Select Committee, and I will place the reference on the Paper to-night.

POSTAL GOOD CONDUCT STRIPES; CLAIM OF LINESMEN.

MR. PLATT-HIGGINS (Salford, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, will he explain on what grounds unestablished postmen with good characters receive a merit stripe carrying with it an increase of pay, whereas unestablished linesmen and mechanics are refused a similar privilege.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY to the TREASURY (MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): The award of good conduct stripes to unestablished postmen who do a full day's work was made on the recommendation of the Tweedmouth Committee. The Committee made no such recommendation in regard to unestablished linesmen and mechanics; but the Postmaster General has directed an inquiry to be made into the question.

WELSH TELEGRAPHIC ADDRESSES.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether there are any Post Office Regulations forbidding the use of a Welsh word as a registered telegraphic address; and, if so, will he state the reasons for such rules.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: There is no regulation directed specially against the Welsh language; but in view of certain practical difficulties the Department follows the regulations of the International Convention relating to code which prescribe words of ten letters drawn from certain languages; and these languages do not include Welsh. As there is no context in abbreviated addresses to help the telegraphists in their transmission it is extremely desirable that the words selected for such addresses should be words which can be telegraphed everywhere without difficulty; but, if the hon. Member knows of any case where inconvenience has been caused by the rejection of a Welsh word, the Postmaster General will be glad to consider whether the word can be accepted for registration without undue risk of error or difficulty in the transmission of the telegrams.

POSTMEN AND THE CENSUS.

Dr. MACNAMARA (Camberwell): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether, seeing that it has been the practice on the occasion of the taking of the census in the past to allow postmen and other postal officials to act as enumerators, on the understanding that their postal duties are not neglected, the same privilege will be accorded at the forthcoming census.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: It is the fact that persons in the employment of the Post Office have in past years been allowed to act as enumerators for the census. Such duties are, however, now considered to be incompatible with the ordinary duties of an established servant of the Post Office, and no such established servant can be allowed to act as an enumerator. Persons not established and not performing a full day's duty for the Post Office may act as enumerators, provided that their ordinary work is not interfered with.

RELATIVES ON POSTAL STAFFS.

MR. GODDARD (Ipswich): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he will state the practice of the Department in regard to near relatives holding appointments on the same staff; and whether it is customary for exceptions to be made; and, if so, for what reason.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Department regards it as unsatisfactory that an officer should have to supervise members of his family, and although exceptions have sometimes to be permitted it is not customary to make them. When such an exception is made it would be owing to the absence of any other suitable person in the office.

IRISH WORKHOUSE DIETARY.

MR. DALY (Monaghan, S): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the change made in the diet of the inmates of workhouses in Ireland last year, while imposing 20 to 30 per cent, of an increase in the cost of keeping of each inmate, is not satisfactory to boards of guardians or the inmates; and whether he will leave this question for settlement by the guardians and the medical officer of the workhouse, and not have the fixed rule laid down by the Local Government Board some time since, and which medical officers were directed privately by the Board to have carried out.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): Recent changes in the diet of inmates of workhouses, made in accordance with the suggestions of the Local Government Board, have not imposed an increase of 30 per cent, in the cost of maintenance. Since

the issue of the Board's circular, the cost of maintenance in Irish workhouses has increased from 3s. 2d. per head to 3s. 2½d. The Board has not laid down any fixed rule to govern the dietary of workhouse inmates beyond the minimum scale prescribed by the Workhouse Rules of 1849. Less than this scale could not be allowed, because it would be insufficient to maintain life. The circular of the 13th November, 1899, to which presumably the hon. Member refers, suggested a revision of the existing dietaries on more varied lines, so far as children are concerned. The workhouse medical officers were not directed

privately to have the suggestions carried out. The guardians of many unions have shown unwillingness to incur increased expenditure in this matter, but if the improved dietary has not been satisfactory to the inmates in any instances, the Board believes it must be upon the ground that the improvement has not been sufficient.

MR. DALY: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the Visiting Committee of the Carrickmacross Workhouse has intimated that it is not satisfied with the new dietary, which is costing the rates of the union several hundred pounds additional?

ENNISCORTHY ASYLUM LOAN.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can say what is the reason for the delay of the Treasury in advancing the money for the loan to the County Wexford County Council in respect of the works the council had to carry out at Enniscorthy Asylum, and how soon will the balance of the loan be paid to the council, so as to enable them to pay their contractor the sum of money due to him.

MR. WYNDHAM: On the 14th December last the Wexford County Council applied to the Board of Works for a loan of £1,500 in respect of works at the District Asylum, and on the 20th December the Board asked the Secretary to the Council to furnish certain information on a printed form, a copy of which was enclosed. This information, without which a loan cannot be made, has not yet been supplied to the Board; any delay, therefore, cannot, be fairly attributed either to the Board of Works or to the Treasury.

SALARIES OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the criticisms passed by the Court of Appeal in Ireland on the action of the Local Government Board towards the County Council of Wexford in fixing the salaries of certain existing local officers transferred to the new local authorities created by the Local Government (Ireland) Act, he will, as President of the Local Government Board for Ireland, consider the expediency, before any fixing of salaries by the Local Government Board takes place in future, of holding local inquiries at which the officers and the councils concerned may be heard in open court.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Board will be happy to hold inquiries in such cases if the councils so desire it; but it is obligatory on the Board under the Local Government Act to charge the entire cost of these inquiries to the county councils. The Board propose before making fresh orders to invite the councils and officers to give their views in writing upon each case, but they will at the same time intimate to the councils that if they would prefer to submit their views at a local inquiry, an inquiry will accordingly be held.

MR. CULLINAN: It having been decided that the Local Government Board was wrong in this matter, will the authorities not enable the local boards to have inquiries without expense?

MR. WYNDHAM: I have explained what the law is.

LAND LOANS IN COUNTY WEXFORD.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of

Ireland whether he is aware that advances under the Land Purchase Acts, 1891–6, in the county of Wexford are suspended owing to the number of holdings purchased in that county; whether this suspension applies to agreements already sanctioned; to cases where the agreements have been lodged but have not yet been sanctioned; and to eases where two or three holdings on estates, where the remainder of the holdings have been sold, remain unsold; and can he state what steps the Government intend to take to enable the occupiers in county Wexford to purchase their holdings.

MR. WYNDHAM: Advances under the Land Purchase Acts have been suspended in county Wexford pending the result of inquiries now being made to ascertain whether the limit of advances of guaranteed land stock fixed by the Act of 1891 has been reached in that county. The suspension applies to each class of the cases mentioned in the second paragraph. Pending the result of these inquiries, I am not in a position to make, any statement of policy.

IRISH NATIONAL EDUCATION BOARD.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, Y.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if He can furnish a Return showing how the members of the present National Education Hoard in Ireland are appointed, and the age, profession, and date of appointment of the different members.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Commissioners of National Education are appointed by the Lord Lieutenant pursuant to the Royal Charter of incorporation. A list of the names of the Commissioners with the dates of their appointments will be found in the last Annual Report of the Board. Their professions and attainments are well known. There are no further materials which could be included in a. Return, and I am unable therefore to consent it.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: Cannot the wishes of the Irish people be consulted in making appointments to this important post?

[No answer was returned.]

IRISH SEALED LOCAL GOVERNMENT ORDERS.

MR. M'GOVERN (Cavan, W.): I beg-to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state what steps the Local Government Board are going to take to rectify the errors they have made in issuing sealed orders and circulars in excess of their authority: and will they allow the county councils which they illegally compelled to increase the salaries of their officials to reconsider these salaries.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Local Government Board has not issued orders in excess of its authority. Its authority is very clearly defined in Section 115 (Subsection 18) of the Local Government Act. The Court of Appeal decided that the preliminary steps taken by the Board to determine the amount in each case were informal, and quashed the orders on that ground. The authority of the Board to determine the increases was not mentioned by the Court. The Board, need I say, is prepared to acquiesce in the decision of the Court of Appeal in respect of every other case in which the orders are brought up on a writ of certiorari. It will make new orders in all such cases, and base its decision in each case upon the lines indicated by the Court of Appeal.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Will the county councils have liberty to reconsider?

MR. WYNDHAM: It is not possible to begin de novo in cases where an agreement has been arrived at.

MR. FLAVIN: May I point out;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The hon. Member must not comment on the answer.

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to give notice that I will put another question down; yes, and I will ask it, too.

IRISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT AUDITORS.

*MR. JOHN O'DONNELL (Mayo, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the auditors appointed by the Local Government Board for Ireland are in receipt of an annual salary or other remuneration apart from what they receive from the District Asylum Committees; and, if so, what is the average amount paid to each per year.

MR. WYNDHAM: The auditors are not in receipt of any salary or remuneration from the District Asylum Committees, or from any other local bodies. Their salaries are paid direct from the Local Government Board Vote, and the Board is required to assess such fees for the audit of the accounts of local bodies as will partly recoup the Treasury for the amount of their salaries, expenses, and superannuations. The present scale of salary is from £400 to £700 per annum by quinquennial increments of £100. An additional annual allowance of £100 is granted to auditors engaged on county audits.

ASYLUM COMMITTEES' ACCOUNTS AUDITS.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Asylum Committees throughout Ireland have been compelled by sealed order of the Local Government Board within the past year to pay a sum of £30 for the auditing of the accounts of these bodies, instead of £24 10s, paid annually up to that time; and whether he will take any steps to free the taxpayers from this charge.

MR. WYNDHAM: It is not a fact that the charge for auditing asylum accounts is now, in every case, £30, or that such charge was formerly £24 10s. in every case. The Board is now obliged to audit these accounts half yearly instead of yearly as formerly, and is under a statutory obligation to recover the cost of such audit. The fees assessed are such as will enable the Board to recoup the Treasury for the additional expense involved by two audits in each year.

LAND PURCHASE IN COUNTY GALWAY.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the owner of the town-land of Madusflynn, parish of Cahirlustraun, barony of Clare, Galway, has entered into negotiations with some of his tenants; to sell them their holdings; that these small tenants are willing to buy provided the owner also sells them a grass farm now held by a non resident grazier who takes in grazing stock, and that they are willing to pay as much as the grazier; whether, in these circumstances, the Land Commission will insist, before advancing money for the purchase of the grass farm, that the whole or part of the grass farm should be divided among the small tenants; and whether, in the many similar cases which

exist in Galway and Mayo, some effort will be made in this direction.

MR. WYNDHAM: Agreements between the Rev. Mr. Gabbett and his tenants for the purchase by them of their holdings, which comprise the entire town-land mentioned, have been received in the Irish Land Commission, and advances have been provisionally sanctioned in all the cases. The Commissioners have no knowledge of the matters referred to in the first part of the question. In answer to the second and third paragraphs, the Commissioners can only consider applications for advances under the Land Purchase Acts on the joint application of landlords and tenants.

IRISH TEACHERS' RESULT FEES.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland will he explain why Irish teachers, whose schools were examined in October last, have not yet been paid the equivalent for results fees.

MR. WYNDHAM: If the names are supplied of the schools examined in October to which the equivalent for results fees has not yet been paid, inquiry will be made and an explanation given.

SHEEP WORRYING BY DOGS IN IRELAND.

MR. DELANEY (Queen's Co., Ossory): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether there has come under notice of the Irish Executive the widespread losses sustained by sheep owners from the ravages of dogs; and whether the Government will consider the advisability of introducing legislation enabling owners of sheep in Ireland to receive compensation for such losses out of the Irish dog tax fund.

MR. WYNDHAM: The attention of Government has been directed to the losses sustained by sheep owners in consequence of the worrying of their stock by dogs. The police have instructions to render every assistance in tracing the owners of dogs causing such injuries. With regard to the suggestion in the last paragraph, the hon. Member does not appear to be aware that the proceeds of the dog licence duty in Ireland, after the deduction of expenses, are paid over to the local authorities in counties and boroughs in aid of local rates. I do not think these authorities would be willing to apply the money so received by them to the payment of compensation to sheep owners. The manner in which the dog licence duty is distributed in Ireland will be found set forth in Parliamentary Paper No. 212 of last year.

MR. FIELD: Will the right hon. Gentleman instruct the police to look after this matter, in view of the enormous loss sustained by sheep owners?

MR. WYNDHAM: The Royal Irish Constabulary have been instructed to give every assistance in tracing the owners of dogs.

MR. DELANEY: Will the Chancellor of the Exchequer increase the dog licence duty?
[No answer was given.]

ULSTER WINTER ASSIZES.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland if he can explain why the original promise to hold the Ulster winter assizes every fourth year has not been fulfilled; and whether he can now undertake that the winter assizes will be held in Armagh every fourth year.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (MR. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): I am not aware

that the promise mentioned was ever made. Having regard to the fact that the selection of the venue for the winter | assizes must depend each year on a number of changing circumstances, I do not think it should be made, and I am, therefore, unable to make it on this occasion.

IRISH LAND FINANCE.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): I beg to ask MR. Attorney General for Ireland whether, in the 123rd Table of the Appendices to the Report of the Irish Land Commission, the following figures are correct, namely: Amount of Guaranteed Land Stock issued, £;269,334; price fixed by Land Judge £;285,322; amount paid in cash by the tenant, £;15,995; and, if correct, what is the explanation as to the amount paid in cash by the purchasing tenants over and above the amount certified by the Land Commission.

MR. ATKINSON: The explanation asked for is as follows: In sonic instances the Land Commission is unable to advance the entire price fixed by thorn because it would exceed the limit of £;3,000; or because there is timber or bog on the holding which, though valuable, might be removed by the purchaser and would not therefore remain as a security to the State; or because the buildings, though valuable, are unsuitable to the holding as an agricultural holding: or because, in order to prevent the hearing by the Land Judge on the report being adjourned till the receiver had collected all arrears for rents due, a sum is added to the price in respect of those arrears.

IRISH FRANCISCAN MSS.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he can state when the manuscripts of the Irish Franciscans, now being published by the Historical Manuscripts Commission, will be printed and circulated.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The greater and most important part of the Report on the Franciscan Manuscripts is now completed, and the printing of it will be proceeded with at once. Owing to various causes, the completion of the concluding part has been much delayed, but this also is expected to be in the printer's hands within a few weeks. The Report, therefore, will in all probability be ready for presentation during the present Parliamentary session.

CASHEL POSTAL MESSENGER.

MR. CULLINAN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether his attention has been directed to the dismissal of a postal messenger, named John O'Brien, in Golden sub-district, Cashel district, in the county Tipperary, on a report furnished by the sub-office official without any inquiry; whether he is aware that O'Brien had, a short time before the date of the report, received a good conduct badge and increased pay after twenty years service; whether any part of his duty was neglected on the occasion of the report; and, whether, in compliance with the wishes of the people of the entire district, as expressed in petition, he can see his way to order the reinstatement of O'Brien, or grant an open inquiry into the circumstances of his dismissal.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The case of John O'Brien, late a rural postman between Thomastown and Golden, Cashel, who was dismissed in December last after being for the fourth time reported for intoxication, was the subject

of full inquiry and consideration by the Postmaster General before his dismissal was decided upon. It is the fact that in October last his good conduct stripe, of which he had been deprived in 1893 (when he was for the third time reported for intoxication), was restored to him. While he was not absolutely incapable of performing his work on the last occasion on which he was under the influence of drink whilst on duty, the Postmaster General is of opinion that, having regard to his previous record, he could not be allowed to remain in the service. It is not desirable to reinstate him, and it is not proposed to reopen the case.

ROYAL DECLARATION AGAINST ROMAN CATHOLICISM; CORONATION OATH.

COLONEL NOLAN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been drawn to the resolution of the Canadian House of Commons praying for a modification of the Royal Declaration; and whether before he returns any answer other than an unqualified adhesion to the resolution, he will afford the House of Commons an opportunity of considering the Canadian demand.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I have seen, press telegrams reporting the passing of the resolution to which the hon. Member refers, but I have received no communication from the Dominion Government on the subject. The latter part of the question should be addressed to the First Lord of the Treasury.

COLONEL NOLAN: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if his attention has been drawn to a resolution of the Tuam Board of Guardians condemnatory of the Oath taken by the Sovereign on the accession; and whether the request of this Board and similar public bodies in Ireland for the modification of the Royal Declaration will be acceded to.

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

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, K.): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether his attention has been

called to the resolution against the present form of the King's Accession Oath, passed by an overwhelming majority in the Dominion Parliament at Ottawa; and whether an opportunity will be given the House of Commons of debating and voting upon the same subject.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: To ask the First Lord of the Treasury if his attention has been called to a resolution passed by the Clare Grand Jury calling on Parliament to abolish the present King's Accession Oath as far as it deals with the Roman Catholic religion; whether, on receiving this resolution, the Irish Lord Chief Justice said he was glad it had been passed; and whether the Government will take any steps in the matter.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, having regard to the resolution passed by the Parliament of Canada in deprecation of that part of the Coronation Oath which is offensive to the religious feelings of the Catholics of the Empire, he will introduce a Bill to excise from the Oath that part of it which is an insult to His Majesty's Catholic subjects.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: These questions relate to a matter on which I have already given several answers. I have really nothing to add to what I have already stated. My view, as I have already intimated to the House, is that the language in which the Oath referred to is couched is very unfortunate. I am not surprised that the form of the Oath as distinguished from the substance should have given

pain to the Roman Catholic subjects of His Majesty; but what I want to point out to the House is, that the Oath will not have to be taken again during the present reign, and I do not think it is the habit of any Government to give pledges as to legislation beyond the session in which they are engaged.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I would ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he could not undertake to devote the small space of time necessary to amend the statute this session?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: What evidence has the hon. Gentleman to support his statement that the time would be small? If the proportion of time taken by his friends in discussing the Supplementary Estimates is any indication, I do not think it would be small.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: The right hon. Gentleman has addressed a question to me, but I presume it would be out of order to answer him and continue the discussion.

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

MR. LODGE (Brighton): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether any objection exists to varying the order in which the items of the Civil Service Supplementary Estimates are put down in different years, so that some of the more important Supplementary Votes may be taken first; and, if not, whether he will arrange for some change to be made in this respect next year.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have to say there is no objection, so far as I know, to the suggestion contained in the question, which is in entire accordance with the policy we have followed the last two years back, with regard to the order in which the Estimates are taken. As my hon. friend is aware, we have initiated the practice of putting down on the Vote on Account the Estimates which are most likely to attract the interest and attention of the House. We have, in regard to the ordinary Estimates of the year, taken care so to arrange them as to meet the general convenience of the House, and I see no reason why the same policy should not be extended to the Civil Service Supplementary Estimates.

MR. DILLON: Will the right hon. Gentleman give a pledge to adhere to the practice of not altering the order of the Votes without a general consultation with the different sections of the House?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not know what the hon. Member means by "general consultation." I have endeavoured always to meet the views of the House at large, and especially of the opponents of the Government.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER: Are we to understand that the business on Monday next will be the continuation of the debate on the Army Estimates?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes. I should imagine that the debate initiated on Friday night will not be concluded on that day, and, if so, we propose to continue it on Monday, unless unforeseen circumstances should arise which necessitate the taking of other business.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): When is it proposed to renew the debate on the Civil Service Supplementary Estimates?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: On Thursday, after the motion relating to the Civil List.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER: I should like to point out that it has usually been the practice to allow a day or two to elapse between the making of the War

Secretary's statement and the further consideration of the Estimate. That was my reason for asking.

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

Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection that they had selected the following six Members to be the Chairmen's Panel and to serve as Chairmen of the two Standing Committees to be appointed under Standing Order No. 47;;Mr. John Ellis, Sir James Fergusson, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, Mr. Laurence Hardy, Colonel Nolan, and Mr. Stuart-Wortley.

Report to lie upon the Table.

MESSAGE FROM HIS MAJESTY (HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN AND MEMBERS OF HIS MAJESTY'S FAMILY).

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: (at the Bar) acquainted the House that he had a Message from the King to this House signed by His Majesty's own hand.

And he presented the same to the House, and it was read by Mr. SPEAKER (all the Members being uncovered), and is as followeth;;

"EDWARD R.

"His Majesty being desirous of making competent provision for the honourable support and maintenance of His Son, the Duke of Cornwall and York, His Daughter-in-law, the Duchess of Cornwall and York, and his Daughters, the Princess Louise, Duchess of Fife, the Princess Victoria, and Princess Charles of Denmark, and being further desirous

that similar provision should be made for Her Majesty the Queen in the event of Her surviving Him, and for the Duchess of Cornwall and York in the event of Her surviving the Duke of Cornwall and York, recommends the consideration thereof to His Majesty's faithful Commons, and relies on their attachment to adopt such measures as may be suitable to the occasion."

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

LONDON UNDERGROUND RAILWAYS.

That they have come to the following resolution, viz.;;

"That it is desirable that a Select Committee be appointed to join with Committee of the House of Commons to consider and report;;

1. Whether the lines of route for underground railways in and near London, proposed by Bills which have been or may be introduced during the present Session, are best calculated to afford facilities for present and probable return traffic; and, if not, what modifications of those lines of route are desirable;

2. What special provision, if any, should be made for the protection of the owners, lessees, and occupiers of properties adjacent to underground railways from possible damage and annoyance;

3. What special terms and conditions, if any, as to the construction and working should be imposed upon the promoters;

4. Whether any, and which, of the schemes proposed by the said Bills should not be proceeded with during the present Session."

NEW BILLS.

WATER COMPANIES (LIABILITY FOR STORAGE OF WATER).

Bill to amend the Law relating to the liability of Water Companies for the

Storage of Water, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Sinclair, Major Rasch, Mr. Rentoul, Mr. Flynn, and Mr. A. Thomas.

WATER COMPANIES (LIABILITY FOR STORAGE OF WATER) BILL.

"To amend the Law relating to the liability of Water Companies for the Storage of Water," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 19th March, and to be printed. [Bill 81.]

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY EXTENSION.

Bill to amend the Acts relating to Employers' Liability, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Sinclair, Major Rasch, Mr. Rentoul, Mr. Boulnois, Mr. Flynn, and Mr. A. Thomas.

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY EXTENSION BILL.

"To amend the Acts relating to Employers' Liability," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 19th March, and to be printed. [Bill 82.]

LIGHTS ON VEHICLES.

Bill to require Vehicles on highways to carry lamps at night, ordered to be brought in by Sir Robert Mowbray, Mr. Bryce, Mr. Grenfell, Sir John Leng, Mr. Scott Montagu, Mr. Wanklyn, and Sir Albert Rollit.

LIGHTS ON VEHICLES BILL.

To require Vehicles on highways to carry lamps at night," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday next, and to be printed. [Bill 83]

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACT (1871) AMENDMENT.

Bill to amend the Factory and Workshop Act, 1878, by reducing the period of employment on Saturday, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Harwood and Mr. Kenyon.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACT (1878) AMENDMENT BILL.

"To amend the Factory and Workshop Act, 1878, by reducing the period of employment on Saturday," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday, 21st March, and to be printed. [Bill 84.]

