

<https://api.parliament.uk/historic-hansard/sittings/1901/may/16>

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 16th May, 1901.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

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 Petitions for the following Bills, the Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz.;

Belfast and Northern Counties Railway.

Biggleswade Water Board.

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

ALDERSHOT GAS AND WATER BILL.

CALEDONIAN RAILWAY BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

CLEVELAND AND DURHAM COUNTY ELECTRIC POWER BILL.

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

KETTERING URBAN DISTRICT WATER BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

LANCASHIRE AND YORKSHIRE RAILWAY (VARIOUS POWERS) BILL.

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

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (GENERAL POWERS) BILL.

Duke of Cornwall's consent signified; Bill read the third time, and passed.

LONDON RIVERSIDE FISH MARKET BILL.

Read the third time and passed.

HAMILTON BURGH PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL [Lords].

Order [13th May] for Third Reading upon Monday next read, and discharged.

Bill to be considered upon Monday next, under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, Section 7, Sub-section (2).;(The Lord Advocate.)

GOLBORNE GAS BILL.

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

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP M).

Mr. CAINE reported from the Committee on Group M of Private Bills, That, for the convenience of parties, they had adjourned till Monday next, at Eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

PETITIONS.

BURIAL GROUNDS (EXEMPTION FROM RATES) BILL.

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

DESTITUTE BLIND.

Petition of the National League of the Blind, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (HIGHER GRADE AND EVENING CONTINUATION SCHOOLS).

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

HOSPITALS (EXEMPTION FROM RATES) BILL.

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

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES AND RATING BILL.

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

LICENSING ACTS AMENDMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition of the Scottish Temperance League, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION BILL.

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND) ACT (1894) AMENDMENT BILL.

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

MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.

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

POLICE SUPERANNUATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

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

POOR LAW OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

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

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Holme Eden; Cleethorpes; Hull; Long Compton; London; Higher Openshaw; St. Agnes; Gorton; Redruth; St. John's Wood; Grimoldby; and Ramsbury; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Croydon (eight); Kettering (five); Rothesay; Manchester; Haslingden; Portsmouth; Bath (two); Cornwall; and Seer Green; to lie upon the Table.]

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

SOVEREIGN'S OATH ON ACCESSION BILL.

Petitions against, from Rawtenstall; and Rothesay; to lie upon the Table.

TROUT FISHING ANNUAL CLOSE TIME (SCOTLAND) BILL.

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

WORKMEN'S HOUSES TENURE BILL.

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

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EMIGRATION AND IMMIGRATION.

Return [presented 15th May] to be printed. [No. 176.]

INQUIRY INTO CHARITIES (COUNTY OF LANCASTER).

Return [presented 15th May] to be printed. [No. 177.]

NAVIGATION AND SHIPPING.

Copy presented, of Annual Statement of Navigation and Shipping of the United Kingdom for the year 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

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

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 15th May; Mr. Gerald Balfour]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 178.]

WAGES AND PROFITS IN COAL MINING.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 15th May; Mr. Gerald Balfour]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 179.]

GAS AND WATER WORKS FACILITIES ACT, 1870.

Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade as to dispensing with the consent of the Horsham Urban District Council in the case of the Horsham Gas

Provisional Order [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 180.]  
GAS AND WATER WORKS FACILITIES ACT, 1870.

Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade as to dispensing with the consent of the Pinner Parish Council in the case of the Pinner Gas Provisional Order [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 181.]

#### TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 2,595 to 2,598 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

#### ARRESTS FOR DRUNKENNESS (IRELAND).

Return ordered, "giving the number of Arrests for Drunkenness within the metropolitan police district of Dublin and the cities of Belfast, Cork, Limerick, and Waterford, on Sundays between the 1st day of May, 1900, and the 30th day of April, 1901, both days inclusive, the arrests being given from 8 a.m. on Sundays till 8 a.m. on Mondays."

"And, similar Returns for the rest of Ireland from the 1st day of May, 1900, to the 30th day of April, 1901 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 271, of Session 1900).";(Mr. William Johnston.)

#### CIVIL LIST PENSIONS.

Return ordered, "of persons now in receipt of Pensions charged on the Civil List of Her late Majesty, under the Act 1 Vic., c. 2, s. 5.";(Mr. Gibson Bowles.)

#### CORPORAL PUNISHMENT.

Address for "Return of all Sentences of Corporal Punishment inflicted under 26 and 27 Vic., c. 44, upon persons convicted of offences against Section 43 of the Larceny Act, 1861, and Section 21 of the Offences against the Person Act, 1861, in England and Wales, from the 1st day of January, 1900, to the 31st day of December, 1900 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 99, of Session 1900).";(Mr. Lloyd Morgan.)

#### QUESTIONS.

##### SOUTH AFRICAN WAR;INQUIRY INTO CONDUCT AND OPERATIONS.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he will state whether there have been recent inquiries by the War Office into certain departments, such as artillery, guns, and transports; and, if so, whether they will interfere with the promised inquiry into the general conduct of the war.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): There have been inquiries into the matters referred to, but it will be obvious to the hon. Member on the smallest reflection that these will not interfere with the further inquiry he desires.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield): Can the right hon. Gentleman give us a day for the discussion of this subject, say on Vote 3 of the Army Estimates?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I can make no statement as to the Army Estimates now.

##### UITLANDER REFUGEES;RETURN OF CIVILIANS TO THE TRANSVAAL.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in October last, he received a telegram from the Refugees' Committee in Cape Town, protesting against their detention in that city, and

stating that there was unrest and dissatisfaction at the postponement of their return; whether the telegram also conveyed a protest against capitalist appointments and legislation in the Transvaal; and what, if any, steps has he taken to remove the grievances of the Refugees' Committee.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): I received the telegram referred to on 24th October, more than six months ago, and I replied immediately, expressing my regret at the unavoidable detention of the Uitlander refugees due to military necessities. I recognise that the sufferings of these people have been in many cases much greater than those of the Boers in the refugee camps, and I hope that circumstances will shortly permit of a general resumption of work. I am not aware of any legislation or appointments which can justly be described as capitalistic.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Is it a fact that the refugees have been kept at Cape Town, while their places have been filled by forced and slave labour?

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order&#x2021;

PEACE NEGOTIATIONS WITH GENERAL BOTHA.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether Louis Botha has published a statement giving his account of his recent negotiations with Lord Kitchener, and the reasons for the breaking off of the negotiations; and, if so, whether he will procure a copy of this statement, and have it printed and circulated.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I have not seen any statement of the kind, and I have no information on the subject.

PLAGUE AT DURBAN;PRECAUTIONS AT ST. HELENA.

\*MR. BATHURST (Gloucestershire, Cirencester): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether there have been any cases of bubonic plague at Durban; and, if not, why the landing at St. Helena of troops from Durban cannot be effected; and, whether the ordinance of the Council of St. Helena, which prohibits the landing of persons coming from certain ports, is extended to goods and military stores.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: There was an isolated imported case at Durban in May last year; since then no further cases have been reported. The Governor of Saint Helena on the recommendation of the Medical Board there has issued an Order in Council that no person or cargo coming from ports in South Africa south of 25 degrees south latitude shall be allowed to land. The question whether this Order in Council must not be modified is under consideration, and that of landing troops from Durban cannot be settled until this point is decided. I must say that it appears to me that the fears of the local authorities are exaggerated.

CAPTURES OF BRITISH TROOPS;CASUALTY LISTS.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War will he explain why, in the casualty lists published from time to time by the War Office with reference to the South African War, the actual losses to the total British forces in South Africa is alone shown, while all reference to the number of British troops captured and subsequently released by the Boers has been omitted; will he state what were the actual casualties of this description in September, October, November, and December; and whether an assurance will be given that in

future the public will be duly informed in the casualty lists of the incidents of the campaign.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): The casualty lists referred to are published monthly, and are only intended to be a summary. I do not think it would be to the public advantage to do more than this. All detailed information affecting casualties is published from day to day on receipt of the telegrams from South Africa.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Am I to understand that when British troops are captured by the Boers, and immediately afterwards released, the fact and the names and numbers of the men are not stated in the telegrams?

No answer was returned.

SOLDIERS' GRAVES IN SOUTH AFRICA; SPION KOP.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been directed to the condition of the graves of the soldiers who have fallen at Spion Kop, where some of the bodies are only partly covered; and whether immediate directions will be given that the bodies of the men slain at Spion Kop be given decent sepulture.

LORD STANLEY: The graves of soldiers in South Africa are being cared for by an association who are working in concurrence with the authorities, and who will, I am sure, take care that the proper condition of the graves is preserved. May I state, from my own personal observation, that the information with regard to the graves of the men who fell at Spion Kop is absolutely inaccurate.

TREATMENT OF INVALIDED SOLDIERS AT GOSPORT.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the troops from South Africa, among whom were many invalids, who landed at Gosport from the transport "Tagus" on 9th November, were without food from 6.30 a.m. till 5 p.m.; and if so, who is responsible for this mismanagement, and what explanation, if any, has the War Office to offer.

LORD STANLEY: The usual arrangements for food were made in this case, which are as follows:;Men disembarked between the breakfast and usual dinner hour (1 p.m.), dine at the station to which they proceed, but if that station is more than a short distance from Southampton they are provided with food to consume en route. Men who cannot be disembarked until after the dinner hour have dinner provided for them on board.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: But did the men get the food?

LORD STANLEY: Yes, Sir.

LICHTENBURG GARRISON.

MR. PARTINGTON (Derbyshire, High Peak): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he has information to the effect that the garrison, 350 strong, at Lichtenburg has been besieged since 17th January, 1901; and whether it has been relieved; if not, what steps are being taken to effect its relief.

LORD STANLEY: No information has been received to the effect that Lichtenburg has been besieged. An unsuccessful attack was made on it by Delarey on 6th March, but no further fighting has been reported. It must be remembered that communications are not kept permanently open with this and other outlying garrisons, but convoys are sent to them from time to time as required.

HOOPSTAD GARRISON.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he has any information to the effect that the British garrison at Hoopstad, after being relieved last summer, was besieged by the Boers from August last till within a few weeks ago, and the garrison practically cut off from communication with the British forces elsewhere for seven or eight months; whether Hoopstad has been evacuated; and why no announcement respecting these matters has been made in despatches issued by the War Office.

LORD STANLEY: The garrison at Hoopstad was, like other garrisons off the railway line, dependent for its supplies on periodical convoys. The garrison was withdrawn about the beginning of April, but no special report has been received.

MR. CHANNING: Do I understand from the noble Lord that the War Office have not received the information which has reached private individuals, that this place was besieged for many months?

[No answer was returned.]

MR. CHANNING: I shall put another question on this.

FARM BURNING IN SOUTH AFRICA.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can give the name of the village or farm referred to at page 10 [Cd. 524], belonging to General Christian De Wet, and the date and reasons for burning; and whether the owner of the house referred to at the bottom of page 10 as belonging to or close to General de Wet's house, and destroyed because the owner was on commando, is known; and, if so, what is the name of the owner.

LORD STANLEY: If the information with regard to the second paragraph had been available, it would have been given in the Return. In answer to the first paragraph, I must refer to a reply given to the hon. Member for South Donegal on the 9th May.

HARTEBEESTFONTEIN.

MR. DILLON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether Hartebeestfontein is to be destroyed; and, if so, what is the reason for its destruction.

LORD STANLEY: Nothing is known of this matter at the War Office.

MR. DILLON: Nothing ever is known at the War Office.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): "Where ignorance is bliss;"

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, Order

MAJOR-GENERAL SIR F. CARRINGTON.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, when Major-General Sir F. Carrington was recently appointed to a command in South Africa, he was selected by the then military authorities at the War Office or was appointed contrary to their advice; and, if so, whether any influence was used by persons external to the War Office to secure the appointment, and whether Papers will be laid on the Table of the House showing Sir F. Carrington's share in the campaign.

See preceding volume, page 1138.

LORD STANLEY: Sir F. Carrington was appointed to a command in South Africa last year on the recommendation of the Commander-in-Chief in the ordinary course, and

not on any external advice. There is nothing connected with his operations which calls for a special report.

#### LEEDS ENGINEER VOLUNTEERS.

MR. CAUTLEY (Leeds, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that on the return of the active service section of the Leeds Engineer Volunteers on the 3rd May, 1901, the men were informed at the Leeds Barracks by their commanding officer that they would receive a month's furlough on full pay; that such announcement was not in accordance with the then existing regulations, and that a few days subsequently they were further informed that under new regulations issued on the day of their arrival they were not entitled to any furlough or any gratuity; and that, on inquiry being made of the War Office, a reply was sent to the commanding officer stating that the payment of gratuity and granting of furlough to returned Volunteers are only applicable to men who have not completed one year of service or who have been discharged as medically unfit; and whether it is in accordance with the regulations that the Leeds Engineers, who have been on active service for one year and one hundred days, have been deprived of their gratuity by reason only of their increased service of one hundred days beyond the year; if so, whether he proposes to take any measures to remedy this hardship.

LORD STANLEY: Men who on return to England had not served the full year for which they had enlisted, and had therefore a claim to complete the year's service, were offered in lieu a gratuity of thirty days pay on their services being no longer required. Men who, like the Leeds Volunteers, have already completed their engagement, have no claim to remain, and are, therefore, not in a position to ask for a furlough gratuity in lieu of remaining. They will, of course, get the usual war gratuity and the £5 gratuity on discharge.

#### COALING STATIONS; NAVAL OR MILITARY DEFENCE.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his scheme for substituting naval for military defence of the coaling station was approved of by the Defence Committee of the Cabinet, and whether the scheme will be persevered with.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): It would be improper to make any communication to the public with regard to the proceedings in Cabinet or Committee of Cabinet.

#### THE WEST SOMERSETSHIRE YEOMANRY.

COLONEL WELBY (Taunton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War a question of which I have given him private notice, namely, whether special permission was granted, on 7th May, to the West Somersetshire Yeomanry to go into lodging and training at Taunton, and why, on the 13th May, only forty-eight hours before the regiment was to assemble, it was revoked, thereby causing great expense to fall on all ranks of the regiment, as well as on the inhabitants of Taunton; will he consider the possibility of granting to the officers and men of the regiment a special allowance to cover this unusual expenditure.

MR. BRODRICK: I am afraid I must ask for further notice of this question.

#### OFFICERS' PASS SCHOOL CERTIFICATES.

MR. PARTINGTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if it is possible

for Militia and Volunteer officers to get the pass school certificates without going through the course at the London barracks; if not, whether it would be possible to hold schools of instruction for them in different parts of the country.

LORD STANLEY: The question is under consideration.

WAR OFFICE REORGANISATION COMMITTEE REPORT.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the Committee on the Reorganisation of the War Office has yet reported; and, if so, when the Report will be presented to Parliament.

LORD STANLEY: The Committee has reported, but the evidence is not yet ready for publication.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): Seeing the importance of the bearing this Report will have on the Army organisation scheme, will the noble Lord consider the advisability of postponing the debate on the Army resolution?

LORD STANLEY: No, Sir.

PAY OF PRIVATE SOLDIERS.

SIR SAVILE CROSSLEY (Halifax): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will give details showing how the amount of 30s. a week now received by the British soldier is arrived at.

LORD STANLEY: This question doubtless refers to a statement of my right hon. friend the Chief Secretary in his speech the other night, and the question, I think, might therefore be addressed to him.

SOLDIERS' PAY; DEDUCTIONS.

LORD HENRY BENTINCK (Nottingham, S.): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether his attention has been called to the fact that, in addition to the varying charges for tailors' and shoemakers' bills, the pay of a private soldier almost invariably suffers deductions under the following heads: 1s. 3d. per month for washing, 1d. per month for hair cutting, 2d. for library subscription per month, 2d. for rifle club per month, and 2d. for cricket club per month; and whether he will consider the advisability of some or all of these charges being borne in future by the State.

LORD STANLEY: The deduction from a soldier's pay, with the addition of that for upkeep of kit, are on the average as stated in the question, and amount in the total to about 2d. a day. To throw this charge on the State would involve an addition of about £600,000. Some of these charges, as the House will appreciate, are for recreation rather than for necessities, and unless the whole terms of remuneration of the private soldier were to be re-considered, the Secretary of State could not undertake to deal with them.

CAPTAIN NORTON: Does the noble Lord consider hair cutting a recreation?

SUFFOLK RIFLE ASSOCIATION.

MR. F. W. WILSON (Norfolk, Mid): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he is aware that the Suffolk Rifle Association has been allowed to draw five rounds for every efficient Volunteer for use at the annual rifle meeting, an allowance being made for empty cartridge cases returned, which, on the last occasion when a meeting was held, amounted to 19s. 9d.; and can he explain why,



though rifle meetings have been discontinued on account of many ranges being closed, and therefore no cartridges were used, 19s. 9d. for empty cases has been returned by the War Office ever since.

LORD STANLEY: The hon. Member has evidently been misinformed. The last payment to the association for empty cartridge cases was made in 1899, and amounted to 13s. 11d., and not 19s. 9d.

CHINA;WAR HONOURS FOR THE TROOPS.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if it is contemplated to confer any honours in respect of the services of the Royal Welsh Fusiliers and other land forces in China, bearing in mind that those earned by the Royal Navy have been already conferred.

LORD STANLEY: Despatches on the subject have been received, and the question of rewards is now being considered.

HONG KONG CHAPLAIN.

MR. BRODIE HOARE (Hampstead): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether any chaplain has been appointed to Hong Kong in place of the former chaplain who resigned in October last; whether he has received notice that the arrangement by which the duty has been done by refugee missionaries will terminate on 30th June; how many European troops, with women and children, are now quartered in Hong Kong; has he received any communication from the general in command on the subject; and what steps have been taken to supply the duty.

LORD STANLEY: A chaplain is under orders to proceed to Hong Kong. No chaplain has been hitherto available owing to the number employed in South Africa. 1,810 of all ranks, 63 women, and 115 children are quartered in Hong Kong. Communications on this subject have been received from the general officer commanding.

INDIA;CENTRAL PROVINCES;NEW BISHOPRIC.

MR. CAINE (Cornwall, Camborne): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if it is intended to establish a bishopric in the Central Provinces of India; and, if so, what cost will it involve to the Indian Exchequer.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): I have not been officially informed of the intention to establish a bishopric in the Central Provinces, but I have reason to think that such a step is contemplated. If established, it will involve no expenditure from Indian revenues in excess of the existing arrangements.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): Is it to be a Mohammedan or a Protestant bishopric?  
[No answer was returned.]

FAMINE IN INDIA.

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he can explain why telegrams from the Viceroy regarding the progress of famine in India have not for some weeks past been communicated to the British press, and whether he will state what is the present condition of the famine districts and the number of persons in receipt of relief at the present time in each of them separately.

LORD G. HAMILTON: (1) The communication of the official famine telegrams to the

press was discontinued about three months ago, when the number of persons on relief had become comparatively very small. As it is now increasing, the publication will be resumed. (2) Owing to failure of spring crops, through deficiency of winter rains, serious scarcity prevails in parts of the Bombay Presidency, Bombay Native States, and Baroda, though the distress, I am glad to say, is much less than was expected three months back. Outside the Bombay Presidency and Native States scarcity does not prevail to any considerable extent. The numbers on relief, as telegraphed by the Viceroy, on 14th May, are: Bombay, 312,000; Bombay Native States, 25,000; Baroda, 21,000; Hyderabad, 12,000; Madras, 6,000; Central Native States, 4,000; Central Provinces, 1,000: total, 381,000.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Are these places adequately supplied with Protestant bishops?

[No answer was returned.]

#### UGANDA RAILWAY.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES (Swansea District): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether Colonel Gracey, R.E., has made his report upon the Uganda Railway; if so, whether he can now form an idea as to the date when the undertaking will be completed, and will he lay the Report upon the Table.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRANBORNE, Rochester): The Report referred to has been received, but not considered, by the Secretary of State, and therefore I am unable at present to answer the first part of the question. Perhaps the hon. Member would repeat it. Colonel Gracey anticipates that the rails will reach the lake by the end of October.

#### BRITISH POST OFFICES IN TURKEY.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he

is in a position to give the House further information regarding the difficulties with Turkey in respect to the British post offices in that country.

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: I am not in a position to give any further information to the House at present. The Governments of the Powers concerned are acting in concert.

#### INCOME TAX ABATEMENT.

MR. CAREW (Meath, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he is able to say what is the loss at the present time, actual or estimated, to the Revenue per penny of income tax levied, in consequence of the several allowances, exemptions, and abatements now made in the levying of income tax; and what would be the estimated gain to the revenue if all incomes under £100 were free, and all incomes over £100 were subject to the full tax of 1s. 2d. in the £; what is the number of persons who now obtain exemption from income tax owing to their incomes being under the £160 limit; and what is the number of persons who obtain abatements of income tax owing to their several incomes being below the several limits up to £700 a year.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): I am afraid I cannot give the hon. Member much of the information for which he asks. The latest complete information on the subject is that for the year 1898-99, and appears on pages 122 and 123 of the forty-third Report of the Board of

Inland Revenue. Any estimate of the number and total amount of incomes between £;100 and £;160 could only be a guess; and the number of persons who obtained exemption by reason of their incomes being under £;160 is not known. The number of abatements under all the schedules allowed in the year 1898&#x2013;99 was 525,361, which, at the then rate of the tax, 8d. in the £;1, amounted to about £;2,765,000.

#### DEATH DUTIES ON OFFICERS' ESTATES.

THE MASTER OF ELIBANK (Edinburgh, Midlothian): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will state the total amount derived from death duties levied on the estates of officers of the Regular and Auxiliary forces who have been killed in action or have died of disease while serving in South Africa, on the West Coast of Africa, and in China since October, 1899.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: No separate account has been kept of the amount derived from death duties on these particular estates.

#### SUGAR DUTY;LOW GRADE TREACLE.

MR. CHARLES M'ARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that a quantity of low grade treacle, worth about 3s. 6d. per cwt., is imported into the United Kingdom not for human consumption but for cattle feeding, being used either direct by farmers or in the manufacture of compound cake; and, seeing that it has been represented to him that a duty of 2s. per cwt. upon this article, being 57 per cent. upon its cost, would press with such severity as to be practically prohibitive, whether it is intended under proper safeguards to admit treacle for cattle feeding purposes duty free.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I am aware that some low grade treacle is imported for cattle feeding, though, according to the best statistics that are available, a very small amount;less than 1 per cent. of the total imports of molasses;is entered at such a low price (3s. 6d.) as that named in the question. I am considering whether it will be desirable to lower the duty on such treacle; but I have no intention of proposing to admit it duty free.