RIVERS POLLUTION PREVENTION.

Bill to make more effectual provision for the prevention of the Pollution of Rivers and Streams, ordered to be brought

In by Sir Francis Powell, Mr. Wilson-Todd, Mr. Henry Hobhouse, Sir John Dorington, Dr. Farquharson, Mr. Brigg, Sir John Brunner, and Sir Walter Foster.

RIVERS POLLUTION PREVENTION BILL.

"To make more effectual provision for the prevention of the Pollution of Rivers and Streams," presented, and read the first time to be read a second time upon Wednesday, [Bill 85.] 8th May, and to be printed.

SUNDAY CLOSING (WALES) ACT (1881) AMENDMENT.

Bill to amend the Sunday Closing (Wales) Act, 1881, and to make further provision respecting the sale of intoxicating liquors in Wales and Monmouthshire, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Herbert Roberts, Mr. Alfred Thomas, Mr. Lloyd-George, Mr. William Jones, and Mr. Herbert Lewis.

SUNDAY CLOSING (WALES) ACT (1881) AMENDMENT BILL.

"To amend the Sunday Closing (Wales) Act, 1881, and to make further provision respecting the sale of Intoxicating Liquors in Wales and Monmouthshire,"

presented, and read the first time to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 20th March, and to be printed. [Bill 86.]

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (MARINERS' VOTES).

Bill to enable Officers and Seamen of the Royal Navy and Mercantile Marine and Fishermen to record their votes when by reason of their calling they will be at sea on the day of the poll, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Macdona, Sir John Colomb, Mr. Cust, Mr. David Morgan, Sir Seymour King, Mr. Firbank, and Sir Christopher Furness.

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (MARINERS' VOTES) BILL.

"To enable Officers and Seamen of the Royal Navy and Mercantile Marine and Fishermen to record their votes when by reason of their calling they will be at sea on the day of the poll," presented, and read the first time to be read a second time upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 87.]

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

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

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMENTS, 1901–2 (VOTE ON ACCOUNT).

Motion made, and Question proposed, "a sum, not exceeding £;17,304,000, be granted to His Majesty, on account, for or towards defraying the Charges for the following Civil Services and Revenue Departments for the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, namely:

CIVIL SERVICES.

Class IV.

£;

Board of Education

4,100,000

Class II.

Board of Trade

60,000

Class I.

Royal Palaces and Marlborough House

20,000

Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens

40,000

Houses of Parliament Biddings

16,000

Gladstone Monument

1,000

Miscellaneous Legal Buildings, Great Britain

18,000

Art and Science Buildings, Great Britain

12,000

Diplomatic and Consular Buildings

12,000

Revenue Buildings
140,000
Public Buildings, Great Britain
145,000
Surveys of the United Kingdom
80,000
Harbours under the Board of Trade
2,000
Peterhead Harbour
6,000
Rates on Government Property
250,000
Public Works and Buildings, Ireland
70,000
Railways, Ireland
70,000
Class II.
United Kingdom and England;
House of Lords, Offices
3,000
House of Commons, Offices
12,000
Treasury and Subordinate Departments
39,000
Home Office
50,000
Foreign Office
30,000
Colonial Office
23,000
Privy Council Office, etc.
5,000
Privy Seal Office
1,000
Mercantile Marine Services
30,000
Bankruptcy Department of the Board of Trade
3
Board of Agriculture
75,000
Charity Commission
15,000
Civil Service Commission
18,000
Exchequer and Audit Department
24,000

Friendly Societies Registry
2,200
Local Government Board
85,000
Lunacy Commission
5,000
Mint (including Coinage)
10
National Debt Office
6,000
Public Record Office
11,000
Public Works Loan Commission
5
Registrar General's Office
130,000
Stationery and Printing
280,000
Woods, Forests, etc., Office of
8,000
Works and Public Buildings, Office of
23,000
Secret Service
40,000
Scotland;;
Secretary for Scotland
25,500
Fishery Board
8,000
Lunacy Commission
2,500
Registrar General's Office
28,000
Local Government Board
5,000
Ireland: ;
Lord Lieutenant's Household
2,000
Chief Secretary and Subordinate Departments
16,000
Departments of Agriculture
70,000
Charitable Donations and Bequests Office
1,000
Local Government Board
20,000

Public Record Office
2,000
Public Works Office
16,000
Registrar General's Office
20,000
Valuation and Boundary Survey
6,000
Class III.
Tinted Kingdom and England;;
Law Charges
40,000
Miscellaneous Legal Expenses
27,000
Supreme Court of Judicature
140,000
Land Registry
14,000
County Courts
14,000
Police, England and Wales
22,000
Prisons, England and the Colonies
260,000
Reformatory and Industrial Schools, Great Britain
140,000
Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum
18,000
Scotland ;
Law Charges and Courts of Law
30,000
Register House, Edinburgh
15,000
Crofters Commission
2,000
Prisons, Scotland
30,000
Ireland;;
Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions
35,000
Supreme Court of Judicature, and other Legal Departments
45,000
Land Commission
50,000
County Court Officers, etc.
46,000

Dublin Metropolitan Police
40,000
Loyal Irish Constabulary
600,000
Prisons, Ireland
45,000
Reformatory and Industrial Schools
55,500
Dundrum Criminal Lunatic Asylum
3,500
Class IV.
United Kingdom and England;;
British Museum
80,000
National Gallery
9,000
National Portrait Gallery
3,000
Wallace Collection
4,000
Scientific Investigation, etc., United Kingdom
25,000
Universities and Colleges, Great Britain, and Intermediate Education, Wales
41,000
Scotland;;
Public Education
650,000
National Gallery
1,400
Ireland;;
Public Education
600,000
Endowed Schools Commissioners
400
National Gallery
1,400
Queen's Colleges
2,500
Class V.
Diplomatic and Consular Services
225,000
Uganda, Central and East Africa Protectorates and Uganda Railway
320,000
Colonial Services
230,000
Cyprus, Grant in Aid

15,000
 Subsidies to Telegraph Companies
 50,000
 Class VI
 Superannuation and Retired Allowances
 280,000
 Merchant Seamen's Fund Pensions, etc
 3,000
 Miscellaneous Charitable and other Allowances
 1,000
 Hospitals and Charities, Ireland
 17,000
 Class VII.
 Temporary Commissions
 10,082
 Miscellaneous Expenses
 8,000
 £;10,434,000
 Revenue Departments.
 Customs
 350,000
 Inland Revenue
 830,000
 Post Office
 3,800,000
 Post Office Packet Service
 210,000
 Post Office Telegraphs
 1,680,000
 Total for Revenue Departments
 £; 6,870,000
 Grand Total
 £;17,304,000

*MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.) Said that during the last twelve mouths they had had in the administration of the Board of Education a very serious departure from those principles which had been laid down in the past in this House and a very serious blow had been struck at the integrity and efficiency of the higher elementary school work of this realm. He found that, in January, 1899. Little more than two years ago, the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education made a statement which was then, and was now, he believed, in consonance with the wishes of the House and the desires of the country. He would quote that statement and then proceed to show the Committee to what extent and in what manner the administration of the Board of Education had departed from the sound principles laid down by the Minister in charge himself. Speaking at Bradford, the right hon. Gentleman said that "he thought that it would be a most unfortunate thing

if the hoard schools, the higher elementary schools, and the schools of science in the large cities were in any way interfered with." He had to submit to the Committee that the operations of the school boards in the great cities of the country in their higher grade schools and schools of science had been very seriously interfered with by the Board of Education under the administration of the right lion, Gentleman himself.

The Committee would remember that little more than twelve months ago a great amount of feeling was manifested in the House upon the question of higher elementary school work. A new principle of allocating the Parliamentary grant to elementary schools had been brought in. And one consequential feature of it was, that the schools which had previously received the highest grants were by the levelling system cut down in tin amount which they drew from the grant. A formidable agitation grew up in the country that the higher grade schools were being unjustly treated, and in March, 1900, the Government, through the mouthpiece of the right hon. Gentleman, announced a compromise and promised to put organised schools and higher grade schools on a legal and legitimate footing. That promise had not been carried out, and the Higher Elementary School Minute, adopted in April last with general approval of the House, at a time when the feeling of hon. Members of all sections was so strong, had not been adhered to, and in spirit, if not in letter, that Minute had become something like an administrative fraud. He must go back further than twelve months ago in order to deal with the whole question of the attack on higher grade schools, which, if not initiated and not favoured, had at least been not repudiated by the Board of Education, and by the right hon. Gentleman himself. This attack had grown and grown

Until the higher grade schools and the organised science schools were in great peril. The evening continuation schools were in greater peril, and the machinery set up in April last had been nullified and stultified by the Board of Education itself. Four years ago, by the enter prise of many school boards, schools had been set up something after the pattern of Les Ecoles Primaires Superieures in France, and the higher grade schools in Germany. These schools were fostered and encouraged by the Board of Education, grants were given to them, and expression of satisfaction were made regarding the work done by them. The Vice-President of the Council went down to the country to open these schools sometimes all official from the Board of Education itself performed that duly, and, generally speaking, the policy of the Department was to foster and encourage, approve and improve these schools. But a change came over that policy. Schools which had been built by school boards, some of them on the invitation even of the Board of Education, for the express purpose of giving this higher grade education, were refused grants when application was made for them by the school hoards. Money laid out in furnishing physical and chemical laboratories, and in the preparation of rooms for drawing and other higher elementary work, became of non-effect and all this was done by the order of the Board of Education under the right hon. Gentleman.

Now, the Board of Education existed by the will of the people of this country. And the right hon. Gentleman himself, as its head, existed to promote and not to

retard education and it there were any gentlemen on the Board of Education who were of opinion that education was to be kept at a standstill, marking time, so to speak, and that what was regarded as a satisfactory amount of education twenty-five years ago was sufficient now, then they entirely misinterpreted the feeling of the House and the country. Those higher grade schools were fulfilling an admirable function. They were not very numerous, only some sixty in all, but, such as they were, they were preparing lads of from thirteen to sixteen years of age to enter the technical

Schools and colleges of the country with that preliminary knowledge which the director's of these schools and colleges found to be non-existent formerly. They were preparing these lads to become captains of industry, managers, foremen, draftsmen, chemists, and leaders of the industrial classes. If one lesson was to be gained from the Reports of Royal Commissions and private investigators as to the condition of things in France, Germany, Belgium, Holland, and America, it was that the cause that the success of the manufacturing processes in these countries, compared with our own, consisted in the higher education of foremen, managers, leaders, etc. The higher education of the great mass of the operatives was comparatively unimportant to that. The higher grade schools and the schools of science existed for providing an education of that kind, which was vitally necessary to the continued existence of the manufacturing industries of this country. The change had begun through the action of an institution that had been condemned both in the House and in the country; the old Science and Art Department at South Kensington. When the Board of Education issued a Day School Code, it had to lie on the Table of the House for a certain number of days, and could be upset by the vote of the House: but this Science and Art Department had had the extraordinary power of being able to issue their own rules and regulations without consulting the House or laying them on the Table at all.

The reactionary, foolish, almost criminal policy of hampering the schools appeared to have found a ready supporter in the right hon. The Vice-President of the Council. The first step taken was to disable school boards from receiving Science and Art grants for science and art classes and organised science schools. But grants were given to all sorts of unimportant and unrepresentative bodies in fact, to any committee of two or three gentlemen, if only they could get sonic little local support in the way of fees or subscriptions. Ordinary grammar schools maintained very largely by endowments, and proprietary schools run as a commercial concern for profit, might apply for these science grants and Get them but by a ukase of this self-constituted and independent section of the Board of Education, issued last year, school boards might not make application for grants to their schools except Upon conditions. They must find local support in the shape of fees, which was opposed entirely to the policy of tree education, or they must obtain support from a rate levied under the Technical Instruction Act. Now the Department knew that very few local authorities rated themselves under the Technical Instruction Act. They did not sec the use of doing that when there was a school rate already drawn by the same authority from the same ratepayer.

The policy was first of all to disable the school boards from obtaining Science

and Art grants for their schools. That being done by the autocratic procedure of the Board of Education, the next step was to disable the school boards from making up this loss by preventing them from using the school board rate for the purposes of higher education.

Having succeeded in disabling the school boards from participating in Science and Art grants, except on condition of charging fees, the next step was to prevent the boards from using the school board rate. The result was that a School of Art in North London, a relic of the era of philanthropic enterprise, drew the attention of the Local Government Board to the expenditure of the London School Board in science and art classes and evening continuation schools. The auditor, under the circumstances, was obliged to test the question raised, and it was desirable to know whether the Board of Education was represented at the audit, and whether the attention of the auditor was drawn to the past administration of the Board in that matter, and whether any care was taken by the Board to see that the auditor was fully informed upon the question from the point of view of public policy, and of law, and of the minutes having the force of law. The Committee would also wish to know whether the Board of Education made any representations. Or whether it did anything more than sit quiet and wait the decision of the law courts upon what had taken place. The case stood for appeal to a higher court, and meanwhile there was the unseemly spectacle of the authority charged with the duty of providing higher elementary education compelled to go into the law courts and spend the money of the ratepayers in defending the right of the authority to give higher education. Last April the policy of the Government was to favour and encourage and to reward the higher elementary schools' efforts. What had the Board of Education done since last April to make the actions of the board schools legal by minutes or otherwise to make such administration applicable. Nothing had been done by the Board of Education, and, so long as the present policy existed, nothing would be done. It was significant that a committee had been formed to fight school boards on this question, and had for its chairman the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich, while another prominent member of the committee and associated with him was long the leader of the Moderate party on the London School Board, and now, he believed, Member for Aston. The result had been that the work of the school boards in regard to science classes had been paralysed. The work of evening continuation schools had been damaged irretrievably or retarded for years to come. The condition had been imposed that education should be confined to persons under sixteen, and as a consequence 150,000 persons in those schools last year would, if the decision were upheld, be ousted from that means of education.

They had been told that the Higher Elementary School Minute would place science schools on a legal and legitimate footing, but he complained that out of 190 applications the Department had sanctioned only two in eleven months. The London School Board made application for the recognition of seventy-nine schools, in various localities of London, to which the most promising children of the elementary schools were to be drafted. All the principal school boards of the country, too, made application for recognition of higher elementary schools, and

again and again they had failed. All sorts of pretexts had been made for the refusal of recognition. It had been impossible for the local authorities to please the Board of Education, and no school board in the country was Satisfied with the way in which the Minute had been administered and hardly one but was disgusted with the administration of the right hon. Gentleman. The right hon. Gentleman, no doubt, would say he expected when this Minute was put forward that the ordinary science schools would be transformed into higher elementary schools, and would probably say that he was not to blame but that was not the opinion generally held. In an organised science school a boy might remain until the age of eighteen, but according to the Higher Elementary School Minute the moment he arrived at fifteen he had to leave. Other conditions laid down in the Minute made it impracticable, and the right hon. Gentleman was warned at the time it was put forward that it would be so.

All this indicated, he submitted, something like a deliberate policy, engineered by whom, and arising from what sources, he would not attempt to discuss. It was something like a deliberate policy to check the higher elementary education, nullify the efforts of the school boards, and change the whole policy of the country in respect to these schools, and the Committee ought to consider that such a policy was not the kind of work they expected the Board of Education to do, and not the kind of work for which money was voted in Committee for the Board of Education. Having disabled the school boards, having refused to recognise the higher elementary schools, having destroyed one useful set of machinery which had existed for twenty-four years, having refused to set up a new set of machinery, he could find no excuse for the course which the Board had pursued. From what quarter and from what machinery they were to get the higher primary school at all? There was no secondary education department set up by statute. The school boards had been refused power to set up these schools, and there was no authority capable of supplying them. Higher elementary education was to go by the board. They had to wait, he supposed, for higher primary schools to be built and managed by an authority not yet created. In the meantime the excellent work done up to now was hampered and arrested, and if the appeal in another place went against them it was to come entirely to an end. The right hon. Gentleman the Vice-President of the Council would quibble, if he might use the term, between higher elementary schools and secondary schools, and distinguish between one authority and another, and east himself on the protection of the law. No doubt he would give a very plausible explanation of the whole circumstances, but the hon. Member would ask the Committee to remember that the net result of all these proceedings was bad. The right hon. Gentleman would tell them that the Government were limited at present by legal considerations. They had heard a good deal of that kind of thing from the right hon. Gentleman. There was nobody more eloquent and less operative than the right hon. Gentleman, but eloquent platitudes and amusing epigrams were poor food for the educational needs of the country.

In moving that the Vote be reduced by £; 100 he asked the Committee to declare that the time had come when they wished the Education Board to make a serious attempt to provide for the people of the country that higher elementary

education which they stood in need of, and which it was in the interests of the country they should have.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Item, Vote 1, Class 4 (Board of Education), be reduced by £; 100."; (Mr. Yoxall)

THE VICE-PRESIDENT of the BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): The hon. Member who has just sat down complained of two things.

First, he complained that school boards had not power to spend the school board rate upon, instruction outside the subjects of the Elementary Education Code in day schools and night schools; and, secondly, he complained that under the Higher Elementary School Minute of last year the school boards did not get large enough Exchequer grants for their higher elementary schools.

Now it is quite true that these higher elementary schools sprang up almost immediately after the passing of the Elementary Education Act of 1870. They were not invented by either Governments or societies; they really sprang up by themselves. I do not think any

the worse of them for that, for such schools are better suited to meet the wants of the people than those invented for them by politicians. I want to ask the Committee to remember what the hon. Member has not explained as yet, that there are two absolutely different kinds of higher grade schools. In the first place, there are a number of higher grade schools which teach each of the subjects of the Elementary Day School Code. They were formerly under the Education Department. They were inspected by the officers of the Education Department, and they were subject to all the rules of the Education Department. I have very often been asked how many of this sort of schools there are. I am sorry to say that I have never been able to answer the question, because there is every kind of school in the shading off from the most elementary school in the country up to the very best of these higher grade schools, and every possible variation of schools between one extreme and the other which keep within the limits of the Elementary Day School Code. It is impossible to say where to draw the line and to say of the schools above, "These are higher grade schools." and of the schools below, "These are only ordinary elementary schools." But there is no doubt there are a very great number of them. The legality of these schools has never been called in question, nor has the right of the school board to spend the rates in building and maintaining such schools ever been called in question.

The right to spend the rates on schools of this kind is not in any way affected or called in question by the recent judgment. But, besides these higher grade schools, of the legality of which there has never been any question, there is another kind of higher grade school which I will describe. It is a school which consists of two divisions; an upper division and a lower division. The lower division is a public elementary school it very generally takes the older children in the higher standards, it takes specific subjects, and it obtains its grants from the Education Department, and is conducted as an elementary school. The upper division is not a public elementary school at all it is, frankly, an organised school of science. It has no children in the standards. It takes not the subjects of the Elementary Day School Code, but the science and art subjects of the Directory. It is inspected by the

inspectors of the Science and Art Department, and it receives its grant from that Department. It is an organised science and not a public elementary school. Schools of this kind, of which there are about sixty or seventy in the country, are inspected by two distinct sets of inspectors. The Education Department inspector inspects the lower division and shuts his eyes to the existence of the higher division, of which he is not officially cognisant. The Science and Art Department inspector comes in his turn and inspects the other division. And closes his eyes to the existence of the lower division, with which he has officially nothing whatever to do. There is no inspection of these schools as a whole. There are no proper accounts kept of these schools as a whole, and they are kept as a sort of double institutions such as I have described. Schools of this kind have never been declared to be illegal either by the Education Department or by the judgment in the recent case. There is no illegality in the establishment of such schools. The illegality is in the application of the school rate to the building or maintenance of the upper division of that school. That is not a new discovery of mine or of the Science and Art Department. It has been known ever since schools of this kind were conducted.

I will just give the Committee an example or two of what was said in past times. I have here an official letter from the Education Department to the Barrow-in-Furness School Board, written in 1884, which says;

"I am to point out that the provision of a separate school for science and art classes does not appear to come within the province of a school board."

Then there is a letter from the Local Government Board to the London School Board, in November, 1885, when an auditor had disallowed an expenditure of the Board exactly analogous to that which was disallowed the other day. The Local Government Board says;

"The School Board have no authority in law to establish or maintain a science and art school at the expense of the school fund, Because that school is not an elementary school within the meaning of the Education Acts."

Then there is a letter written to the London School Board in 1888, which says;

"An organised science and art school is quite distinct from a public elementary school. In such a school the money paid by the Science and Art Department to the managers forms no part of the receipts or expenditure of the school as a public elementary school; The rates cannot legally be applied to supply instruction in any subject which is not recognised by the Code and taught to the children in the standards."

I have another letter written, in 1888, by the Local Government Board to the Brighton School Board, who had also had their expenditure disallowed by their auditor upon similar grounds. It says;

"The school board had no legal authority to pay out of the funds of the school board any part of the costs of establishing and maintaining an organised school of science, the school not being an elementary one within the meaning of the Education Acts."

I find again, in 1892, a letter to the Hanley School Board, which says;

"The higher section of the [higher grade] school organised as proposed and

receiving grants from the Science and Art Department as an organised science school would not be a public elementary school, nor could the cost of the erection of the premises in which it was to be conducted be included in a loan sanctioned by this Department."

I think that that will show that the expenditure of the school rate on the maintenance of schools like the upper department of this kind of upper grade school has all along been declared by the Education Department to be illegal, and the judgment given the other day only confirmed the statements of the Department under every kind of Minister, from the time these schools were, established down to the present day. There was no difficulty about the buildings, because the schools were established in buildings which were already in existence, or which, in some cases, were given for the purpose.

As regards maintenance, the schools were at the outset maintained not out of the school rate, but by fees and the Science and Art grants. Some of the school boards boasted not only that the schools were not a burden on the rates, but that the ratepayers made a profit from the fact that the school board managed a school of this kind. I should like to establish what I have said by a quotation or two. The Brighton School Board writes, in 1887;

"If the amount of the fees received is taken into account, it will be seen that a profit to the ratepayers has resulted."

Before the Education Commission in 1884, Mr. Scotson, the headmaster of the Central Higher Grade School, Manchester, said, in answer to a question on this point, "It is practically more than self-supporting." He very frequently had more than £150 to distribute amongst the teachers, of which £50 used to go to himself. A great deal has been said in these controversies about the late Mr. Mundella's Circular in 1882, which undoubtedly encouraged the establishment of these schools. What did he say? I have never seen it quoted; "Under a well-organised system of graded schools the cost to the ratepayers need not be greater than it is now."

MR. YOXALL: With the Science and Art grants.

Sir J. GORST: Then Mr. Macarthy, the chairman of the Birmingham School Board, gave evidence before the Secondary Education Commission in 1895, and this is what he said;

"I should like to say that the present Board secondary school can only rightly exist if, so far as its most ordinary work is concerned; namely, the real secondary work; it costs the local rates nothing. Practically, such schools are dependent on grants from the Science and Art Department."

To show my bona fides in the matter, I may mention that in 1890, when I was comparatively new to this office, I wrote an article, on education, which appeared in the Nineteenth Century. That article was very much complained of on some accounts, but this particular passage was criticised by no one;

"The Boards, as purveyors of higher education, allege that they make a profit which inures to the benefit of the ratepayers."

That shows my bona fide belief of a few years ago, that the school rate was not spent on the maintenance of these schools, and that they were really not Only self-supporting, but, in some cases, even a source of profit to the

ratepayers.

Then there is the question of buildings. That, of course, is the difficulty. A school board cannot raise a loan to build a school without obtaining the sanction of the Education Department to the loan. School boards from time to time applied for loans to build schools of this kind, but they were always told that it would not be legal to charge such loans upon the school rates. Yet, in spite of that, it is quite true that such schools have been built and the expenditure met out of loans charged on the school rate. I will illustrate what the *modus operandi*, generally, was. An application was made by the Brighton School Board for sanction to a loan for building a higher grade school, in which the upper portion should be a school of science. They were informed that such a use of the school board funds was illegal. That application was then withdrawn, and an application was made for a public elementary school giving science instruction under the Code, and having laboratories for that purpose. Sanction to that was given, the school was built, and was at once used not as a public elementary school, but as a school of science.

MR. YOXALL was understood to say that in the case of Hanley the building built with the loan referred to was a public elementary school and an organised school of science as well, but the main part of it was used for the purposes of the latter.

SIR J. GORST: I will give the facts of that case. The Hanley School Board, in 1892, asked for sanction to a school which was to begin at Standard VII., and have a higher department as an organised science school. The Education Department replied that such a department would not be a public, elementary school, nor could the cost of the erection of the premises in which it was conducted be included in the loan sanctioned by the Department under the Elementary Education Acts. The school board replied withdrawing that part of the scheme, and saying that the chemical laboratory, art room, etc., would now be used for the instruction of children

In the standards of the Education Code. The loan was thereupon sanctioned. The school was opened on 24th May, 1894, and a school of science started in the building. Three years after there were 191 pupils in the organised science school, no science at all being taught to the children in the standards.

MR. YOXALL: Will the right hon. Gentleman quote the figures for the school as a whole, or allow me to do so?

SIR J. GORST: The hon. Member will have an opportunity afterwards; it is not germane to my argument. I am illustrating how it came about that although the Education Department said it was illegal, yet these schools were built. I will give another very recent case which shows exactly how the thing is done. In February, 1899, when attention had been called to this illegality and everybody was aware of it, the Leeds School Board wrote for sanction to a building they required for science accommodation and intended for the use of scholars in the primary elementary schools taking the scientific subjects in accordance with the scheme of science laid down in the Code. The reply of the Education Department was this;

"We understand the premises to be required for the purposes of a primary

elementary school in which science is to be taught in accordance with the scheme laid down in the Code; that the science rooms are not more than sufficient for these purposes; that they will be used for these purposes; and upon that understanding we sanction the loan."

That is clear enough. But this is what the school board say in their report eighteen months later;

"The fine structure now in course of erection in Burton Street is to be the future home of the present Southern Higher Grade School',
;which is a school of science. I thereupon directed a letter to the school board to ask how they reconciled the condition on which they accepted the sanction to the loan with this statement in their report, but I am sorry to say, although that letter was sent some time ago, they have not yet offered an explanation. The hon. Member in his speech said that if this judgment is affirmed on appeal it will not touch the buildings, because they are built and done with. But the judgment will, as the hon. Member

Pointed out, strike at the revenue of the schools. It will prevent the rates being any longer spent in the maintenance of these schools, which, I may say, nobody wishes to see injured or destroyed. The school boards will have three courses open to them. First of all they can return to the condition of things, if it is possible to return to it, which obtained in the early days of these schools; they can charge fees and make the schools self-supporting, as Mr. Mundella said they ought to be, with the provision of free places for children whose parents are unable to pay the fees, but who deserve to be educated in a school of this kind. The second possibility is, to come to terms with the local authority which has power to rate for this purpose. The hon. Member was very scornful about that. The real point is that the borough or urban council has power to lay a rate to be applied to this purpose.

Mr. YOXALL: Up to a penny.

Sir J. GORST: Yes, and a penny would in most cases be sufficient. That arrangement is actually in operation at Jarrow-on-Tyne and New Mills, Derbyshire.

Mr. YOXALL: In two cases!

Sir J. GORST: Those are two cases I know of and can verify, but I have every reason to believe that there are many other cases, and if there were time I have no doubt I could find them. There is the case of Ulverston. Ulverston was one of the school boards that applied to have an elementary school, and correspondence took place. Undoubtedly they did not want a higher elementary school at all; they wanted a school of science. Negotiations are now going on which, I believe, will be brought to a satisfactory conclusion, by which the county of Lancaster will lay a penny rate in the town of Ulverston and apply that rate to the maintenance of this school.

Sir JOHN BRUNNER (Cheshire, Northwich): Do I understand that the county can levy a rate in Ulverston?

Sir J. GORST: It is rather a curious state of the law at present. Ulverston can lay a penny rate itself, and the County of Lancaster also can lay a penny rate.

Sir JOHN BRUNNER: In Ulverston?

Sir J. GORST: In Ulverston. The Ulverston penny rate is unfortunately already appropriated to some other purpose, and in order to make the thing legal the Ulverston people have requested the county of Lancaster to lay a penny rate upon them, and I have every reason to believe that in the course of a few weeks that will be done, and the rate applied, with the consent of all parties, to enable the school to be established in a legal manner.

Sir JOHN BRUNNER: Will Ulverston then be able to spend twopence in the pound?

Sir J. GORST: Yes. I do not think there is any danger of any one of these schools, if it is a good school, being injured, even assuming the judgment is confirmed. The final course open is the Higher Elementary School Minute. I stated last year that the Higher Elementary School Minute was invented on purpose for these schools; it was intended, in the event of the judgment being in accordance with the legal opinion of the Board of Education, to legalise their position.

I must now say a few words about the evening schools. Evening schools are the most chaotic part of the whole of our chaotic system. Evening school instruction ranges from the three R's ;which generally have been previously taught to the scholars at the public expense and are being taught again at the public expense; up to such subjects as drawing from the life, differential and integral calculus, spherical trigonometry, and advanced processes of metallurgy. These evening continuation schools draw their revenue from public as well as from private sources. They get their revenue firstly from the rates, which is perfectly legal so long as they keep within the very wide range of the Evening Continuation School Code. Then they draw revenue from the county council for technical instruction, and they also have local taxation money, which comes from the Chancellor of the

Exchequer, and which is distributed through the county council. They also have a grant from the Science and Art Department and the grant for elementary education. These schools are inspected by four different sets of inspectors, and they are established by one set of managers who compete with those schools set up by another set of managers, and thus pupils are drawn from schools supported by public money. In the case of London the London School Board took upon itself some three years ago, without any definite Parliamentary authority, to make all the evening schools free, and the effect of making these evening schools free has been not to draw students out of the streets, but to draw students from other schools and institutions. There is no doubt that in the case of a great many of the polytechnics receiving public money the students are drawn away into the schools because they have to pay either smaller fees or no fees at all. It is quite true that if the judgment is confirmed on appeal, these evening schools, maintained by the rates, will not be able to teach subjects outside the Evening School Continuation Code, and they will not be able to teach science. The Lord President of the Council was asked in the House of Lords the other day * whether he would bring in a Bill to cure this difficulty, and from the answer my noble friend gave in another place. I cannot promise, and hon. Members must not expect, that the Government will bring in any Bill which will deal with this specific complaint of school boards. But the Government will bring in a Bill, as

my noble friend said in the House of Lords, upon which all these points can be raised, and upon which a Parliamentary decision can be taken. The Government will bring in a Bill for the creation of secondary education authorities having power to provide public instruction in those subjects which are not contained in the Elementary and Evening Continuation Schools Codes. Parliament will then decide whether there is to be one authority for dealing with education. If it decides that there should be only one, it will

* See preceding volume of Debates, page 978.

then have to say who that authority shall be. If Parliament decides to have two authorities, the House will then have to decide what definition of higher education shall be adopted, and where the limit of one authority ceases and that of the other begins.

Parliament will also have to decide another matter which has never yet been brought to a decision. That is, whether it is for the interest of the country that adults shall receive this higher education or any education at the expense, of the country. I do not wish to prejudice this question at all. There is, of course, a great deal to be said on both sides. But take a case of this kind: A person of mature life wishes to amuse himself, to provide himself with recreation by drawing. Has he any right to ask the ratepayers or the taxpayers to pay not only the cost of his being taught, but also of the materials which he uses?;because, I am told, anybody who wishes to learn drawing has nothing to do but to walk into one of the London evening continuation schools, and he can there get most excellent instruction and have all his materials found for him. It may be right that that should be done, but I think Parliament ought to decide it. I do not think it is right that even such an august body as the London School Board should decide that question without the authority of Parliament, and certainly upon the Bill to be brought in the House will have an opportunity of deciding this question.

I have already detained the House rather a long time, but I must briefly refer to the Higher Elementary School Minute. The, Higher Elementary School Minute does no doubt diminish the Exchequer grants received by the higher grade schools of the type to which I have been referring, and that I say is perfectly legal and perfectly light. That question was discussed last session. It is inseparable from the system of the block grant that those schools that are earning most from the Government should suffer; hut, on looking through the figures, I find that the School Board of London all through London has lost only £;4,000 by the operation of the block grant system, representing a one-thirty-seventh of a penny rate.

Cardiff lost one-sixth of a penny, Liverpool one-fifteenth of a penny, Manchester one-eighth of a penny, and so on. I do not think the higher grade schools are in any danger, because a slightly greater proportion of their cost will be defrayed by rates and a slightly less proportion will be paid out of the Consolidated Fund. It does not seem to me to be reasonable that rich schools should come to this House and cry out that we are destroying the higher grade schools by putting on them a charge of one-thirty-seventh of a penny. I do not think that I need say much more. The agitation that is going on in

regard to this matter is really an attempt on the part of the school boards of the country to get themselves made secondary education authorities as the school boards are in Scotland. We can discuss that when the Bill to which I have already referred comes on. I will only just say briefly what are my objections to the school board as the education authority. My first objection is its inapplicability to the rural districts, which require higher education quite as much as, if not more than, the great towns. My second objection is that the methods of the school boards have the effect of destroying excellent institutions which already exist and which are doing really good work. I am sorry to say that the figures show that there is not the slightest doubt that the secondary schools of London, which have been aided by the Technical Instruction Committee of the London County Council, and which are very efficient schools, have been injured by the higher grade schools of the London School Board; for whereas formerly a great number of children from the elementary schools found their way into these secondary schools, they are now kept out of these schools because the School Board keep them in the inferior schools, and they are not allowed to enter the higher schools. It will be seen that, so far from giving the children of working men a better education, you are actually preventing them getting the better education which they would otherwise get. My third objection is that the type of school established by the school board is not the type you would like to see all over this country.

It is tainted by the defects of our elementary school system; defects which lead to too much of an attempt to drill and too much training of the children, and too little attempt is made to develop their character and give them any originality of their own. You cannot help this if you have hundreds of children under one management, for it is impossible for the head of the school to superintend such a large number and to know enough of the children to enable him to develop their character at the same time. These are the reasons why we think the school boards should not be made the authority for these higher grade schools. One thing I quite admit, and that is, that we shall never have anything like a proper system of education in this country until we make up our mind what is to be the authority, until we have one authority, and until schools of every kind and every grade are placed under that authority. Then there will be no more overlapping, no more trouble about the particular kind of school, or the particular course of education to be given in it; because if you have one authority in a district you can lay out a plan of education suited to the wants of the people of that district, and you can build such schools as are necessary for the peculiar wants and idiosyncrasies of the people of the district. You would have education carried on in a sensible and business kind of manner, and you would get rid of the chaos which exists at present.

*MR. J. H. WHITLEY (Halifax) said he wished to draw the attention of the right lion, the Vice-President to the special difficulties under which evening continuation schools at present laboured. He could speak with some little authority on this question, from the fact that for the last fifteen years he had been engaged in Halifax in the management of some of the most successful continuation schools in the country. The first thing he wanted was the abolition

of the 17s. 6d. Limit. He did not know whether it had been an oversight on the part of the right hon. Gentleman, but when the Day School Code abolished the 17s. 6d. Limit, it was left in existence in regard to evening schools, which was an extreme hardship. For fifteen years those with whom he had been working had been labouring to raise the standard of education in those evening schools, and when, at the end of fourteen years, they were able to earn grants exceeding the 17s. 6d., they found that the money could not be paid because this iniquitous regulation still remained on the Evening School Code.

The second matter which he wished to press on the right hon. Gentleman was the connection between the evening and the day schools. Three years ago the right hon. Gentleman introduced into the Evening School Code a regulation forbidding children who were attending a day school to attend, at the same time, an evening school. With the spirit of the regulation he agreed, but in actual practice it had resulted in considerable harm to the children they wished to benefit. His most important point was to get the children to pass from the day to the evening school without the break. His experience showed that unless they did that, the chances were doubled or tripled that they would never get them into the evening schools. He would ask whether the right hon. Gentleman would not consider a system whereby a child, within six months of leaving a day school, could enter an evening school. The two systems would overlap in the least degree, but they could be so arranged as to take away the probability of break. What happened was this. Unless a child became a "full timer" during the six months of the summer, he was unable to begin the evening school session at the proper time. All the classes had been arranged, and the children had fixed on their companions. The child did not like to go into the school halfway through the winter session, and therefore in many cases he said he would not go to the evening school until next year. When the break was once made in this way the chances were that they never got such children into evening schools at all. If a reasonable modification of the regulation made eight years ago were introduced, it would not be a hardship on the children in the day schools, and would be a very great advantage to the country.

The third matter he wished to press on the attention of the right hon. Gentleman was physical education in the evening schools. In the evening schools with which he was connected, he had insisted, in spite of the Evening School Code, on a large proportion of physical education. Hon. Members must remember that they were dealing with children who had spent ten hours already at work; and he had always held that it was not advisable that such children should have their education based entirely on book work. Therefore, in his evening schools, it had always been essential that physical drill and gymnastics should be carried on alongside and with mental instruction. He attributed to that fact a large part of the success of these schools, and the high percentage of the regular attendance at them. He would ask the right hon. Gentleman whether, when he was arranging his next Code, he would not put in a specific grant for physical culture under proper precautions. In the present condition of the Army and Navy there was nothing more important than that our youths should get more

regular and systematic physical education in the evening schools. He had heard with gratification the concluding words of the speech of the right hon.

Gentleman, when he asserted that the Bill he was going to introduce into the House would not be like some other Bills, or like the laws of the Medes and Persians, which could not be altered, but that it would be a Bill which the House could discuss in a businesslike manner, not a cast-iron Bill which they must accept or reject. He trusted that the promise would be fulfilled, and that the Bill would be brought in and discussed in a broad spirit.

MR. FLOWER (Bradford, W.) said there were two or three matters to which he wished to draw the attention of the Committee and the right hon. Gentleman. First of all, however, he joined cordially in the concluding remarks of the hon. Gentleman opposite. He thought the time had now come when, in discussing matters affecting education, they might well eliminate party elements and think solely in a practical and business-like way of the very difficult and intricate problems with which they had to deal. The speech of the right hon. The Vice-President was an evidence of that fact.

Passing from that, what was it that evening continuation schools were trying to do? They were trying three things;

to combine what he would call a system of night schools with that of continuing the education of children from the elementary day schools, and with a soupçon of technical education;and they were failing in the combination.

At least, his experience on the London School Board was that the effort to combine the three systems in one was not a success. They had heard accounts brought before the London School Board of such evening continuation schools being opened free, but at a very large cost to the ratepayers, and of the classes being very largely attended. But the Committee would have smiled if they had heard the report as to the actual attendance at some of these classes.

Nevertheless, the evening continuation schools of the London School Board were doing a great and useful work, and in these days when public attention was being directed to the large number of young people who were loafing about the streets, one would be sorry to do anything to curtail that useful work, although it needed to be systematised. He sincerely hoped from the speech of the Vice-President that it was the intention of the Government to steadily and persistently persevere in that course. The task was really not so very difficult. They had not to contend against any antagonism, or any public feeling, but only against the smaller petty jealousies between local bodies. Of course the ideal which the right hon. Gentleman had sketched of one central authority would be the true solution of the problem;one local authority responsible for all education throughout well-defined areas.

There was another matter to which he would like to draw attention, and again he did so in no party spirit. From time to time they heard of the educational progress in other countries. That had become almost a commonplace, and in metaphorical language it was urged that England was lagging behind other nations in this respect. Unhappily it was the truth. No matter what codes they might invent, or what authorities they might establish, they had got to I come back at last to the quality of the teachers who were going to impart the instruction.

[An HON. MEMBER: And the number of them.] Those who were responsible for the education of this country might make every attempt in other directions, but these would of necessity fail. The scarcity of places in the training colleges was now nothing less than a scandal. Representative after representative of the Education Department had, from the Treasury Bench, deplored the scarcity of places in the training colleges, even after the Chancellor of the Exchequer had met the request of the Education Department with a rebuke. The accommodation in the training colleges was wholly and utterly inadequate to meet the demand, and the result was that young teachers, with every hope that they might make themselves useful public servants, found themselves unable to complete their career or to obtain admission to the training colleges. Consequently they resorted to other professions, and the years of work they had given was lost, besides a considerable amount of public money expended on them. He hoped the Government would consider the question of increasing the number of training colleges. The ideal would be to link the training colleges to the universities, and give the young teachers a taste of that wider life which was obtained in a public university. But if that could not be done, they ought not to see the teachers of the future dropping out of the ranks; hundreds, almost thousands, of capable young people who might be efficient and brilliant teachers, denied admission to the training colleges. He hoped and believed that the religious difficulty was not going any more to hinder them from working for the progress of education. He believed that all the religious difficulties could be settled by a five minutes conference round a common table, on the broad principle of "give and take."

That brought him to another point which he wished to bring before the attention of the Committee; namely, the securing of a reasonable fixity of tenure for the teachers. This equally applied to teachers in voluntary as in board schools. How could they hope to induce the young people of the country to become teachers unless there was some reasonable prospect of fixity of tenure, and some provision made against the arbitrary and capricious dismissal of teachers? He believed himself that that could be secured by a Minute of the Education Department; but if not, it might be done by a Bill of an entirely non-contentious character. But until it was done there would from time to time arise cases of harsh, capricious, and cruel dismissal of teachers. And these would disgust a large number of young people who would otherwise enter the teaching profession.

He would most respectfully and earnestly press on the attention of the right hon. Gentleman the matters which he had brought before the Committee; and he hoped that he would be permitted to express the anticipation that the Bill promised by the right hon. Gentleman would be introduced ere long in the House. At the present moment, all who engaged in the work of education were doing so under difficult conditions. There had been a legal decision of the King's Bench Division pronouncing that much of the education given by the school boards of recent years had been illegal. That decision had been appealed against, although the Education Department had very properly decided to continue paying the grants pending the appeal. This condition of chaos could not, however, and ought not

to, go on much longer. It ought to be the serious work of the Government this session to simplify and regulate the education of the country as it ought to be, and to create an authority which would once for all put an end to the disastrous and extravagant system of overlapping, and place the public education of the country on a real businesslike footing.

*DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, K) said they must all agree with the right hon. Gentleman that every grade of school and each kind of education should be in each district under the same local authority responsible to the people. The right hon. The Vice-President had told them that the right of any school board to use the rates for advanced instruction had been challenged in the courts of law. Now, the very fact of that challenge was, in his opinion, a very serious commentary on the capacity of the officials of the Education Department to interpret the Parliamentary statutes for the last thirty years. The late Mr. Mundella, a pre-

decessor of the right hon. Gentleman, had gone out of his way to invite the Welsh school boards to establish higher grade schools, although no doubt he had added that they ought to be self-supporting. But, apart from Mr. Mundella, the present Vice-President and other members of the Board of Education had gone down to the country and in various cities and towns made flamboyant speeches congratulating the people of these towns on founding higher grade schools. No opposition had ever been raised by the Department until the other day as to the propriety of using the school rates for the support of these schools. He did not propose to deal further with this part of the question, seeing that the decision of the courts had been challenged, and that the point must hereafter be decided by the final court of appeal.

But what he wanted to come to was a matter which was not sub judice, and which had not been challenged in a court of law; namely, the administration of the Higher Elementary Schools Minute. He hoped the House would excuse him if he went into this matter in some detail. Hon. Members would remember that the Education Code last year initiated a very salutary reform; a reform due to the right hon. Gentleman, and which provided for the "block" grant instead of special grants.

Under that system a large number of schools which had been devoting attention to a large number of specific subjects lost a great deal of money, and in response to the pressure from both sides of the House; [An HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh.] ; well, or as a result of the spontaneous goodwill towards education which the right hon. Gentleman had always evinced in everything he had said;

SIR J. GORST said that he might explain that the grants to the higher grade schools and the schools of science would be continued until the legal issue of the appeal which had been made to the House of Lords on the point.

*DR. MACNAMARA said he would confine his remarks to the Elementary School Minute of April last, which provided for special instruction and special grants. That Minute seemed to be a

genuine endeavour on the part of the right hon. Gentleman to provide facilities for the continuous education of the children of the working classes whose parents were willing to keep them at school up to fifteen years of age. It was on that statement that the hon. Member for Cambridge University based his

suggestion for a Higher Elementary Education Minute. It was on the strength of this statement that it was a genuine endeavour to make provision for the further education of the working-class children; rendered necessary by the cutting down of the grants under the Block grant system ; that the House has agreed that the Code and the Minute were conducive to the best interests of education. He did not want to put it offensively, but directly the matter had passed away from the House the scope of the Minute began to be dwarfed to a very alarming degree. The local authorities who applied for recognition of their schools under the Minute were promptly told that such schools to be recognised must have a curriculum bearing a close resemblance to the curriculum of a school of science. Schools of science were higher grade schools organised under rules of the now happily defunct Science and Art Department, and which had a curriculum mainly scientific. He complained of that administration; there was nothing in the Minute about conforming to a scientific course. The Minute was one merely establishing higher elementary schools, not higher elementary schools of science; and if that had been the intention of the Minute it would have been better for the House to have been told of it before it passed away from them. The Minute laid down that the Board should decide which grant should be paid in the case of each year's course after consulting the report and recommendation on four points; the suitability of the instruction to the circumstances of the scholars and the neighbourhood; the thoroughness and the intelligence with which the instruction was given; the sufficiency and suitability of the staff; and the discipline and organisation. Of these four points the pregnant phrase was the first. Would the right hon. Gentleman argue that a course of instruction, mainly scientific, would be universally suitable to the use of all schools in all neighbourhoods? If he did not argue in that way then there was nothing in the Minute which would justify the ruling which the Board of Education was now giving right and left, that the provisions of the Higher Elementary School Minute were not applicable to schools of a commercial type. He considered it was a most fatuous ruling. The one thing needed at the present time was opportunity for commercial training. It was always his impression that the Government believed that the one particular need of the moment was commercial education. At a conference held at the Guildhall on the question of commercial education, and which was convened by the London Chamber of Commerce, the Vice-President of the Council agreed that commercial education was in the opinion of the Government essential. That was also shown by the remarks made by the Home Secretary on the previous day when distributing prizes in connection with the London Chamber of Commerce scheme. The right hon. Gentleman said on that occasion, that in being present he was only performing his duty. "It would be a strange thing," he added, "if the Government of a great commercial country like this did not show an interest in a matter so vitally affecting the interests of the country." The way in which the Government showed that interest consisted in their rigidly declining to recognise schools which proposed to give commercial training. The Government must be very unworthy fiduciaries if they deprived the working classes of this one avenue to success which was now open to them. Everybody was alive to the importance of commercial education except those

who ought to be most alive to it; those who controlled education. He protested very strongly against this endeavour to rule out commercial training for the people. Although Lord Rosebery and the Colonial Secretary had recently made strong statements as to the necessity for commercial education, all that was received from the Board of Education was well summed up in a letter written to the London School Board::

"Business training cannot be recognised as part of the curriculum of higher elementary schools."