#### SUGAR DUTY ON PEPPERMINT CREAMS.

MR. PIRIE: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that a consignment of peppermint creams, imported from America via Glasgow for a firm in Aberdeen, has been detained by the Customs inspectors in Glasgow since about 15th April in order that a sample should be sent to Somerset House, so that the proportion of sugar on which duty would have to be paid might be ascertained; that the firm in question has requested leave to pay full duty and take afterwards what rebate might be given, so as to secure delivery of the goods, but this request has been refused; and, in view of the fact that in the meanwhile the firm is being put to considerable loss from its being unable to fulfil its orders, the deterioration of the goods, and the locking up of their money value, he will give instructions which will meet this or similar cases in future.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I am afraid it is quite impossible for me to answer a question of this sort, which obviously involves local inquiries, without longer notice than the hon. Member has given me. I will make inquiry and communicate

with the hon. Member.

#### SUGAR DUTY;RETURNS.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can arrange to state in the Board of Trade Monthly Returns henceforth the quantity of sugar paying duty under each degree of the polariscopic scale.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): As I informed the hon. Member on Thursday last, this question is being considered by the Board of Trade and Customs, but I may say that I am not prepared, without further experience, to add such copious details to the Monthly Trade Accounts as are suggested by the hon. Member.

#### GLUCOSE DUTY.

MR. BARTLEY: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, having regard to the fact that since the 19th April no duty has been charged on English-made glucose, that it has been announced that no duty will be charged on this English-made glucose until the 1st July next, and that large supplies of glucose are being thus made and supplied for manufacturing purposes free of duty, whether steps will be taken to prevent this loss to the revenue and advantage to some branches of the trade over others.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I regret the inequality of treatment of manufactured and imported glucose, resulting from the delay in levying the Excise duty, but it is inevitable, because the Excise duty cannot be levied without a considerable amount of machinery for regulating the process of manufacture. I am considering whether it will be possible to fix an earlier date than the 1st of July.

#### COAL DUTY;INCIDENCE ON DIFFERENT QUALITIES OF COAL.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if his attention has been called to the unequal incidence of the coal tax of 1s. per ton on exported coal, irrespective of value, when the coal is of cheap quality, like that raised in Llanelly and other districts; and, if so, whether he is prepared to take into his consideration the alteration of his scheme so as to prevent this inequality.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: My attention has been called to this matter. If the principle of a duty on exported coal were accepted by the trade, and they proposed to me a scheme for some alleviation of the duty on the cheapest kind of coal, I would consider it; but of course I could not agree to anything which would destroy the yield of the duty.

#### LONDON BARMAIDS;HOURS OF LABOUR.

MR. SAMUEL SMITH (Flintshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to the long hours of work required from barmaids in London, averaging in some cases fifteen, sixteen, and eighteen hours per day, and 100 hours per week; and whether he can take steps, by legislation or otherwise, to put a stop to these hours of work.

\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): This question forms part, and not the least difficult part, of the problem of the hours of shop assistants generally. If the cases indicated by the hon. Member do not come within the Shop Hours Act of 1892, legislation would seem to be

necessary in order to deal with them, and I am afraid that I do not see my way to proposing that at present.

#### BREACHES OF THE EXPLOSIVES ACTS.

MR. VAUGHAN DAVIES (Cardigan): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the fact that, under the Explosives Act, 1875, the maximum penalty for any breach of any act or default of the general rules prescribed by the Act in any registered Act, namely, 2s. for every pound of the explosive in respect of which, or being on the premises in which, the offence was committed, is the same in respect of gunpowder as of other explosives which are more dangerous and destructive, bulk for bulk; whether the official reports show that, in the case of such explosives as dynamite and nitro-glycerine, the existing penalty is so inadequate as not to be deterrent; and, if so, whether he can see his way to amend the law on the matter.

\*MR. RITCHIE: Yes, Sir; my attention has been called to this matter. So far as the illegal keeping of explosives in unauthorised places is concerned, I am advised that the penalty is inadequate in regard to dynamite and similar explosives, and if any good opportunity of amending the law in this respect were to present itself I should be very glad to take advantage of it.

#### RAILWAY BRAKE TRIALS.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the brake trials, stated to be impending in the early spring on one of the leading railways, have yet been held; if so, whether the patentees or manufacturers of the chief rival systems were permitted to compete under identical conditions; and whether he is able to announce the results of such competition.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I learn from the Great Western Railway that some trials with their own brake appliances have been made to test the efficiency of the brake power on their own trains. The inquiry did not go further. I shall be happy to show the hon. Member the communication I have received from the company.

#### MANNING OF THE MERCANTILE MARINE.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state the number of ships lost during the last twenty years which were afterwards declared by courts of inquiry to have been undermanned.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The number of ships belonging to the United Kingdom lost during the last twenty years which were afterwards declared by courts of inquiry to have been undermanned, insufficiently or unsatisfactorily manned, was fifty-one, but in no case did the court attribute the loss of the vessel directly or solely to undermanning?

#### A.B. SEAMEN; PROOF OF SERVICE; CONTINUOUS DISCHARGES.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the shipping master at Liverpool or other ports has the power of asking for proof of service of persons tendering themselves as able seamen; and whether men are shipped as A.B.'s who have given no proof that they are so.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The superintendents at the ports are instructed to ask for proof of the service of persons proposed to be shipped as able seamen, and, if

such proof is not forthcoming, to place the letters N.P. (not proved) against their name in the agreement. There is no doubt that a considerable number of men are shipped as A.B.'s who for some reason are not able to prove their service, but this, I am advised, is not a matter in which I have any power to interfere.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether we are to understand that the Board of Trade has no power to prevent masters from taking as members of their crews men who are not qualified as able seamen, and whether, if that is the case, this being such a serious matter, the right hon. Gentleman will consider the advisability of acquiring such powers for his Department?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The Board of Trade has no powers in this matter beyond what I have described to the hon. Gentleman. Whether we should go further is a matter for consideration.

COLONEL DENNY (Kilmarnock Burghs): May I ask whether it is not the case that the Board of Trade have now adopted a form of continuous discharge which will in future very largely prove whether a man is an able seaman or not?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Yes, Sir, that is the case, and I hope the provisions with respect to a continuous discharge will operate usefully in that direction.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: In view of the number of ships being lost, will the right hon. Gentleman consider the advisability of obtaining powers for the Board of Trade;

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The right hon. Gentleman has already answered that question.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: In consequence of the reply, and in view of the number of lives lost, I will at the earliest opportunity call attention to the question of the undermanning of ships by the shipping of men who are not sailors at all.

COMMITTEE ON MANNING.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether there is any reason why the recommendations of the Committee on Manning, which were published in 1896, have not been carried out.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The hon. Member does not appear to be aware that an Act was passed in 1897, and instructions to the Board's officers issued under it, to carry into effect the two recommendations of the Committee which commanded unanimous agreement; namely, to provide for the detention of undermanned ships, and to secure a minimum effective watch. Steps have also been taken to introduce continuous discharge certificates for seamen, and to encourage the employment of boy sailors. With regard to other recommendations of the Committee, great differences of opinion were disclosed, and the Board of Trade did not consider that a sufficiently clear case had been made out to make an attempt to deal with them desirable.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Will the right hon. Gentleman induce the Government to appoint a Select Committee to inquire into the matter?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: No, Sir; I see no necessity for that.

LOSS OF THE "MOEL TRYRAN."

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the finding of the court of inquiry on the loss of the ship "Moel Tryran" in January, 1901, which declared that the vessel was

not properly ballasted, and that the court could not too strongly condemn the practice of sending a ship to sea in this condition, and whether the Board of Trade has taken any steps in reference to the finding of this court of inquiry. MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Yes, Sir; my attention has been called to the case to which the hon. Member refers, and I am in communication with the owners and their solicitors on the subject before I decide whether it is desirable for me to take any steps in the matter.

#### BUTTER ADULTERATION.

MR. ARCHDALE (Fermanagh, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether his attention has been called to the recent prosecutions at Limerick and the Potteries for selling butter containing an excessive quantity of water, and the fines imposed in each case; whether he is aware that the firm so convicted have stores all over England, trading under two names; that they, last week, were prosecuted before the Birmingham Police Court for a similar offence, and the magistrates refused to decide the case, awaiting the decision of the defendants to appeal; and that the firm have a manufactory in the East End of London, where they turn out about sixty tons of this so-called butter weekly and distribute it over the country as pure butter; and will he undertake to consider whether means can be adopted by which this fraud on the public can be prevented.

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.): At the same time may I ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he is aware that a patented process is now on the market by which water may be fraudulently added to butter, and that thousands of tons of foreign butter thus treated are sold monthly; and, if so, what steps he is taking to prevent the further sale of such process or machines connected therewith, and to prevent the further use of those machines already sold.

\*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): I may perhaps reply at the same time to the question which stands on the Paper in the name of the hon. Member for South Kilkenny. We have official knowledge of one factory in Finsbury in which butter is mixed with milk by a mechanical process, and we are following up information supplied to us as to the existence of others. The Finsbury firm has a very large number of depots scattered over the country, and the quantity sold is presumably large. I have no power to send an inspector into such a factory, though one was admitted into the Finsbury factory on sufferance. Nor have I power to stop the sale of butter so manipulated. But we have been acting in concert with various local authorities to have the legality of the sale of butter so treated tested in a court of law. A conviction was recorded against the Finsbury company last Wednesday at Longton, against which the defendants have given notice of appeal. There are three prosecutions pending. The whole question points to the necessity for fixing a standard of butter, which I hope to be able to do without any avoidable delay.

MR. KEARLEY: Is it not the fact that under the Act passed two years ago special powers were given to the Board of Agriculture to set up a butter standard, and if that had been done these frauds would have been prevented?

\*MR. HANBURY: I do not know whether the frauds would have been prevented, but I hope, as I said, to fix a standard very shortly.

#### PAY OF CENSUS ENUMERATORS.

MR. SCHWANN: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board, seeing that the enumerators for the late

Census commenced their work about seven weeks ago, and handed in their enumeration books, completed, five weeks ago, and that some of the returns have been compiled and issued, whether arrangements can be made to pay at once the remuneration of the enumerators, who are not all able to withstand delay in payment.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): The enumerators are paid through the superintendent registrars. I am informed by the Registrar General that payment has been made to 495 of the 636 superintendent registrars, and that it is anticipated that all the cases will be dealt with by the end of the week. The enumerators were informed before appointment that it was improbable they could all be paid before the middle or end of this month.

MR. MOONEY (Dublin Co., S.): On behalf of the hon. Member for St. Patrick Division of Dublin, I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will state the approximate cost of Census enumerators respectively in England, Scotland, and Wales, and also how much approximately is paid by way of extra remuneration for the same work to the Irish police.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): The amounts provided in the current Estimates for Census enumerators are: England and Wales, £114,000; Scotland, £26,000. It is not possible to say what proportion of these sums is paid for work corresponding to that done by the constabulary in Ireland, as the system is much more centralised in Ireland than in Great Britain; but the provision in the current estimates for "expenses of enumeration" in Ireland is £3,322, which is mainly for subsistence allowances to the constabulary engaged. The work of distributing and collecting Census papers is part of the ordinary duties of the constabulary, covered by their ordinary wages.

#### HOUSE OF COMMONS; LOBBIES AND CORRIDORS; VENTILATION.

SIR SAVILE CROSSLEY: I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether he could arrange for the admission of fresh air into the House lobbies and corridors.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): A Committee is now sitting on this question, and if the hon. Baronet can give us any evidence we shall be glad to hear him.

#### UNCERTIFIED DEATHS IN INVERNESS-SHIRE.

MR. JOHN DEWAR (Inverness-shire): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the Secretary for Scotland is aware that the Medical Officer for Health for Inverness-shire in his report recently issued calls special attention to the fact that during the last ten years there have been as many as 3,967 uncertified deaths in the county; and that during last year eighty deaths were registered in the parish of Duirinish, of which fifty-one were uncertified by a medical attendant; that in Kilmuir forty-seven deaths were registered, of which thirty-three were uncertified; and that in South Uist, of eighty-five deaths registered, fifty-seven were uncertified; and, that taking the entire county,



nearly 400 persons were buried during the year whose deaths had not been certified by a member of the medical profession; and whether, in view of these facts, the Secretary for Scotland will introduce legislation on the subject so soon as opportunity offers in order to remedy these conditions.

\*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): The answer to the first paragraph of the hon. Member's question is in the affirmative. As I stated the other day in reply to the hon. Member for Ross-shire, a medical certificate of death is not a necessary condition of burial in any part of Scotland, and the Government are not at present prepared to legislate on the subject.

#### SCHOOL CERTIFICATES IN SCOTLAND.

MR. TENNANT (Berwickshire): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether he would be willing to grant a Return showing for Scotland and for such large towns as Edinburgh, Glasgow, Dundee, and Aberdeen, how many children leave school because they are fourteen years old, how many because they have labour certificates, and how many because they have merit certificates.

\*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: In answer to the hon. Member's question, I am informed that the number of merit certificates gained each year might be given. It would also be possible to calculate approximately the number of children who leave school on reaching the age of fourteen. School boards might also be able to give the number of labour certificates gained in their own district. But it would be impossible to say which reason actuated each child in leaving school. In view of the change contemplated in the Bill now before the House, such a Return, which would necessarily be to some extent problematical, seems scarcely to be worth the labour it would involve.

#### EDUCATIONAL FEE GRANTS IN SCOTLAND.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether he can state the amounts received in each of the financial years ending on 31st March, 1900 and 1901 in respect of fee grant in State-aided schools in Scotland under the provisions of Sub-section (1) of Section 1 of the Education and Local Taxation Account (Scotland) Act, 1892, of Sub-section (6) of Section 2 of the same Act, and of Section 2 of the Local Taxation (Customs and Excise) Act, 1890.

\*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The amount received in the financial year ended 31st March, 1900, under Section 1, Sub-section (1), of the Education and Local Taxation Account (Scotland) Act, 1892, was £;323,633, and under Section 2, Sub-section (6), of the same Act, £;5,379 12s. 2d. Under Section 2 of the Local Taxation (Customs and Excise) Act, 1890, nothing was paid until the expiry of that financial year, as it was for the advantage of the Scottish schools that the £;40,000 under that section should not diminish the draft on the parliamentary grant. In the year ended 31st March, 1901, the amount received, under Section 1 Sub-section (1), of the Education and Local Taxation Account (Scotland) Act, 1892, was £;314,933; under Section 2, Sub-section (6), of the same Act, £;64,036 15s. 5d.; and under Section 2 of the Local Taxation (Customs and Excise, Act, 1890, £;40,000.

MR. CALDWELL: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if he can state the amount paid into the Local Taxation (Scotland) Account in each of the years ending 31st

March, 1900 and 1901 respectively in respect of each of Local Taxation Licences and Estate Duty; also the average attendance in State-aided schools in Scotland on which fee grant at the rate of 10s. per child was paid in each of the said two years; and what balance, if any, was standing at the credit of the fee grant fund on 31st March, 1901, after allowing for the settlement of all claims then due on the fund.

\*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The amounts paid into the Local Taxation (Scotland) Account in the year ending 31st March, 1900 were in respect of Local Taxation Licences £;361,212 15s. 2d., and in respect of Estate Duty £;514,939 4s. 9d., of which £;182,960 7s. 9d. was paid under the Agricultural Rates (Scotland) Act, 1896. The amounts paid in in the year ending 31st March, 1901 were in respect of Local Taxation Licences £;364,665 18s. 6d., and in respect of Estate Duty £;481,003 2s. 8d., of which £;182,499 5s. 9d. was paid under the Agricultural Rates, Etc., (Scotland) Act 1896. The Parliamentary fee grant for 1899&#x2013;1900 was calculated on an average attendance of 631,515 at 10s.; for 1900&#x2013;1901 on an average attendance of 629,867 at 10s.; and in each case was completely spent. In the former year, fee grant, including that from the Local Taxation Account, was paid at 12s. on an average attendance of 626,284; and for the year ended 31st March, 1901, the payments for which are not yet completed, it is estimated that the 12s. payment will be made on an average attendance of about 631,000. The amount standing to the credit of the Fee Grant Account on 31st March, 1901, after deducting the amount since paid out of the fund, is £;59,799 5s. 5d.

#### GOVERNMENT PRINTING CONTRACTS IN SCOTLAND.

\*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether his attention has been called to the payment of less than the recognised wage in the case of contracts for Government printing to Messrs. Neill and Company; whether Messrs. Neill and Company have ceased to be the Government printers for Scotland; and under what department is the supervision of the fair wage principle in the case of the successors of Messrs. Neill as regards the work for the Registry of Sasines produced in the old Register House, Edinburgh.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I have received no complaints upon this subject from any of the parties concerned. Messrs. Neill and Company have not ceased to do Government printing, but a part of the contracts formerly held by them are now held by another firm. The duty of seeing that the fair wages clause is observed in these cases rests, primarily with the Controller of the Stationery Office, and in case of appeal with the Board of Treasury. I have made inquiry into the cases referred to in, the question, but my information is to the effect that the clause is not being infringed.

#### HIGH COURTS OF JUSTICE CLERKS; RETIREMENT RULES.

MR. KEARLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, in view of the statement made by the Secretary to the Treasury on 28th May, 1900, that differences of opinion existed between the Lord Chancellor, the late Lord Chief Justice, and the late Master of the Rolls as to the application of the retirement rules of the Ridley Commission to the clerks of the several divisions

of the High Court, he will ascertain whether such difference of view prevails among those now holding these posts; and whether they can now be induced by the Treasury to apply the same rules of retirement among these clerks as prevail in all other public offices; whether he is aware that there were twenty-five clerks on 5th April, 1900, between sixty-five and seventy-five years of age, with thirty-two to fifty-four years service; and that there were six clerks of over twenty years seniority serving in the same class and on the same pay as at time of entry, with ages ranging from forty to seventy-one years; and whether, considering the strong opinion expressed by the judge of the Probate Court, in common with the late Lord Herschell, in favour of retirement rules working automatically, he can state what action he proposes to take.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I am informed by the Lord Chancellor that owing to the doubts which have been expressed in high legal quarters as to the power to make a general rule applicable to the clerks appointed under the Judicature Acts, it would now be impossible to deal with this question without legislation. This view appears to have been shared by the late Lord Herschell, as he included this subject in a Bill brought in by him to amend the Judicature Acts.

LONDON TELEPHONE SERVICE.

MR. BANBURY (Camberwell, Peckham): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he will press forward the work of laying the telephone wires which has now been going on for nearly a year; and also give instructions that all pipes and materials shall be unloaded at night, as at present the streets are nearly impassable, and when unloading is going on are quite impassable.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General asks me to assure my hon. friend that everything is being done to press forward the work of laying the telephone wires in London, and that most of the main lines have already been completed. He understood that the unloading of pipes and materials was being done early in the morning, but he will make further inquiry in view of my hon. friend's question.

MR. BARTLEY: When will the system be in working order?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I think, if my memory serves me right, towards the end of the present year.

POSTMASTERSHIPS.

MR. SCHWANN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he can state the number of postmaster ships and sub-postmasterships awarded in England not exceeding £150 per annum since June, 1897, and whether awarded to sorters, telegraphists, postmen, or persons outside the Department, and how many to each.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: There have been sixty-two such appointments to postmasterships in England and Wales since the date named, awarded as follows: To telegraphists, 1; outsiders, 2; to the provincial class of sorting clerk and telegraphist, 34; to other officers of the Department, 25. Similar information as to sub-postmasterships is not available.

CIVIL SERVICE STAFF CORPS.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether a staff clerk in the permanent Civil Service, who was promoted from the second division in 1895 to a scale of salary rising from £350 to £450 per annum, is recognised by the Treasury as being a clerk of the upper division, as defined by Clause 1 of the Order in Council of 15th August, 1890; and, if not, will he state under what Order in Council or authority such a clerk is considered to be deprived of the status of the upper division.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The staff post described in the question does not form part of the upper division. It is distinguished from that division by the Treasury Minute of 10th August, 1889; the holder is not required to possess an upper division certificate. The Order in Council of 15th August, 1890, is not limited to the upper division, but applies to all officers on scales of salary in excess of that of the second division.

#### ACHONRY DISTURBANCES.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland will he explain why, on the 5th May last, a police force of over fifty dispersed a meeting of the United Irish League at Achonry, County Sligo, and on what evidence the meeting was proclaimed; under what authority, in spite of the protest of the chairman

against the dispersal of the meeting, the officer in charge ordered the police to fix bayonets and advance to the platform; is he aware that on the same occasion the police attacked a band on its way to the meeting and batoned the people following the band, and attacked Patrick O'Neill, of Achonry, and his son in their own garden; and if he can give the number of the people injured on this occasion, and whether he will cause further inquiry to be made into the matter.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): No meeting was proclaimed on the 6th May, but on the previous day a disorderly crowd attempted a repetition of the unlawful demonstrations lately organised against certain persons in this locality. The police, who were violently assailed with sticks and stones on three occasions, dispersed the mob with truncheons. The order to fix bayonets (which were not used) was given by the district inspector, who considered it necessary to adopt this course in view of information received as to the intentions of the crowd and of their threatening demeanour. I am inquiring further into the necessity of this order, but full accounts which have reached me prove that the district inspector and all his force exercised exemplary self-control during a trying day. I am unable to say how many were injured on the occasion; a number of police, however, were struck. Patrick O'Neill and his son stoned the police, and the former received a blow from a baton.

MR. O'DOWD: Has the right hon. Gentleman received any representation from the local authorities on the subject?

MR. WYNDHAM: No, Sir.

MR. O'DOWD: Were orders given to the police to baton the people?

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order—

GOVERNMENT ANALYST FOR IRELAND.

MR. MOONEY: On behalf of the hon. Member for the St. Patrick Division of Dublin,

I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether a Government analyst and chemist to the Lord Lieutenant will be appointed in Ireland, seeing that the Somerset House analyst is obliged to do Irish work, and that in certain cases the journey renders the article almost unfit for analysis.

MR. WYNDHAM: The number of articles sent from Ireland to the Government laboratory at Somerset House is very small, consisting usually of samples of milk and an occasional sample of whiskey. The other articles are mainly drinking waters. There is no reason to suppose that the time occupied by the journey renders the article "almost unfit for analysis."