But the right hon. Gentleman might say that the Government never having paid for commercial education could not begin to do so now; but that I would be an extraordinary statement to make, seeing that the country had I paid for commercial instruction and that the Board of Education in its Science and Art Directory made provision for commercial instruction. He hoped the Board of Education would see its way to modify this ruling at once. Let them contrast the system in this country, with that of Scotland. Why should not the one be as good as the other; what was sauce for the Scotch gander surely was sauce for the English goose? In Scotland it was always desired that the local authorities should feel themselves free to vary the curriculum according to local needs, but that was not so in England, and the same remark applied to the age for leaving. In Scotland it could be extended to eighteen years, whilst in England it was ruled down to fifteen; the only complimentary explanation being that an English child could at the age of fifteen attain the same intellectual level as a Scotch child of eighteen. The local authorities of Bradford (the Manchester of the woollen trade) desired to have a higher elementary school organised on commercial lines, with French and German as the leading subjects. That was a suggestion which one would have thought would have been encouraged, but it was not, and Bradford was told that it could not have a school organised on commercial lines, it must be a school of science. There was nothing whatever in the Minute to justify any such ruling.

The House had been told a short time ago that there had been some 190 applications for recognition under the Higher Elementary Minute. The same information had been given on the 31st of July last. Were they to understand that no applications were made during the seven months which intervene between those two dates? Out of those 190 applications two only had been recognised.

That was the information given to the House nearly twelve months after the Minute was passed, that only two had been recognised out of 190. In London there were seventy-nine high grade schools, and the London School Board, disliking the science course, had foregone the preferential grants and took most of the cost out of

the ratepayers, because they preferred a general commercial curriculum. When the Higher Elementary Minute was introduced they suggested that these seventy-nine schools should be recognised, and the Board of Education magnanimously offered to recognise four, or rather the School Board authorities were told that the Board of Education would consider four out of the seventy-nine. Seventy-nine looked rather a high figure, but that was only one school to every 100,000 of the population. Surely every district with 100,000 population was entitled to

one higher grade school. The answer which they obtained was that the Board of Education would consider the advisability of recognising the four schools of science, which would give two higher grade schools in Greenwich and two in Marylebone, those being the places in which these four schools were situated. In nine out of the eleven divisions of the London School Board there were no higher elementary schools under the Minute. In the Division of West Lambeth, which he himself represented, there were seven Parliamentary boroughs with 650,000 population, 130,000 of whom were children attending the elementary schools, and that division did not possess a higher elementary school under the Minute. That was not the spirit in which the Minute was placed before the House of Commons. He did not want to labour the point, but he could not help saying that, all the country over, there had been a set determination on the part of the Board of Education to put every conceivable obstacle in the way of establishing higher elementary education and the further development of the working-class children. It was simply marvellous how the rulings under the Minute were developing. In April last the Birmingham teachers applied through the Secretary to the Colonies that elementary and higher elementary schools might be held under one roof, and he received a letter from the Board of Education which contained the following; "The new Minute does not state that the new type of school must necessarily be in a totally separate building from an ordinary elementary school."

Shortly after that the Hebden Bridge School Board wrote to the Board of Education on the same subject and received the following reply;

"The Board of Education do not propose to sanction as higher elementary schools, schools which are in part used as ordinary elementary schools. Higher elementary schools must be separate and complete."

He submitted that such a ruling as that was in direct conflict with the ruling obtained by the Colonial Secretary on behalf of the Birmingham teachers.

SIR J. GORST was understood to say that the second ruling was a mistake. He would not object to sanction as higher elementary schools, schools which were partly used as ordinary schools, and in many cases he had sanctioned them.

*DR. MACNAMARA: Had the right hon. Gentleman sanctioned the schools at Hebden Bridge? That was the school to which he was referring, and he would be very much surprised to hear that the Board of Education had at Hebden Bridge sanctioned a higher elementary school and a primary school under one roof. If Minutes were administered in this manner they would before very long be administered entirely out of existence. It was impossible to fix these people. They dodged about from kopje to kopje in a way that put the activity of Christian De Wet into the shade. When endeavouring to fix the responsibility for the deliberate and reprehensible attempt to whittle down the Higher Elementary Minute, the difficulty with which one was confronted was that it was quite impossible to believe the Vice-President could be responsible, for every public utterance of his proclaimed him to be a generous and enlightened and progressive educationalist. Whoever was responsible, having regard to the manner in which we were plunged into the fiercest of commercial struggles with our foreign rivals, it was lamentable to the last degree. It was Little Englandism of the most pernicious type to put these obstacles in the way of most generous facilities

for the intellectual equipment of the children of the people. He pleaded for a touch of Imperialism in this matter, and thought that the greatest possible facilities should be given by the Board of Education.

SIR W. HART DYKE (Kent, Dartford) said the debate had been one of extraordinary interest, and if it had shown one thing more than another, it had shown that it was high time that they had something more than these educational speeches from the right hon. Gentleman. It was high time that, after debate upon debate in this House, measures of the kind which had been shown with almost sickening reiteration to be necessary should be produced before them, and that an Act of Parliament should reduce this matter to a practical shape.

Hon. Gentlemen who had spoken on the subject on this occasion had cast upon the administration of the Education Department the imputation that the treatment of higher grade schools for many years had been a serious reflection on the Education Department. He thought the reflection should rather be cast on the people of this country, who for thirty years past had shown so little interest in education. If they had taken half the interest in this question that they had taken in taxation and other matters a remedy would have been found long ago. All Governments had dreaded and shirked the difficulty of filling up the obvious gap between elementary and higher education. He appealed to the House never to cease to put pressure on the Government until the latter produced a measure and gave earnest of their intention to carry it to a practical conclusion. No Government ever had such an opportunity as the Government had at this moment of dealing with the question. This debate showed what an extraordinary change had come over public opinion in respect to this subject, not only outside but within the walls of that House. This new Parliament was prepared to deal practically with the question. He believed that hon. Members were prepared to make some sacrifices of principle on each side to secure a good measure. They were prepared to approach the matter, not as partisans of either the voluntary or school board system, but as educationists. He believed that before many years had passed, and when the first stress of pressure came as regarded our commercial supremacy, we should find what a bitter penalty we had to pay for thirty years of negligence. Facts could be adduced which would show the fruit of the educational efforts in America as regarded the engineering trade. He believed that facts and figures would be brought before the House which would awaken hon. Members and the Government to the urgency of proceeding in this matter. His right hon. Friend had alluded to a Bill which was to come before the House. He believed that that Bill had the germs of success in it. He believed that the whole key of the position was that they must trust the representatives of the people in each locality. The less Parliament interfered with the localities the better. They must have a central authority, but the solution of the difficulty was to place the education of the people in some local authority in each district. He appealed to hon. Members, whatever the promised measure was, to remember the huge issues involved, to sink their political differences, and to endeavour to come to a wise and just conclusion.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) Said the discussion that day showed that there was a general feeling that the time had come for endeavouring to pass a comprehensive

measure which would get rid of the evils and inconveniences which had been so strongly pointed out on the Opposition side of the House. The right hon. Gentleman the Vice-President did not grapple with the difficulty underlying the whole matter; namely, the fact that the higher grade schools, which had been allowed to go on for a good many years, had suddenly found themselves dealt with in an entirely different spirit, and had found themselves in great difficulty in carrying on the work they did.

The House would allow him to say how these higher grade schools came into existence. A Commission which reported in 1868 pointed out that the greatest educational need of the country, besides, of course, the establishment of elementary schools, was the establishment of higher grade schools; secondary schools which should give a practical education to children from the age of fourteen or fifteen for a moderate fee not exceeding £4 a year. Nothing had been done to give effect to that recommendation from that time to now, and except by the schemes of the Endowed Schools Commissioners nothing was done to create these schools, which were the greatest need of the country then, and were the greatest need of the country still. Then came the Education Act of 1870, and two years after that Act came into operation the school boards, feeling that the benefits obtained in the elementary schools were very largely lost because the children could not carry their education further, started these higher grade schools. He did not think the right hon. Gentleman would dispute the growth of these higher grade schools. From that time to now they had been of the greatest possible benefit. No part of our educational machinery had been better than those sixty or seventy schools which would be hit at by the case now under appeal. Therefore this was a very serious case.

It was not denied, and it would not be denied by the Education Department itself, that the line they had taken lately had been very different from the line taken at an earlier time. It would have been quite impossible for the school boards to have gone on as they had done continually developing these schools and working them out on larger lines if the Education Department had adopted the kind of policy which had been adopted lately. He did not at all deny that there were some drawbacks. One of them had been mentioned that night. Under the influence of the science and art grants these schools were going too exclusively on the scientific line. He did not deny that there were some places where it might be true that, as the right hon. Gentleman had pointed out, the higher grade schools were to some extent coming into competition with secondary schools in a way that made it difficult for them to carry on, but, on the whole, the balance of advantage was very greatly on the side of the higher grade schools. They had become so indispensable in the educational machinery of the country that any interference with them ought to have been avoided by the Board of Education. Well, under some influence, the origin of which he could not guess, the Board of Education had disregarded the danger, and they had checked the usefulness of these higher grade schools. He believed that at this moment these schools were in serious difficulty, because in order to satisfy the requirements of the Science and Art Department they had gone on

incurring expenses, erecting schools, and purchasing apparatus. Now they found themselves suddenly cut off from the resources on which they had counted, and they were in serious financial difficulties.

SIR J. GORST said he had distinctly stated that until the final judgment was given in the case the grants would be paid.

MR. BRYCE remarked that there was a sword hanging over their heads, so to speak, and they were unable to develop their work. The present position of school boards was really an extremely difficult one, and one which made it impossible for them to continue the course by which they had rendered considerable service. Therefore, he could not help wishing that the Board of Education, before they issued their new Minute, before they set the Cockerton case going;

SIR J. GORST said he absolutely disclaimed all responsibility for the Cockerton case; the Board of Education had nothing whatever to do with it.

MR. BRYCE said that in that case the Board of Education ought to have framed their Minute in a different way, and they ought to have administered the Minute in a different spirit from that which they appeared to have pursued. These schools filled gaps, and were doing most useful work. The higher grade schools were doing most useful technical work, and he asked why it should be cut short. There was neither reason, consistency, nor public advantage in the line the Board of Education had taken.

He agreed with the main conclusion of his right hon. Friend the Member for the Dartford Division that what was wanted was a systematic revision of the whole system. The Vice-President of the Council had said that there was a want of public interest in the question; but why was there a want of public interest? Because it was perfectly impossible for any private individual, unless he gave his mind to the study of the excessively complicated condition into which our system of education had got, to understand anything about it. This was not a new matter. It had been admitted for years. It was dealt with in the fullest manner by the Royal Commission that reported in 1895. That Commission was unanimous. The right hon. Gentleman on every occasion he had addressed the House since had admitted that the matter was urgent. The present Government had a large majority. Why did it not deal with the question, and why by the Minute of last session did it actually begin to pull down the old house before erecting a new one? That ought not to have been done until they had established a new authority to carry out a new scheme. The Board of Education had reversed that progress, and they had stopped the authority which was doing useful work before they had started a new authority to take its place. He hoped the Committee might take it that there was no doubt that the Government would introduce a Bill. Perhaps they would say whether the Bill would be introduced in this or in the other House?

SIR J. GORST said he was afraid he could not tell the right hon. Gentleman yet.

MR. BRYCE said he would conclude with one piece of advice to the Government. If they desired their Bill to succeed, let them frame it with sole reference to educational considerations, and make it a Bill that should be fair as between the different authorities which were more or less seized of this question, and, above all, let them take every taint of sectarianism out of it. Let there be nothing in the Bill which would arouse those sectarian passions which had so

much injured the cause of education, which would impede the passage of the measure, and which would make it more difficult to work. If they would introduce a Bill purely educational, he thought they would have no difficulty in passing it through the House.

EARL PERCY (Kensington, S.) Protested against the imputation that those who supported the Government's action in this matter were reactionary and opposed to commercial education. He thought that commercial, education was the thing we most needed, probably more than scientific education, and unless it were provided by the Government, or unless the Government provided the means by which that commercial education could be given, we would not retain for long our commercial supremacy in the competition with foreign countries. It by no means followed that they undervalued commercial education because they refused to allow schools to supply it which, by the very essence of their being, were incapable and unfitted to provide it. The hon. Member opposite said that no one would have dreamt when the Minute was discussed in the House that the Government would have placed a construction on it which would prevent the school boards giving commercial education in the schools. He should say that anyone who considered the subject for a moment would see that the Government had no alternative. The Royal Commission on Secondary Education reported that the school boards had already taken the place of what were called by the Schools Inquiry Commission the third grade, and in some cases the second grade schools. The Minute of last year seemed to him to have begun to carry out the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Secondary Education which investigated the subject of these higher grade schools. It laid down the age limit of these schools; the age limit was fifteen; and by doing so it sharply distinguished these schools from the secondary schools, in which the leaving age was sixteen to nineteen years. The whole object of these higher grade schools was that they should provide scientific training for those who were going into industry or manufacture, while the secondary schools should be open to those who could afford more than one or two years attendance after leaving the ordinary public elementary school, and who could undergo a more general and business training which should fit them to go into a college. The Government had agreed to recognise those schools under the Minute.

Surely the wisest policy of the Government in regard to their future Education Bill was to encourage school boards to provide all higher grade science schools which were necessary for that part of the population which was going to enter into some industry or manufacture; that they should then erect an authority for secondary education which should provide higher grade schools, in which the children should remain for four years, and in which they should have a proper commercial education; and, lastly, that they should provide a regular system of scholarships which should, on the one hand, take the child of the public elementary school to the higher grade organised science school, and, on the other hand, from the public elementary school to the secondary commercial school. When that had been done we would have a thorough businesslike system.

*MR. GEORGE WHITE (Norfolk, N.W.) said he knew it was a somewhat dangerous thing to make any personal reference in first rising to address the Committee, but he

wished to say that he had been connected with a large school board for twenty-seven years, and he had for four terms been chairman of that board; he was also a governor of two endowed schools. Therefore he was sure the Committee would pardon him in giving this educational history, because he felt that he had had some opportunity of informing himself in regard to the various phases of educational work, of knowing how they might overlap each other, and how cooperation might be secured with advantage to all.

He felt, in rising to support the Amendment, that he was not opposing any grant of public money for the purpose of education. It must be a relief to the Committee, as it was to himself, for a short time at any rate, to get rid of the interminable discussion they had had upon the war, and the never-ending payments necessary for the cost of the war, and to consider for a few hours matters affecting the condition and the well-being of the people at home. He could not forbear from reminding the Committee that measures of coercion and destruction were far more costly than those of beneficial construction. The prosecution and imprisonment of one Hooligan cost ten times more than an elementary scholar's education. It was a sad and awful thing to feel that when this war should terminate, for the two years it has existed it will have cost more than the whole of the money the State has expended on education since the Act of 1870 was passed. He felt that the House ought to know what plans the Government had for the future with regard to the education of this country, and whether they had any remedy for the chaos the right hon. Gentleman had so graphically described; and especially whether they were prepared to put the higher grade schools on a more permanent footing.

He quite supported the distinct allegation that the Department and its work in recent years, so far as education is concerned, had been of a decidedly reactionary character, not only in regard to legislation, but more especially in regard to the administration of the Acts by the Department. There was the best evidence of this in some portions of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman opposite, in which he attempted to show that the work of school boards need not be injured in the least, because they had the technical education grant, or the rate which the technical committees are allowed to raise, to fall back upon to continue their work. Would any hon. Member contend that the technical grant and the technical rate combined were too much for the work which a technical committee had to undertake, whether in cities, boroughs, or rural districts?

This was another evidence on the part of the right hon. Gentleman of the way in which the Department attempted to throw the proper work of the school boards on to some other department of educational work. It did not appear to matter to the right hon. Gentleman who took up this work so long as it was taken away from the school boards.

He would instance two or three cases of the reactionary policy of the Department. The grant-in-aid of three-quarters of a million of money, and the exemptions of denominational schools from rates began a new principle with regard to the administration of grants in connection with education in this country. It seemed to him, and he thought the working out of it would prove, that the grant-in-aid was really intended to assist inefficient schools, which

were doing their work very badly, and at the same time to demand no increased efficiency from them. Until this Government came into office it was always thought, and acted upon by educationists in connection with school boards, that the school board was the proper authority to supply any acknowledged deficiency of educational accommodation. It had been for this Government to show that that was not so. He could demonstrate over and over again from examples, from large towns as well as from villages, that obstacles had been put in the way of school boards supplying acknowledged deficiencies, where the accommodation had been insufficient and inefficient, and yet delays, extending to years, had been granted until a denominational effort had been made, rather than permit a school board to be established, or an existing board to supply the deficiency. That was a way of administering the Acts which he did not think was in accordance with the spirit of the Education Act of 1870, and certainly was not in accordance with the action of the Department up to the time this Government came into office.

It was not only in these ways but in the efforts which were apparently being made to check the character of the education in our midst that the Government had shown their reactionary policy. It was not necessary for him to detain the Committee with the history of the growth of higher grade schools, but he could not follow the right hon. Gentleman opposite in his description of their growth. They were but the natural and simple outgrowth of the Act of 1870. Even that Act gave scope for certain specific subjects, and he believed that before that Act was passed grants were administered from the Education Department for specific subjects, some of which were even in these later days almost dragged into what is called secondary education. It was quite true that school boards and those who were anxious to establish higher grade schools did on many occasions proclaim the hope that these schools would be erected and carried on without expense to the rates. But the right hon. Gentleman argued as though that was a proof that the illegality of these schools was acknowledged. It was nothing of the sort. He himself, as a strong advocate, and perhaps the founder, of the higher grade school in connection with one large school board, when he stood before his fellow citizens expressed the hope that in a few years it would not be a burden on the rates. But he did not express the hope because he felt there was any illegality in taking money from the rates in support of such schools. The growth of the interest of the public in education had been slow, and it was necessary, so to speak, to gild the pill a little in order to induce ordinary citizens to give the thing a chance. Mr. Mundella in the same way said the schools should be self-supporting, but by so saying he did not give the slightest intimation that it was illegal to take money from the rates for their support. Surely it was not contended that the education of to-day should be judged upon the same standard as thirty years ago. Was it to be assumed that the progress of the century was to be marked in everything except our educational work? The hon. Member for West Nottingham said that we appeared to be merely marking time in regard to higher education. He thought we were doing worse, and that in the past five years we had gone back.

After a few years experience of the Education Act, the larger school boards

began to establish these higher grade schools. Naturally, they found that it tended to economy, and also to efficiency of teaching, to group higher standards in certain schools, and most large towns established these higher grade schools. They were established in order to deal with those children who were capable of following the instruction given in the higher standards, and also those whose parents were willing they should remain at school for a few years longer. He would take the higher grade school at Norwich as an example, and give the concrete history of that school. In the first instance, only a small modicum of science was taught, such as he supposed higher elementary schools were now intended to teach, but they were almost driven by the South Kensington Department to establish a school of science. Therefore, after a few years they established a science school within the higher grade school. He quite agreed that the science schools as then established were too scientific for the curriculum of a popular day school like a higher grade school, and therefore they got relief. The Committee would notice that within two years from that date they had been compelled as a school board to build, in addition to the chemical laboratory which they had in connection with the higher grade school, a physical laboratory, at an expense of £1,000. That had been open only twelve months, and now they were told that all this was illegal, and that they had no right to take any money from the rates for the support of this science school.

The matter of age was another point upon which the Education Department had shown a very reactionary tendency. A little time ago 65 per cent, of the boys and girls in our schools left at the age of eleven. The efforts of all educationists had been devoted to getting children to stay longer at school, especially in the higher grade schools. Nothing could be more suicidal than in the face of the progress which was being made to put this block upon our higher education. What reason was there for it? The ratepayers who had to pay had made no public protest against the application of rates to higher grade schools. As one who knew something of the educational work in the big towns of the country, he said that so far as his knowledge went there was no rate more popular or more willingly paid than the, portion which goes to the maintenance of these higher grade schools. He ventured to say that the persons at the bottom of this objection were mainly the head masters of our secondary schools, who had been stirring up the opposition to school board work. Many of these secondary schools were private schools run for private profit. He was somewhat surprised at the attitude of the right hon. Gentleman in comparing the teachers of our higher grade schools and their capacity for giving instruction with the teaching capacity of many of the secondary schoolmasters. It was a sorry thing if the efficiency and thorough training which the best masters in our higher grade schools had had would not compare satisfactorily with that of the secondary schoolmasters, many of whom, although extremely able men, had had no training whatever, so far as the art of teaching was concerned.

A great deal had been said which was not strictly accurate with regard to the influence of higher grade schools upon secondary schools. To a very great extent the fears expressed were groundless.

If the secondary schools were doing their duty and giving a thoroughly sound education, why should they be afraid of the competition of the higher grade schools? A cry of this kind was raised in his own city some years ago. It was said that one of the schools there was being injured by the influence of the higher grade school. He sifted the facts, and found that not one scholar less attended the school after the higher grade school was opened than attended previously. But he also found that a year and a half before the higher grade school was opened this endowed school had raised its fees, and in consequence the number of boys attending had considerably diminished. That was before the higher grade school was opened, but yet it was popularly supposed in the city that the higher grade school had injured the endowed school to that extent. Grammar schools, many of which confined themselves to a classical education, would always have a separate section of the community supporting them, because class distinction, which, had such influence in the country, would always separate the attendants at the grammar schools from those at the higher grade schools.