#### DUBLIN SCIENCE AND ART BUILDING.

MR. MOONEY: On behalf of the hon. Member for the St. Patrick Division of Dublin I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the site allotted by the Commissioners for the erection of the building of the Science and Art Department in Dublin is still available, and whether he can explain the delay in commencing the building.

MR. WYNDHAM: The site selected is still available. Provision is made in the Estimates for the current year in respect of the preliminary measures towards the erection of the new college. The report of the committee on the requirements of the college is now before the Board of Works, who will proceed to work out a scheme with all due speed. There are some difficulties of a practical nature which will prevent operations from proceeding very rapidly.

#### CAVAN AND MONAGHAN LUNATIC ASYLUM.

MR. DALY (Monaghan, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the committee of the Monaghan County Council at their last meeting passed a resolution regretting the expenditure of the ratepayers' money on the Cavan and Monaghan Lunatic Asylum, which has been going on for the past two years, and whether he will order an inquiry as to the need for the work being carried out.

MR. WYNDHAM: This matter is now under consideration by the Joint Asylum Committee, who have deputed a sub-committee to investigate the expenditure, and, if necessary, to suspend work.

#### FAIR RENT APPEALS IN COUNTY MONAGHAN.

MR. FLYNN (Cork Co., N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the observations made by Mr. Justice Meredith at the recent Land Sessions in Monaghan, when he commented strongly upon the increase in the number of appeals from the decisions of the sub-commissioners fixing fair rents, and complained of the overburdening of the Land Court and putting the State to unnecessary expense in taking appeals where the sub-commissioners had done their duty between both parties; is he aware that out of 154 cases listed at the sessions 81 were cases in which the judicial rent fixed by the sub-commissioners were under £10 and 29 under £5; and, whether, in view of the learned judge's remarks, the delay to the tenants, and the expense to the State, the Government will take steps to limit the right of appeal from the decisions of the sub-commissioners.

MR. WYNDHAM: The statements in the first and second paragraphs are generally

correct. The suggestion in the last paragraph, that the absolute right of appeal which the 44th Section of the Act of 1881 confers in every case, should be limited, could only be effected by legislation.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY;ISSUE OF LEE-METFORD RIFLES.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, in view of the fact that a number of officers and non-commissioned officers of the Royal Irish Constabulary have gone to the School of Musketry at Hythe for the purpose of rifle drill and practice, will he say whether it is intended to arm the Royal Irish Constabulary with the Lee-Metford rifle in place of the Martini-Henry rifle at present in use; and, if so, will the pay and other allowances of the members of the force as regards members joining in future be assimilated to the

pay and allowances of non-commissioned officers and men of the Regular Army.

MR. WYNDHAM: There is no intention, at present, to re-arm the constabulary with Lee-Metfords. The course at Hythe comprises the theoretical principles of musketry. The method of the instruction given is of more importance than the pattern of rifle employed, and there is no sufficient ground for forming a special Martini-Henry class with special instructors.

MR. FLYNN: What about the last paragraph? Are they to be armed? Will they be paid as a military force?

MR. WYNDHAM: There is no intention of making them a military force.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Will the right hon. Gentleman now tell me that the men now undergoing a course of instruction at Hythe are not using the Lee-Metford rifles?

MR. WYNDHAM: I fully answered that the other day. They are at Hythe for a course of musketry.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): Who is it intended to shoot with these rifles?

CROWN APPOINTMENTS IN IRELAND;ROMAN CATHOLICS.

MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the number of Roman Catholics holding appointments under the Crown, legal or judicial, in the counties of Derry, Tyrone, and Donegal; and whether he will also state the proportion the Roman Catholic population in each of these counties bears to the other religious denominations.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have no official information on the religions of persons holding Crown appointments, except in the cases of justices of the peace and the police. Of the former, there are thirty-five, forty-six, and sixty-five Roman Catholics; 106, 202, and 152 Protestants, respectively, in the counties named. The police number 131, 142, and 315 Roman Catholics, and 102, 98, and 141 Protestants. The information desired in the second paragraph will be found in the Census Returns.

KINSALE FISHERIES;DESTRUCTION OF HERRINGS.

MR. TENNANT: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the deliberate destruction of about £;1,000 worth of herrings at the entrance of Kinsale Harbour on Thursday the 9th instant, owing to the fact that there was no market for the fish, numbering,

approximately, 4,000,000 herrings; and whether it would be possible to procure some means of transit in such cases whereby a market could be obtained elsewhere for this valuable food supply when the local market has been glutted.

MR. WYNDHAM: It is a fact that a quantity of herrings was thrown overboard by Scotch herring boats now fishing at Kinsale. The merchants who purchase herrings provide steamers for their transport to market. It is, I am informed, impossible to provide against a glut of herrings of inferior quality, which occurs perhaps only once in a season.

#### VACANT INSPECTORSHIP OF IRISH FISHERIES.

\*MR. CREAN (Cork, S.E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether Mr. W. Lane, a Cork brewer, has been appointed Inspector of Irish Fisheries in place of Mr. Cecil Roche, resigned; and, if so, will he state on whose recommendation Mr. Lane has been appointed, and what qualification, if any, he has for the position.

MR. WYNDHAM: No appointment has yet been made to the vacant office.

#### CADWALLADER EDWARD'S ESTATE.

MR. FFRENCH (Wexford, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that last June the parties interested in Cadwallader Edward's estate, in Wexford County, agreed to sell at eighteen years purchase; that an inspection was made then by the Land Commission inspector

to sanction the advance to enable the tenants to purchase, but that the land judge, in consequence of one objection, applied the 40th section, so that a new inspection had to be made, after which no report was sent by the Land Commission to the judge; is he aware that the Land Commission stated on 16th April that the report was deferred by the suspension of advances in Wexford County, but that the commissioners could send in their report to the judge, but wrote on the 7th May that no such report could now be sent in; will the Land Commission be asked to send in the report at once; and what steps will the Government take to facilitate the sales of properties like this in the county of Wexford.

MR. WYNDHAM: The statements in the first paragraph are correct. The report of the Land Commission under Section 40 has now been sent to the land judge, who has been informed that the commissioners are in a position to make the advances suggested in their report, which previously they were unable to do.

MR. FFRENCH: What has caused the delay in furnishing the funds?

MR. WYNDHAM: The limit of credit standing to the credit of the constituencies had been reached, and application had to be made before further funds could be granted.

MR. FFRENCH: Will the right hon. Gentleman introduce a Bill dealing with this difficulty?

MR. WYNDHAM: I have a Bill, and shall be glad to introduce it.

#### POLICE RETIREMENT REGULATIONS.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state how many years a policeman must serve before he is entitled to retire on a pension; whether he is aware that within recent years many policemen have retired from the police force in County

Longford at a comparatively early age, and without sufficient cause as to physical unfitness to continue doing duty; whether such vacancies are being filled by recruiting, contrary to the promise of his predecessor in office in June, 1896; and whether there is any power to prevent the crowding of Irish small towns with police pensioners, many of whom are fully competent to continue discharging the duties for which they enlisted.

MR. WYNDHAM: Twenty-five years, unless incapacitated in the meantime by sickness or injury. Eight men have retired on pension in the county of Longford during the past two years. Such vacancies are filled by recruiting. No promise was given in 1896 of the nature indicated. Constabulary pensioners, like other members of the community, are at liberty to reside where they like.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: The question on the Paper is not in the form in which I handed it to the clerk, and does not now convey my meaning. I wish to know whether in the case of the men who have been superannuated the authorities were satisfied that they were incapacitated from further service by illness or any other cause.

MR. WYNDHAM: I understand that they retired in the ordinary way, after twenty-five years service.

MR. FLYNN: Is it not a fact that an undertaking was given that police recruiting should proceed but slowly?

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes; and it has been fulfilled. The Royal Irish Constabulary establishment is lower now than then.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY; VICEREGAL COMMISSION.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if Messrs. Holmes and Starkie are members of the Viceregal Commission who are to sit in Dublin on the 20th May to inquire into the position of the Royal Irish Constabulary; is Mr. Holmes the Treasurer Remembrancer for Ireland, who sat on a similar Commission in 1883, or is he the President of the Board of Works; is Mr. Starkie a resident magistrate; and have any Commissioners been appointed who are not in the pay of the Government, and which of them is understood to represent the rank and file of the constabulary.

MR. WYNDHAM: The members of the Committee are Colonel Sir C. E. Howard Vincent (Chairman), Mr. R. W. A. Holmes (Treasurer Remembrancer), and Mr. R. F. Starkie (Resident Magistrate). Mr. Holmes sat on a similar Commission in 1883. Mr. Starkie served in the constabulary for sixteen years prior to his appointment as resident magistrate.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I understood that Sir Howard Vincent was unable to sit on the Commission in consequence of the state of his health.

LABOURERS' COTTAGES IN THE LONGFORD UNION.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state how many of the labourers' cottages and half-acre plots applied for in the union of Longford were refused by the inspector sent down by the Local Government Board, and why this gentleman practically rejected three-fourths of the scheme without any serious objection being made by either the owners or occupiers of land prepared to be taken, or does the inspector



justify his decision on financial or legal grounds; and has the district council any power to appeal against his decision.

MR. WYNDHAM: Thirty-two cottages and thirty-two half-acre plots were approved by the inspector; twenty-five cottages and twenty half-acre plots were withdrawn at the inquiry. The decision as to the cases to be included in or excluded from the Provisional Order rests with the Board, not the inspector. If the district council is of opinion that in any particular case the circumstances are such as would justify the Board in including it in the Provisional Order, the Board will be happy to consider any representations that may be made by the council.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I am much obliged to the right hon. Gentleman. May I ask whether, if application is made, any further expense to the rural district council will be involved.

MR. WYNDHAM: I should like to have notice of that.

MARLBOROUGH STREET (DUBLIN) STORES; BOOKBINDERS' SOCIETY'S COMPLAINT.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if any reply has been received from the Commissioners in Marlborough Street, Dublin, to the complaints of the secretary of the bookbinders' society, forwarded to these Commissioners by him for report, and if so, will he give their reply and will he say what quantity of books were supplied to the Marlborough Street stores for the past twelve months, with their titles, and the names of the publishers and the number supplied by each publisher; and whether the provisions of the Fair Wages Resolution are complied with in their production.

MR. WYNDHAM: So far as I know, the Commissioners have not been approached recently by the bookbinders' society. I received a communication on the 8th May, which I have transmitted for their observations. In reply to the second paragraph, the Commissioners have informed me that they are unable to give such a Return, since it would involve great labour in preparation and could not be completed for a considerable time.

MR. NANNETTI: Will the right hon. Gentleman take steps to see that the resolution is complied with?

MR. WYNDHAM: I have already written a letter on the subject.

IRISH SCHOOL TEACHERS' SALARIES.

MR. REDDY (King's County, Birr): On behalf of the hon. Member for South Galway I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether teachers whose examinations were held before last March were paid salaries for the year ended 31st March, 1901, under the old system, which included class salary, results fees, capitation grant, and balance of residual grant, calculated at the end of each year, or whether they were paid under the new system of consolidated incomes; whether, if paid under the former, such teachers are now to be deprived of the balance of residual grant which was paid in former years, and to which they are entitled; and whether the National Education Commissioners or the Treasury are responsible for this scale of payment.

MR. WYNDHAM: The teachers in question were paid salaries on the old system up to the month of examination, and under the new system for the remainder of the

year. The reply to the second paragraph is in the negative; the grant known as the residual grant is included in the incomes of teachers under the new system.

#### CLANRICARDE ESTATE.

MR. REDDY: On behalf of the hon. Member for East Galway I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state the amount of cost incurred by the Government in carrying out evictions on the Clanricarde estate since June, 1886, till 1900.

MR. WYNDHAM: The expenses incurred by the police in affording protection to the sheriff or his officers on this duty amounted to £;3,523 in the period stated.

#### BIRR AND PORTUMNA LINE.

MR. REDDY: On behalf of the hon. Member for East Galway, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Government will advance £;24,000, the amount required by the Great Southern and Western Railway Company towards restoring and working the Birr and Portumna line.

MR. WYNDHAM: No, Sir.

#### RE-AFFORESTING IN IRELAND.

MR. O'MARA: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state how many acres of land have been acquired for the purpose of re-forestation of the country.

MR. WYNDHAM: Nine hundred and sixty acres.

#### RABIES IN IRELAND.

COLONEL J. M'CALMONT (Antrim, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether, in consideration of the fact that but two cases of rabies have been officially reported as having occurred in Ireland this year, he can now see his way to at any rate relaxing the existing prohibitions in regard to the importation of dogs from Ireland into Great Britain.

\*MR. HANBURY: I am not disposed to undo the excellent work of my predecessor in practically clearing Great Britain of this disease, and until Ireland can show a clean bill of health for some months I see no reason to alter the regulations. The last case of rabies was so recently as the week ending April 20th, in County Cavan, and in the week ending April 27th four dogs were destroyed as having been exposed to infection.

#### IRISH LAND JUDGE'S COURT;RECEIVERS' DEPARTMENT.

MR. MACARTNEY (Antrim, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether estates under receivers in the Land Judge's Court contribute to the expenses of the staff of the receivers' department; and, if so, by how much has the contribution exceeded the expenditure; whether the balance, if any, may be applied to any other object than the expenses of that department; and, if so, how has it been applied, and by whose authority.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: My information is that the expenses, which were intended to be covered by fees in respect of receiver's accounts, have exceeded the receipts from those fees. The question of dealing with a balance has not therefore arisen.

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

\*SIR BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, having regard to the Prime Minister's declaration of last year to the

Agents General for the Australasian Colonies, that the Government makes it a rule not to interfere in questions affecting the subject of marriage with a deceased wife's sister, he will refrain from moving the adjournment of the House to a date posterior to that fixed for the Committee stage on the Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think the suggestion of the hon. Gentleman would meet with general approval in any quarter of the House. In any case a Bill that passes its Second Reading so late as the Bill in which he has a particular interest has not the smallest chance of passing into law in the course of the session.

\*SIR BRAMPTON GURDON: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the Committee on a private Bill cannot be fixed before Whitsuntide, and that the Committee on this Bill has been fixed for the first Wednesday after Whitsuntide?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think the hon. Gentleman is mistaken in that.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): Will the First Lord before the adjournment say what course he intends to take with reference to the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I shall certainly make a statement on that subject either before Whitsuntide or, more probably, shortly after Whitsuntide, when I shall probably have to ask the House for greater facilities for the conduct of business.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. CROMBIE (Kincardineshire): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury what Votes in Class 2 will be taken on Friday, and in what order.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The Votes will be the Privy Council Office, the Charity Commissioners, Civil Service Commissioners, the Exchequer Audit Department, the Friendly Societies, the Lunacy Commissioners, the National Debt Office, and Votes 20, 21, 22, and 23.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Will the right hon. Gentleman include in the list the Vote for the salary of the Under Secretary for the Home Department?

MR. A. T. BALFOUR: No, Sir.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Can we have notice before the Board of Trade Vote is taken, seeing that considerable interest is taken in it?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I always endeavour to give notice at the beginning of the week of what Supply will be taken on the Friday.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Is it intended to take Supply to-morrow week?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That depends on the course of business between now and then.

MR. BARTLEY: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he has made any arrangements for allowing another day for the debate on the Army resolution, seeing that so many hon. Members desire to take part in it?

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY (Shropshire, Newport): Will the right hon. Gentleman bear in mind that many Members of this House who take a deep interest in this question would like, in view of the fact that there is no alternative proposition before the House, to see the debate ended?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think I stated only yesterday that arrangements  
AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Banbury, Frederick George

Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)

Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin

Cayzer, Sir Charles William

Aird, Sir John

Beach, Rt. Hon. Sir M. H. (Bristol)

Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)

Allsopp, Hon. George

Bentinck, Lord Henry C.

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.)

Anson, Sir William Reynell

Blundell, Colonel Henry

Chamberlain, J. A. (Worc'r.)

Archdale, Edward Mervyn

Bond, Edward

Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-

Chapman, Edward

Arrol, Sir William

Boulnois, Edmund

Charrington, Spencer

Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis

Brassey, Albert

Coghill, Douglas Harry

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John

Cohen, Benjamin Louis

Austin, Sir John

Bryce, Rt. Hon. James

Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse

Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy

Brymer, William Ernest

Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole

Bain, Col. James Robert

Bullard, Sir Harry

Compton, Lord Alwyne

Baird, John George Alexander

Buxton, Sydney Charles

Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Balcarres, Lord  
Campbell, Rt Hn J A. (Glasgow)  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Baldwin, Alfred  
Carlile, William Walter  
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)  
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manc'r)  
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.  
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)  
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds)  
Cautley, Henry Strother  
Crossley, Sir Savile

had been made in the ordinary course, and according to well established and most convenient usage, to take a division to-night. This arrangement cannot be broken without inflicting the greatest inconvenience on a very large body of Members. I am painfully aware that a large number of Gentlemen have hitherto been unable to find an opportunity of taking part in the debate, but we have a whole evening still before us, and I hope that the speeches still to be delivered will differ from their predecessors by being of greater brevity. If hon. Gentlemen who are fortunate enough to catch the Speaker's eye will remember that others desire to address the House I am convinced there will be no great difficulty in concluding the discussion. Under these circumstances, and in view of the appeal of my hon. and gallant friend the Member for Newport, who, I know, represents a very large amount of opinion in this House, I do not think it would be possible to upset the arrangements carefully come to some days since.

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE (EXEMPTION FROM THE STANDING ORDER).

Motion made, and Question put, "That the proceedings on the resolution as to Army organisation, if under discussion at twelve o'clock this night, be not interrupted under the Standing Order, Sittings of the House."; (Mr. A. J. Balfour.)

The House divided:;Ayes, 261; Noes, 157. (Division List No. 188.)

Cust, Henry John C.  
Hudson, George Bickersteth  
Plummer, Walter R.  
Dairymple, Sir Charles  
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)  
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp  
Denny, Col.  
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse  
Pretymann, Ernest George  
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.  
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick  
Purvis, Robert  
Dickson, Charles Scott  
Johnston, William (Belfast)

Randles, John S.  
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.  
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)  
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne  
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield  
Kearley, Hudson E.  
Ratcliffe, R. F.  
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred. D.  
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.  
Reid, James (Greenock)  
Dorington, Sir John Edward  
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T (Denbigh)  
Remnant, James Farquharson.  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)  
Renshaw, Charles Bine  
Doxford, Sir William Theodore  
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)  
Rentoul, James Alexander  
Duke, Henry Edward  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge)  
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart  
Lawson, John Grant  
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)  
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas  
Lee, Arthur H (Hants, Fareham)  
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson  
Faber, George Denison  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Robertson, Herb. (Hackney)  
Fardell, Sir T. George  
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie  
Ropner, Colonel Robert  
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward  
Leveson-Grower, Fredk. N. S.  
Round, James  
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r)  
Llewellyn, Evan Henry  
Royds, Clement Molyneux  
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst  
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.  
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander  
Finch, George H.  
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine  
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)

Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham  
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S  
Sharpe, Wm. Edward T.  
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond  
Lonsdale, John Brownlee  
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew  
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon  
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)  
Simeon, Sir Barrington  
Flannery, Sir Fortescue  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)  
Fletcher, Sir Henry  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)  
Skewes-Cox, Thomas  
Flower, Ernest  
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth  
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)  
Forster, Henry William  
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred  
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.  
Foster, Sir Michael (Lond. Univ.  
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W G Ellison  
Spear, John Ward  
Fuller, J. M. F.  
Macdona, John Cumming  
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C R (Northants  
Galloway, William Johnson  
MacIver, David (Liverpool)  
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich)  
Garfit, William  
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert J.  
M'Calmont, Col. H. L. B. (Cams.  
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart  
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.  
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)  
Stroyan, John  
Gordon, Hn J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)  
M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.)  
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley  
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)

M'Killop, Jas. (Stirlingshire)  
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier  
Gordon, Maj Evans (T'w'r Ham.  
Majendie, James A. H.  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.  
Malcolm, Ian  
Talbot, Rt Hn J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.)  
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim  
Martin, Richard Biddulph  
Thorburn, Sir Walter  
Graham, Henry Robert  
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H E (Wigt'n  
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray  
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)  
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire  
Tritton, Charles Ernest  
Greene, Sir E. W (B'y S. Edm'ds)  
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.  
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward  
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)  
Middlemore, John T.  
Valentia, Viscount  
Grenfell, William Henry  
Milward, Col. Victor  
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)  
Greville, Hon. Ronald  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney  
Groves, James Grimble  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.)  
Guthrie, Walter Murray  
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)  
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd  
Hain, Edward  
Morgan, Hn. F. (Monm'thsh.)  
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne  
Hall, Edward Marshall  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Whitmore, Charles Algernon  
Halsey, Thomas Frederick  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset).  
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x  
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford



Williams, Rt Hn J Powell (Birm  
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'derry  
Mount, William Arthur  
Willox, Sir John Archibald  
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robt. Wm.  
Mowbray, Sir Robt Gray C.  
Wills, Sir Frederick  
Harris, Frederick Leverton  
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute  
Wilson, A. S. (York, E. R.)  
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.  
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)  
Wilson, John (Falkirk)  
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.  
Myers, William Henry  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Heath, James (Staffs., N.W.)  
Nicholson, William Graham  
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)  
Helder, Augustus  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath  
Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotter  
O'Neill, Hon. Robt. Torrens  
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm  
Hickman, Sir Alfred  
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay  
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-  
Higginbottom, S. W.  
Palmer, Geo. Wm. (Reading)  
Wrightson, Sir Thomas  
Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampst'd)  
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)  
Wylie, Alexander  
Hoare, Sir Samuel (Norwich)  
Parker, Gilbert  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)  
Pease, Herbert Pike Darlington  
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong  
Hobhouse, Henry, Somerset, E.  
Pemberton, John S. G.  
Young, Commander (Berks, E.).  
Hope, J. F (Sheffield, Brightside  
Percy, Earl  
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham)

Pierpoint, Robert  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;  
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)  
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard  
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
Hozier, Hon. Jas. Henry Cecil  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
NOES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)  
Asher, Alexander  
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)  
Abraham, William (Rhondda)  
Atherley-Jones, L.  
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.  
Allan, William (Gateshead)  
Balfour, Maj. K. R. (Christch.)  
Blake, Edward  
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud)  
Barlow, John Emmott  
Boland, John  
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn)  
Harrington, Timothy  
O'Dowd, John  
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.  
Hayden, John Patrick  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Brigg, John  
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Chas. Seale-  
O'Malley, William  
Broadhurst, Henry  
Healy, Timothy Michael  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Brookfield, Col. Montagu  
Heaton, John Henniker  
Palmer, Sir Chas. M. (Durham)  
Caine, William Sproston  
Helme, Norval Watson  
Partington, Oswald  
Caldwell, James  
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.  
Paulton, James Mellor  
Cameron, Robert  
Holland, William Henry  
Perks, Robert William  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)

Pirie, Duncan V.  
Carew, James Laurence  
Horniman, Frederick John  
Power, Patrick Joseph  
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton  
Jacoby, James Alfred  
Price, Robert John  
Causton, Richard Knight  
Jameson, Major J. Eustace  
Rea, Russell  
Channing, Francis Allston  
Joicey, Sir James  
Reckitt, Harold James  
Churchill, Winston Spencer  
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)  
Reddy, M.  
Clancy, John Joseph  
Jones, David Brynmor (Swans'a  
Redmond, John E. (Waterford  
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready  
Joyce, Michael  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Colville, John  
Kay-Shuttleworth, Rt Hn Sir U  
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries)  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth  
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)  
Craig, Robert Hunter  
Lambert, George  
Roe, Sir Thomas  
Crean, Eugene  
Langley, Batty  
Schwann, Charles E.  
Crombie, John William  
Layland-Barratt, Francis  
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)  
Cullinan, J.  
Leamy, Edmund  
Sinclair Capt. John (Forfarshire  
Daly, James  
Lewis, John Herbert  
Smith, Samuel (Flint)  
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)  
Lough, Thomas  
Soames, Arthur Wellesley

Delany, William  
Lowther, Rt. Hon. Jas. (Kent)  
Stevenson, Francis S.  
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles  
Lundon, W.  
Strachey, Edward  
Dillon, John  
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift  
Sullivan, Donal  
Doogan, P. C.  
M'Cann, James  
Taylor, Theodore Cooke  
Duncan, J. Hastings  
M'Crae, George  
Tennant, Harold John  
Dunn, Sir William  
M'Dermott, Patrick  
Thomas, A. (Glamorgan, E.)  
Elibank, Master of  
M'Kenna, Reginald  
Thomas, David Alfred (Merth'r  
Emmott, Alfred  
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin  
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings  
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidst.  
Mansfield, Horace Rendall  
Tomkinson, James  
Evans, S. T. (Glamorgan)  
Markham, Arthur Basil  
Trevelyan, Charles Philips  
Farquharson, Dr. Robert  
Mather, William  
Tully, Jasper  
Farrell, James Patrick  
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John Wm.  
Wallace, Robert  
Fenwick, Charles  
Mooney, John J.  
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.  
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)  
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen  
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan  
Ffrench, Peter  
Murphy, J.  
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Ta'nt'n  
Flavin, Michael Joseph

Nannetti, Joseph P.  
White, George (Norfolk)  
Flynn, James Christopher  
Norman, Henry  
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth.  
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry  
Norton, Capt. Cecil William  
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)  
Furness, Sir Christopher  
Nussey, Thomas Willans  
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd  
Gilhooly, James  
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)  
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'ry, Md  
Yoxall, James Henry  
Goulding, Edward Alfred  
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)  
Gretton, John  
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;  
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill  
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.  
Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.  
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton  
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)  
Harmsworth, R. Leicester  
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)  
ARMY ORGANISATION.  
[THIRD DAY'S DEBATE.]

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment proposed to Question [13th May], "That it is expedient that six army corps be organised in the United Kingdom, with the requisite staff, stores, and buildings; that a Reserve for the Militia be enrolled not exceeding 50,000 men; that the establishment of the Yeomanry be raised from 12,000 to 35,000; and that eight regiments be enrolled for garrison service.;"(Mr. Secretary Brodrick.)

And which Amendment was;

"To leave out from the word 'That' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words,

'this House, while desirous of supporting, measures for improving the efficiency of the Army and securing Imperial defence, is of opinion that the proposals of His Majesty's Government are in many respects not adapted to the special wants of the Empire, and largely increase the burdens of the nation without adding substantially to its military strength.'";(Sir Henry Campbell-Eannerman).

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

Question."

Debate resumed.

\*SIR ARTHUR HAYTER (Walsall) resumed the debate. He said: Keeping, in view the friendly suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury that speakers on this

question to-day should remember that "brevity is the soul of wit," I promise him and the House that I will not trespass long upon their attention. I am sure the House will bear with me if I address a few inquiries to the right hon. Gentleman as to the new powers he proposes to confer on the generals commanding the corps d'armee in this country which are not at present provided for, because I think the right hon. Gentleman will agree with me that, until we understand what the expense of this system will be, and until we know what the new powers entrusted to the generals are, we are only at the very threshold of the question. The right hon. Gentleman encourages me, because he used these words, which I thought very striking in the excellent speech he made on the 8th of March;

"I believe that the proper delegation of authority is the only means by which we can redeem our military system and our officers from the paralysing effects of relying for every detail of their task in time of peace on a central establishment in Pall Mall."

I am sure that all the military Members of this House, and any gentlemen who have given attention to the conditions at the War Office, will agree with me that these are wise words, and that we ought to do all in our power to support the right hon. Gentleman in carrying them out.

The first thing we have to understand is, what are exactly the powers which are now to be delegated to the generals commanding districts and divisions in this country. I will, with the permission of the House, compare the old duties and powers entrusted to general officers in command of districts in this country with the duties and powers of officers in command in Germany and France. In our case every question connected with the drill and discipline of troops is under the general in command. We all know that the general officer in command of a district is absolutely supreme and responsible for drill and discipline, but he neither arms nor equips them; he neither clothes, feeds, nor houses them. All that is done by separate departments of the Government. If the right hon. Gentleman intends at all to proceed on the lines of the powers granted abroad he must very much enlarge the

powers of the generals in command of districts. Now, what is the case in Germany? I ventured on Tuesday to state what were the powers of an officer commanding a corps d'armee. The officer commanding has under him a corps intendant, and I quote with respect to the duties of that officer from a paper presented to Parliament in connection with Lord Harrington's Committee;

"The corps intendant is responsible for corps accounts, supply, clothing, barracks, hospitals, pensions, invalidings, control of funds for building fortifications, technical superintendence of military buildings. In France the corps commanders are responsible to the War Minister for the efficiency of the troops and establishments in their regions. The corps commander is the direct and responsible chief of the administration, financial or otherwise, in his

corps. The directors of the various departments are under his immediate orders and correspond with him alone. The corps commander is, under the authority of the Minister, responsible for the administration of his army corps."

Very similar is the case in France. Is the right hon. Gentleman prepared to give these corps commanders in this country the control of, say, their contracts for forage supplies? Is he prepared to give them control of their transport? Does he propose to allow them to be responsible for the carrying out of those buildings in Class 2 of the Works Vote, which amount to no less than £100,000? Will they have control of the supplies? Of course, it is of the greatest importance that they should have, but, if they do, and if they have this subordinate command, it will, of course, enormously decrease the overwhelming correspondence with which in the past the War Office has had to deal.

I think hon. and right hon. Gentlemen are hardly aware of the amount of detail work which this correspondence involves. I saw an account given to the Decentralisation Committee as to the sort of questions to be answered from headquarters. I do not know whether it is the same now. If a child was too small to toddle to the army school, the head of the military department was asked whether he might be allowed to go to a civil school. A schoolmistress had to ask whether she might marry her young man, and a schoolmaster was not allowed more than three days leave without the permission of the War Office. Well, the absurdity of that is apparent. When Lord Roberts

appeared before the Decentralisation Committee in 1898 he was asked; "Have you in your mind anything in the nature of a reorganisation under the army corps system which now obtains in India which would lessen reference to this office?"; It would be impossible unless the officer commanding the army corps has some sort of financial authority.

"You would, in fact, take over a considerably larger financial authority?"; Yes.

"You would regard them as part of the duties of an officer?"; Yes; on service you give an officer almost unlimited financial control, but his training in time of peace does not teach him how to exercise that control. I would give a general officer commanding a district more financial responsibility.

"Do you think the regulations keep them too much in leading strings now?"; Yes, far too much."

I think the House will endorse that.

I now come to the question of the decentralisation of accounts. The system which prevails at present is this: The quartermaster makes up the pay list and submits it to the officer commanding the battalion, who signs it. He must have besides another officer's signature. The pay list comes up to the Accountant General in Pall Mall and; will the House believe it?; every single item has to be audited and reaudited. It is to this enormous amount of time, labour, and expense in auditing and reauditing accounts that I wish to call the serious attention of the House. There are no less at the present moment than seventy-seven clerks employed in auditing the accounts of the officers and men; there are twenty-one additional clerks employed in auditing the accounts of the Reserve forces; and there are no less than 120 clerks employed in auditing the accounts for clothing and stores. What I say is that this is a system enormously troublesome,

expensive, and useless, because it would be far better to adopt, as the Germans do, a local audit in the district itself. We must, therefore, get behind this audit at the War Office. Perhaps I may read on this question of decentralisation of accounts the opinion given by Sir Henry Brackenbury before a Committee of the House of Commons in 1887;

"If you had a system of decentralisation, always supposing that you do away with this system of second audit, because, first of all, every pay list, every list that is sent in, is audited by the paymaster of the district, or regiment, and then it comes up to the War Office here, and the whole of that work, every single fragment of it, is gone over again; if, as I say, you had a system of decentralisation, with a test audit, such as they have in Germany, instead of this complete audit, with every item gone over again, I believe you would do away with half the clerks in the War Office. You would also, I believe myself, not lose one single fragment of efficiency as regards real true audit."

That is a very important thing, but there is another great benefit you might obtain if the right hon. Gentleman would give certain powers to adopt a local audit. I believe what I propose is carried out in other Departments of the Government. If the clerks who go down, as I hope they will go down, to audit the accounts on the spot could also take stock of the articles there, compare the vouchers, and see that all the articles said to be there are really there, then, I think, we should have a businesslike audit, and one of the utmost value to the Department. What does Lord Wolseley say on this point? I venture to mention his name because he was for a long time Adjutant General and Quartermaster General at the War Office. He said;

"It is desirable to give more trust and confidence to the military authorities. I think that there is an enormous amount of expenditure in the War Office in the continual system of check and countercheck. A large number of gentlemen, I cannot tell how many, are maintained to audit the accounts. I think that a great deal of that audit might be dispensed with if, instead of having those elaborate audits of accounts, you might have a check audit; that is to say, you have a great pile of vouchers and papers, and if instead of going through the whole mass of them you pull out a bundle here and there for a few examples, you might audit them as a test for the accuracy of the others."

Therefore Lord Wolseley agrees with me on this point. I am sure if that system could be adopted it would be of advantage to the War Office, and would considerably reduce the expenditure. I have seen so much of this useless expense at the War Office from the auditing of accounts that I would venture to impress on the right hon. Gentleman to do all in his power to bring about some decentralisation of accounts.

I am anxious to say one or two words about the military system under this proposal. I must say there are some most striking defects. One is that little consideration is given to the condition of recruiting. The right hon. Gentleman knows, and the House knows, what the comparative crisis will be which he will have to face when the troops come back from South Africa. There are a number of men who are waiting for their discharge, the Reserve is depleted, three years' reliefs for India are due, and



besides this we have these ominous words from the Inspector General of Recruiting, where he says;

"It will be many a day before the supply of recruits comes up to the demand."

And again;

"that the great problem of the military system now is to find recruits for our increasing requirements."

In the first three months of this year there was a deficiency of 3,000 recruits as compared with the same period of last year. The right hon. Gentleman recognises this, and he offers certain attractions for new recruits. I rejoice to see that he proposes to reduce the amount of what is called "Sentry go," and to give the men cubicles and other concessions which will tend to their comfort and welfare, and to change the drill. But the right hon. Gentleman must know that these attractions of themselves are not enough. He proposes to give at the end of militia and garrison service a pension of 6d. per day, and when the men reach the age of sixty-five a pension of no less than 1s. 6d. per day. I think that is an excellent thing, and I believe the men to be thoroughly entitled to it; but can anyone imagine a young man of eighteen being attracted into the Army by the prospect of a pension of 1s. 6d. per day at the age of sixty-five? There are two things that are attractive to soldiers, first, the period of enlistment; and second, the increase of pay. What we want is a short service accompanied by a period in the Reserve, and in addition an extended period of service for men to go to India and the colonies. I can speak from personal experience at the War Office of the popularity of the three years system. At that time the Brigade of Guards was 800 short, and it was felt that some heroic step should be taken, and the period of enlistment was reduced to three years, with the result that the whole 800 men were obtained in a few months. I was speaking to an officer of the Grenadier Guards the other day, who said that their battalion was 3,000 strong, and was almost entirely com-

posed of three years service men. The Coldstream battalion is 2,000 strong. I do not think there can be any doubt that we can obtain a considerable amount of men for three years service. But the question is what can you do to induce men to extend the period of service from three to ten years, for service in India and the colonies? I maintain that you have no right to impose the same conditions on a young man of twenty-one years of age and on a soldier in the prime of life, and although I do not propose, as the hon. Member for the Fareham Division has done, that the latter should receive 1s. 9d. per day, I think they should receive some slight addition to their pay. An addition of 3d. per day would cost £800,000. Any increase of pay would have an attraction to the soldier, and there ought to be a sliding scale in order to induce them to continue in the service. I cannot omit to say that the present proposal is a very expensive system for the number of men we get. The right hon. Gentleman says he will get 11,500 additional men, but he counts in that number 8,000 of the garrison regiments, which are not to be available for service except in the Mediterranean and South Africa, so that for this great increase of two millions a year, only 3,500 men will be added to the effective fighting strength of the Army. I am anxious to say a few words on the question of the officers. I recognise with

much pleasure that the right hon. Gentleman is going to give a great boon to the officers of cavalry, by allowing, them to take horses at a merely nominal sum from the Government studs. I hope this boon will be extended to the officers of infantry and adjutants of Yeomanry and Volunteers. I am sure the House will agree that it is a great scandal that it should be necessary for an officer to have a large private income in order to hold the King's commission. I have known for years that an officer in the Household Cavalry must have a private income of £;800 a year, and in the ordinary cavalry of between £;500 or £;600, while in the infantry a subaltern must have £;100 a year, besides, his equipment, to live in comfort. That excludes absolutely gentlemen of the poorer classes, such as the sons

of clergymen, who are desirous of entering the Army. There are no Jack of officers for the Royal Marines, because they can live on their pay. Sumptuary laws are of very little use; but we must remember that in the universities rich and poor live together, and why should they not do so in the Army? Commanding officers of cavalry ought to be interviewed by the Commander-in-Chief, and if the rate of living in their regiments is too high they should be made strictly responsible. Again, I hope the right hon. Gentleman will relieve officers from paying subscriptions to the regimental band. There is no reason why the officers in a regiment should maintain the band, which is on the establishment of the regiment. I would also ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he could not provide some cheap form of barrack furniture for the officers. That furniture might always remain in barracks, and the officers would be simply tenants, and when quarters changed any damage done could be easily assessed as it is on the outgoing troops.

As to the Yeomanry, which the right hon. Gentleman proposes to increase to 35,000, I do not complain at all of the terms offered; 5s. per day pay, and free rations, with £;5 to every man who brings his own horse. These are very generous conditions, but it must be remembered that their period of duty is to be extended from eight to eighteen days, and that would necessarily include the two market days, which would not be very popular with the farmers of the south of England. But the great question is whether we can hope to raise the Yeomanry up to 35,000. A short time ago the establishment of the Yeomanry was 15,000, but we have never been able to raise much more than 10,000. Then, if 35,000 Yeomanry are not found, where are the cavalry for the three last army corps to be got?

The scheme adds no regular cavalry, and disestablishes the mounted infantry. That leads me to the conclusion that the right hon. Gentleman would have done much better by cutting his scheme in half, and making an experiment with three army corps. Much as I admire the right hon. Gentleman's attempt at decentralisation, I feel that this scheme is not well fitted for our wants at home. It is a very expensive scheme in regard to transport and supply. It was tried in peace time and failed, and it was tried in the time of the war in South Africa, and it also failed. Therefore, although I have listened with very great pleasure to the right hon. Gentleman, I have no other alternative but to vote against him.

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

this debate has disclosed undoubtedly considerable divergence of opinion among Members of the House as to the merits of the resolution submitted by the Government. But this debate has been far from disappointing to those who have framed the scheme which is the subject of it. The speech of the right hon. Gentleman opposite with which the debate opened was one which was moderate in tone and which certainly, to us on this side of the House, appeared neither very exhilarating to the right hon. Gentleman's followers nor very damaging to the Government. Indeed, listening to it, I found it difficult to remember that the right hon. Gentleman himself had in his earlier days been associated with a great scheme of Army reform. I think his enthusiasm as an Army reformer has very sensibly diminished since the days of Mr. Cardwell. If he will pardon the expression, he is an example of what used to be known in racing parlance as Chifney training. Chifney could train a horse in such a way that it could win one race, but was never able to do anything afterwards. The right hon. Gentleman as an Army reformer exhausted himself in 1870&#x2013;71. He certainly has never won any race in great Army reform since, and I do not think he would profess that he ever started in one. My own recollections of this House are of the very faint support which he gave in 1887 to the scheme of Mr. Stanhope, which was almost universally accepted, and which proposed to work up two army corps for foreign service. The right hon. Gentleman said on that occasion that it was very well to have some standard, some point at which we could stop, but that the scheme ought not to be too pedantically applied. Even that faint expression of commendation was all frittered and swept away six years later when the right hon. Gentleman came down and boldly asked, What did people want with an army corps at all? and congratulated himself that his scheme of 1893 would be reduced simply to this; that we should send a little force abroad consisting of an infantry division, a cavalry brigade, a mounted infantry battalion, five batteries of artillery, etc., making in all, he hoped, something like 20,000 men; and for this he was not afraid, for the striking power of Great Britain in any part of the world, to come to this House and ask it for a vote of eighteen millions of public money.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: (Stirling Burghs): There were some other duties to be fulfilled besides that.

\*MR. BRODRICK: Yes; I am quite aware.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: That was a mobile force for any exceptional expedition that might be required in an emergency. All the other garrison duties and other duties of the British Army were not in question at that time.

\*MR. BRODRICK: Yes, I am quite familiar with that, but the right hon. Gentleman had been himself a member of a Government which a few years before had sent nearly double that number of troops to Egypt and had thrown down the gauntlet to Russia in 1885, when an expedition on a very different scale was actually under discussion at the War Office; an expedition which the right hon. Gentleman's 1893 plan would have made it impossible for us to carry out.

But, Sir, I have not come down to-night for the purpose of merely making a reply to a party attack from the right hon. Gentleman; but I have noticed that, even on that side of the House, more than one Member has spoken in terms which showed

me that, even if they are about to vote against the resolution; which probably as party men they cannot avoid; yet at the same time they have great sympathy with the object we have in view.

The hon. Member for Hastings, who delivered an excellent maiden speech, and the hon. Member for East Bristol, spoke in terms which were sympathetic, and which, at all events, led me to feel that, if I have not their support on this resolution, I shall have their support at some time or another for the principle which this resolution affirms. The fact that the great majority of the Opposition intend to go into the lobby against this resolution will not tempt me into making a party speech. I say that with the more reason because I feel that there is something altogether incongruous that a man charged, as I am at this moment, with conducting a campaign on a great scale, directing the employment, not of tens of thousands but of more than 250,000 men, under circumstances of stress and difficulty; I think there is something incongruous in approaching the functions of this office before the world from a party standpoint. But, Sir, although I feel that, at whatever expense of party majority, or otherwise, it is necessary to lay down the foundations of Army reform on which we intend to work, I am fully conscious that the superstructure cannot be reared in the years to come if the principles which are adopted by the great mass of our own party at this moment, and which I believe will obtain wide sympathy out of doors, do not ultimately command the support of more than one party in the State. It is because I am fortified, in the position we have taken up, by the best military advice, and because the system on which we undertake to work will, as I believe I can show to the House, be of permanent advantage to the Army, that I approach the matters under discussion this afternoon without doubt or hesitation.

At the outset I should like to clear away one or two points which have, I think, been the cause of some mistaken speeches and a good many mistaken leading articles in the press during the last few weeks. It has been assumed that we are dealing with difficulties with which we are not dealing, and with a state of the Army which we, as a Government, cannot admit has arrived. Sir, we are not meeting with such a collapse as occurred after the Crimean War. We are not repairing the

complete breakdown of our system. We are not here to-night to lament, as we had to do after the Crimean War, that, after sending out 30,000 or 40,000 men we could only fill up the gaps in the ranks with a few raw boys sent out straight from the depots; we are not here to apologise for great failures in the provision of stores and the munitions of war. On the contrary, when I spoke two months ago I was able to say that we had succeeded in keeping 150,000 Regular troops and 70,000 or 80,000 irregular troops in the field from home and the colonies with every store and munition requisite during fifteen months. I was able to vouch the opinions of all the officers who served to the excellence of the men whom our present system of recruiting had brought out, and I was able to give the verdict of Lord Roberts and Lord Kitchener that these troops had been maintained in the field in a way that they could not have wished to be surpassed as to supplies and stores. My case was then, and is now, that there has been an awakening, or rather a discovery, that there are many flaws and imperfections

even in those portions of our Army which we deemed to be the best; and if the House will bear with me for a few moments I will endeavour to focus the discussion and to state again in a few words what are the points with which this new organisation professes to deal, and what are, therefore, the reasons why I press them on the attention of the House.

My case is this. We have got a great number of available forces. These forces are not properly organised. I propose to give them, by this scheme, an organisation which will be most efficient in peace, and also a proper organisation for war. I urge that we have now masses of troops at home in large numbers which could not be of their full value in the field, because they are without the due proportion of different arms, and I propose to give them a due proportion of arms to fit them for the purpose for which they are intended. It is obvious to everybody, whether, like my hon. friends behind me, who are learned in Army matters, or, like myself, a civilian, that we have a mass of untrained or half-trained troops in this country to whom, if you are to give defined functions, you must also give adequate training. My scheme provides that we should bring a certain number of these troops up to that higher level of efficiency which is demanded by military authorities if they are to be put in the line of battle, relegating the others to those positions of usefulness for which the military authorities consider them to be admirably suited. Though the right hon. Gentleman cheered just now in reference to his own speech, in which he said he did not see on what platform or where we are going to use two Army corps, I rely, as I relied two months ago, on recent events and on the position of Great Britain on three continents, in saying that it is necessary for us to have a proper force for service abroad. That force, on the authority of the Government and on the fullest consideration, we put at 120,000 men. This scheme provides it, and I pledge the Government to maintain it. I cannot assent to the proposition of those who, like my hon. friend the Member for Oldham, ask me to wait to begin to raise it and organise it until the enemy has begun to march. As was shown in the speech of the Chief Secretary two days ago, when last year these three army corps were withdrawn from England we were left in a condition of disorganisation at home in which we had to hastily improvise all the staffs, all the mobilisation for an army, in order to bring what troops remained in the country into a condition fitting them for service. If this scheme be accepted that will never be our condition again, for, if we send three army corps away from this country we shall have in the remaining three army corps the nucleus on which we can build up, carefully and efficiently, a proper defence.