While there were some who protested against the action of higher grade schools, let him draw the right hon. Gentleman's attention to the fact that there were very loud protests coming from the great bulk of our organised labour men and artisans against the efforts which were being made to injure the higher grade schools. At labour congresses and trade-union meetings great interest had been excited in this movement, and the right hon. Gentleman would hear from these trade councils that they were determined their children should not be robbed of practically their only chance of securing that education which was necessary to fit them to take their fair position in life. These higher grade schools were the best aids to the technical schools which were being established with such great advantage throughout the country. They were really the groundwork upon which the technical schools might and would be able to build, and instead of restricting their influence

in our large towns he would suggest that it the right hon. Gentleman would devise a scheme to extend their influence and advantages to the rural districts he would be doing a great service to the cause of education and to the country at large. The rural districts stood in need of the instruction which the higher grade schools were giving in the more populous districts, and if the right hon. Gentleman would by some scheme or other provide that it should be given he would confer an inestimable advantage upon those districts.

The right hon. Gentleman had laboured a great deal to prove the illegality of the school boards in this matter, but something more would be heard about that when the appeal had been decided. Even if it were demonstrated that their action had all through been illegal, he hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would see fit to provide some means by which the higher grade schools might not be injured in the work they were doing. Those behind the scenes did not forget that long before the Cockerton case was before the country there were attacks upon our higher grade schools in one way or another. In 1896 there was an attack in this House, which was afterwards withdrawn, but there had been a sapping and mining going on ever since, which he felt had been a very great injury. First of

all, the Science and Art Department, through the Technical Instruction Committee, did their best to limit the work of the present boards and to prevent new boards taking up science teaching. That had been going on for five years, until it has now culminated in an appeal to the law.

With regard to the Minute of last April a great deal had been said as to the manner in which it had been administered. It restricted the education and the age, and he did not think that the Committee would be satisfied unless the right hon. Gentleman told them what it was that had kept the Department from recognising more of these higher elementary schools. He believed that in December the right hon. Gentleman said there were several more applications that were on the point of being recognised, and yet to-day we stood at the point of having two;

SIR J. GORST: There are a great, many more than two now. I should think certainly a dozen.

*MR. GEORGE WHITE said we had reached a dozen in twelve months out of 190 applications, and the Committee was absolutely ignorant of the reasons why the remainder had not been recognised. Rumour had it that all the chaotic condition of education in regard to science and art was caused by the ill-assorted union which had taken place between the Education Department and the Science and Art Department of South Kensington. He did not think a single educationist in the country desired to see the Science and Art Department survive one month longer than it did, but since the union the Education Department had gone back. There was formerly not much fault to be found with the administrative work so far as promptness was concerned, but since the union both Departments appeared to be as bad as the Science and Art Department was previously. He thought the Committee ought to know whether there was any unanimity of feeling and action between the two branches, or whether there was likely to be a divorce again. At present it is like a father and mother who are quarrelling, and are yet determined to live together, to the great detriment of the family they are bringing up.

The Committee would appreciate some of the difficulties with which the right hon. Gentleman had to contend in his present position. The right hon. Gentleman himself had said that we had a territorial aristocracy who were very indifferent to the interests of education, and he (Mr. White) had been struck with the cheers coming from hon. Gentlemen opposite when anything was said against the work of the higher grade schools being supported out of the rates. Probably not a few of the hon. Gentlemen opposite had had a great deal of their education from funds which they had not supplied, and he for one was democratic enough to feel for and to press the interests of the working classes being supplied from the rates in regard to higher education such as was given in the higher grade board schools. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would not be deterred by such influences, especially as he belonged to a Government which included amongst its members the right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary. It was from that right hon. Gentleman and those who sat with him at that time that he got his fullest and best ideals of a national system of education a great many years ago, and, knowing the power he wielded in the, Cabinet, he could not, and the nation would not, exempt him from blame if this state of things

continued. He would appeal to the right hon. Gentleman to show the same interest in popular education that he had shown in the earlier part of his political career, and not to allow reactionary ecclesiastical individuals to put back the clock of education, to the great detriment of the commercial and moral interests of the country.

One word with regard to the authority of which the right hon. Gentleman had spoken. To his mind the best and most encouraging words delivered by the right hon. Gentleman to-night were the few words with which he concluded his speech in reference to one authority to deal with elementary, secondary, and technical education. He (Mr. White) was an ardent supporter of the school board system, but he was perfectly content to say; and he was speaking the sentiments of a great many educationists throughout the country; that they were not wedded absolutely to a school board management of these three branches of education. They did not feel that a school board was necessarily the best body that could be elected for the purpose. It was elected for one purpose, and if these additional duties were added it might require reforming in various ways. But he did contend that, whatever the body might be, it should be very largely, if not entirely, an elected body. The people should have a very large voice in its constitution, and then, and only then, would it have the confidence of the people sufficiently to back it in carrying on the great educational work of the country.

He could have said a word or two with reference to the influence of these Acts upon the evening schools, but he would forbear. The question was now before the Committee, and he hoped the very emphatic words of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dartford would influence the Government, so that when their Bill was proposed it might be such as all true educationists could support. He was sure he expressed the sentiments of those who felt strongly upon the question of school board education when he said that they would be willing to sacrifice some of their opinions in this matter if they could but see the three systems of education under one popularly-elected body, and that authority administering the Education Acts in an enlightened spirit to the advantage of the community at large.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.): All who have listened to this debate with the true interests of education at heart must feel grateful at the unanimity on both sides in favour of educational reform, and at the freedom the discussion has displayed from that thin sectarian and party spirit which is apt to disfigure and delay our educational debates. The friends of the school board system have, not unnaturally, taken an early opportunity of directing attention to the condition of the law, but naturally they have found themselves somewhat in a difficulty in discussing a question which is still sub judice. The London School Board, rightly or wrongly, have decided to appeal to the highest law court of the land, and they have the natural answer of the Government, "Unto thee thou hast appealed, and unto thee thou must go." I somewhat regret that they have thought it necessary to spend the money of the ratepayers in prolonging this litigation, and consequently to cause considerable delay in the deciding of a question which, after all, is not a

matter for the law at all. This is a question with which the Government and this House must ultimately deal, whatever the decision is in the law courts. I think we ought to realise that difficulties have arisen in respect of these higher grade schools principally from the fact that for so many years past we have neglected to deal with this very difficult question of the organisation of the higher education of this country. The school boards, which are no doubt most ambitious and aspiring local bodies, have done their best, and I think it ought to be recorded to their credit that in many of our thickly populated centres they have filled the gap in the educational system which undoubtedly existed. They have, in some places, it may be, interfered and somewhat injured the schools of other institutions, but I think we must all acknowledge that in some places where educational needs are most pressing they have erected a very useful and necessary class of schools. That higher elementary schools, or what some of us regard as secondary schools, are required cannot be denied. Whether it is necessary to make them free or not is another question. I think we must all regret that some of the great school boards should have had recourse to such subterfuges and evasions as the Vice-President of the Council has mentioned just now. But I do not think that any jealousy on the part of local authorities ought to be allowed to retard the completion of our system of education in our huge towns and elsewhere. It has been recognised on the highest authority most emphatically, and with unanimity by the late Commission on Secondary Education, that what was really required was co-ordination between the different local authorities, and this was actually carried out, not by legislation or by the action of the Government; although they have done something by the introduction of Clause 7; but by voluntary co-ordination and a coming together of the local authorities. The city of Manchester is a very striking example of this, for there the Technical Instruction Committee, the School Board, and the University College have come together, and they have decided what the limit of their respective jurisdictions should be. They have not spent their time considering how they shall cut into each other, but they have made a point of deciding how to arrange their schools so that they shall not overlap but fit in one with the other. Everybody laments this want of organisation and overlapping, and we have had some very remarkable instances this evening. Ulverston could not get a science school until three different local authorities had been brought into co-operation by the action of the central body. Such a thing is a scandal at the present day. Look at the position of the evening continuation schools in the rural districts. A great many of them have been started by the action of the county councils, but those councils have no statutory power to carry them on, and there is some doubt as to whether they are legal. They have had to give large grants of money for the purpose, because otherwise these schools could not exist. Let us take a broad view of this matter and not impure too closely which local authority ought to be entrusted to carry on these schools. As a nation we ought to make up our minds that in this twentieth century it is necessary to have a complete system of national education, and let us have as few local authorities as possible, and do

everything we can to strengthen the hands of the central department. I am asked to vote to-day for a reduction of the salary of the Vice-President of the Council, but as far as I know he is the only gentleman on the front bench who takes any interest at all in this question. There has been a most singular absence to-night of most of the prominent members of the Cabinet. If I had been asked to vote for a reduction of the salary of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, I should have been much more ready to have gone into the Opposition lobby, because, after all, many of these educational reforms are believed in and supported by my right hon. friend the Vice-President of the Council; but his difficulty is with the Treasury. The Treasury is not quite as liberal on these educational matters as it is on some matters of reform which are perhaps more popular on this side of the House. I have no doubt that my right hon. friend would have dealt more generously with the Minute if he had had more funds. I cannot think that it is necessary to give these higher grade board schools always a scientific character. We do not want to specialise either as to commercial or scientific education, and I cannot help thinking that in this ease the result of our system of science and art grants is somewhat prejudicial to general education. I hope the Treasury and all other departments of the Government will recognise that in this country education must grow, and the expenses must grow as well. We cannot afford to stand still in this matter. If no other authorities

are erected to start schools of this character, then these higher grade elementary schools, or whatever they may be called, which exist largely for the benefit of the working classes and which are demanded by them, and without which our system of education will not be complete; these must be carried on, and, if no new authority is erected, then the school boards must carry them on. If the Government wish to alter this state of things the sooner they bring in their Education Bill the better. It must take a long time to discuss that measure, and we have already waited too long for it. Every year that passes increases the difficulties rather than diminishes them, and the net result of this debate will be a valuable one if it only convinces this House that legislation is sorely needed in order to bring about the only solution of these difficulties of our educational administration.

*MR. DUKE (Plymouth): As a Member who has a direct interest in this question, owing to the action of the Education Board in my constituency, I would like to join hon. Members who have spoken in pressing upon the Vice-President of the Council the great urgency there is for the introduction of some measure which will put the practical business of education for promising boys and girls of the poorer classes upon something like a business footing. Hon. Gentlemen on the other side have reproached the right hon. Gentleman and the Government with a want of sympathy with the development of the kind of education to which I have referred, because of what has taken place in the testing of the legality of the attitude of the school boards. I venture to suggest to the House that that is a great mistake, for there could not be a stronger evidence of the necessity of legislation upon this question than the decision in the Cockerton case, and the state of things which that decision showed to exist. For my part, I think the

trial of the question in the Cockerton case has been a great public benefit. I think those who raised the question and challenged the legality of the proceedings of the London School Board did a public service in that respect, because it is not a satisfactory thing that the commercial and business education

of a large section of the poorer part of the population should depend upon the tolerant attitude of the Education Department towards that kind of education. I am sure it is not satisfactory to the working classes in the country that that branch of education should depend upon the tolerance of any department of the Government. It must be as a matter of right and as a matter of public administration in the common interest that that branch of education shall be put upon a sound footing. Nobody who knows what has been going on in the higher grade schools will be disposed to say that these schools have not met a public necessity, and that public necessity has been aggravated by the improvement in the provision of elementary education. There was in former years, especially in the towns of the country, a class of schools which the board schools have practically put out of existence, where moderate fees were paid, and where the smaller tradesmen and business men and the better-paid class of artisans sent their children for business education, and got an education of a different kind from that which is now provided in board schools, under the direct personal influence of a class of schoolmasters who practically have now ceased to exist. That class of schools, if not practically driven out of existence, has been diminished very much in number by the severity of the competition which has been produced by the development of the board-school system. Nothing has been provided in its place.

One of the aggravating circumstances in regard to the provision of satisfactory business training for boys of the poorer class is that while you have developed the elementary schools you have done nothing to provide a substitute for those schools which the elementary schools have killed. The frightful condition of commercial education in our towns, as compared with the condition of that in Continental towns, is felt by business men everywhere to be a scandal in this country. One only needs to see the proceedings of chambers of commerce or to meet business men in order to find out the difficulties they have in obtaining satisfactory clerks with business training and commercial knowledge, to feel that the Government is not doing its duty

to a large class of its constituents in this source of great satisfaction to the public respect. We are laying up for ourselves outside as well as to hon.

Members in difficulties for the future by provide or to encourage a system of sound commercial education. You have at the present time an excellent system of elementary education for boys who are to be employed in workshops and in industries, and who are not expected to take an active, leading part in those employments; but you are doing nothing for the boys who are to compete with the boys of France, Germany, and America in endeavouring to maintain for this country. I will not say a supremacy, but something like an equality in competing for the commerce of the world. It has been shown by the recent decision of the courts that we have done nothing in this country in the way of making proper

provision for the aspiring and capable boys of the poorer class, and for this reason one does not need to blame those who have brought forward the question raised in the Cockerton case and brought it to an issue. I regard it as a matter of very little consequence which way the Cockerton decision ultimately goes, provided that this House makes up its mind that the reproach which lies upon our present system of education shall be removed.

There was one part of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman which I listened to with great satisfaction, and which seemed to indicate that he might be placed in charge of a measure which would be devoted to sweeping away those defects which now exist in our system of education. If the right hon. Gentleman succeeds in passing such a measure into law he will confer not only a service upon this generation but upon future generations, and he will associate his name with the cause of education in a manner which will please those who know how much he has the cause of education at heart. But there was an observation which the right hon. Gentleman made, in answer to a question from the other side of the House, which I must confess disappointed me a little. At present it seems not to be known when or where the proposed measure for this improvement of the educational system will be introduced. I hope that that uncertainty will very speedily be dispelled, and I am sure it would be a

source of great satisfaction to the public outside as well as to hon. Members in this House if the right hon. Gentleman would assure the Committee that we shall have certainly in the course of this session, and at a period when it can be fully discussed and its difficulties fully dealt with, a measure which will do something substantial at any rate to remove the confusion which exists in that branch of education which is proposed to be dealt with, and which will supply the link which is missing in our present educational system. One hon. Member has referred to the great expenditure upon the war, and he seemed to regard it as a matter for regret, in view of our educational necessities, that we had spent such great sums in that direction. For my part I am content that we should do all we can to find the money for all our responsibilities. I do not regret that we have spent that money in that direction, but I should regret it if I thought it was possible that people who know what are the necessities of the country at home in respect of this very urgent and pressing matter would be at all discouraged in dealing with this matter because of the obligations we have had to face abroad. I certainly shall not be disposed to vote for the proposal to reduce the right hon. Gentleman's salary, I wish to give the right hon. Gentleman a free hand in the matter, and I hope that when he introduces this Education Bill he will meet with that success which he deserves.

MR. LOUGH (Islington. W.): There is only one point to which I desire to draw the attention of the House; it is a matter which was referred to by the hon. Member for North Camberwell, and also by the noble Lord who represents South Kensington. We have listened with interest to the short and able speech made by the noble Lord, and we know he has a right to speak on this question, because he is a London Member. The question I refer to is the treatment of the seventy-nine higher grade schools of London. I disagree with the view which the noble Lord has put before the Committee, and I rise, to support my hon. friend, who has

brought forward a most pressing grievance, which is great felt by the people of London, which the right hon. Gentleman opposite could settle, I believe, in the way we desire, and I hope he will make an announcement on the subject before the debate closes. The noble Lord said that the Board of Education was perfectly right in this matter, because the maintenance of the seventy-nine, higher grade schools would interfere with secondary education as it exists at the present time, and that it would interfere with the schools which are to be created. This is an entire mistake, for these schools are provided only for young people between the ages of twelve and fifteen. When a child passes the fifteenth year he must be taken away from these schools. The second grade schools deal with young people between the ages of sixteen and nineteen years, therefore there is no conflict between the two. We heard with a great deal of pleasure the able speeches delivered from the benches opposite, and we hope to hear many more speeches in the same spirit from the same quarter during this debate. The hon. Member who has just sat down dealt with the question of the necessity of securing a better commercial education for the children. These seventy-nine schools were intended to give a commercial training. In November, 1898, one of the Government inspectors said, in regard to one of these schools which was about to be opened, that it should be designed not only with a view to provide for science and art, but also for the teaching of modern languages and for giving a commercial training. That was in the year 1898, and that is the opinion of one of the inspectors of the Board of Education. On the 2nd of March, 1899, there was a Memorandum sent out, which drew attention to two points; namely, the lack of commercial training, and the inadequate amount of time which was given to the only modern language taken. Those recommendations came from the Education Department itself. At that time the Education Department were urging schools to give a commercial education, and now they were taking away the grant because those schools had done this. The noble Lord who represents South Kensington said that it was more desirable to give a science and art training than to give this commercial training, because it would be a much better preparation for an industrial or manufacturing career for boys and girls who would ultimately assist in those industries. But in London the great industry is commerce. That is our chief industry, and while we agree that in Manchester and other manufacturing cities the schools should provide the special training which the children want in those districts, surely we have a right to claim that in London commercial education is an absolute necessity for the children. I do not see how this could have been made the ground by the Education Department for the withdrawal of these grants. On the 27th of July last, in this House. I put a question to the right hon. Gentleman, and I got a very long answer to that question.* I then put a supplementary question, in which I asked him in how many of these seventy-nine schools he was prepared to pay the higher grants asked for by the London School Board, and the right hon. Gentleman replied, "Not one; the curriculum is of a commercial and not of a scientific nature." Therefore, for giving this commercial education all these schools are to be fined, and all the work of the London School Board in this direction is to be upset. I will give another illustration. Shorthand,

typewriting, and bookkeeping have been taken up, because it was thought that an effort should be made to fit out these young people in these branches, because there was a greater demand for them; but the Education Department has singled out the London School Board for persecution, and it has done what it can to destroy these schools.

SIR J. GORST dissented.

MR. LOUGH: I do hope that the right hon. Gentleman will give us a more, intelligent reply than merely shaking his head. I asked the right hon. Gentleman to deal with the Minute, and he said he would deal with it presently, and later on he made a most apologetic, reference to it. The right hon. Gentleman admitted that there is a loss of £4,000 a year in London on the operation of this system, and he

* See The Parliamentary Debates) [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxxvi., page 1516. minimises the seriousness of that loss by saying that it was only one thirty-seventh part of a penny. The Vice-President of the Council appeared to apologise for the treatment London has received in respect of commercial education; but why does he, pursue that treatment? This is not a question of the amount of money, but it is the spirit of the Board of Education that the people protest against. You may say what you like about the Code, but I think that shorthand, typewriting, and bookkeeping should not be classed as scientific or artistic education. I hardly know where the line can be drawn between these things, and it does seem to me to be straining a point very much, first of all to urge these schools to teach these subjects, and then fine them because they have done so. We have had three elections recently; the General Election, the School Board, and the County Council election; and I noticed that the people were moved as much by the treatment of these seventy-nine schools as by any other question that was presented to them. "We have been reminded that there are already seventy-nine of these schools, but that means only one school for every hundred thousand of the population. These are higher grade schools, and they should not be mixed up with the secondary schools. I want to press this question on behalf of London absolutely home on the right hon. Gentleman. We are, reminded by the First Lord of the Treasury that we have twenty-three days to criticise the Government, but I venture to observe that most of that time is wasted, because our criticism is generally perfectly barren. Perhaps to-day we shall waste from half-past four to twelve o'clock to-night criticising the policy of the Government. This is a matter which is entirely at the disposal of the right hon. Gentleman.

SIR J. GORST: No, no.

MR. LOUGH: The right hon. Gentleman shakes his head. We all believe and hope that the right hon. Gentleman will be in a position to say after this debate that he was compelled by the House of Commons to yield upon this question. Are our representations to meet with no response whatever upon a practical question of this kind when there is an almost unanimous opinion expressed on both sides of the House? I will conclude by simply asking the right hon. Gentleman to consider during the remainder of the debate these points on behalf of London, and one way or another to try to do something to save from extinction these seventy-nine schools, which are doing a most useful work in the

Metropolis.

*MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.) said the debate had shown very clearly the great dissatisfaction of the country at the present state of education in this country.

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

*MR. TULLY (resuming) said that serious complaints had been heard from both sides of the House, so that it must be a difficult thing for the right hon. Gentleman the Vice-President to perceive where he, had a friend. But when hon. Gentlemen lodged these complaints ought not they to consider whether they were not equally responsible for what had happened? Much of the trouble arose from the fact that many hon. Gentlemen desired to exclude the religious element from the teaching, whilst others desired to include it. A great deal had been said about the necessity for higher education, but it appeared to him that what was really required was a, good sound commercial education, which according to many of the experts who had spoken upon the question was not given to the people of this country. Typewriting, shorthand, and modern languages were all branches of higher elementary education, and if this country was to attain the educational level of Germany, France, and America, all these subjects would have to be taken up. In Germany particularly most people knew one modern language besides their own, and the neglect to teach modern languages in this country was very disadvantageous to the people. The present state of education was largely due to the persistent endeavour to drive religion out of the schools, and that had militated with special force against the Irish, who by bad government had been driven from Ireland to seek their livelihood in England, and who had had to provide voluntary schools for their children. Such schools, supported only by the voluntary subscriptions of an indigent people, could not hope to compete with board schools maintained out of the rates; to which these people also had to pay their share; and consequently the children of these poor people were unable to obtain the advantages to which they were entitled. The religious aspect of the question had been definitely settled in Germany, where there was a large Catholic population living side by side with a Protestant population. The schools in each district taught the religion of the district, and unless a similar system were adopted here, England would never obtain the same educational level as her greatest competitor.

The complaint which he had to make was the unfair way in which the Irish were treated in this matter, and it was for that reason he protested against the Vote. In any scheme that was put forward he hoped some steps would be taken to put the Irish children in this country on the same level as the English children, and that the attempt which was made in this intolerant manner to keep the Irish children down would cease.

MR. RICHARDS (Finsbury, E.) said, speaking from an experience of twenty years on the subject of secondary education, the plan which he wished to see adopted as far as possible in this country was the German, which recognised primary, secondary, and, finally, university education. That was the educational ladder which he wished to see erected by the Government. He protested against handing

over to school boards the work of secondary education, for which they were not created and for which they were not fitted. He was satisfied that by pursuing the policy of either taking the town council in county boroughs or the county council in counties, or representatives of those bodies, as the educational authority, the Government were more likely to solve the educational problem than by allowing school boards to include in their curriculum subjects which were essentially within the domain of secondary education. The majority of school boards, especially in rural districts, were returned, not on educational questions, but as the result of battles between Church and the intolerance of dissent. What had been said with regard to Germany was absolutely true. They had satisfactorily solved the religious difficulty in the manner suggested, and no educational difficulty resulted.

The hon. Member for North-West Norfolk had spoken of the necessity for some authority for evening continuation schools; with that he quite agreed. He remembered once being told that a great deal of money was wasted in evening continuation schools, but the London School Board had shown that that was a fallacy. He, for one, did not grudge the money spent on the education of those who were prepared to give up their time after business to improve their position on the educational ladder. He appealed to the Government not to allow the school boards to run in opposition to the higher educational colleges established in various parts of the country, and to teach in their curriculum subjects of secondary education. He was sure it would be for the benefit of education that the work of primary education should be retained for the school boards only. Of course, he was not for a moment suggesting that the primary schools should direct their attention to primary education only. We were in need of a real system of commercial education, and that could not be obtained by what were called continuation classes. He was quite prepared to admit that they could deal with subjects which would lead to the commercial school, but they could only deal with them as specific subjects, and not on what he called the higher level of commercial education. We ought to follow the German plan, and he would recommend hon. Members to read the report of the Committee of the London County Council on technical education. Anyone who studied that report would master the systems of two or three Continental nations, and, he thought, would come to the conclusion that the German system was the best. We should establish in each of our large towns a system of commercial education, taking sixteen as the lowest age, and going up to nineteen, or even later; a three years system. He said, unhesitatingly, that was not work for any of the school boards, but for another authority. He knew one parish in Cornwall where it was actually charged against the clergyman of the parish that an effort he made to provide secondary education was only another attempt to win young men for the Church. It only showed the depth to which the sectarian spirit which was abroad in these educational matters would descend. He knew another case where a clergyman established a higher grade school in a cathedral city, and the proposal that the local authority should make a grant to the school for the teaching of technical subjects was opposed on the ground that it might be an injustice to the

Nonconformists, as if it could possibly matter in the teaching of chemistry whether the children were taught by a Pagan or a Hottentot. Such was the blindness of the supporters of hon. Members on the other side that they would pursue any policy of opposition to a secondary school which had an ecclesiastical flavour about it. Until we realised that religious matters should be shut outside the educational purview we should never get on with such a system. He knew that the hon. Member for Camberwell had been attacked for his liberal views on education. He hoped the hon. Member would show that he was willing to place those broad views at the disposal of his party, and support any real scheme which the Government might bring forward. He was sure they would carry it if they remembered that in primary education they had no wish to displace the present authority.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley) said the last two speeches must have cheered the spirit of the Vice-President, as they had introduced for the first time the religious and theological difficulty. The hon. Member for East Finsbury told them that Liberals and Nonconformists only sought positions on school boards in order to put an end to voluntary schools. He never knew that before. Supposing that they succeeded in getting on the boards, they were absolutely unable to achieve that object. He had always thought that "the boot was on the other leg," and

that the object of the supporters of voluntary schools was, as a rule, to try to put a stop to the school boards, in order to put an end to the authority of the people.

This debate was initiated by the hon. Member for West Nottingham on a different question altogether. The matters they had had under discussion related largely to the higher grade schools. The right hon. Gentleman the Vice-President of the Council was face to face with a strong feeling in the country. It was not a party feeling. On this question there was no party view. They had men of all parties. He thought the conclusion to which they had arrived in regard to the administration of the higher grade schools for the past twelve months was that it had been absurd. The right hon. Gentleman in the early part of his speech dealt with the illegality of the uglier grade schools.

SIR. J. GORST: I beg the hon. Gentleman's pardon. I did not say that the schools were illegal. What I said was that the spending of the rates on them was illegal.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON said he perfectly understood the distinction. Of course, it was the spending of rates upon them that was illegal. The right hon. Gentleman told them two ways to get out of the difficulty.

SIR. J. GORST: Three ways.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON said he only remembered two at the moment. The first was that the school board could come to an arrangement with the local authority. The local authority had two funds at its disposal. He would ask the right hon. Gentleman, supposing the local authority had already quite sufficient engagements to meet without increasing its contribution to the school board, what was to be the position of the school board in that case? Every one of the towns instanced by the right hon. Gentleman was comparatively small in area. Take Bradford, Halifax, and Huddersfield; he believed in all these three towns

the county council or town council had undertaken the control and management of the technical school. If a school board went to these authorities and told them that they were in duty bound to maintain the higher grade schools, he was afraid they would be disposed to reply that they would take their own course and see to the efficiency of their own school. The town councils of Bradford and Leeds had other engagements. They gave large contributions to the Church Institute classes. Would the right hon. Gentleman defend the withdrawing of the grants from those classes in order that the higher education schools might be maintained? It was absolutely hopeless that these schools could be maintained efficiently. These urban authorities had not the resources free and at liberty, and having sufficient engagements at present they could not assist the school board to maintain the higher grade schools. The only other solution suggested by the right hon. Gentleman which he could recollect was private subscription.

SIR J. GORST: I said they could charge fees, as they did in the early stages.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON thought the answer to that was that having once abolished fees it would be exceedingly difficult to put them on again. He did not think it would be possible to reinstate them. The third course was the Minute. When the light hon. Gentleman explained the Minute to the House of Commons a year ago,* they were told, notwithstanding all the criticisms which they ventured to offer, that the Department were making a proposal which they honestly intended should be used in the maintenance of the efficiency of the schools. He should like to read the concluding portion of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman, it was so very much to the point.

"Now I hope that the House will believe that this Code and this Minute, which are so heartily approved by the Opposition, have been conceived with a desire to advance the elementary education of the country; that this scheme is the result of careful consideration and consultation with the best authorities available; and that the Board of Education believes that it can be carried into practical and useful effect. I hope the House will also believe that the Board of Education will watch the operation of this new policy and will be ready at once to make amendments wherever experience proves that amendments are necessary." The Department had refused every time to vary the conditions it had laid down.

*See The Parliamentary Debate [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxxii., page 683.

SIR J. GORST: They cannot vary the Minute without laying a fresh Minute before the House of Commons.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON said it was rather significant that the Department had always replied in the stereotyped phrase that they could not possibly hold out any hope that any changes would be made in the Minute under which the application had been made. The right hon. Gentleman went on to say;

"I trust the House will not reject the scheme put forward by Her Majesty's Government because there are two or three provisions in it of a purely detail character which may not in all respects accord with the notions of some hon. Gentlemen opposite."

There were numerous cases in which amendments had been named, and in every case the Department had replied that they could not possibly consider any alteration in the Minute. He thought they had done worse. They had interpreted the Minute

in a way that nobody could possibly have anticipated. He was perfectly aware that for many years in this country we were woefully behind other countries in matters of scientific teaching. Now we were having science run mad. Nothing but science would receive any consideration from the Government. If any other proposal was made they denied any grant or recognition at all. He fully expected when the new Code came up that they would have a regulation that no infant school would be recognised unless it was supplied with proper arrangements for the teaching of elementary science. The school boards were seeking to have something in addition, or some option, but the right hon. Gentleman was doing his best to deny it. They were not asking the right hon. Gentleman to establish a new type of school; they simply asked for some latitude; and what were the excuses offered for refusing this? In one case the Department replied that they could not recognise the curriculum proposed by the school board, because they found in it book-keeping, shorthand, and business training. But the extraordinary thing was that while the Department refused to recognise in the curriculum of the higher grade school book-keeping and shorthand, those subjects could actually be taught under the Code in the elementary schools. The Department replied that these were to be considered outside the scope of the higher grade schools, which were to be confined to the teaching of elementary science. He thought he might say that very few boards would ever consent to bring their schools under the Minute unless some of the conditions were altered. To bring them under the Minute would be to degrade the education given, and if a board would consent to do that, he did not think their majority would be the same after the next election. People in the large towns were proud of these schools, and they were not going to have them degraded by having them brought under the grant-earning Minute which the right hon. Gentleman brought before Parliament with the promise that it would be elastic. The right hon. Gentleman made one remark which he thought very unfortunate. He said the school boards were trying to make themselves the authority for secondary education. The right hon. Gentleman had no justification whatever for that statement. The hon. Member ventured to state that there was not a school board in the country that had the slightest ambition to make itself the authority for secondary education. Whether that were so or not, he felt bound to say, by way of warning the right hon. Gentleman, that in fixing upon some new authority he would be unwise to select either of the two antagonistic bodies at present in existence; the school boards and the technical instruction committees of the county councils. They were, rather jealous of one another. If the right hon. Gentleman were wise, he would create some authority which would not partake of favouring either of these disputants for the honour of having charge and control of secondary education. That would prevent jealousy, and put an end to the search for some line of demarcation between elementary and secondary education. If the Government were going to pursue that will-o'-the-wisp, they would never settle education. No line of demarcation could be found.

SIR J. GORST: Hear, hear!

MR. ALFRED HUTTON said he was very glad the right hon. Gentleman cheered that statement, because they had had the Duke of Devonshire repeatedly saying that

the Department was seeking a line of demarcation. He maintained that it was impossible to find one. The Department, knowing it could not find it in the curriculum, was seeking for it in the age of the students, but that was equally impossible. The only way to avoid the difficulty was to establish one authority with which all could fall into line, and which would be acceptable to the friends of the technical instruction committees on the one hand, and to the school boards on the other.

*MR. GRAY (West Ham, N.): The general tone of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman filled me with deep regret. There was only one statement with which I found myself in complete agreement, and that was the statement with which he closed his speech in reference to the necessity for having one authority controlling all forms of education. Even with regard to that his view is apparently not the view of the Government, as he says the Government is to introduce a Bill upon which the House will have an opportunity of settling this question without the guidance of the Government. The Bill is to be introduced in such a form that the House shall settle for itself;

SIR J. GORST: I said nothing of the kind. What I said was that on the Bill the Government would introduce Parliament would have an opportunity of raising these questions and getting a Parliamentary decision upon them. I never said the Government would introduce a Bill without guidance.

*MR. GRAY: If Parliament is to have an opportunity of raising the questions, that generally implies that the questions are not in the Bill when it is introduced.

SIR J. GORST: Oh, no.

*MR. GRAY: I am glad my right hon. friend excludes that interpretation. I should be much more satisfied if the Government will screw up its courage at last, and come down with a scheme of one authority for all forms of education. I use the words "screw up its courage" advisedly, because although we were told in 1896 that this thing was essential, and in 1897 that the Bills they introduced were patching measures, designed to prepare the way for a final scheme of reform, yet the years which have since elapsed have witnessed no progress in the movement inside the House, while the country outside is clamouring for a settlement. Year after year, on the Education Estimates, the Vice-President of the Council declares that this thing is necessary, and I am driven to the conclusion that it is simply on account of lack of courage on the part of the Government that we do not get the measure.

The speech of the right hon. Gentleman to-night filled me with surprise. I understood that the object of this debate was to obtain from the Vice-President a clear interpretation of the policy of his Department with regard to the Higher Elementary Minute. He failed to give any such interpretation. That policy has been inconsistent from the first day to the last. Will the right hon. Gentleman himself get up and defend it? I think not. Can he explain the principles upon which the Department is acting now? The explanation he gave at the commencement of this debate is totally different from the explanation put before the Committee when the Minute was before us. Is he not aware that amongst these school boards, a large number of which are composed of Church people, with

majorities of what are called "Moderates," as well as among all people interested in the education of the children, there is a feeling of deep anxiety as to what he would say this evening with regard to higher elementary schools. They started in May last with considerable hope; they saw a prospect of the schools called higher elementary schools being legalised. We were told that the object of this Minute was to legalise these particular schools. To-day we are told that it was in order that the organised science schools might be safeguarded in view of the possible decision of the courts in the Cockerton case.

SIR J. GORST: That is what I said in May last.

*MR. GRAY: The right hon. Gentleman says that is what he said in May last. Perhaps I may venture to quote. What was the difficulty in May last? I was present throughout the whole of the debate, and the circumstances are very vividly before my mind. The block grant had been introduced, and that lobby was full of gentlemen who were trying to get the Government to withdraw the block grant on account

of the mischief it was said it would inflict upon certain of the higher class schools. That block grant was in jeopardy; it was saved by the introduction of the Minute. The hon. Member for Cambridge University coupled the block grant of the Code with the Higher Elementary Minute in one and the same motion, and we went through the lobby in support of the Government on the double question; the Higher Elementary Minute, the natural corollary of the introduction of the block grant. The block grant did not inflict the slightest shadow of loss or injustice upon the higher grade schools. It did not touch the higher grade schools by so much as the, one-thirty-seventh of a penny at which the right hon. Gentleman estimates the injury in certain large towns. That one-thirty-seventh of a penny is not a very great loss to the ratepayers, but it represents a very large loss indeed to the 200 or 300 children who would have taken advantage of it, not only in board schools but in voluntary schools also. What are the facts of the case?

The hon. Member for Cambridge University used these words;

"It is also objected that the 22s. grant;"

that is, the new block grant;

"did not adequately reward those schools which have hitherto been teaching some higher subjects over and above the ordinary elementary work."

That is not, the higher grade schools.

"Such schools, which may have been earning a 25s. or 27s. grant, will be losers."

Those are not higher grade schools; they are the higher standard schools, the higher divisions in some of the schools where a grant of 25s. or 27s. had been earned before the introduction of the block grant. He went on to say;

"These schools may be obliged to give up their higher teaching."

Now mark the next statement:

"If the Code stood alone that objection would have force. But the new Code has been supplemented by the Minute of the Board of Education of April last," supplemented, as he went on to explain, to meet the very case of these higher standard schools where a grant of 27s. had been earned in the past, and not to

meet the case, of the higher grade schools at all. The right hon. Gentleman may say that he is not responsible in any way for what his colleague in the representa-

tion of Cambridge University may say. Unfortunately for that line of argument, in his own speech the right hon. Gentleman says;

"I think the very lucid and clear exposition of the Code and Minute by my hon. friend and colleague the Member for the University of Cambridge would have put Members of the House of Commons in possession of all the views of the Government upon this subject."

I have always regarded that, as I am sure the great majority of Members on both sides of the House in the last Parliament also regarded it, as fathering the exposition of policy given by the hon. Member for Cambridge University. It was perfectly clear to all of us that this Higher Elementary Minute was to meet the case of the schools which were to be hit by the introduction of the block grant. But what do we hear to-night? That it is not to meet the case of those schools, but the case of the higher grade schools. In the early part of his speech the right hon. Gentleman said there were two or three forms of higher grade schools. He went on to explain that there was the form in which the teaching of the ordinary Code subjects was followed, and that there was a large number of these schools. These were not organised schools of science; they taught the ordinary subjects of the Day School Code; and then he said, "These can go on." He dismissed them in the most airy fashion. I want to know how they are to go on without the money they are expecting to get out of this Higher Elementary Minute. These schools were, from the point of view of the ratepayers, and also from the public point of view, not only necessary but carried on on the most economical lines. What can be more ruinous than to have three or four children in one school, half a dozen in another, and a dozen in another, stopping for two or three years, demanding the attention of special teachers, and being taught special subjects? What can be more expensive than a system of that sort? These higher standard schools took all these children and grouped them together in one school, devoted the whole of their teaching to upper standard work, and relied on getting the higher grant of 27s. per child. These schools could not continue to exist, when the block grant system was introduced, but for the safeguard of the Higher Elementary

Minute. To-night we learn that these schools are not to look for any hope under the Higher Elementary Minute. They are not to continue the work they have been doing for years their only chance of getting assistance from the central treasury is by becoming organised schools of science. Nothing can be more disastrous than to try to cast the whole of these schools into one mould. I always thought these higher elementary schools were to resemble Les Ecoles Primaires Supérieures in France, with their three years course, and that the children stopping two or three years would take just those subjects which would fit them for the work they were going to follow in after life. They can specialise at that age to some extent. I have seen the schools in excellent working order;

SIR J. GORST: In France?

*MR. GRAY: Yes, in France. I spent several days only a fortnight ago in some of these French schools; they were doing good work, and, as far as one could judge in a rapid glance, producing excellent results. They were not insisting on all the children following a scientific course in the first year. In the first year the children all take the same general line of study; in the second year they are divided into three sections; the literary, the industrial, and the commercial; and in the third year they mark still more emphatically the amount of time they should spend in the year on either industrial, commercial, or literary subjects, according to the walk of life they are going to follow later. It may be said that that is specialising at too early an age. But the great majority of those children will never go a step further; they are going to leave educational work when they have finished their course at the school. If they have no chance of specialising before leaving what are they to do? In Bradford they want the boys in their offices as commercial clerks; where are they to get the early stages of their training? According to the policy of the Board of Education they are to get it in the school of science.;[AN HON. MEMBER: There is an excellent grammar school in Bradford.];Yes, at which fees must be paid, and in which the greater portion of the study is not commercial but literary, from which the children may come out with a good literary education, and yet be only fitted to starve as clerks at £;50 a year. I want to see introduced in our English schools a system of training which will induce the children to look upon manual labour as an honourable calling. But you do not get it by making all the schools organised science schools. Why should you not have book-keeping for a lad thirteen or fourteen years old? If you have an advanced course of organic chemistry, why not a course in French or some other modern language? Are all these children going to earn their living in the manufacturing departments of the State? Are they all going to be mechanics? We are training a large number of our children in the primary schools to do the manufacturing of the article, but we are training hardly one for the distribution of the article when made. All over the country merchants are lamenting this defect in our national system of education. It would be all very well to talk about specialising at a later date, that it could be postponed until the children got to the secondary schools, but for the one fact that a very large percentage, of the children can never have an opportunity of going to a secondary school, and unless there is something in the way of specialisation in these schools you have not only done no good to those children, but you have done them a great deal of harm. You ought to be able to judge at fourteen years of age what the parent proposes to do with, the child. In some schools I have visited the head teacher's time is largely occupied in advising parents as to the walk of life a child should follow, having carefully noted the aptitudes of the child in school and the liking it has for special branches of study. I thought we were going to have under the Higher Elementary Minute schools of the description I have mentioned; the very name encouraged that hope. Now we are told it is to safeguard the higher grade schools. I should like to go a step further with regard to these higher elementary schools. It has been argued all the evening as if none but school boards were

able to establish these schools. What about half the children of the country? What

about the 2,600,000 children who are still attending voluntary schools? Are these to have no opportunity whatever? Said the Vice-President very airily, "These schools can go on." Yes, legally they can go on, but they cannot go on without the necessary money. If the right hon. Gentleman withdraws the support of this Higher Elementary Minute, these schools must of necessity close their doors. As far as voluntary schools are concerned, there are two courses open: to transfer their children to the board schools and seek the support of the rates, in order to keep the higher elementary school going, or to abandon all hope of a child attending a voluntary school getting this slightly higher form of education. I beseech the Committee not to run away with the idea that this is secondary school training. Go into the schools and see them at work; look at the work in the higher elementary schools across the water; judge for yourselves whether that is secondary school work. Recollect the homes these children come from, their limited vocabulary when they start, the difficulties they have to contend with. It is absurd to suggest, except in a very few cases indeed, that anything in the nature of real secondary education can be given to such children before the age of fifteen. The Swiss would laugh at the idea of this being secondary education. They look upon it as an essential feature of their primary school life. In many countries they would refuse to let the child leave school earlier, insisting on the whole burden of its education being thrown upon the State, and insisting upon the child staying at school until it had passed through this course in the higher elementary school.

Now I turn for one moment to the question of the higher grade schools; the organised science schools. I hope the right hon. Gentleman did not intend to leave the impression, but I am bound to say he left it on my mind, that these schools had been established by fraud. We had case after case quoted where school boards had applied for loans to build schools, giving an assurance that they were to be elementary schools and organised science schools, and then, having obtained the loans on these conditions, they used the school solely as an organised science school. It sounded very much like a charge of fraud, of obtaining loans under false pretences. I hope the right hon. Gentleman did not intend to convey that impression; but, if so, if these school boards were fraudulent in their intentions, the Board of Education connived at the fraud, aided and abetted it, published documents, quasi-official, encouraging boards to carry on this work, suggesting to them that it was their obvious duty to establish these schools; and I believe I have been out with some of the officials of the Department to the opening of higher grade schools, when no words could be too flattering of the authority for the excellent way in which they were discharging their public duty. I have heard it over and over again, and I agree with the flattery, or rather the praise; I agree that these authorities are doing their duty. If they were not, what would the ratepayers have done with them at the next election? They would have thrown them out of office. These are popularly-elected bodies. One would imagine that they were bodies which held office contrary to the wishes of the local ratepayers. The

establishment of the great majority of these higher grade schools has been the subject of keen criticism and contest at school board elections. The people, if any, to condemn are not the members of the school board, but the electors who put them into office. The electors are primarily responsible for every higher grade school in existence.

When the Vice-President was referring to these schools he gave us one or two instances in which he said these loans had been obtained under false pretences; cases in which, having obtained the loan, they then established a science school. Somebody asked him to give the figures showing the proportion of science and elementary scholars respectively in the school. I will give the figures in one or two instances. I believe one of the schools referred was at Hanley, where under the conditions set forth the school was established, and, said the right hon. Gentleman, "What did they do? There were 309 scholars receiving scientific instruction in that school" Perfectly true; but I think he ought to have added that in the same building there were 279 children receiving the ordinary elementary instruction. Therefore it seems to me that they were fairly keeping the conditions. Another case mentioned was that at Leeds, in which the conditions were laid down and said to be violated, and we were told there were no less than 204 scholars taking the scientific course. Yes, but surely we ought to have been told that in addition there were in the same building no less than 737 children taking the ordinary elementary school course. Therefore, I suggest that the conditions under which the loans were obtained were not violated. If I take the total of fifty-nine of these so-called organised science schools, I find 11,800 scholars in the science section, and no less than 26,099 in the elementary section, so that the great majority of the scholars are still doing the ordinary elementary school work, and the remainder are taking the scientific course.

I do not propose to weary the Committee except with one word more. I am tired of trying to get any progress in the administration of the Department. What do I find? Why, at the General Election a few months ago Member after Member, on this side of the House as well as on that, set forth in paragraph after paragraph their desire to see rapid progress in popular education. Speeches were made by Conservative and Unionist candidates, in favour generally of the Imperialistic policy of the Government; but if the word "education" were ejaculated by some enthusiast in the meeting the reply was; "Yes, I am all in favour of progress in popular education." No sooner do we get in this Chamber than the desire to see progress vanishes. [Ministerial cries of "Oh, oh."] Well, if the desire for progress in this matter has not evaporated, then I hope that hon. Members will soon have an opportunity of showing their zeal. This debate tonight has been worth the having if only for the speech which we have heard from the right hon. Member for Dartford. But what he has said in the House to-night on this question has been said here and in the country scores of times, and yet we cannot get this question settled. Public meetings attended by the clergy and the bishops of the Church have all clamoured for this reform, and voluntary school managers declare that in spite of all their endeavours in the past few years they cannot keep going much longer. Only yesterday another

case came into my hands of a London school which was shut up because it was found impossible to carry it on any longer. The same cry is coming from one end of the country to the other. Owing to the vacillating policy of the Education Department we do not know what next year may bring. It has been said that it is necessary to draw a clear line of demarcation between primary and secondary schools, but you would not need that if you had one local authority. A great waste of money, waste of effort, and waste of time is characterising the existing system. There is needless overlapping, and a struggle is going on between the secondary and technical authorities and the school board and the voluntary schools for the body of the same child, in order to drag that child into this and that school simply to get the grant per head that is paid by the State. If Parliament will but give us a single educational authority in each county council area, that local authority will take precious good care that there is none of this overlapping. Such a reform would destroy three-fourths of the existing jealousies, for it would then be nobody's interest to keep a child in a particular school, but it would be everybody's interest to put a child in that school in which it would be best taught.