All these matters which I have mentioned are questions of principle and questions of expenditure, which we cannot properly bring before the House in a resolution like the present; but I think a misconception has arisen among those who have been good enough to say that the scheme, as originally propounded, was much more attractive than the resolution before the House. Sir, it is impossible to convey in a resolution all that is required to place our Army on a proper footing. This resolution is only the skeleton. We intend to clothe it with flesh and blood, and the criticisms which

have been given to us, or which may be given to us, will not be thrown away in that operation. This is the necessary foundation on which we can build up all the reforms that we consider to be necessary; and among those reforms I place first and foremost the great delegation of business from the War Office to districts, and which I undertook should be carried out, and which cannot be carried out without this scheme; secondly, the organisation of units under commanders with whom they would have to serve in time of war; thirdly, the improved training of officers and men, which can only be carried out in bodies which have a proper mixture of the three arms; and there are also other points, such as the reform of the Army Medical Service, to which we are pledged, and upon which we are engaged, the reform of the transport service, and the reform of the War Office itself, and the reform of the system of appointing or selecting officers to commands. All these are vital to the Army. They all ought to, and must, pervade every action in connection with this reform. I cannot embody them all in a resolution, but I regard them as irrevocably connected with the resolution, and without them this organisation would be void. I mention them, and I ask for some belief in our resolution to carry them through. It has, I know, been the maxim of some Secretaries of State to allay the possibility of panic, possibly also to put off the day of reckoning, by making pleasing speeches to the House of Commons, assuring them that there is not much the matter with the Army, and that it does not matter much if there is, because all things will come tight with time. I have not taken that position. I have endeavoured to be very frank with the House. I have admitted that there are states that require to be improved, and systems that require to be built up; and I would ask the House of Commons when they vote on this resolution to-night to consider that they are not voting merely for the words which are embodied in the resolution, but for the spirit which pervades this reform. It may be too much to ask the House to give their complete confidence to any Commander-in-Chief or to any Secretary of State in regard to provisions of this kind; indeed, I think I have heard it suggested in this debate that it is unfortunate that circumstances have not permitted us to give an earnest of some of these reforms before we had to come to Parliament for our organisation. Sir, I am well aware of the serious nature of the task; but surrounded as I am by admirable coadjutors, and in complete concurrence with my military colleagues, I do not shrink from it. I ask the House to give me a little time, and I think we shall be able to show them a good result; and I would ask those who are critics, and those who are inclined to compassionate a man who, with a good many difficulties, has got to carry on a good deal of business at once, to wait till they see that result. It is in that spirit that I would meet the strictures that have been passed, and especially I hope that I shall be able to remove doubts expressed by the right hon. Gentleman opposite as to the composition of the army corps which are the substratum of the scheme. I said just now that the army corps represent what is, in our mind, the best organisation for peace, as well as the best organisation for war. I am not very much moved by the objections which have been made as to outgiving a name to the army corps, nor, I confess, can I quite follow the right hon. Gentleman opposite

when he complains that because an army corps had to be put on board ship it could not be used as an army corps.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: No, I did not say that.

\*MR. BRODRICK: Well, that was the impression he gave. I am in the recollection of the House; the right hon. Gentleman said that these troops will have to go on board ship, and asked, How, then, will they form army corps?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The point of that is, we do not know very long beforehand where the ship will go when it has got them on board. [Laughter.]

Hon. Members laugh, but I do not know what at; the whole point turns on that. In any Continental country

you know exactly where your army corps will be employed, and you train it and you prepare it for years beforehand with reference to that particular duty; but with us, if we have to send 20,000, 40,000, or 100,000 men abroad we have to put them on board ship, and it depends on the circumstances and necessities of the time to what particular climate and against what particular enemy they are to be sent.

\*MR. BRODRICK: Yes, but whether they are going to another climate or whether they are going on board ship they still want the due proportions of arms, they still gain by being commanded by officers who have commanded them in peace, they still want cohesion. No, I will not allow myself to be driven off this point by the right hon. Gentleman's desire that we should have no organisation at all.

The point between me and him; I will not say between this side of the House and the other; is whether we should have an organisation or whether we should muddle through as best we can. He has had his day, he has had four periods of office at the War Office; the last three of them were devoted to a system which has been condemned by the House and by the country, and I will not abide by it. When I spoke of the army corps in war I argued from this point of view; your officers will know the men with whom they have to deal, and your various units will be prepared; they will not be collected from Malta, Ireland, Scotland, Aldershot, put under a commander they have never seen before, and then told to fight three weeks afterwards as a homogeneous brigade. As regards war, I do not think the scheme is open to any criticism. I know no military man of great experience who does not prefer that we should mass these troops together into the army corps in which they are likely to have to act. But in peace the case is infinitely stronger. In peace these army corps will be arranged with reference to the whole system of decentralisation.

I have had in my hands during the last few days, and I will undertake to lay it on the Table as soon as I can, the report of Mr. Dawkins's Committee on the organisation of the War Office. From a complete study of that extremely interesting document I find that almost the whole of their recommendations are based on a large delegation of authority from the War Office to the military districts. That cannot take place unless you set up authorities in the military districts who are to receive the authority. The right hon. Gentleman opposite, or somebody sitting on that side, said, Why not give it to the eighteen or twenty general officers who are now in command of those districts? I will take one illustration. Supposing the general officer at

Plymouth has twelve artillerymen too many and the general officer at Portsmouth has twelve too few, obviously the one should transfer to the other. But they have not the authority to do it without referring to the War Office. But if you set up a general officer over both the officers of those districts he can transfer from one to the other without difficulty. And while we can arrange, as desired by the Committee, for a large delegation of financial authority, we cannot set up eighteen or twenty financial authorities in various parts of England. We should have no cohesion if we did, but we can lay on the man who commands the whole of Ireland, or Scotland, or the whole of the west of England this responsibility, and keep him up to the mark if it is not carried out. More especially do I urge this view on the House because I think the time has come when at all hazards we should put an end to what I would call the paralysing system of reference to Pall Mall on every small item or movement of a soldier's life, which entirely occupies officers of high standing during peace times. That is what I have felt for years past. It is borne in on us by the evidence of Lord Roberts before the Committee of 1898, and by the experience of the war, and that is why I would ask the House to believe that this proposal with regard to army corps is not an ambitious or a grandiose proposal, as it has been described by my hon. friend the Member for Oldham; it is a plain, wise, prudent, and practical measure, without which you will not build up a fresh and reformed army system.

One word on various points that have been raised in connection with this proposal. I pass over altogether one observation of the right hon. Member for Forest of Dean which I thought was not worthy of him. He must have known that he was comparing like and unlike when he said that this proposal was very much the same as the eight army corps of Lord Cranbrook in the Army List. He knows that Lord Cranbrook's proposals never professed to be anything else than a division of troops upon paper, to show how they might act. There was no localisation of them in districts, and no attempt to establish them in corps with the officers commanding in war, or to establish a complete proportion of the various arms. It differed in every respect from this scheme. We have been asked whether it is our intention to establish a full Staff in time of peace for districts which will not have a full number of regular troops. Certainly not; in those districts we shall establish the necessary nucleus. We have been asked are all the present Staff officers to remain outside the army corps system. Certainly not; they will all be removed into the army corps system or be under the commander of the army corps district, and each command their brigade or their unit as may be desirable. We do not propose to keep men idle; on the contrary, we propose to keep men much more actively employed than hitherto, by bringing them together at a proper time of year. Then I was asked as to buildings. My right hon. friend last year asked the House for a loan for the purpose of barracks, and explained at the time that the loan did not cover the whole of the barracks necessary for the troops which would be in Great Britain at the end of the war. Moreover, in 1897, before we had a loan and before these additions to the Army were anticipated, we had a deficiency of barracks, and a certain number of barracks required to be reconstructed. Between



1897 and 1899 provision was made for thirty-five mountain and field batteries and seventeen battalions. The largest provision was made in the last four years which could be made, but that still left twenty-five field and mountain batteries, seventeen battalions, and three cavalry regiments, which have been or must be removed from barracks which have been condemned as insanitary, and we may therefore say that taking the whole of the barracks which have got to be pro-

vided we shall have to find for three cavalry regiments, fifty-seven field and mounted batteries, seven horse batteries, six battalions, and eight depots. These barracks are to be constructed in the new Army corps districts according to the distribution of the troops provided by the army corps. But not one of them will be in addition to what would have to be provided now according to the present system. There is no expenditure on barracks involved in this proposal which would not have been involved if this scheme had not been undertaken. There may be some expenditure in offices and staff buildings, but that will depend largely on the view taken of recommendations which have been made. There will also be some slight expenditure in stores. There, again, the large expenditure will have to take place in the decentralisation of stores, which is one of the most important of the mobilisation requirements of the country, but that was provided for by my hon. friend last year, and is in no way affected by the scheme I am now laying before the House. Therefore the suggestion of wild extravagance in this scheme may be taken as proceeding from hon. Members who have not got sufficient information before them.

Before I leave the subject, perhaps I may be allowed to say a word about the name. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to attach an exaggerated importance to the name of "army corps." "Army corps" may be a foreign term; but I will guarantee that, if the system is given a fair trial for three or four years in this country, at the end of that time the term "army corps" will be neither strange nor unpopular, for it will stand for all that which this House had asked for time after time and not obtained. It will stand for good organisation, for delegated powers, for the reduction of references, for rapid correspondence, and, I hope, for the abolition of red tape. It will be a guarantee for the proper training of our officers, and it will fortify our military system at the point at which it is weakest, namely, that which was exposed last year when we had helter-skelter to call together troops under officers they had never seen, in order to fill up Aldershot after the troops had been taken away from it.

Now I come to what is really the kernel of such attacks as have been made on the resolution before the House. It is not what is in the resolution, but what is not in the resolution, for which we are attacked. I have had strong appeals made to me by my hon. friends behind me, by members of the Military Committee in this House, to consider the question of adding to the pay of soldiers. May I point out that, although I certainly am ready to discuss this subject, it is not affected by the scheme which I have laid before the House. For the last four years this House has voted increases of the Regular Army. It has voted three regiments of foot guards, fifteen battalions of infantry; it has added eighty men to eighty-six battalions in the Army to bring up the home strength; it has

added seventy-one batteries of artillery, and nearly 7,000 men belonging to garrison artillery or departmental corps. That is a great addition. It may make difficulties in recruiting, but they are not made on this occasion, as I have not added a single man to that establishment. Still, the House has a right to ask that I should say how these men are to be obtained. Our normal recruiting before 1898, when some changes and ameliorations were made in the soldiers' conditions of service, was about 35,000 a year. Our normal requirements under the new system will, so far as we can estimate them; these matters are very difficult to estimate; be something like 45,000 recruits a year. Last year, though we were recruiting largely at a high rate of pay for Yeomanry and certain departmental corps, and although we raised something like 12,000 men for those corps, we took 46,000 ordinary recruits, or something like 11,000 more than the normal number which it had been the habit to take before 1898. There were confident predictions made and great expectations that we should have a falling off in recruiting this year. It was said with great force that, under the excitement of the war, the younger men, as it were, anticipated the levy of this year, and that, moreover, the 5s. rate of pay would deter many from offering themselves as ordinary recruits at the 1s. rate. I confess that I myself have had anxiety about this matter.

But we have had an extraordinary result. In the first four months of this year we took 16,000 ordinary recruits, which rate, if it were maintained; I do not say it will be; would give us 48,000 recruits for the year. We raised during that time not 10,000, but 25,000 men, at the high rate of 5s. A better exemplification could not be given of the point I have urged the House to bear in mind, namely, that by offering a higher rate of pay you will have to include a number of men in that higher rate who are willing to come at the lower rate, because, offering so high a rate as we did to get Yeomanry; men of twenty-one or twenty-two years of age; we have not interfered in the slightest degree with the ordinary recruiting. However anxious one may feel as to the future, I put it to hon. Members, can I come to the House and say there has been such a breakdown in recruiting? Can I honestly say, "I am in great straits; assist me, and release me from my difficulty"? We have had bumper recruiting this last year. The popularity of the Army, at all events in time of war, has been established. Every regiment in South Africa is, I believe, at this moment over its strength, and it needs a strong incentive for any Secretary of State to come down and ask the House to add three or four millions to the pay under conditions of this kind.

But let me sweep away the idea that seems to be held in some quarters that there is some vicious feeling at the War Office which induces us to desire to keep down the pay and to make the terms of recruiting less elastic and more rigid than the House could desire. There is nothing of the kind. I have two points which I must press upon the House in this connection. The first is that, although the men are young; call them boys or youths, or what you like; they very rapidly become what we desire. A very false idea has found its way into many papers and even into speeches in this House, in consequence of a speech made by Lord Lansdowne last year when asked why, if we had 92,000 Regular troops in this

country, we were sending Militia to South Africa. Lord Lansdowne said in reply that the 92,000 men, though the equivalent of nearly three army corps, could not be so described, as they contained a large proportion of immature youths; immature soldiers. That was taken to mean that the 92,000 were none of them available. But, as a matter of fact, the 92,000 contained a large number of regiments which were ready to, and did, leave the country as they were required for South Africa. Thirty thousand of those men alone were unfit to go; but a considerable number had embarked by April 1st last. My hon. friend the Member for the Fareham Division, who made an excellent speech the other night, suggested to us that we should shed these 30,000, and take the money and use it to give the general body of the Army a higher rate of pay. That is a most attractive proposal. He quoted America in its support. I am afraid the American analogy may be pressed too far. What is the fact? Under the excitement of war the Americans raised their army from about 40,000 to 100,000 men. Those 100,000 had a very high rate of pay, and were found to include men of the right age and of superior size to ours. Yes, but America draws, or has drawn, only for the last two years, 100,000 men out of a population of 70,000,000, and we; for England, India, and the Marines, who must be counted in in this matter; are drawing at this moment nearly 400,000 men out of a population of 40,000,000. It would be unwise to build on the attractions which bring to the colours in America one man out of every 700, a system intended to bring men of similar age who have already started in trades or avocations, when we ask for one man in every 100. If you adopt the American system, and add, as was pointed out the other night by my noble friend the Financial Secretary, £3,700,000 to our Estimates, a million and a half to the Estimates of India, and a quarter of a million to the Admiralty Estimates for Marines, you will come at least to an expenditure of £5,000,000. What does that £5,000,000 represent? It represents the whole cost of 100 of your infantry battalions at home. You will always have what now goes on in America. In America I understand Congress not infrequently changes the numbers. When questions of expense come up, and a party opposed to militarism make head, the military forces find themselves reduced by 25,000 men. Are we secure in this House? If we raise the Estimates to such a pitch that our population find them difficult to maintain, are we secure that those motions will not be made and carried in this House? I have not seen anything from the Front Opposition Bench which gives me so great a security as that. I have not seen so emphatic a belief on their part that the troops for which we ask are absolutely necessary. I was at the War Office in 1886, when it had been the practice for years whenever money was wanted to make the Budget of the year square with what the Chancellor of the Exchequer could spare to reduce infantry battalions by twenty, forty, or even fifty men. If you raise the pay to an unnecessary extent you will hold out the strongest inducement to a Government less convinced than we are of the necessities of the case to relieve their Budget by an operation which will spoil every regiment in our service. I halt in this matter; I think we should not move before a very strong case has been made out, because I do not regard the Secretary of State for War for the time time being as a mere machine for getting money out of the Chancellor of the

Exchequer. After all, he has some right as a Member of the Cabinet to look at the general finances of the country, and he has an absolute duty, in my opinion, to treat himself as a trustee not merely for the temporary, but for the permanent, advantage of the Army. Believing as I do that a large rise of pay would be followed, at some not very remote time, by a heavy reduction of numbers, I fall back on the submission I made to the House when I first introduced these Estimates; that if the war fever is followed by a peace collapse we shall be pusillanimous if we do not make further proposals to the House of Commons.

With regard to the short service, I am entirely in accord with those who urge that our terms of service should be elastic. But our terms are elastic as regards at least the three years and the seven years. The Line enlists for three years in a limited number of cases and for seven years in other cases. We are giving more elasticity by means of the garrison regiments, which will provide a career for a man, if he desires it, up to twenty-one years in the Army. The right hon. Gentleman challenged me with a strong, as I thought very strong, appreciation of the Guards system. But he missed the whole point of his own remarks. The Guards have not to go abroad except on active service. Remember that we have to find drafts for India to the extent of 15,000 a year. I will give the House a convincing proof of the straits we might find ourselves in if all the three-year men in a particular year thought it well to return to private life in the Reserve, which they would have a perfect right to do. I had a letter the other day from an officer of the Guards serving in South Africa telling me that all the Guardsmen who had done such admirable service there were three-years service men, and that they were bent on going into Reserve when they returned to England. The number of three-years men re-engaging in the Guards has gone down considerably, but, of course, these men would form a very fine Reserve. Imagine our position next year supposing that after this long strain in South Africa we find the three-years' men, who form the great body of the Line, saying "We have done our work fairly; we prefer going into private life and marrying in England; we wish to draw our Reserve pay, and you must not expect us to re-engage." Why, we might be forced every year into the undesirable system of bounties, or into a large increase of pay, to get men to go abroad and fill up our Indian Army. It is therefore from no desire to make difficulties that we consider the elasticity of our term of service must be regarded with reference to the first duty we have to fulfil, that of keeping our standing Army in India and in our garrisons in the colonies up to their full strength.

One word as to the portions of the scheme which, beside the army corps, figure in the resolution before the House. The reason why I claim the indulgence of the House for them is because we have undertaken a great development of the Auxiliary forces, with regard to which in every debate on the Army in the House I have heard strong incentives applied to the Government. All that is connected with the Regular Army must be subject to the recruiting test. What we are doing with regard to the Reserve forces appears to be a matter of certainty upon which we can rely. The proposal to have a real Reserve for the Militia has not met with opposition in any quarter of the House. I will not, therefore, trouble

about it further except to say that we shall succeed through the Reserve in giving to the Militia exactly that stiffening which is required in case of emergency to bring them up to full strength and enable them to take the place of the Line at home when the regiments of the Line have gone abroad.

With regard to the Yeomanry, which I still maintain are rightly called "Imperial Yeomanry," seeing that they are the inheritors of a name now well known and well regarded; seeing, also, that we propose to attach to them, I hope at no distant date, similar forces to those colonial forces who have served in South Africa; seeing, further, that, although we cannot pledge them, we feel pretty certain that their disposition will in many instances enable them to volunteer when a time of need arises, or when there is a great emergency; I think, in these circumstances, we may regard the scheme with regard to Yeomanry as already an assured success. As soon as I have the authority of the House I can proceed on the new lines to answer the applications which have poured in upon us during the last month. In one month we have had the formation of nine new regiments, and several new squadrons have been suggested to us. In Lancashire, Sussex, Surrey, London, Norfolk, Essex, in Scotland, the Isle of Man, and all over the country, there is a desire to join the King's service on horseback rather than on foot. I confess that I have great sympathy with that desire; and may I say that I feel personally grateful to those members of the old Yeomanry who, having given much time and money to their regiments, have contemplated the change in such a thoroughly patriotic spirit. I know perfectly well that the scheme means the breaking of some; I hope not many; old associations. The sword has to be laid aside, and the rifle to become the main arm of the Yeomanry. I may tell the House that the Commander-in-Chief and a body of officers only yesterday rode over a considerable portion of the country which might have to be defended in the neighbourhood of London, and they decided; I believe without a single dissentient voice; that there was not a part of the twenty-seven miles they travelled over in which cavalry, as cavalry, could possibly act, whereas mounted troops, armed and drilled as it is proposed to drill and arm the new Yeomanry, would be invaluable.

As to the garrison regiments which have gone to Gibraltar and the Mediterranean, they have been described in the press as the finest regiments ever seen to leave Aldershot. We shall be put to some additional charge owing to the fact that the men have not led celibate lives; but I think the House will not grudge the money if we can find accommodation for the families who are accompanying them.

One word more I must say in reference to our organisation for foreign expeditions. I have been told that all these developments of our military service will not give us that small war force, ready to go abroad without calling out the men of the Reserve, which we so often require. But we have not done away with the small war Reserve, for there are 15,000 men who receive extra payment, and can be called up without our coming to the House for an emergency Act. These men receive a special payment and undertake a special duty, and this enables us to send 15,000 men abroad without disturbing other regiments.

I think that the last criticism which has been made on our scheme is that the expense of the Army is enormous, and that I am responsible this year for adding

considerably to it. It is quite true that our expenditure was £16,000,000 in 1886, and that it is now £30,000,000. But the additions which I make this year ought, I think, to be taken by themselves. The additions to the Auxiliary forces, which are really needed, will provide us with 90,000 men, and the expense involved is only £1,700,000, or on an average less than £20 each. But undoubtedly the continual growth of Army Estimates must strike every man whether he be an economist or otherwise; and I only protest that as it is unfair that those who desire an exact military system, such as you can obtain from compulsion, should throw stones at me because our system cannot be exact without the compulsion

which we do not desire to resort to, so I think it is also hardly right that those who are urging strongly an increase of pay should at the same moment complain of exaggerated Estimates without indicating in a single particular where they can be reduced. The right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean the other night, in two sentences which followed each other, pronounced for an increase of pay, and at the same time declared that our Estimates were large and exorbitant compared with those of other Powers, and with all his knowledge he did not show a single case in which there could be a reduction. I confess I do not value these pious aspirations unless they are interpreted into practical proposals.