I am appealing for no one sect, but for the training of these children upon whom the future of this great Empire depends. There is a great commercial contest going on between the great nations, and you are doing nothing to meet it. We know how much the intelligence of a battalion affects results on the battle field, and we hear that it is necessary that our soldiers should be better trained. Why not give them this chance in the day school? Why should those parents who want to keep their children at school until they are fifteen years of age not have the chance of doing so? At all events, if the locality is prepared to do this, do not let the Government hinder them, and if their action happens to be illegal, then I say that it is the first duty of the Government to come to Parliament for that legislation which will enable a locality to carry out its own desire.

SIR JOSEPH LEESE (Lancashire, Accrington): I wish to call the attention of the House to the summary dismissal of teachers without them having any opportunities of appeal or any chance of reinstatement. I remember that in the last session of Parliament, in the year 1900, I put a question to the right hon. Gentleman the Vice-President of the Council, asking him if he would bring in a Bill making the Board of Education the final court of appeal in such matters as this. I remember that he promised then to bring in a Bill the following session. Then there came the General Election, and in the short session of December last I put down another question, and he promised me another Bill this session. And I am sorry to say that when a question was put the other night he gave the same rather evasive answer. My reason for rising to-night is simply and solely to ask him to regard this matter as one of pure justice and not as a party question.

SIR J. GORST: I cannot allow the hon. Member to say that I gave an evasive answer upon this subject.

SIR JOSEPH LEESE: I said "a rather evasive answer," but I will withdraw it.

SIR J. GORST: I said that my noble friend the Lord President of the Council in December last authorised me to say that the matter would be dealt with in the

present session. My noble friend is still of the same mind. The matter will be dealt with, but whether it will be dealt with by minute or legislation is still under consideration. My hon. friend the Member for West Ham accused me of saying one thing last year and another thing this year. The only way to defend myself against this charge is to inflict upon the Committee a passage from a speech which I made on. 3rd May, 1890. I then said;

"You have school boards who have established excellent higher-grade schools, whose work I have always spoken of in terms of the highest eulogy, and school boards are now supporting those schools in an illegal manner out of the school funds. What, then, is to be done? This Minute affords an opportunity of placing these schools on a legal and legitimate footing, and although there may be some higher-grade schools which will stand out and take the chance of the law courts, yet I believe the great majority of these schools have hailed with satisfaction the publication of this Minute, and that they will convert themselves into higher elementary schools so as to put their proceedings on a proper and legitimate footing."

The majority of the great school boards boycotted the Higher Education Minute and resolved, particularly as the Science and Art Department were continuing to pay the grants, to wait for the final judgment. A few of the boards have come in, and Sheffield and Salford and some others have converted their schools into higher elementary schools; but the majority of the boards are holding out until the final judgment, and then I have no doubt that a very large number of them will come in.

The hon. Member for Halifax asked me three questions. The first was why 17s. 6d. was still imposed upon evening continuation schools. That is a question for the Treasury, and not for the Board of Education. With regard to the question of the attendance of children at evening continuation schools, I will do everything in my power to make regulations by which the evening continuation schools shall be real continuation schools, but I am most reluctant to allow even for six months a wretched child to attend all the day at the day school and all the evening at the evening school. I think that if a child of tender years has attended properly to school in the day-time it is almost cruel to expect that child to attend at an evening school as well. As to the question of physical instruction in evening schools, I can assure the House that I am as eager as any hon. Member to see that the children, both boys and girls, have proper physical instruction.

The hon. Member for West Islington, the hon. Member for North Camberwell, and my hon. friend the Member for West Ham have all been extremely zealous in regard to the case of commercial education generally. My idea of a commercial education differs somewhat from theirs, but I do not doubt that they are genuine in their zeal, and I hope that they will be equally generous to me and believe me when I say that I am not trying to destroy our education or the commercial schools by the policy we have adopted. My idea of a commercial education is not satisfied by merely teaching typewriting and shorthand to boys of ten to fourteen years of age. That is not my notion of a commercial education. Book-keeping as a branch of arithmetic is a very proper subject, and there is no obstacle to its being taught; but typewriting of course

is a more technical accomplishment, and so is shorthand, and I do not think, considering the short time there is for general education, that the time of the children should be devoted to teaching them a merely technical art.

The hon. Member for North Camber-well was good enough to weary the House by quoting a number of passages from the speech which I made some years ago at the Mansion House, but his quotations do not fairly represent my views. What I said was that the only way by which you can have a good commercial education is by establishing it upon a sound general elementary education, and between the ages of ten and fourteen years the children ought to be undergoing their general education; and to attempt to specialise and teach them what is called a commercial education is merely a waste of time, and will produce results which will be of no value whatever. I should like to be allowed to say on this subject that this question of specialisation in education is one which has exercised very much the attention of those who look upon education from a philosophical point of view. If anybody takes the time and trouble to do what I have had to do as part of my duties, that is to visit the educational exhibits at the late Paris Exhibition, he will have been struck by a very remarkable divergence between the northern Teutonic and Anglo-Saxon races and the Southern races, like the French and the Italians. The universal principle of the Northern races is general education and the general development of intelligence up to a comparatively late age, and no specialisation before sixteen or seventeen. That principle is carried out, too, in a most remarkable way in America. America is a practical country, a commercial country, a manufacturing country, where everybody is looking to "the main chance," and yet these unphilosophical and practical Americans do not attempt to specialise in any way whatever until a comparatively late age. They do not prepare the child for a particular walk in life, but they give it a general education which is calculated to develop all the faculties of mind and body, and then for the first time they begin to specialise. But that is not so in France, and my hon. friend has been speaking about the French schools. In France, as in Italy and the Southern countries generally, they attempt very early to teach the children what we call something useful. That is to say, at a very early age they begin to give one kind of instruction to a child who is going to be an agricultural labourer, another kind to a child who is going to be a clerk, and so forth. In this way the children are prepared for the course in life which they are expected to follow. It is a very remarkable thing, but I was told by the people with whom I conversed at Paris that the result of the Exhibition had been to very much shake the faith of the French educationists in their own system, and they were very much more inclined to adopt the American system of general education, which was, in the main, the English system of not specialising. That is the policy which the Board of Education have been pursuing in this country in relation to these higher elementary schools for which we have been so severely handled. The idea of the higher elementary school is that it should be a school giving a general education calculated to develop the faculties of the boys and girls between ten and fourteen. I think that is a very early age to specialise.

Then some hon. Member has talked about these schools being pure schools of

science. The amount of science which is required in the higher elementary school is four hours per week for the first two years, and six hours per week for the last two years, half of which is to be practical work. That is not more science than can be reasonably acquired in an ordinary general education. There are twenty-five hours in the school week, and, therefore, twenty-one or nineteen available for other than scientific subjects. It should be remembered that it is not the same science in every school, for there is a great variety which can be taught. The teaching of science is a matter in which there can be an enormous amount of variety. Therefore you have twenty-one hours at the disposal of the school managers for other subjects in the first two years, and you can devote it to your own English language, or even to shorthand and bookkeeping, though I regret enormously the time which school boards I when those children arrive at the age devote to those subjects. Then why, it is asked, are not these large grants given to the ordinary higher grade schools?

The Department is tied by its duty to Parliament. There is no power to give these large grants in the Higher Elementary School Minute to any school which does not teach subjects outside of the Elementary School Code, and there is no Parliamentary authority to give grants for anything outside the Code but scientific subjects. The general idea of Parliament is that literary education is provided for by very large endowments, that technical education is provided for by the whiskey money which comes out of the Consolidated Fund, and that science and art and elementary education are provided for by the annual grants of the House of Commons.

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): You can modify the Code.

SIR J. GORST: Yes, we can modify the Code, but until it is modified it must be observed. Suppose that a higher elementary school is started for teaching boys between twelve and fourteen some special commercial subject such as the Spanish language, for instance. Let me point out this fact. There is another authority in the district which is empowered by Parliament to teach modern languages, and which has Exchequer money given to it by this House for the purpose of enabling it to teach them. What is really proposed is, that having set up a technical instruction committee, say, in the borough of Bradford, for the purpose of teaching Spanish and having the power to teach the Spanish language, we are to set up another authority to teach Spanish which is to receive a large Exchequer grant. Therefore, we should have two schools at Bradford drawing pupils from one another and competing for the same students. It is the most monstrous confusion that you can possibly conceive. I do not think that there is a matter in which there can be an hon. Members who are so zealous for a commercial educational have any idea of this. If instead of agitating for these higher grants you will take the children of the higher grade schools and teach them within the four corners of the Code all the subjects which the Code allows you sound general elementary education, when those children arrive at the age of fourteen or fifteen and leave the elementary school, then they are exactly in the condition to receive a special commercial education. If the school boards would give up the idea of keeping the children out of the secondary schools and instead of this prepare them for the

secondary schools, and after they have left this course of study, then send them into secondary schools to receive technical education in one, and commercial education in the other, I think you would have your children very much better educated than you will if you persist in keeping the children out of the secondary schools. In this way you give the children the advantages of a much wider education. It is not the hon. Members opposite alone who are zealous for the poor man's child. We are trying to do what is best for his child, but you want to keep the poor man's child perpetually in a school of his own. We want him to mix with the rest of the population, and we want the cleverer of the children of the working classes of this country to mix with other children and with other boys and girls, so that they can ultimately find their way into the universities. Everybody knows how many of the distinguished men in the universities of the land and in our scientific societies have sprung from the ranks of the people. You can never promote the real higher education of the people by shutting them up in a separate school of their own. You want to mix all classes together, and give scholarships and exhibitions by which the best and cleverest children of the working classes can find their way to the universities, and it is in that way only that you will perpetuate that system which has made this country as great as it is.

*MR. MATHER (Lancashire. Rossendale): Any hon. Member who has looked at the crowded Strangers' Gallery to-night must have noticed the intense interest which is taken in this subject by the country as a whole. The old lassitude and lethargy connected with this great subject seem to have passed away. It has passed away not on purely academic grounds, but owing to a fear, which is becoming intensified as the years roll on, that Great Britain stands in danger among the great nations of the world as regards her future during the next twenty-five years. The right hon. Gentleman opposite has used arguments and littered sentiments which do not appear to me to be quite consistent the one with the other. None of us, I think, on this side of the House, or on the other side of the House, will dispute the fact that the American system of general education for all classes of the community, from the bottom to the top, is the most perfect and symmetrical plan by which the human mind can be trained intelligently for the purposes of life. All classes join together in this system of education. They meet at the primary school, they meet at the grammar school, and pursue their way to the higher schools, and many of them find their way to the colleges eventually. You find under the American system all classes of the community mingling together, and nothing in my opinion, is better calculated to make a nation truly great in all its aims and objects than that the children should be educated on the American plan. That is precisely the plan that we advocate on this side of the House, and which many hon. Members on the opposite side desire to see carried out and adopted in England. But to do this you must adopt the American authority, and the American authority is a universal school board in every city of the country. There is scarcely a single exception in all the areas of city life in America where the school board is not elected to take charge of education from the bottom to the top, and it takes entire control. Education is afforded without money and without price to all ranks and classes

of the community through public taxation. If that were the system established in this country, none of us would object, but we have cause to complain now of the way in which our children are trained under dual authorities. Under the American system the children pass from the primary school upwards, and if that system was adopted in England, we should have an educated people in a comparatively short space of time. The interest taken in this discussion this evening will make itself felt not only with the Committee, but certainly throughout the entire country, as marking a new departure in the great question of education. I understand that we are about to have introduced during this year many new things. At any rate the Government of the day have promised certain reforms in several directions. But of all the reforms which appear to be most necessary for the salvation of the country, in my opinion and in the opinion of many others who have studied this question for many years, a reform in our national education stands the first; and it also stands the first in the estimation of the country. In the discussion of this great national question we have had an empty Front Ministerial Bench, and rather a small attendance in Committee, but the interest outside in this question has been manifested to-night by the very large number of the public present here. I believe that next Friday we are to have another reform introduced into this House in connection with the Army. Upon that occasion the Front Bench opposite and all the benches in the House will be crowded, and it will be difficult to get a seat in the House. But I maintain that this question of national education should precede all other reforms, because even Army reform depends for its efficiency upon educational reform. I do ask the right hon. Gentleman to take it most seriously into his consideration, because it must be evident from what he has heard during the debate to-day and from his own experience outside, that at least the people of this country have come to the conclusion that we can no longer face the future upon the basis of that want of intelligence and that inadequate provision for general education which we have been passing through during the last twenty-five years. We are thankful for the small progress achieved, but that has only made us feel more acutely than ever what a vast difference there is between the advantages of the working classes in this country and those enjoyed by America and Germany when they come face to face with the real purposes of life. I am a large manufacturer, and we engineers of England are in a position to compare our industry with those large industries carried on on the other side of the Atlantic and in Germany. It must be within the knowledge of every Member of the Committee that during the last ten years there has been a gradual encroachment upon all the industries for which this country was distinguished in former years. Our supremacy has been challenged and undermined. This has not happened for want of natural resources, or for want of coal, iron, copper or other raw materials which we obtain from all parts of the earth by a splendid development of the shipping interest. The difficulty is that the human material is not as competent now to deal with the scientific and industrial problems of the day as it was twenty-five years ago. The rest of the world has gone ahead, and has got into line with us, and even passed us in many industries. Those engaged in scientific industries naturally ask why it is that we cannot maintain

this supremacy in the future; why we fear the competition of to-day. There is only one palpable reason, which stares us in the face all the time, and that is the lack of that cultivated intelligence amongst the industrial classes which is necessary to enable us to carry on our industries in the scientific manner which the world demands in all directions. Only the other day I came across a remarkable illustration of this point. I was asked to obtain an English chemical analyst for a large manufacturing firm abroad, and after looking round for weeks, I could only find four who were in any sense competent to come up to the necessary requirements. On the other side of the water I could have found scores where I could only find one here. That kind of thing disheartens industry when looking to the future. I will ask the right hon. Gentleman, if he doubts my experience, or the results of it, to consult any large employer of labour, engaged in any scientific industry in this country, and he will find that one and all of them experience the greatest difficulty in getting proper human material to face the great problems which have to be met. I think that is the greatest obstacle to our maintaining the supremacy which we formerly held amongst the nations of the world.

For these reasons, is it not the duty of the Government to throw aside all other considerations, and give all that we require for the reform of our national system of education? The right hon. Gentleman stated in regard to the 17s. 6d. limit that the matter depended upon the Treasury. Any Government worthy of the name that wishes to meet our enemies not only in the field but also those in our own household; any Government capable of recognising the signs of the times and which desires to meet these enemies, surely ought to regard national education as one of the most important questions to which it could devote the money of the people. The Treasury should be made to feel this, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Prime Minister, the Leader of the House, and the gentlemen who rule the destinies of the nation, should recognise the fact that we at least on this side of the House are willing to bury the hatchet of discord so far as all the minor differences of a national system of education are concerned, and are willing to support the Government as we did in the passing of the Technical Instruction Bill of 1889; which would never have passed but for our action on this side of the House. We are willing to go with them and justify their action in our constituencies, if they will only give us the chance by establishing once and for all a system under one large authority, without making any lines of demarcation to differentiate between the education necessary for the working classes and for the middle classes of the country, and all classes up to that stage of culture to which some of them may aspire later on. I have done what I could in my business to encourage the spirit of education among parents, for I have stipulated that in my works no apprentice shall be taken under sixteen years of age who has not undergone a regular course of higher instruction. Age alone cannot be the test. You cannot differentiate between the ages of fifteen and sixteen. Elementary science should be a subject of common and general education in our primary schools, and to teach something of the laws of nature is to make a child understand the A B C of science. There is no difficulty about explaining to a child the nature of the atmosphere he breathes,

or the manner in which we obtain water by means of a pump, or the difference between a vacuum and air pressure, or the forces of nature. All these things meet him through the ordinary course of his life, and they can be brought before him in the schoolroom at the age of fourteen or fifteen just as well as they can be at the age of eighteen.

I earnestly press upon the right hon. Gentleman to take it from the Committee's attitude to-night that we are really in earnest. I have never heard the House of Commons so much in earnest as it has been to-night on this great question of national education. Outside the House the right hon. Gentleman needs no proof that the country is aroused upon this important matter. We have the example of other nations before us. It is a matter for irony for us to be now discussing what the English nation requires in education for her future destiny. We are the oldest nation of the world in the modern sense of the word, and should be the most advanced. The right hon. Gentleman has now a splendid opportunity, for the House is ready and more than eager to support him in every way it can, and if he will only make the Cabinet understand how much in earnest the House is, and still more the country, then I think we shall have reached a very happy period in our history. A new reign has just dawned upon us. We have a new monarch and a new Parliament, and we have entered on a new century. Let it be recorded in our history that this was a time when a new national system of education was established throughout the length and breadth of the land, and then I believe the country will once more rise to great achievements.

*Mr. BOND (Nottingham, E.) said that in the earlier part of the debate his right hon. friend the Member for South Aberdeen gave an account of the way in which the higher grade schools came into existence. Those who were acquainted with the history of this educational movement knew that here and there up and down the country it began by pressing education beyond the standards of the Code, which it was perceived could be got through by children of average ability long before the time at which it was desirable that they should leave school. The consequence was that schools began to be established which had since been known as higher grade schools. It was recognised that when they got beyond the standards of the Code they could no longer use the rates for the support of those schools, and the result was that though the children were still kept in the buildings the education was supposed to be paid for partly by fees, partly by the grants from the Science and Art

Department. Subsequently, however, the fees were diminished, and in some cases entirely abolished. The grants of the Science and Art Department were diminished or were less easily obtained, and the consequence was that schools of this kind, established to meet a real want, found themselves obliged to carry on in a manner which in the earlier stage of their existence they would have considered to be illegal. Then there came a still further development in the schools of the great northern towns. In London, where the higher grade schools had only lately been developed, the object of establishing them was not so much to fill an ascertained gap in education as to increase the prestige of the School Board, and really enter into competition with existing secondary schools. That had

happened to his knowledge to a very large extent, and the difficulty in the matter was that the masters conducting the higher grade schools were naturally desirous of keeping the children in the schools instead of willingly relinquishing them to the secondary schools, to the detriment not only of the education of the children, but to the great detriment of the secondary schools. Children were now kept at the higher grade schools until they were about fifteen, and then because it was found that they would have a better chance of obtaining certain kinds of employment if they came from a secondary school they were sent to such a school for what was thought to be a finishing year. That was bad for the education of the children and disadvantageous to the secondary schools.

There were two great things to be considered in connection with the matter. One was that the Act of 1870 was intended to provide for the elementary education of the great mass of the people ;labourers, artisans, soldiers, policemen, and the men filling the lower ranks of the Civil Service. At what age would such people begin to earn their livelihood? Was it possible in the conditions of our social system;even though he thought it desirable;that such children as those for whom the elementary system of education was devised could remain at school beyond the age of fourteen? He heard with great interest the statement of the hon.

Gentleman opposite about not taking apprentices into his works until they were sixteen. But from the way in which the hon. Gentleman announced the fact he evidently regarded it as exceptional. Elementary education was now free, or practically free, and question was whether the Committee was prepared to go any further in the direction of making education, to a higher degree, gratuitous?

The higher grade schools had one great attraction in the eyes of parents, and that was that no fees were payable at them;at least in London. Another difficulty was the comparative lateness of the age at which scholars now entered the secondary schools. That was a real danger to education. They were not at liberty to treat education as consisting of a number of different stages, like a house of cards*. Education properly understood was a much more serious matter than that. It was a matter of organic growth, so far as it could be secured, of drawing on the child stage by stage, from subject to subject, and in the end turning him out as complete a social instrument as he could be turned out having regard to the time he remained at school. He confessed that the situation presented very great difficulties. School boards and schoolmasters and mistresses in elementary schools, actuated no doubt by very laudable motives and desirous of doing their very best for the education of the children confided to their care, had departed from the plain course prescribed for them by the Elementary Education Act, and had unquestionably encroached on the field of secondary education. They did it in many cases with the assent, approval, and recognition of the inhabitants of the districts in which the development had taken place, and with the left-handed recognition of the Education Department. Now that the illegality of such action was being discussed, they were confronted with what was certainly a difficult, delicate, and awkward question. The schools which had been established were doing good work, and work which met with the approval of the bulk of the inhabitants of the districts where it was being

carried on. It would be extremely difficult to shut them up altogether, and he himself thought that the conclusion which had been arrived at by some 61 the speakers in the debate was a right

conclusion, and that the only way of getting a really satisfactory system of education, which would provide necessary instruction up to the age of about sixteen, was to establish either one central authority or several local authorities to deal with the whole subject. There were however immense perils and difficulties in that plan. They could not remodel their education system in that way without a very large increase of expenditure. Hon. Members on both sides seemed prepared for that, but no hon. Member had given any figures to indicate what the cost would be. At present education was practically free up to the age of fifteen or thereabouts.

If they wished to go further, and provide State education for children remaining at school until the age of seventeen or thereabouts, and to eliminate the unhappy jealousies which had prevailed for a long time between the elementary and secondary schools, the only way to proceed, so far as he could see, was to fall back on some such plan as had been suggested. He hoped that when the Bill which had been promised was introduced it would be found to contain provisions for the consolidation of education authorities in different districts, so that the entire system from beginning to end might be worked harmoniously on a definite plan.

Mr. ASQUITH: I shall not detain the Committee for more than two or three minutes. As this has been such a remarkable debate, it may be desirable before we proceed to a division for one to endeavour to summarise its main features. It is certainly the first time in my experience of the House of Commons in which practically a whole evening, nominally devoted to a Vote on Account embracing all the branches of the Civil Service, has been entirely occupied by the one topic we are engaged on. We hear a great deal, rightly and justly, about the necessity of reforming some of our public Departments, the War Office, and so on; but I think the manner in which the House has occupied its time to-night is the most significant proof the country could have that we look on the reform of our educational system as coming first and foremost. I think, without any distinction of party, we may recognise that as a hopeful sign, because it shows that not merely has the debate been contributed to almost equally by both sides of the House; not merely that we are full of hope and desire for the future, but that we are animated by what I conceive to be a just and legitimate apprehension as to our existing educational position.