One speech made in the course of this debate recalled to us a great stand by a Chancellor of the Exchequer against militarism and extravagance. Yes, and I am going to tell the House a little more than some Members know about that campaign. I was myself the victim of many attacks from Lord Randolph Churchill, because, being at the War Office in the post of Financial Secretary at the time, I found myself unable to concur in the views he expressed. Lord Randolph Churchill should be noted by this House as a sign-post and a warning to those men who profess economy, but who do not venture to bring it to the test of experience. There is no man whose professions of economy with regard to the Army were more shown up by practical experience. In 1886 he resigned because he would not provide for coaling stations and the mercantile and military ports the moderate sums; then asked for sums much more moderate than those Parliament afterwards voted. I do not believe there is a man in this House who wishes to maintain our power abroad who will say that the expenditure on military ports and coaling stations is not vital to the country. But I remember well, before Lord Randolph Churchill resigned, an interview which I had with him. A few days before he resigned, by order of the Secretary of State at the time, Mr. Smith, I approached him on the subject of the position of the Volunteers. We were able to prove, and had proved, that it was impossible for them to make both ends meet, even with absolute economy, on the sums Parliament allowed them. A Committee sat, the facts were proved, and we asked for the modest addition of £100,000 to enable us to satisfy the very moderate claims of these 220,000 men. I remember Lord Randolph Churchill's answer. He said;

"I have assigned £16,000,000 to the Army votes. I dare say you will make as good an argument as any other man for the addition, but it is useless your doing

so. That is the money the Treasury can spare, and no argument can shake my determination."

What was the result? The Chancellor of the Exchequer himself presided over a Committee to investigate Army expenditure. He had his own way throughout, and the Committee had the best men before them, and the net result of that Committee was that, after the most careful investigation, £;100,000 was knocked off the Army Estimates. A great portion of that sum was money which had been spent on the Army medical service, which was then reduced, and which the Government of the present moment is seriously arraigned for having allowed to fall so low.

Within a week, on the hearing of one officer, Lord Randolph Churchill decided that the state of the barracks was so great a scandal in 1886 that it was necessary to add to the Estimates £;4,000,000 or £;5,000,000 at once in order to improve them. The result of that Committee, therefore, was to add enormously to the military charges; and I say that those speeches which are of the same character, urging economy without condescending to details, are simply an attempt to fortify the Treasury in the position in which Lord Randolph Churchill alone of all the Chancellors of the Exchequer with whom I have had to deal took up; that the Treasury should be a dominant and despotic body, that it should dictate terms to the various Departments, that it should be blind to the progress of science and deaf to the arguments of responsible Ministers. That view is one which I certainly would never accept, and which my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer has never asked me to accept. It is true that our Estimates have risen from £;16,000,000 to £;30,000,000, and that the troops in the Regular Army and

Reserves have risen during the time from 190,000 to 290,000, an increase of 100,000 men, and when I am asked about these army corps to go abroad; when I am told there is danger in a sharp sword lest you should be impelled to use it; I should like to ask right hon Gentlemen opposite whether there have not been occasions when protestations have been made and steps taken when the sword was not sharp and could not be sharpened. I give the House this guarantee, that there is no danger in saying now, after fifteen years, that if a Committee of Parliament had sat upon the condition of our stores and armaments when the gauntlet was thrown down to Russia in 1885 by Mr. Gladstone, that committee would have given to the House of Commons, and could even now give to the House of Commons, and the country, food for reflection which the Committee which is going to sit on the existing war will not find means to do. Therefore I hope, indeed I confidently expect, that Parliament, which was not afraid to part company with a brilliant statesman in 1886, will not sleep the less soundly because of the financial heroics of my hon. friend the Member for Oldham. Those of us who disagree with him can only hope that the time will come when his judgment will grow up to his ability, when he will look back with regret to the day when he came down to the House to preach Imperialism, without being willing to bear the burdens of Imperialism, and when the hereditary qualities he possesses of eloquence and courage may be tempered also by discarding the hereditary desire to run Imperialism on the cheap.

I would urge the House of Commons not to deal with vague generalities, but to

come to close quarters with this scheme and to test it by its practical utility. I cannot follow the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire, who wanted to go back fifty years to discuss our armaments, any more than I can agree to discuss them on the thirty-years-back principle adopted by the Leader of the Opposition. We cannot base our present armaments either on the days of smooth-bore artillery or on the days of the Brown Bess. We have to face the facts as they are, and if I am told, as I have been told by a Member of the Front Opposition Bench, that there is no thorough-going apologist for our scheme outside the War Office, I reply that my letter-box for many weeks back is at his disposal. It is quite true that I get a good many letters of abuse, some even on postcards marked "Secret and confidential," declaring that I am engaged in a task which will irrevocably ruin the country. But for one man who urges me to go back I have ten who urge me to go forward, not merely from generals and other officers of high rank serving in South Africa, but from officers whom I do not know at all, and from non-commissioned officers and private soldiers who look upon this scheme as being, if not the first, at least a genuine attempt to estimate the needs of the Empire and to meet them. I know we have against us the views of men who have theories of their own, whose theories I respect even if I cannot adopt them. I know we have against us also some men who deceive themselves as to our capacity to carry through these reforms, and some who deceive others by endeavouring to prove that these reforms are not required. If we are to wait for an ideal scheme on which all those who have a right to speak upon army reform are agreed, we should never begin this work at all. If we are going to be frightened by the increased and increasing numbers which are demanded for our military service this House would be blind to the teaching, of the present war and to the orders which the House has given to carry it through. If we are going to flinch from the expenditure which after grave consideration has been put forward by the responsible Government, the House of Commons will set an example which in the whole history of this assembly, it has never set before. If this resolution is rejected it may be that you may find fresh Ministers and fresh military advisers, less convinced or more pliable than we are, who will be willing to embark again and stake their whole existence on the thorny and, perhaps thankless task of Army reform; but looking to the experience of other measures in this House, and more especially to Army experiences, I think it is far more likely that in the lassitude which must follow a great war these questions will be quietly put aside, and we shall fall back again in keeping a large number of effective men with a defective training, in keeping military districts different in size and in every respect divergent, except that of being totally destitute of any military organisation, and you will throw away the one great chance of removing the whole authority from Pall Mall. It is because I believe that a return to such a state of things would have a graver influence on this country than the fate of any Minister or the fall of any Ministry that I would urge upon Parliament to give us a measure of confidence in an effort which is whole-hearted, which is fearless, and which ought to be united, to give this country a permanent military organisation and an effective measure of army



reform.

\*MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): The right hon. Gentleman told us at the beginning of his observations that he was not going to make a party speech, and, though he has not been altogether sparing of party allusions, yet upon the whole he has kept his promise, and I will endeavour to imitate his example. But I must at the outset call attention to the peculiar conditions, singular if not unique in Parliamentary history, in which this debate is being carried on. Whatever may be the contents of the right hon. Gentleman's letter-box, it must be admitted that the admirers and champions of his scheme have been singularly reticent in this House and in the public Press. Rarely in my experience, or, I think, that of any Member who has sat for a longer time in this House, has a plan put forward by a responsible Government, whether administrative or legislative, found so few cordial friends outside the Treasury Bench, or been exposed during the whole course of a debate to such a fusillade of criticism and censure. Many hon. Gentlemen opposite who have taken part in the debate; almost every one of them without exception; has either prefaced or concluded his quota of condemnation, by announcing that, as the Opposition have seen fit to make this a party question, he feels it to be his duty either to abstain from voting, or even to record his vote in favour of the expediency of adopting a scheme which he has proved, or was about to prove, impolitic, indefensible, and even absurd. Before we witness, as I suppose we are destined to witness, to-night, when the division bell rings, this wholesale exhibition of political suicide, I think we may for a moment analyse the grounds on which these Gentlemen allege that an unpatriotic Opposition have deprived them of the opportunity of making their votes accord with their convictions. The Chief Secretary for Ireland on the first night of this debate told us that the country had given the Government a mandate at the election last autumn for army reform, and I am not at all disposed to dissent from that proposition. But the right hon. Gentleman also told us that at the time the mandate was given the Government were in a state of, as he described it, suspended animation. At what precise date the suspense terminated and the animation returned I am not in a position to tell the House. But at any rate I do not think it could have been before the later days of November. At that time the Commander-in-Chief, upon whose counsel and co-operation both the Government and the country legitimately counted in the preparation of any scheme, was still away in South Africa and did not return to this country till the end of December. Now this scheme was put on the Table of the House in the first week in March, and I venture to say, when we are told that the country gave the Government a mandate for Army reform, the country neither instructed nor expected the Government in hot haste, after a few weeks of hurried consideration, when, as the right hon. Gentleman has most properly told us, he himself was harassed with the responsibilities, duties, and anxieties of conducting a great war in a distant part of the world; I say the country never expected that, when a scheme produced in those conditions is put upon the Table of this House, its acceptance or rejection should be made, as it has been made by the right hon. Gentleman to-night, a matter of confidence in the Government. When the right hon. Gentleman introduced his scheme, which he

did, as we all acknowledged at the time, in a speech of remarkable dialectical and oratorical power, it was at once seen that there were many features in it which would command universal assent. They were sufficiently numerous and sufficiently important, if they had been carried into effect, as they might have been, with the practically unanimous assent of both sides of this House, to make this year a memorable year in the history of Army reform. Unfortunately, these innocuous or even useful improvements, were accompanied by a new system or organisation, to which, it is no exaggeration to say, in the weeks that have elapsed since this scheme was originally presented to the House of Commons, not one single military expert or military authority has been capable of giving his approval or even his confidence. I am not in the least exaggerating the facts when I put it as strongly and broadly as that. That being the state of things, and there being on the Notice Paper of this House no less, if I remember aright, than eleven Amendments proceeding from hon. Gentlemen opposite, and traversing the merits of this scheme both in principle and in detail, the right hon. Gentleman is allowed by his colleagues to announce to the world that in the view of the Government their plan holds the field, that they mean to stand or fall by it, and that they will make it a matter of confidence with their supporters.

Now I want to ask hon. Gentlemen opposite, who are not going to vote in accordance with their convictions, and who attribute the unhappy situation in which they find themselves to the almost diabolical malignity of an unscrupulous Opposition, who is it who made this a party question? They have only to look at the bench below them and they will see the real authors of the transformation. What were the Opposition to do? We do not approve of this scheme in its main features any more than the great bulk of hon. Gentlemen opposite do. What were we to do? Were we to vote for it? Is that the part of a patriotic Opposition? Were we to vote for it in order that the matter might be removed from the domain of party controversy? Were we to vote against it by a direct negative? That, of course, was possible, but it would have involved two results. In the first place we should have condemned the whole scheme, although there were some features in it which many of us approve. In the next place, we should have been told as much as now that we were making it a party question. Were we to vote for any of the Amendments proposed by the supporters of the Government? I can very well imagine what would have been said if we, His Majesty's Opposition, had said, "This is no doubt a matter of great national concern, but our ideas are so unformed, our views upon the subject are so nebulous and inarticulate, that we are not in a position to put them down on the Paper, and we will, therefore, hide behind the shelter of the Amendment of the hon. Member for Oldham or of one of the other hon. Gentlemen opposite." It would have been said, and in my judgment with great reason, that the Opposition were abdicating their constitutional functions if, holding the opinion, as we do hold strongly and conscientiously, not in the interests of a party but in the interests of the Army and of the nation, that this is not a forward but a retrograde step, we had abstained from expressing that opinion in clear and unambiguous language, and from submitting that issue to the House.

What are the propositions in my right hon. friend's Amendment? There are two. "The House is of opinion that the proposals of the Government are in many respects not adapted to the special wants of the Empire, and would largely increase the burden of the nation without adding substantially to its military strength."

How many Gentlemen opposite are prepared to deny either of those propositions, not by their votes in the division lobby, but by getting up in their places and, with a sense of their responsibility to their constituents and to the country, declaring that in their judgment these propositions are unsound? I do not think I have heard more than one in the whole course of this debate. That being the case, it is not the Opposition who are making this a party question and bringing about what I confess I think to be one of the most extraordinary anomalies in the whole history of the House of Commons; that to-night it is going to record a decision which everybody knows does not represent the mature or deliberate conviction of something like three-fourths of its Members; [Cries of dissent.]; I do not pledge myself to three-fourths, but certainly a very large majority of Members; and is going to reject an Amendment which, if it could be voted upon without the trammelling influence of party ties, would be carried by an equally large majority. It is said, I know, You have the scheme of the Government; what is your alternative? A more preposterous demand was never addressed to the Opposition. Here you are dealing with one of the most delicate and complicated questions of administration that can possibly arise. The Government have at their disposal not only the resources of the much-abused War Office, but materials, which are not in the possession of anybody else, in the way of information and so forth, and they have opportunities of resorting to the advice of the most eminent experts of the Empire. It is for them to formulate and tabulate a scheme of administrative reform, and I demur to the proposition, which is totally inconsistent with the analogies and traditions of our Parliamentary system, that the Opposition is not to be allowed in a matter of this kind to criticise and even to censure without being exposed to the demand that it should produce a cut and dried alternative scheme.

I have said so much as to the Parliamentary situation because it seems to me it is a somewhat singular one. I pass now to deal with the general aspects of the scheme which the right hon. Gentleman has just so ably and exhaustively defended. I need not say I make no pretence to expert military knowledge, and I shall confine myself to broad and general principles. I think there is one satisfactory and valuable feature in this debate, and that is, we have attained to a general consensus of opinion as to the objects which ought to govern our military organisation in the United Kingdom. I do not believe that there is any difference of opinion; I will not say between the two sides of the House, but even between any two sections of the House; as to what these governing aims or objects ought to be. In the first place, we have to supply, as everybody agrees, from the Army here at home the drafts and reliefs for the eighty-five battalions engaged in garrisoning India and our colonies and other dependencies. That is the primary

requirement of our home military organisation. In the next place, I think we are all agreed, having regard to the peculiar emergencies and the unique geographical conditions of our Empire, we must have always at home, in adequate numbers and, if possible, in perfect training and with full equipment, not a large, but a mobile and efficient fighting force, which can be despatched across the seas at a moment's notice, wherever the conditions of the case may require it. In the third place, as regards what is called the problem of home defence; the actual defence of our shores from invasion and the consequences of invasion; I think we are all agreed that we depend upon the Navy, and, in the long run, upon the Navy alone. But even those who have the most ample conception of the duty of the Navy will admit that we do need a force, and a trained force, here at home for garrison purposes, and to give what may be called temporary protection to exceptionally vulnerable positions. If, as I believe, these are the objects, and the only objects, or at all events the main and governing objects, with which our home organisation of the Army ought to concern itself, the problem the Government have to solve is how these objects are to be met, subject to two conditions, equally important; namely, first, that you must not unduly add to the financial burdens of the people, our Army expenditure having in the course of the last six years advanced by twelve millions sterling a year; and in the second place, whatever scheme you propose must be consistent with the maintenance of our voluntary system of enlistment. Does the Government scheme solve that problem? We are all agreed as to the necessity of substituting efficient for obsolete guns, if such there be, in our forts. We agree with the right hon. Gentleman's proposals for improvements in the soldier's dress and general comfort, for more civilised arrangements in barracks, for a less mechanical system of drill and training, and above all for as complete a system as you can get of decentralisation of administration. There is not one of those objects which might not

have been perfectly well attained without what is, after all, the central and cardinal feature of the Government's plan, the creation of six army corps, with, as the resolution says, the requisite staff, stores, and buildings.

Now, what are these army corps? When the Secretary of State produced his scheme early in March he certainly represented to the House, and we all understood his scheme to be, a most important change in our existing military arrangements. Tonight he has told us there is nothing of a grandiose or ambitious character in it. This is the only tribute to public criticism which has been conceded during this debate. The picture originally drawn of six army corps, which were for the first time to put us in position for meeting our enemies abroad and defending our shores at home; that picture has faded away like a dissolving view. Why, the Chief Secretary, with a nonchalance which at once charmed and bewildered the House, said; "Why do you trouble about this? It is only a question of nomenclature. He seemed to think, that the use of the words "army corps" was a sort of lapsus linguæ; on the part of the Secretary of State, or, at all events, that the military authorities consulted a dictionary and, at haphazard, took the first phrase that, happened to suit their purpose. What, according to the description of the Chief Secretary, and to some extent it was corroborated

by the Secretary of State for War to-night, are the functions of these army corps going to be? So far as I can make out, the net result of the whole proceeding will be this; instead of sixteen or eighteen district commands there will be six. That is all. The question of men is, of course, the crux of the problem, to which I will come presently; but from the point of view of administration you simply reduce eighteen positions to six. I agree with the Chief Secretary; I do not wish to misrepresent; or minimise his argument; he said in these districts, as compared with the sixteen or eighteen, you will be able to carry on the training of men on a larger scale, and with a more complete representation of the various arms of the Service, and that they will form, as he happily describes it, a sort of continuation school for the Army, and, above all, will provide occupation for our generals who have returned to this country from South Africa.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): They will give for the first time the opportunity, and the sole opportunity, for the training of generals and staffs, and utilising the experiences of generals and staffs obtained in the war.

\*MR. ASQUITH: That elegant and pleonastic language, of which he is such a complete master, I think reproduces the sentence I endeavoured to express. Now, what about these generals? It is a point to which the Chief Secretary attaches considerable importance. I am disposed to agree with the Chief Secretary it would be a good thing to provide adequate and, indeed, absorbing occupation for some of our returned generals. I am not at all sure that a distinguished warrior fresh from the field of battle, with the laurels of victory still twined in his hair, getting on his legs at the opening of a bazaar, or responding to a toast at a semi-private luncheon, is not almost as serious a danger to the State as a distinguished politician would be at the head of a brigade in South Africa. I hope that represents only a temporary phase in our military system. It is hardly worth while to disturb and re-create the whole of our Army organisation in order to provide other occupation for our generals. The real truth is, whatever may be the intention; and the Government may have the very best intention in their scheme; the effect will be that you will have the magnified and unnatural name "army corps" for what is merely a provincial command. Now let us see what these army corps really are. The right hon. Gentleman admits that of the six only two will go abroad, or can be sent abroad at any given moment, without voluntary elements. As I understand, you will have three large commands with a general, and staff, divisional generals, and brigadiers in each of three districts. And what will these be doing for the greater part of the year?

\*MR. BRODRICK: I stated distinctly the contrary. I said that with regard to the last three army corps there would be a nucleus and proper arrangements. Of course, brigadiers employed for brigades not in training for the whole year.

\*MR. ASQUITH: Exactly; that entirely corroborates the argument I am using. In other words, it will not be an army corps at all; it will be a thing which exists in nubibus for the greater part of the year with a nucleus in the shape of a staff. It will have an effective existence for two months of the year, and then will again disappear into space. To describe an organisation of that kind,

in which, as I have shown, out of six army corps only two are available for foreign service, and three army corps are nonexistent for the greater part of the year; to describe that as a system of six army corps and as putting the army in a better position than it was in before for foreign service and home defence is not, with all respect, a proposition to be considered seriously. The right hon. Gentleman was angry, or a little indignant, because the Leader of the Opposition said you could not export one of these army corps. The moment it was needed for service and put on board ship it would have to be broken up. But that is true, is it not? I do not understand that it is denied. As to the remarks of my right hon. friend in connection with the question of transport, we were told in the speech of the Secretary of State, when the scheme was introduced, that each army corps was to be furnished not only with barracks and stores, but with transport. ["Land transport."] I am glad of the interruption. As my right hon. friend pointed out again and again, and again this evening in an interruption, the conditions under which our foreign expeditions are carried out are so infinitely varied as to distance, climate, race, and geographical conditions, that it is not possible to tell until the last moment what particular form of land transport will be specially adapted for the work to be done. I cannot imagine greater waste of money than to train these army corps with expensive equipment of transport when it may turn out that that transport may have to be left behind as useless for a particular expedition.

One more general criticism, which I think is a vital one. How should we have been better off when the war in South Africa broke out in the autumn of 1899 if the right hon. Gentleman's organisation had been in existence? No one has yet told us how we should have been, and if you say we should, I say your argument rests entirely on conjecture and assumption, unproved; namely, that by setting on foot these army corps you will stimulate recruiting and raise the quality of your raw material. Now the right hon. Gentleman has given us some remarkable figures on the subject of recruiting, and I am sure the House will be relieved and glad to know that during the four months of the present year the process of recruiting has been satisfactory. But there is some difference of opinion upon this, for the right hon. Gentleman's figures do not tally with those of the Inspector-General of Recruiting.

\*MR. BRODRICK: Those were for last year.

\*MR. ASQUITH: I am speaking of the Return presented to Parliament, which seems to show that during the first three months of this year there was a sensible diminution in the number of recruits as compared with previous years. [An HON. MEMBER: 4,000.] My hon. friend says 4,000. If that diminution has been made good during April so much the better. But this is not material to my argument. What I was going to say is this; both as regards recruiting, and as regards the offers the right hon. Gentleman has received for the creation of new Yeomanry corps it is obvious that it is quite impossible to argue from the state of feeling which has existed while a critical and protracted war was going on to that normal state of things to which we shall sooner or later return, when everything is at peace and the glamour of war is over, and when the labour market will probably be unusually competitive and active. To make the figures of the last two years

the basis of your calculation for ordinary conditions and circumstances would be a serious fallacy.

To sum up the vital defects of the scheme, to my mind they are three in number. In the first place, it professes to adopt a form of organisation which is either a mere change in name,

and therefore a sham, or if intended to be a reality is not adapted to the special exigencies of our military and geographical position. In the next place, notwithstanding the improvements made in comparatively small matters in connection with the condition of the private soldier's life, it holds out no effectual promise of dealing with the crucial question of recruiting. Thirdly, I say it encourages the notion that the question of home defence is a military rather than a naval one, and therefore if it is adapted and developed, as it will have to be, on the lines started, would lead to a great and most regrettable waste of our national resources. I was very much struck the other night by some figures given by my right hon. friend the Member for Forest of Dean. If you take the military expenditure, not of the United Kingdom, which is all which appears on these Estimates, but of the Empire at large, you will find it comes to something like fifty-five millions sterling.

\*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): According to the rate of the rupee; between fifty-one and fifty-nine.

\*MR. ASQUITH: Let us call it fifty-five. That is what we spend at this moment, or shall have spent when the Estimates of this year are passed, on our military forces. On our Navy we spend, I was going to say only, but I will not, because it is a portentous sum, though relatively a small one; on our Navy, our real arm, our real first line both for attack and defence, we spend thirty millions sterling. In other words, the Army, which, although it is subject, no doubt, to those large and various duties which it has to perform in remote parts of the Empire, is after all only our secondary and subsidiary arm, costs us for the Empire at large very nearly twice as much as the Navy. And while expenditure is growing in both branches, the disparity between the two is, I believe, growing also, and that is not a state of things which Parliament ought to contemplate with satisfaction. Finally, there is one other and still more serious question that arises. This scheme is put before us; it was in the speech of the right hon. the Secretary of State for War when he introduced it, and the same idea was to be found in the speech of the Financial Secretary to the War Office; as the only practical alternative to compulsory military service. It is supposed to be the last despairing attempt to maintain the voluntary system. [Ministerial cries of "No."] I do not say so, Heaven forbid; but that is the position, according to the declarations of the Government, an which we are intended to be placed. To the policy of the substitution, even as a contingency, of compulsory for voluntary service, a policy as alien to the genius of our people as it is unsuited to the geographical position of our Empire, I believe this nation to be unalterably opposed. The problem which faces the army reformer to-day; I do not in the least deny its gravity or its urgency; is not a whit more serious; I doubt whether it is so serious as that which was confronted thirty years ago by Lord Cardwell and his advisers when he was at the War Office. They, and among them do

not let us forget that great soldier Lord Wolseley, whom it appears to be the fashion of the hour to ignore;[Ministerial cries of "No"];but to whom I venture to say our military organisation is more indebted than to any other living man;I say Lord Cardwell and his advisers succeeded in combining the abolition of purchase, the establishment of short service, and the creation of a Reserve, with the maintenance of the voluntary system. Time and the growing complexity of our political and economic conditions require, I entirely agree, that their work should be developed and readjusted to the new requirements of a later generation. But it ought to be, and for my part I am convinced that it is, well within the resources of statesmanship to enlarge and improve the structure without destroying its foundations, and to provide us with an army adequate for all emergencies both at home and abroad, while preserving to us the happy immunity we have so long enjoyed from the heaviest tax which the military rivalries and ambitions of nations has ever imposed upon mankind.

\*SIR JAMES FERGUSSON (Manchester, N.E.): The right hon. and learned Gentleman who has just sat down has disclaimed any intention of addressing himself to this question

of Army reform in any partisan spirit; but not long since the right hon. and learned Gentleman led up to his speech in the House this afternoon by a speech on the same subject of an eminently partisan character delivered to a Liberal and Radical association. At the beginning of that speech the right hon. and learned Gentleman proposed a resolution;

"That this meeting is of opinion that the present Government by its conduct of public affairs have shown themselves to be unworthy of the confidence of the country, and in the interests of economy and much needed reform it is desirable that the country should be once more placed in the hands of a Liberal Government.

And in supporting that resolution the right hon. and learned Gentleman devoted a large part of his speech to a dissection and condemnation of my right hon. friend's proposals on Army reform. Well, at all events, that points the moral of the Amendment of the right hon. the Member for the Stirling Burghs, and I think it supplies any partisan spirit which has been lacking in the speech to which we have just listened. In that part of his speech in which the right hon. and learned Gentleman criticised in his severest manner the present scheme of Army reform, he complained of the scanty manner in which provision had been made to strengthen the regular military forces of the country. That was, in the right hon. and learned Gentleman's opinion, the crux of the whole thing. Under the proposed scheme he said that the Regular Army would not either become more strong or more effective, that it would not be more easily recruited, or the standard of training and age be raised either for officers and men. But the right hon. and learned Gentleman could not in one breath complain against the very great additions which the measures of the Secretary for War had brought on the expenditure on the Army in comparison with that on the Navy, and at the same time point to a different system which would involve far larger expenditure. The increase of the Army and the raising of the standard of the age of recruits cannot be carried out without a large increase of expenditure. The two things



hang together, and therefore to criticise the proposals of my right hon. friend because he does not increase the numbers of the Regular Army and the standard of the recruits without increasing the expenditure of the Army, as compared with that of the Navy, is absurd. The right hon. and learned Member said that it was unnecessary that this measure of Army reform should be brought forward in hot haste, because the country did not ask for it; but at the General Election there was an almost universal declaration by candidates, including even those of the right hon. and learned Gentleman's own party, that immediate measures of Army reform were required, and that this session should not pass over without, at least, the foundations of the superstructure being laid. My right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War has never said that his scheme was a final measure, or that it comprised all the reforms that are necessary, but that he had only proceeded on moderate and conservative lines, which could, if need be, after experience be improved upon. The criticism that the scheme had been brought forward in hot haste would not bear much examination. At the head of the War Office is now the most distinguished soldier of our day; a man who has come back from South Africa covered with honours, and who enjoys the admiration of the whole country. With all the advantage of that distinguished officer's experience in India, South Africa, and this country, he has been able to gauge the defects of the existing system, and to point out where improvements may be made. With that experience and that of many others behind him, the right hon. the Secretary of State for War has proposed this scheme, which is only the basis of a structure which will, I hope, in future years, be maturely built. I cannot refrain from offering my tribute to the present Commander-in-Chief, but in doing so I have no intention of minimising the services of his distinguished predecessor, of which the right hon. and learned Gentleman has accused us.

MR. ASQUITH: I never suggested anything of the kind.

\*SIR JAMES FERGUSON: Well, I am the last man to do it. On the contrary, I fully agree with what the right hon. and learned Gentleman said, that the British Army owes a great deal to Lord Wolseley for the work he has done for the improvement of the British Army and for the important military capacity he has brought into it. The right hon. and learned Gentleman pointed to the numerous Amendments to the Government scheme which had been put on the Paper from the Government side of the House, and contended that the scheme of the Government had attracted no considerable approval from any quarter. I would remind the right hon. and learned Gentleman and the House that the reason for bringing forward these Amendments on the resolution was to give hon. Members an opportunity of discussing the Army Estimates and the statement of the Secretary of State for War to a greater extent than they would on usual occasions of introducing the Army Votes, which were necessarily cut short at the end of the financial year. Why should hon. Members who take a special interest in the Army not have an opportunity of putting forward Amendments which are not necessarily hostile to the Government? I believe that the intention of many of my friends who have put down these Amendments was only to take advantage of this opportunity of discussing matters in which they are interested, and on which

they are peculiarly qualified to speak. Of course, some of these hon. Gentlemen have plans of their own. As Lord Beaconsfield said in a case when rival plans were prepared, it reminded him of Popkins' plan. It would be an unjust imputation on hon. Gentlemen in this House qualified to speak on affairs to say that because they criticised the right hon. Gentleman's scheme they were hostile to him and the Government. The right hon. and learned Member, following previous speakers, criticised what was called the army corps organisation proposed in the resolution, and had questioned its efficiency. I should have thought that it would have hardly been necessary to open that again, but the right hon. and learned Gentleman only showed how little he understood the matter. The right hon. and learned Gentleman asked what was the use of substituting six districts for sixteen military districts. But because the whole country was divided into six larger districts, with a high general in command in each, it did not follow that they were

going to disturb the existing districts with their divisional commanders. It was of peculiar importance, as a matter of decentralisation, that there should be large districts with a high general in command, and that all the troops in these large military districts should be specially trained, organised, and supervised in a manner that could not possibly be done otherwise.

The right hon. and learned Gentleman asked how much better off the country would have been if this army corps organisation had existed in 1899 than it is now.

The answer to that was not far to seek. For one thing, we should have had an organised staff of general officers who had been accustomed to acting together, acquainted with the regiments which they would command. It stands to reason that we should have been much better off, because general and regimental officers, as well as the men, pull better together after personal experience, both in ordinary circumstances and in occasional manœuvres. It is almost impossible for anyone who has seen anything of war not to recognise how much better it is to have generals, brigadiers, officers and men well known to each other in manœuvres before they go to war. A very remarkable book had been recently published by an Austrian officer called "England's Danger." That officer had devoted all his life to a study of the British military system, and he presented between the boards of his book the most remarkable compilation of information upon British military affairs I have ever seen, which had been derived from official documents. The author said that no great army in the world but the British was without a corps organisation, and that British troops were not formed into a practical organised body until the moment of battle. Under the stress of a campaign they were scraped together just as they could be got hold of. I have myself seen in the selection of generals for the South African War generals sent out with brigadiers who had not acted under them even in peace manœuvres. How much better would it have been, and we cannot say how many accidents and mistakes which have occurred would have been avoided, had officers and

regiments gone out who had been acting together at home. Moreover the plan is a great step in the decentralisation of War Office control in minor matters.

The right hon. and learned Member said that there were many good features in the

scheme, but I should have thought that the good features which had the right hon. and learned Gentleman's sympathy and approval were the leading features, and that the others might be easily remedied if found defective on trial. The right hon. and learned Gentleman once more evoked the fetish of Lord Cardwell's scheme, as if Lord Cardwell had put the Army on such a footing that no future Secretary for War would have anything else to do. The present Secretary of State for War did not propose to upset Lord Cardwell's scheme, but the pity is that it has not been before now brought down to date; and my right hon. friend is only extending Lord Cardwell's scheme in accordance with the requirements of the present day. I think that the Opposition have chosen the wrong horse to put their money on, and that they are greatly in want of a weapon with which to attack the Government. On the one hand the objection is made that the scheme is not revolutionary enough, and, on the other, that it involves considerable changes. I maintain that it is a moderate scheme, that it could be extended in future years; that it would meet present wants, that it will do more than anything else to meet the approval of the people of the country, because it will strengthen our old constitutional force and popularise and regularise and improve that great Volunteer movement which has been so useful in recent years and is so creditable to the loyalty of the county.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford) said he had listened to the speech of the hon. Member for Maidstone in which he called attention to the case presented on behalf of the British soldier by Count Sternberg. He felt very strongly on the matter because he himself had a son at the front. He should like to say a few words in regard to the defence which the Chief Secretary for Ireland had made for the scheme presented to the House. In that very able speech the right hon. Gentleman had conjugated his moods and tenses, and he did not wish to contrast it with the speech of the hon. Member for North Ayrshire, because in vain was the net set in sight of any bird. But he was rather astonished at one or two things which the Chief Secretary had said. The right hon. Gentleman suggested, to the best of his understanding, that the Army was made for the generals, and not the generals for the Army, and that in order to keep sixteen generals and their staffs off the half-pay list the House ought to support the scheme of the Secretary of State for War. He was astounded that the Chief Secretary could get up in this House and say to the hon. Member for Fareham that the pay of the soldier amounted to thirty shillings a week. He should have thought that those lines of Canning's, which were repeated by Sir Robert Peel from the very place where the right hon. Gentleman now sat, would have occurred to him;

"But of all plagues, good Heaven, thy wrath can send  
Save, save, oh! save me from the candid friend."

When he read the speeches which had been made in the House of Lords, and those made by hon. friends behind the Treasury benches, it was not for him to criticise the proposals of the War Office. Since the Secretary of State for War made his speech a good deal of water had flowed under Westminster Bridge, and there had been some remarkable articles in *The Times* and its sea-green contemporary, the *Westminster Gazette*, with reference to the right hon.

Gentleman's scheme. What they said was;"What sort of an Army do you want?" And the answer they gave was;"We want a comparatively small, flexible force able to hold India and the colonies, and able to send two army corps abroad." That was not what they had got, and he was afraid they were not likely to get it under the scheme of the right hon. the Secretary of State for War.

Let him call attention to what happened in August, 1899. That was, of course, ancient history, but, after all, not very ancient history. They then found it necessary to send out a force to South Africa, but, although they paid twenty-nine millions a year for the Army, all they could do was to despatch two weak battalions;one of

which was en route to the West Indies;and three batteries of artillery which had to be made up by tearing to pieces other batteries at home, and the Mediterranean garrison regiments. That was all the War Office could do for the money they took from the taxpayers. If the War Office had had an army corps available and ready in 1899 they would have been spared the entanglement of Ladysmith and the losses at Spion Kop and Colenso. The Leader of the Opposition;and he was bound to say that he thought he was quite right;used outside the House very unparliamentary language about the first army corps. As the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife said in his speech, an army corps was a military combination which was not suited to the military requirements of this country. The country wanted territorial regiments, which it had not got, and which it would not get as long as half of the regular troops were kept in India and the tropics. A mild form of compulsory service was also required, but that would not be forthcoming as long as the country had a Prime Minister who said that the very suggestion of the ballot for the Militia would send every able-bodied man shrieking out of the country. The Secretary of State for War pinned his faith to army corps, and wanted to go one better than Lord Cardwell. The right hon. Gentleman had got six army corps, three of which were to be available for foreign service. It was quite possible that the first and second army Corps might be available for foreign service, but the third army corps, which was to be composed of regular troops in Ireland and the Irish Militia, was in a different position. Nobody, of course, had a word to say against the Irish Militia. He had met them at Aldershot, and they used to drill all day and fight all night, and better soldiers could not be, but they could not be regarded as immediately available for foreign service. The fourth, fifth, and sixth army corps were to be scattered over the place, and it was throwing dust in the eyes of the country to call them army corps at all.

The right hon. Gentleman said that the number of Regular troops would be 155,000, and that the Reserve would be brought up to 90,000, but it should be remembered that the recruiting last year showed a deficit of 18,000 men.

He should like to call the attention of the right hon. Gentleman to a rather remarkable letter which appeared in The Times and the Pall Mall Gazette from Sir Robert Giffen, who was not a Moltke of the Treasury Bench, but a statistician.

He said that out of 155,000 Regular troops the right hon. Gentleman proposed to send 120,000 men abroad, and he added that if the number of recruits per annum were put down at 45,000, and if recruits were not to be sent abroad until they

had two years service, 90,000 men should be deducted from 155,000, and that therefore the right hon. Gentleman would not have 120,000 men to send abroad. If the right hon. Gentleman meant that he intended to fill up the ranks with Reservists, it was a pity he had not said so, and if he did that he would be in the same unfortunate position he was in last year, when the Reservists had to be put into the fighting line. The right hon. Gentleman proposed to increase the strength of the Army by eighteen battalions, but how was he going to do it? He proposed to take five battalions from India and tropical stations, but he said the other day that the garrisons at Aden and Hong Kong would still be composed of white troops. The Indian Government might allow white battalions to leave India, or they might not, and probably they would not. It was further proposed to garrison the coaling stations with Royal Marines, but the Secretary to the Admiralty, and Lord Goschen in the House of Lords, gave the country to understand that they were not absolutely in accord with the Secretary of State for War in sending the Royal Marines to coaling stations. Then eight battalions were to be raised from the Royal Reserve battalions, which, as they all knew, was a very extensive business. They were brought together in a hurry without drill or arms, and as they had no prospective employment they were given a considerable amount of leave. He put a question to the Financial Secretary to the War Office as to how many troops had been obtained from the Royal Reserve battalions, and he was informed that only a thousand men had been recruited for garrison regiments out of a total of 24,000. There were, of course, two battalions at Aldershot, but yet two battalions were not, except in War Office nomenclature, eight battalions.

The difficulty and the crux of the whole matter was how to get the men. The right hon. Gentleman did not propose to increase the pay, because he did not think it necessary, and he was not going to apply the mild suasion of the Militia ballot, but he was going to give the men less sentry-go and more cubicles; but if he gave them all the cubicles in this world and the next he would not get half the recruits he required. He might be regarded as an old fossil, but still he had an extensive and peculiar knowledge of certain phases of military life, and, speaking of what he knew, he said that cubicles would not do the right hon. Gentleman the least good in the world. The House would remember in considering the question of how to bring the Army up to its normal strength that there were 15,000 time-expired men in India, and that there was also a deficit of something like 20,000 men in the Reserve. Of course, men could not be in the Reserve and in the fighting line at the same time, and the Reserve was accordingly depleted. But before they considered an increase in the Army they should provide for the 15,000 time-expired men in India, and also the deficit in the Reserve. He thought that the Secretary of State for War had put his money, as Lord Salisbury once said, on the wrong horse. He had put his money on the Volunteers and the Yeomanry. The Yeomanry were practically an untried force. 1,900 of them went to South Africa, but not a single troop or squadron, as such, went to the front at all. As for the Volunteers, not a single battalion went to the front during the present campaign. The Volunteers who did go to South Africa were the pick of 220,000 men. The right hon. Gentleman was

putting his money into forces over which he had practically no control, instead of putting it into the Militia or the Army. It seemed to him that the right hon. Gentleman was spending twenty-nine millions on an army list which was made of paper and nothing else. He knew very well that it was useless for him and his hon. friends who held the same views to protest against the scheme. They were merely slaving away in the stokehole while the right hon. Gentleman was on the quarterdeck with 130 votes in his pocket. He certainly would not vote for the Amendment of the Leader of the Opposition, because, although he had the greatest respect for him, when he was at the War

Office he was one of the most dogged obstructives of military matters who had ever sat on the front bench. As far as he was concerned, he would vote for the scheme if he thought it would be of the slightest use to the service in which he had the honour to hold a commission; but he did not think it would, and therefore he would not follow the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War into the lobby.

\*MR. FULLER (Wiltshire, Westbury): I intend to respond to the appeal of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House, and will curtail my remarks as much as possible. I wish to say a few words on the financial question which this motion brings before the House, and I am bound to say that, although there is no one in the House more fully alive to the importance of the most stringent economy in our national services than I am, yet I cannot agree with the position taken up by the hon. Member for Oldham. I do not think that in that speech, to which I as well as every other hon. Member listened with delighted admiration, he contributed much to the question under discussion. It seems to me that what the country wants, and what the House of Commons must provide, in the Army as in the Navy, is not so much economy, although that in itself is of sufficient importance, but efficiency, and if I understand the position taken up by the hon. Member for Oldham it is that he wants to go back to the condition of our national defences of fifteen years ago. I do think that we must realise the full importance of keeping efficient the Army as well as the Navy. The hon. Member for Oldham twitted the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean on his Imperialism, and told him that he had noticed that when a Radical became an Imperialist he got it very badly. I cannot help thinking that when a Tory becomes an economist he gets it very dangerously. I wish to say that I give to the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War more credit than has been given to him by many of his hon. friends. He has dealt with what is admitted to be a grave national problem in a spirit of great courage, and I am bound to say that although I do not agree with all the details, yet, at the same time, I cannot help admitting that the country owes the right hon. Gentleman a great debt of gratitude for the courage with which he has faced the situation. The arguments against the hon. Gentleman's scheme have been dealt with by my right hon. friend the Member for East Fife, and they are unanswerable. I do not propose to refer to them, There is one point to which I wish specially to direct attention. The right hon. Gentleman proposes that five battalions of British troops should be withdrawn from our garrisons in the Far East. Speaking with due regard to our experience of native troops in the past and to the absolute

necessity of keeping open our trade routes in time of war, I venture to think that this proposition is fraught with great danger, and I appeal to the right hon. Gentleman to consider whether it may not be possible to keep the same proportion of white troops at our important coaling stations in the Far East as at present. I wish to say one word about a matter of which we have heard a great deal. We have heard from every quarter and from every section of opinion the lessons that we should draw from the war. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War detailed some of these lessons. He told us that if our Army is to be efficient we must have increased artillery, that we must have more mounted men, that we must reform our Army medical service, and that we must have more efficient transport. I admit fully that the right hon. Gentleman has to a considerable extent met the deficiency in the artillery; but as regards mounted men and the Army Medical Corps I find that he has done nothing whatever. At any rate he has taken no money to increase these arms of the service. It seems to me that the great lessons of the war are that mounted troops were insufficient in number, that our hospital arrangements broke down, and caused the deaths of thousands who otherwise would have been saved, and that our transport was insufficient.

I should like to make an appeal to the right hon. Gentleman for a slight modification in the way he proposes to increase the Yeomanry forces. I am quite sure that every Yeomanry officer in this House and out of it will, to the very best of his ability, endeavour to secure all the men he can get. But the great difficulty will be to secure a sufficient number of men. There are only three classes from which they can be recruited, namely, farmers, tradesmen and artisans. We tax every one of these classes very heavily. We ask them to come out for a period of

sixteen days, fourteen days training and one day marching in and another day marching out. They are to be paid 7s. a day, and they will be practically unable to take anything back with them. I would suggest to the right hon. Gentleman that he should accept the unanimous recommendation of the Yeomanry committee and pay the Yeomanry 10s. a day for ten days instead of 7s. a day for fourteen days, and I think he will find that the difference in cost will be absolutely nothing.

I thank the House for its indulgence, and I hope the right hon. Gentleman will give my humble proposals some measure of consideration.

\*LIEUT.-COLONEL TUFNELL (Essex, S.E.): I cannot claim the indulgence of the House on the ground that I have written letters on military reform to the papers, or that I know something about foreign armies, but I have passed some twenty-three years; the best years of my life, and perhaps the happiest years; in an Irish regiment. They were a fine body of men, who knew no fear, who were obedient to their officers, and loyal to their colours, and if at any time their zeal outran their discretion they were always heartily sorry and expressed their contrition, an example which I should like to have seen followed in this House not long ago. At the General Election I promised, I am afraid, a great number of things. I have visions before me of deceased wife's sisters, and would-be beery children and other things, but one thing which was an especial part of my platform was Army reform. I remember perfectly well that one of my posters was

"Vote for Colonel Tufnell, who will reform the Army." I should like to say that I went through this scheme of Army reform very carefully, and I was astonished to find that the Order in Council of 25th November was not cancelled, because, as all military men well knew, especially after what happened in another place, it was thought that the authority of the Commander-in-Chief, would be restored to him entirely, and also that whatever reforms were made the House would have the authority of the Commander-in-Chief that they were adequate. Although I have no doubt that the Secretary of State for War has consulted the Commander-in-Chief, still we have not his authority that this scheme is complete. Before the Franco-German war

the French military attaché said to his Government, "Beware of the German staff." We all know that that warning was disregarded, and we all know the result; but it shows what great importance should be placed on an efficient staff. The staff of the British Army has never been brought up to date. Every military man in this House will tell you how we have suffered in time of active service; that whenever his regiment has been ordered to any place there will be three or four orders sent, each countermanding the other, before the order actually arrives telling him where his regiment is to go. And in time of war, when we get order after order, each of which countermands the one sent before, it is the fault of the staff. In South Africa one of the greatest catastrophes was brought about owing to an operation being undertaken which should not have been undertaken before the ground had been properly reconnoitred first by the staff. We all know how we lost the Highland brigade. The six centres mentioned by the Secretary of State for War I think are the best parts of the scheme, because they give opportunities for training the officers of the staff upon whom these duties will fall in time of war. The hon. Member for Oldham said he thought generals were made for the Army, and not the Army for the generals, but you cannot buy generals in a shop like you can a pound of cheese. Generals have to be made. I do not entirely agree with the hon. Member for Fareham about the pay. The hon. Gentleman said that when a man was twenty years of age he should receive a certain sum, 1s. 9d., or whatever it is, I think myself that when a man joins the Army, until he has learnt his drill he is an absolute encumbrance to his battalion, and to give him 1s. 9d. under those circumstances would not be right, but when he has been in the force for a year and proved himself to be a good soldier I would give him 1s. 6d. or 1s. 9d., and after he had been in the Army three years I would give him 2s. or even more. Another thing which a soldier hates is the system of "barrack damages," and I hope in this scheme the right hon. Gentleman will do away with "barrack damages." Another thing they object to is the autumn manœuvres. On those occasions they suffer from all the hardships

of a military campaign without any extra pay, and they wear out their clothes. I myself would give each man an extra 3d. a day while he was out and a working suit. The principal point of the right hon. Gentleman with regard to the reorganisation scheme is the permanent position occupied by the chief of the staff in time of war. That is most important. If we do not drill our staffs in time of peace, where shall we be in time of war? Wars come so quickly upon us



now that it is absolutely necessary to have an army equipped and organised so as to be able to meet our enemy and beat him before he has time to beat us.