My hon. friend the Member for Rossendale, in his speech a few minutes ago, and speaking with his long experience as a large employer of labour, emphasised in. I think, not at all accentuated or exaggerated terms, the enormous danger to which the industries of this country are exposed, not from any falling off in the energy or even in the intelligence of either our capitalists or labourers, but from the superiority in methods of training which have been adopted by our leading competitors in the industrial world. For the first time in the history of this country, -indeed in the history of the world, the exports of a foreign country during the last twelve months have exceeded, our own and if ever there

were an occasion when it was time for us to look round and put our educational house in order that occasion has now arrived. There is also another point which has found ample expression during the course of this debate, and that is that whatever differences we may have had in the past or may have in the future;and J do not in the least disguise or minimise their importance;as to the position of denominational schools on the one side and board schools on the other, there is a certain neutral ground in the direction of educational improvement on which all parties in this House may meet. The greatest educational reform which has taken place in our time was carried out under the conduct of my right hon. friend;I mean the providing of free education in our primary schools. That was a matter on which there was no division of party opinion, and the measure was carried into law practically with the consent of all parties. There is another illustration, not perhaps so wide-reaching in its effects, but not to be ignored;I refer to the Technical Instruction Act of 1899. That Act, I am sorry to say, was circumscribed in its extent, but it has already produced, and will, if largely extended, continue to produce, the foundations of a system of technical

education throughout the length and breadth of the country. Having regard to the manifest indications of a universally dominating interest in this matter, and to the willingness of all parties in the State to co-operate in the solution of it, cannot the Government give us this year;they have an unexampled opportunity;a chance of making a really large step forward?

There are two measures to which I desire particularly to refer. The first is what may be done by legislation, and the other is what may be done by administration. As regards legislation, I think it is universally acknowledged that the time has come when we may really take a practical step towards the attainment of what has long been an educational ideal;namely, the co-ordination of our various systems of primary, secondary and more developed education into something like a harmonious and logical system. Speaker after speaker has pointed out to-night that a clever child, the child with brains, who has passed through a primary school, finds himself in the next stage very much handicapped by want of adequate provision for his more developed education, and very often cut short at a time when, if he had proper facilities and opportunities, he might be able to develop his education to a degree which would make him a really efficient worker in the development of the industries and science of the country.

That is a matter of course as to which we must suspend our judgment until we see the scheme of the Government, but I want to lay even still greater stress on the necessity and urgency of a reform which does not depend upon legislation at all, but which could be carried out to-morrow by a stroke of the Vice-President's pen. There are a number of children who have reached the age of twelve or thirteen, and who from the necessities of the case;the circumstances of their parents and so forth;can probably never hope to mount up the higher rungs of the educational ladder, or obtain the advantages which a secondary and more developed system of education would provide. If the law is to be interpreted in the sense in which it has been interpreted by the Courts, these children

will be left absolutely stranded during two of the most important and critical years of their lives. Having passed the sixth or even the seventh standard, and being still at a school age, and in the elementary schools, they will be left absolutely stranded and compelled to go without any further education. Well, I say to the Vice-President and to His Majesty's Government, if they will modify and mould the Code issued from Whitehall so as to continue the facilities which are now provided in the higher branches of elementary schools, but of which they are threatened to be deprived, they will provide for this class of children, who really may not have another chance in their lives, the only possible means of developing their minds and faculties and making them capable and efficient citizens. That is absolutely within the power of the right hon. Gentleman to-morrow, if he wishes to exercise his statutory rights to bring it into effect. I earnestly hope and believe that the debate to-night will supply an impulse and incentive to the Government to carry out these two steps, and I hope that such a favourable opportunity will not be lost.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford) said he did not pretend to be an expert in educational matters. In the agricultural districts education was sometimes regarded as a great advantage and at other times as an unmitigated nuisance, but he did not propose to express his own views on the subject. He only wished to say that he desired to support the view put forward by the hon. Member for Accrington with reference to the security of the tenure of teachers in elementary schools. The teachers were subject to irresponsible Boards, and if they went to church or to chapel, if they played the organ or refused to play the organ, or accepted the eastern position, they were liable to dismissal and had no appeal. All they asked was that there should be an appeal to the county councils or to the Vice-President himself. For the last year and a half he and other hon. Members had been pressing the matter on the Vice-President of the Council without the slightest effect; they only received the usual official answer that the matter was being considered. When the right hon. Gentleman was asked a supplementary question, he only said his answer was veracious. It was, however, un-commonly unsatisfactory. The right hon. Gentleman said just now that the question was under consideration, but if the Duke of Devonshire could not make up his

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)

Gilhooly, James

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

Allan, William (Gateshead)

Gladstone, Rt. Hon. Herbert J.

O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)

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

Goddard, Daniel Ford

O'Malley, William

Ambrose, Robert

Grant, Corrie

O'Mara, James

Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Hy.
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Griffith, Ellis J.
Partington, Oswald
Bell, Richard
Guidon, Sir W. Brampton
Paulton, James Mellor
Roland, John
Haldane, Richard Burdon
Pirie, Duncan V.
Boyle, James
Hammond, John
Power, Patrick Joseph
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Hardie, J. K.(Merthyr Tydvil)
Price, Robert John
Brigg, John
Harms worth. R. Leicester
Rasch, Major Frederic Carrie
Broadhurst, Henry
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.
Reddy, M.
Brown, George M.(Edinburgh)
Hobhouse. C. E. H.(Bristol, E.)
Rickett, J. Compton
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Holland, William Henry
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Joicey, Sir James
Roche, John
Burke, E. Haviland-
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Jordan, Jeremiah
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Caine, William Sproston
Joyce, Michael
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Caldwell, James
Kearley, Hudson, E.
Schwann, Charles E.
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)

Layland-Barratt, Francis
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Smith, HC (North'mb. Tyneside
Causton, Richard Knight
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Cawley, Frederick
Levy, Maurice
Soares, Ernest J.
Channing, Francis Allston
Lough, Thomas
Spencer. Rt Hn C. R (Northants.
Cogan, Denis J.
Lundon, W.
Stevenson, Francis S.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Sullivan, Donal
Craig, Robert Hunter
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Tennant, Harold John
Crean, Eugene
M'Crae, George
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Cullinan, J.
M'Dermott, Patrick
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
M'Govern, T.
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
Tomkinson, James
Delany, William
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
Trevelyan Charles Philips
Donelan, Capt. A.
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Tully, Jasper
Doogan, P. C.
Mather, William
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)

White, George (Norfolk)
Duffy, William J.
Morton, Edw. J.C.(Devonport)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Duncan, James H.
Murphy, J.
White, Patrick (Meath, North
Elibank, Master of
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Emmott, Alfred
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Evans, Sir F. H. (Maidstone)
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Flavin, Michael Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipp'ry, Mid.)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Mr. Yoxall and Mr. Alfred Hutton.
Foster, Sir W. (Derby Co.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Fuller, J. M. F.
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
NOES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J. (Manch'r.
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Bull, William James
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Balfour, Maj. K. R. (Christch.)
Butcher, John George
Allhusen, Augustus Hy. Eden.
Banbury, Frederick George
Carlile, William Walter
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benj.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lanes.)
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Beach, Rt. Hn Sir M. H.(Bristol)

Cavendish, V.C.W.(Derbysh.)
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Arrol, Sir William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Ashmead Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J.(Birm.)
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bond, Edward
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc.
Bagot. Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Brassey, Albert
Chapman, Edward
Balcarres, Lord
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Churchill, Winston Spencer
mind in a year and a half with reference to such a simple question;well, he did
not deserve to be where he was.
Question put.
The Committee divided:;Ayes, 130; Noes, 225. (Division List No. 38.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Collings, Right Hon. Jesse
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Plummer, Walter R.
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Kennedy, Patrick James
Pretymann, Ernest George
Cook, Frederick Lucas
Kenyon, Hon. G. T. (Denbigh)
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Corbett, A. Cameron(Glasgow
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)
Purvis, Robert
Cranborne, Viscount
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)

Pym, C. Guy
Cross, Herb. Shepherd(Bolton)
Keswick, William
Randles, John S.
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Cust, Henry John C.
Knowles, Lees
Reid, James (Greenock)
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chath'm
Law, Andrew Bonar
Remnant, James Farquharson
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Lawrence, William F.
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Lawson, John Grant
Rentoul, James Alexander
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Lee, Capt A.H (Hants, Fareh'm.
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (St'ly bridge)
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Leveson-Gower, Fred. N. S.
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore
Long, Col. Chas. W.(Evesham)
Ropner, Col. Robert
Duke, Henry Edward
Long, Rt Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Russell, T. W.
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Rutherford, John
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Fardell, Sir T. George
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander

Fergusson, Rt. Hn Sir J. (Manc'r
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Lucas, R. J. (Portsmouth)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Finch, George H.
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Seely, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Macdona, John Cumming
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Fisher, William Hayes
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
FitzGerald, Sir R. Penrose-
Maconochie, A. W.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward A.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Smith, James P. (Lanarks.)
Forster, Henry William
M'Calmont. Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Gibbs, Hon. V. (St. Albans)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Spear, John Ward
Gordon, Hn. J.E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Majendie, James A. H.
Stanley, Hon. A. (Ormskirk)
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Malcolm, Ian
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'ml'ts
Markham, Arthur Basil
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Stock, James Henry
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Sturt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Goschen, Hon. Geo. Joachim
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Goulding, Edward Alfred

Milward, Colonel Victor
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Graham, Henry Robert
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Talbot, Rt. Hon. J. G. (Oxf. Univ.
Greene, Sir E.W. (Bury St. Ed.)
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Thornton, Percy M.
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Mooney, John J.
Tollemache, Henry James
Gretton, John
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Groves, James Grimble
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Tufnell, Col. Edward
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
Valentia, Viscount
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Morrell, George Herbert
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Hambro, Charles Eric
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Hamilton, Rt Hon Lord G (Middx
Morrison, James Archibald
Wason, John C. (Orkney)
Hamilton, Marq of (Londonderry
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford)
Avelby, Lt.-Col. A.C.E. (Taunton
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford)
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-under-Lyne)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynemouth
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)
Wills, Sir Frederick

Heath, Jas. (Stat fords., N.W.
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Helder, Augustus
Nicholson, William Graham
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B. Stuart-
Hermon-Hodge, Robert T.
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Higginbottom, S. W.
Nolan, Col. John P.(Galway, N.)
Wylie, Alexander
Hoare, Edw. B. (Hampstead)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Hobhouse, Hy. (Somerset, E.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Young, Commander(Berks, E.)
Hope,J. F. (Sheff'ld, Brightside
Parkes, Ebenezer
Hoult, Joseph
Pease, H. Pike (Darlington)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt, Wellesley
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Pemberton, John S. G.
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Percy, Earl

Original Question again proposed.

It being after midnight, and objection being taken to further proceeding, the
Chairman proceeded to- interrupt the business.

Whereupon Mr. A. J. Balfour rose in

his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put"

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

The Committee divided::Ayes, 220; Noes, 117. (Division List No. 39.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)

Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Allhusen, Augustus Hy. Eden
Cretton, John
Nicholson, William Graham
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Groves, James Grimble
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Arrol, Sir William
Hambro, Charles Eric
Parkes, Ebenezer
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Mid'x
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry
Peel, Hn. Wm. Rbt. Wellesley
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Pemberton, John S. G.
Balcarres, Lord
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Balfour, Rt.Hn.A.J.(Manch'r.
Harris, F. L. (Tynemouth)
Plummer, Walter R.
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Balfour, Maj. K. R.(Christch.)
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)
Pretymann, Ernest George
Banbury, Frederick George
Heath, Jas. (Staffords., N.W.
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Bathurst. Hon. Allen Benjamin
Helder, Augustus
Purvis, Robert
Beach, Rt Hn. Sir. M. H. (Bristol
Hermon-Hodge, Robert T.
Pym, C. Guy

Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Randles, John S.
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Hoare, E. Brodie (Hampstead)
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.
Hobhouse, Hy. (Somerset, E.)
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Blundell, Col. Henry
Hope, J.F. (Sheffield, Brightside)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Bond, Edward
Hoult, Joseph
Remnant, James Farquharson
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Brassey, Albert
Hutton, John (Yorks., N. R.)
Rentoul, James Alexander
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Ridley, Hn. M.W. (Staly bridge)
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Morton
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Bull, William James
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Butcher, John George
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Carlile, William Walter
Kearley, Hudson E.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Kenyon, Hn. G. T. (Denbigh)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Cavendish, V.C.W (Derbyshire)
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)
Russell, T. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)
Rutherford, John
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)

Keswick, William
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J (Birm.
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alex.
Chamberlain, J Austen(Worc'r
Knowles, Lees
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse
Chapman, Edward
Law, Andrew Bonar
Scott, Sir S.(Marylebone, W.)
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Lawrence, William F.
Seely, Chas. Hilton (Lincoln)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.
Lawson. John Grant
Sharpe, Willian Edward T.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Lee,Capt A.H. (Hants, Fareh'm
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Colomb,SirJohnCharles Ready
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Smith, HC (North'mb. Tyn's'de
Cook, Frederick Lucas
Leveson-Gower, Fredk. N. S.
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Long, Col. C. W. (Evesham)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Cranborne, Viscount
Long. Rt. Hn. W. (Bristol, S.)
Spear, John Ward
Cross, H. Shepherd (Bolton)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Stanley, Hn Arthur (Ormskirk)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Stanley, Lord (Lanes.)
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Stock, James Henry
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Lucas, Col. F. (Lowestoft)

Sturt, Hon Humphry Napier
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Lucas. R. J. (Portsmouth)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Dimsdale, Sir J. Cockfield
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J.G (Oxf'd Univ.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Thornton, Percy M.
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Macdona, John Cumming
Tollemaohe, Henry James
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore
Maconochie, A. W.
Tufnell, Col. Edward
Duke, Henry Edward
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Valentia, Viscount
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Fardell, Sir T. George
M 'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Majendie, James A. H.
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Malcolm, Ian
Welby, Lt-Col. A.C.E (Taunt'n
Finch, George H.
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-U.-Lyne
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Maxwell, W.J.H. (Dumfriessh)
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Fisher, William Hayes
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Milward, Colonel Victor
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Fitzroy, Hon. Edw. Algernon

Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Wills, Sir Frederick
Forster, Henry William
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
More, Rbt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Morrell, George Herbert
Wylie, Alexander
Gordon, Maj Evans- (T'r H'm'l'ts)
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-
Morrison, James Archibald
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Sir William Walrond and
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Murray. Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Mr. Anstruther.
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Gilhooly, James
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Allan, William (Gateshead)
Goddard, Daniel Ford
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud)
Grant, Corrie
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Ambrose, Robert
Griffith, Ellis J.
O'Malley, William
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton

O'Mara, James
Asquith, Rt Hon. Herbert Henry
Haldane, Richard Burdon
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Bell, Richard
Hammond, John
Partington, Oswald
Boland, John
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Paulton, James Mellor
Boyle, James
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Pirie, Duncan V.
Brigg, John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Broadhurst, Henry
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Price, Robert John
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Jordan, Jeremiah
Reddy, M.
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Joyce, Michael
Rickett, J. Compton
Burke, E. Haviland-
Kennedy, Patrick James
Roche, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Roe, Sir Thomas
Caldwell, James
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (Accrington)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Schwann, Charles E.
Cawley, Frederick
Levy, Maurice
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh.)
Channing, Francis Allston
Lough, Thomas
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Cogan, Denis J.
Lundon, W.
Soares, Ernest J.

Condon, Thomas Joseph
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C R (Northants
Craig, Robert Hunter
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Sullivan, Donal
Crean, Eugene
M'Crae, George
Tennant, Harold John
Cullinan, J.
M'Govern, T.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.
Delany, William
Mansfield, Horace Kendall
Tomkinson, James
Donelan, Captain A.
Markham, Arthur Basil
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Doogan, P. C.
Mather, William
Tully, Jasper
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Mooney, John J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Duffy, William J.
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
White, George (Norfolk)
Duncan, James H.
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
White, Luke (York. E. R.)
Elibank, Master of
Murphy, J,
White, Patrick (Meath, North
Emmott, Alfred
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Whitely, J. H. (Halifax)
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone)
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.
Farquharson, Dr. Robert

Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Yoxall, James Henry
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'ry Mid)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. Causton.
Fuller, J. M. F.

O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)

Original Question put accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN named the Tellers:; Ayes, Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther;
Noes, Mr. Yoxall and Mr. Brodhurst.

MR. BOYLE (Donegal): As a new Member of the House, I rise to a point of order;

*The CHAIRMAN: Order, order; The House must clear for the division. I must ask hon. Members to proceed to the division lobbies.

[A minute later.]

*The CHAIRMAN: I must ask hon. Members to be kind enough to proceed to the division lobbies.

Mr. M'HUGH (Leitrim, N.): We will not divide.

Mr. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): May I be permitted to point out that we feel it our duty to protest against the manner in which all the Irish Votes have been closed without a single Irish voice having been heard.

*The CHAIRMAN: Order, order; It is not possible to go back on the decision of the House. The House has already decided that the question should be put, and it is my duty to put it.

An Hon. Member: And it is our duty not to divide.

*THE CHAIRMAN: It is impossible to carry on this discussion.

MR. FLAVIN: The Irish Members have got no chance of speaking.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order; If the hon. Members decline to proceed to the division lobbies, I must report the circumstances to the Speaker.

MR. M'HUGH: Bring in your policemen, but we are not going to divide.

The CHAIRMAN thereupon directed the doors to be unlocked in order to report the matter to the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have to report to you. Sir, that during the course of the division on the question which I was ordered to put by the House as a result of the division upon the closure, a certain number of Members of the House declined to leave their seats and to proceed into the division lobbies. I requested them more than once to proceed, but I gathered from the observations which fell from these hon. Members, or some of them, that they declined to proceed. Thereupon I thought it was due to the House, in the position in which we found ourselves, that I should follow the precedent which had been set on a

former occasion and ask you, Sir, to return to the Chair. It was impossible for me, Sir, to see all the hon. Members who declined to leave their seats, but I may say that among those whom I was able to observe were the Members for South-East Cork, North Kerry, South Tipperary, North Meath, North Leitrim, East Limerick, North-East Cork, West Cavan, East Tyrone, South Fermanagh, East Cork, and West Cork.

Mr. JOYCE (Limerick City): And the Member for Limerick City.

Mr. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): And the Member for College Green.

*Mr. JOHN O'DONNELL (Mayo, S.): And the Member for South Mayo.

Mr. KENDAL O'BRIEN (Tipperary, Mid): And the Member for Mid Tipperary.

*MR. SPEAKER: The order having been made for clearing the House, it is the duty of every Member, in accordance with that order, to clear the House for the purpose of a division. I must remind hon. Members that they are breaking the rules of the House in not clearing the House for a division. I

must ask them whether they still persist in refusing to leave the House?

[Severa: Hon. Members: We will not.] I name you, Mr. Crean, Mr. Flavin, Mr. Cullinan, Mr. White, Mr. M'Hugh, Mr. London, Mr. William Abraham, Mr. M'Govern, Mr. Doogan, Mr. Jordan, Captain Donelan, Mr. Gilhooly for wilfully obstructing the business of the House and disregarding the authority of the Chair.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I move that these Gentlemen be suspended from the service of the House.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the said Members, Mr. Crean, Mr. Flavin, Mr. Cullinan, Mr. Patrick White, Mr. M'Hugh, Mr. London, Mr. William Abraham, Mr. M'Govern, Mr. Doogan, Mr. Jordan, Captain Donelan, and Mr. Gilhooly be suspended from the service of the House."; (Mr. A. J. Balfour.)

The House proceeded to a division.

Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther were appointed Tellers for the Ayes, but no Member being willing to act as Teller for the Noes, Mr. Speaker declared that the Ayes had it.

*Mr. Speaker then directed the said Members to withdraw.

Mr. FLAVIN: You have named me, and I refuse to leave the House.

*Mr. SPEAKER: The Serjeant-at-Arms will see that the orders of the House are obeyed, and that adequate force is used if it becomes necessary to compel the hon. Member. I must call the names of the hon. Members in order, and I must ask the messengers to see that they are removed if they will not withdraw. I call on Mr. Crean to leave the House.

MR. CREAN (Cork Co., S.E.): I respectfully decline, Mr. Speaker.

*Mr. SPEAKER: I must ask the Deputy-Serjeant to see that Mr. Crean leaves the House.

Mr. CREAN: I will not leave.

*Mr. SPEAKER: Then the hon. Member must be removed by force out of the House. Mr. CREAN was accordingly removed.

*MR. SPEAKER: I must ask Mr. M'Hugh to leave the House.

MR. M'HUGH: I refuse to go.

*MR. SPEAKER: This scene is as distressing to an Englishman as it can be to any Irishman.

MR. M'HUGH: Why are we gagged?

*MR. SPEAKER: I appeal to the hon. Members to have some respect for the dignity of the House to which they belong.

MR. M'HUGH: We are absolutely defiant, and we will defy even the Chair and the Government.

MR. FLAVIN: May I point out, Sir, that in your absence a Vote of seventeen millions of money was closed without a single Irish Member having taken part in the discussion?

Mr. M'HUGH was removed.

*MR. SPEAKER: I must ask Mr. Patrick White, who is one of the Members I have named, to leave the House, and I appeal to him to leave it peaceably,

Mr. PATRICK WHITE (Meath, N.): I shall not leave the House.

*Mr. SPEAKER: Then the hon. Member must be removed.

Mr. PATRICK WHITE was removed.

*MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): Before this unpleasantness proceeds any further I am, speaking for myself, very anxious that some way out of the difficulty should be found. I sympathise with the protest of my hon. friends, and if a way out is not found, then the same course as that which we have just witnessed will have to be gone through with every Member on these benches. I would appeal, if I may, through you, Sir, to the Leader of the House, and ask him if he would not let the matter now end. I think that by allowing the House to be now adjourned, we might meet in a better temper all round to-morrow. If that suggestion cannot be adopted, then I see no other alternative to every Member on these benches being forcibly removed.

I hope you will see your way to offer some suggestion, Sir.

*MR. SPEAKER: The only suggestion that I can possibly make is that hon. Members, whether they agree with the course that has been taken in the House or not, should respect the order of the House first. An order having been made and a division called, and the hon. Members having been named for refusing to proceed to the lobby, they should retire from the House decently. A protest may be made on a proper occasion, but their duty now is to retire peaceably.

Mr. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.), Mr. DOOGAN (Tyrone, E.), CAPTAIN DONELAX (CORK CO., E.). Mr. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork Co., N.E.), Mr. GILHOOLY (Cork Co., W.), Mr. LUNDON (Limerick, E.), Mr. MCGOVERN (Cavan, W.), Mr. JORDAN (Fermanagh, S.), and Mr. FLAVIN, having refused to obey the order of the Speaker to leave the House, were removed.

*Mr. SPEAKER: The House will now resume its proceedings in Committee, and I hope that, if it is found necessary to take a division, and hon. Members are asked to leave the House, they will do so in accordance with the order of the Chair.

The House again resolved itself into Committee::

(In the Committee.)

[MR. W. J. LOWTHER in the Chair.]

Original Question put, "That £17,304,000 be granted on account for the said Services."

The Committee proceeded to a division.

Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther were appointed Tellers for the Ayes, but

no Member being willing to act as Teller for the Noes, the Chairman declared that the Ayes had it.

It being after midnight, the Chairman left the chair to make his report to the House.

Resolution to be reported to-morrow.

Committee to sit again to-morrow.

House adjourned at Ten minutes after One of the clock.