CAPTAIN JESSEL (St.

Pancras, S.): If I might venture to say so, I think the speech of the Chief Secretary for Ireland on Tuesday last has removed many of the objections that were entertained to this scheme by many Members of the House. One of the great difficulties arises from the extraordinary system which exists in the Army of calling things by names which really mean something else. We now learn that the army corps is not really an army corps at all in the proper sense of the word. We see the same thing in regard to other things in the Army. One would think that the men in the "Army Reserve" were reservists, but that is not the case; the Army Reserve men are really the first line. Again, the "Imperial Yeomanry" are yeomanry, but they are not Imperial; that is, they are not liable to serve in all parts of the world. Again, the "Militia Reserve" hitherto has not been the reserve to the Militia at all, but a reserve for the Army. Now that it has been explained that the creation of six army corps means only the division of the United Kingdom into six great districts, many of our objections are removed. If that is what is meant, I, for one, gladly welcome that portion of the scheme. When the war in South Africa broke out we saw how great was the confusion in the selection and allocation of officers for high commands. Men were sent out who had never before seen their brigades or their units. We also saw; and I hope we shall never see it again; a great many officers removed from the headquarters staff and sent to the front. In time of war the headquarters staff should remain at headquarters to direct and organise the future supply of men for the front, instead of themselves hastening off to the scene of action and taking active command in the field. By this new system we should be able to decentralise much of the business which at present is such a curse to the War Office. Another point is, how does the Secretary of State propose to deal with the troops that are not allotted to the army corps? I take it that these army corps will consist of about 40,000 men each, which will mean a total of 240,000, while we should have on the establishment altogether about 600,000. Will the men who are not allotted to the army corps be under the command of the district commander; if not, how will they be allotted?

\*MR. BRODRICK: They will be under the command of the corps commander of the district.

\*CAPTAIN JESSEL: Will they be brigades by themselves, or kept simply in their units?

MR. BRODRICK: I think that is a point rather for subsequent consideration.

CAPTAIN JESSEL: I am glad that that is going to be considered, because I think it is very important that the army corps commander should have the command of the whole of the troops within his district, as he will be able to judge of the requirements as to barracks, ranges, and other necessities; a thing which it is very difficult for a central authority to do. I think the Chief Secretary for Ireland dealt rather hardly the other day with the Leader of the Opposition for stating that the best general in the field was not always the best administrator for peace purposes. Surely there is a difference between the man who is able to

lead in the field and the man who is good at office work. It has always seemed to me to be a great fault in our system that the generals who ought to be riding about, inspecting and looking after the troops, are so tied to their offices that they are not able to give proper instruction to the various brigades under their command. In fact they have been so chained to their offices in the past that they have had very little time to undertake the active duties of their profession, so far as they concern educating and leading the men under them. I hope this state of things will be changed, and that, if possible, the Secretary of State will introduce some department of the Army, such as a control or administrative department, for the men who are not active combatants. Even in an ordinary regiment, nowadays, the colonel and the adjutant, in the same manner as the generals, are tied to their office. It seems to me that if a department was made under the assistant adjutant, with all the quartermasters and men employed in the various messes and canteens; in fact, if all the non-combatant portion of the regiments belonged to some department of the Army; it would be a very good thing, because you might reserve those posts for men who had already passed through the ranks and were in the Army Reserve. If this were done, the Reserve men would have something to look forward to, and you would be able to keep a lot of men who would make the Army a profession. I think this is a point worthy of attention; that in some way or other the general and colonels commanding units should be freed from some of the merely routine work.

As regards the army corps itself, there is another point I cannot very well understand. Owing to the exigencies of the service, certain regiments never stop very long at one place. How can we expect to see any esprit de corps if the regiments are continually moved about? I am strongly of opinion that it would be a great deal better if regiments were not moved about in the United Kingdom as they have been in the past. It costs an enormous amount of money, and the officers, and especially the non-commissioned officers and men, suffer very much from the great expense, because the amount of luggage they are allowed to take about is very small. The officers are also put to much expense in refurnishing their quarters in every barracks they go to, and the same applies to the non-commissioned officers and men who are married. In India, where I had the honour to serve for several years, most regiments stop in a station for three years, and the regiment I was in stopped nearly seven years. The argument in this country is that the men get tired of being in one place, but in view of the practice in India, I cannot see how that argument applies.

With regard to the 120,000 men of the first three army corps, I understand that they will be ready for mobilisation at short notice. Does the right hon.

Gentleman intend to include the Guards in one of the army corps, or are they to stand outside? I understood that we were to have a same small force ready to go without calling on the Reserves at all.

\*MR. BRODRICK was understood to intimate that the guards would be included in the three army corps.

CAPTAIN JESSEL: I am very glad to hear that, because we will have some men, at all events, who will be ready to go off at once without the Reserves being

called upon. The Intelligence Department has really done wonderful work, but, in my opinion, it is very much undermanned; there ought to be a great many more officers attached to it. I would respectfully submit that steps should be taken to create a body on the lines of the general staff in Germany; a body of men who are constantly engaged in working out plans, mobilisation schemes, and things of that description. The Intelligence Department is really a kind of information department in most armies, but somehow in England the Intelligence Department has to do the work which the general staff does abroad. If the Secretary of State would create a body on the lines of the general staff I think it would tend to much greater efficiency in any future campaign in which we might be engaged. Some Members have greatly objected to these garrison battalions. I think they are an excellent thing, and although at present we hear that only 2,000 have enlisted, I am confident that when that rather extravagant bounty of £12 10s. which the men received the other day has been spent many of them will be on their beam-ends again, and will come back to serve in these battalions. It is also a very good thing that these men will not be confined to Malta and Gibraltar, but will be sent also to South Africa. I think that will help to solve the great problem of how South Africa is to be populated with Englishmen, because I heard the other day that one of these battalions 1,000 strong had no less than 600 women and over 2,000 children attached to it.

I regret that there is no increase of cavalry in the scheme. The cavalry have been very much abused by certain critics in connection with the present campaign, but I may point out that their horses were very badly fed and they had to carry tremendous weights. I would respectfully urge that criticism should be deferred until the British public have had an opportunity of reading what that great leader who has done so much in this war; General French; has to say on the subject.

With regard to the Yeomanry portion of the scheme, I wish it every possible success. But there may be a certain difficulty in places, where the men have always been accustomed to look upon themselves as cavalry, to get them to turn themselves into what I imagine to be intended; mounted rifles, and not mounted infantry. In view of the circumstance that there is so very little cavalry in the country, it might be as well if, where regiments wished to remain as cavalry, they should be allowed to do so, and that new regiments should be raised for the mounted rifles. I think also that the Secretary of State runs a great risk in giving this mounted pay to the Yeomanry and providing them with horses, by making it more easy for a man to serve fourteen days in the Yeomanry than to do a whole month in the Militia. Everybody, in the military service as in anything else, naturally wishes to do that which is easiest for himself, and it would be a pity if the great constitutional force of the Militia were in any way harmed by the new attractions of other forces. I hope the Secretary of State will put his foot down upon there being competition in the way of mounted men between the Volunteer forces and the Yeomanry. It would be very difficult in some parts of the country for the two forces to exist; they would only compete with each other, and the efficiency of both would be destroyed. I was very anxious to see the line the Leader of the Opposition would take with regard to

the pay of the men, and I noted that he wisely, as his party may some day be in power, refused to lend himself to any suggestion of a great increase of pay. I think the Government have a complete answer to any such suggestion at present. They say, "Let us try our scheme; if we can get the men, well and good; the country will not be bound down to any great increase in the future." If, on the other hand, they find that under existing conditions they cannot get the men, it will then be open to the Government to come and say, "We have tried our best, but we are unable to get the men, and we must alter the conditions." It would be wrong of the Government to come forward with any such suggestion at present. The very first thing that would be said would be, "You have not tried your scheme, and yet you say we must give higher pay." Then there is the question of increasing the comfort of the men in barracks. Lord Roberts, I know, is very anxious that that should be done, and the Secretary of State is very sympathetic on the matter. Whoever has seen the miserable barrack-rooms in this country, where thirty men sleep in one room with one little gas-jet, cannot fail to be impressed by the fact that it is difficult for men of education to join the Army under such conditions. In India for several years past they have had separate dining-rooms and so on. The conditions of civil life have very much improved, and comforts have increased. The officers take very good care to be made as comfortable as possible, and eminent authorities have said that even on service the more comfortable you make your officers and men the better they will fight. You ought to make the conditions more cheerful, and try to make barrack life brighter. If you could accomplish this, then you would be able to get a very superior class of men for the Army.

I am very sorry that this has been made a party question by the Amendment of the Leader of the Opposition, for many hon. Members on this side will now be obliged to close up their ranks in regard to any objections they had to the scheme and support the Government. The late Home Secretary seemed to be quite in accord with the best military opinion in this House. Firstly, he advocated the necessity of keeping up the drafts for India; secondly, the necessity of providing a mobile force; and, thirdly, that the Navy was the first line of defence, and that we should have a number of men here to form a home army. The Leader of the Opposition did not seem to recognise that the responsibilities of the

Empire had increased at all, and he appeared to doubt whether there was any necessity for an improvement. The Army reformers in this House may not have got the whole loaf which they desired, but we do recognise that we have got a very fair and substantial amount of bread. We admire the way in which the present Secretary of State for War has laboured to bring out this plan, and I think it is a great credit that he has, in so short a time, while he has been engaged with the conduct of a great war in South Africa, produced a plan which still holds the field.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): I noted with pleasure the concluding remarks of the Secretary of State for War, because he said that in this scheme he wished to secure the abolition of red tape, and also secure decentralisation. I am sorry that these objects were not put before the country earlier, and I regret that

the right hon. Gentleman did not take the opportunity in his speech at Guildford of giving the country explanations on such matters as these. I think the principal feature of this three days debate has been the kaleidoscope changes which the Government schemes have undergone. On the first day we had an assurance from the Chief Secretary for Ireland that the army corps were not to be considered as army corps; on the second day we had from the Financial Secretary to the War Office a hint that the Government would welcome suggestions; and to-day we have a very different statement from the Secretary of State for War. There are many of us who, in spite of the great temptation to win popularity by supporting this scheme, prefer to place the interests of our country first. I approach this question from no party point of view, but I cannot be expected to vote in any other way but with my party on this question, more especially after the exposition of the fallacies of the scheme just given by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife. I will take advantage of the statement of the Financial Secretary to the War Office, who said that the Government were prepared to receive suggestions calculated to benefit the scheme. The suggestions I have to make are many years old, more especially the reform which has been advocated by no less an authority in this House than the present Secretary to the Admiralty. These suggestions will bear repeating, for in some ways I do not see that we are any nearer their adoption than, we were many years ago. I look upon this scheme as, to a certain extent, being built upon a foundation of sand, because it does not deal with the very crux of the question, namely, the question of the men. It has been said that this argument has been repeated ad nauseam. I wish, however, the country to remember that the Army exists for the State, and not the State for the Army. We are sometimes told that we wish to secure reforms in the Army without being prepared to make the necessary sacrifices. But we have to consider this question of the men, and we shall have to do away with a great many old prejudices. We should aim at making the conditions which animate men in coming into the Army identically the same as those which animate officers who wish to enter the Army, and I do not think this country should remain content with the voluntary system until we have as much competition to enter into the rank and file of the army as there is to enter into the commissioned ranks. No matter what suggestions are put forward, you cannot expect immediate success. The men who advocate these changes are told that they will not succeed at once, but you have to kill the mistrust and want of confidence which an erroneous system has created in the minds of the people. I should like to see the man who enlists in the ordinary ranks obtain the same social advantages as the officer does when he enters the Army.

I rather regard with apprehension the attack which has been made in this debate upon the wearing of the uniform. I deprecate any such idea, and I fancy that in previous debates there was a much more healthy tone to the effect that uniform should be more worn and more respected than in the past. When, men go completely away on furlough they should have the chance of wearing plain clothes, and I would urge that officers and men should be placed on absolute equality in this respect. I should like to see the men who enlist in the Army given many

advantages over the civilians of the same class. The soldier should be able to travel more

cheaply on our lines, and procure more easy terms of admission into places of amusement or licensed places than the civilian. The civilian ought to be made to see that in everything he is placed at a disadvantage as compared with the soldier. I would urge that in the service the men should not simply be regarded as servants of the Government for the time being, and the whole training of the soldiers should be in accordance with this idea. The soldier must be taught to understand that we not only look after him while he is in the service, but that we also provide for him in the future. I would also urge that trades should be thoroughly taught in the Army, and it might be considered whether it would not be possible to offer to employers a bounty or a rebate in taxation in proportion to the number of ex-soldiers or reservists in their employ. It would also facilitate the teaching of trades if regiments were not kept so much on the move. I agree with the hon. Member for the Fareham Division that we should make the conditions such that the soldiers will speak well of the Army. But there is something higher than that, for we want the people outside the Army to speak well of it. I remember the first time I spoke in this House I told the story of how a country woman had said that she would sooner be following her son to the grave than see him enlist in the Army.

There is another important matter which I have never lost an opportunity of bringing before the House, and it is the question of the age at which the recruit is taken into the Army. All the speakers in this debate have criticised the youthful age of the recruits, but if the regulations which exist were enforced the question of youth would not come up so often. It is because these regulations are absolutely a dead letter that speaker after speaker in this House dwells upon the youth of the soldier. I wish to see an absolutely correct age given without doubt by the soldier, whether he be a Militiaman or a recruit for the Regular Army. I differ from those who say that if this is done we shall not get the men. If you narrow the door of coming into the Army you will create competition, and until you do this you will never have a satisfactory state of recruiting. If you make it difficult

and exacting to get into the Army, and insist upon the production of a good character, you will not only obtain recruits from a higher class of the community, but you will get these lads at their proper age. I would also urge that the system of mixing boys up with the men should be stopped. Until the boys are fit to go abroad you should keep them together as boys, and not allow youths of fifteen and sixteen years of age to live the barrack room life with old soldiers. There was a report made the other day by the Inspector-General of Military Prisons in regard to a soldier of twenty-two years of age who had enlisted nine times. The first time he enlisted he was only fifteen years of age, and he deserted no less than six times. What a waste for the country is that boy's career, and how many are there at the present time in similar situations. How many cases are constantly brought up before the House of youths and boys who ought never to have been allowed to join the Army. Instead of my suggestion being against economy, I believe the country would save enormously if

it was carried out.

It has been calculated that, after making due allowance for waste, the disappearance of half the recruits takes place after less than two years service. I think that proves that a large percentage of these boys ought not to have been allowed to enlist at all. I think recruits should be compelled to produce proof of their ages. The practice of allowing boys and men who are morally or physically unfit to enlist causes great waste. It is calculated that in ten years 150,000 soldiers had disappeared before their engagements were completed, and that represents a loss to the country of £9,000,000 in the ten years, owing to the want of a correct and reliable system of recruiting. This means that the men are fed, clothed, housed, instructed, and paid for at the expense of the State before their engagements are completed, and absolutely no return is got for this expenditure. These are the terrible effects of enlisting youths and men of bad character in the Army, and it must be apparent that the country would gain if a more reliable system of recruiting were adopted. I also desire to protest against youths being sent on service to India contrary to the regulations. Many of

the youths sent out to India have turned out to be three years under the regulation age, and how do they come back? They come back very often the victims of terrible diseases, a fact which is well known to Members of this House. How can you expect people here at home to have any confidence in the Army when they see their sons coming back to this country wrecked and ruined, and their lives spoilt? As long as I am a Member of this House I shall continue to bring up this matter until a complete change is brought about. I agree with the last speaker that the pay is not the chief inducement for men to go into the Service. I should like to see an advance in the pay to a certain extent, but I am not of the opinion that the boys who enlist should get full pay until they are trained. With the saving effected by not enlisting men under age, or men with physical or moral defects, I would arrange to pay a slow progressive rate of pay. Perhaps that would be an advantage, although I do not believe for a moment that it is the pay that induces the men to enlist. Even in the most highly paid corps desertions and purchase of discharges goes on much the same as in other regiments.

I would like to say a word or two about the officers. I called attention some two years ago to this question, and one would have thought that, with every incentive for recruiting, the percentage of commissioned officers taken from the ranks would have held its own. I think there ought to be a stated proportion of officers from the ranks laid down and adhered to. I notice from a Return that the average number of commissions from the ranks during the last three years has gradually dropped. The average for the year 1895 was 4½ per cent., but within the last three years the percentage has been reduced to 2½, or nearly half; and this has occurred at the very time when there ought to have been the greatest inducement to recruits to enlist. I believe that, to a very great extent, reforms are denied to the Service because certain classes are not prepared to make the necessary sacrifices, and it is impossible to obtain reforms unless we make some sacrifice in regard to our old prejudices. I would

like to say a word or two in regard to the question of officers' expenses. I think upon this

subject the House has been treated to some fantastical figures, which I believe are highly exaggerated. I know that certain cavalry regiments, such as the 7th Dragoon Guards and the 19th Hussars, were, by the courageous action of their colonels, reformed in this respect, and I know that some of the officers have been able to live upon £200 a year. But this does not hide the fact, which I am prepared to admit, that for many years all the regulations for lessening the expenses of cavalry regiments have been absolutely a dead letter. Twelve years ago I remember that order after order was issued by the War Office that regimental expenses were to be lessened, but there was not the slightest diminution in the expenses in nine cases out of ten. As regards the education of officers, the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition has been criticised severely for having spoken, and spoken truly, about public school education and its capacity for turning out good Army officers. I ask the House to remember the extraordinary facts brought out in every Return in regard to the entrance examination to the Army. I wish to know how it is that the sons of the richest men as a rule secure the smallest number of marks in the entrance examinations, but commissions in cavalry regiments are given to candidates with a small number of marks. The very reverse ought to be the case. These are the sons of men who can afford to send their boys abroad to learn foreign languages, and they ought to be the candidates who secure the greatest number of marks. It is invariably the case that you find commissions in the cavalry regiments given to those who get the smallest number of marks. It is quite time these anomalies were changed. I wish the House to remember that it is quite possible to reform the Army without being obliged to increase it.

As far as the general scheme is concerned, I will merely suggest two other points. It is most important to recognise that there should be a mobile force able to leave this country at once. I would suggest that one or two divisions in each of the proposed army corps should be kept equipped, not only for European service, but also for tropical service; and they should be kept ready to leave the country at a moment's

notice. I would also suggest that several brigades in each division should be thoroughly trained as mounted infantry. This would create a force able to leave our shores at a moment's notice when it might not be necessary to despatch an army corps. The hon. Member for East Bristol suggested that certain regiments should be trained in this way. I think they should be kept equipped for tropical as well as European service. As regards the Volunteers, I merely wish to say that I look upon it as dangerous to make invidious distinctions, which must act unfavourably upon those in the second rank. I cannot help thinking that for this and many other reasons the scheme devised by the Government is incomplete. I compliment the hon. Member for Oldham upon the brilliant courage and ability displayed in his speech, for it is a call to duty which the House has not listened to for some time. I am opposed to the scheme because I think the fundamental problem of the men has not been solved, in spite of the figures which have been quoted in regard to recruiting. I passed St. George's Barracks



yesterday, and I gathered that the average number of recruits there used to be something like fifty per day, but they are now taking on an average between twelve and fifteen per day, and I cannot understand the figures which the right hon. Gentleman has given us to-day. In a case of emergency if we mobilised two army corps for foreign service the Reserve would disappear at once, and the number for home defence would merely exist on paper. If they cannot be mobilised for foreign service the scheme gives a larger force than we require for peace, and a smaller force than we require for war. I cannot help thinking that in the right hon. Gentleman's speech there was an almost wilful attempt to discredit the voluntary system. It certainly not only impressed the House, but the country generally. It is impossible for me as a military man and Member of Parliament to favour conscription in any way. I think it is impossible for foreign service and for home defence, and I hope the country will never see it.

COLONEL BROOKFIELD (Sussex, Rye): I sympathise with much that was said by the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down, and believe that he is very sincere in his wishes for the welfare of the whole Army. I cannot say that many hon. Members on that side of the House have given any great enlightenment in this debate, or that they made a favourable impression. I turn to the observations of the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for East Fife, who addressed the House this evening. His exordium dealt chiefly with the tactics of his own party, which I leave to his party to settle. He accused some members of this House of intending to vote against their own convictions. He said the great bulk of us wholly disapproved of these proposals. I join issue with the right hon. and learned Gentleman altogether on that question. Many of us, if I may speak for my hon. friends, have neither approved nor disapproved of the proposals, because until quite recently we were unable to understand them. The text was wide and vague, and the marginal notes became more and more ample. For months past this question has been treated by Ministers rather as of departmental than of great national importance. No Cabinet Minister of first rank has condescended to shed any light on this question of Army reform, with the exception of my right hon. friend the Chief Secretary for Ireland, who made an interesting and lively speech the other evening. The Prime Minister himself spoke of the "nebulous attack" on the War Office, and went on to encourage the fatuous proposal for the establishment of rifle clubs as an all-sufficient reform to deal with the military shortcomings of the nation. I have waited anxiously for the author, even more than the commentator, to hear what he would say on the subject, and I congratulate my right hon. friend very sincerely upon having reassured many hon. Members who sit near me on some of these proposals. All depends on the practical construction put on the words of the resolution. My right hon. friend described the resolution very accurately as a skeleton. What pleased me was that he afterwards said that it was his intention to clothe it with flesh and blood.

The opposition generally to this measure has come from two schools of opinion; those who think that the proposals go too far, and those who think that they do not go far enough. The right hon.

Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition belongs to the school who think that they

go too far. At the outset of his remarks, when he compared the present proposals with those of Mr. Cardwell thirty years ago, I thought he was going to complain that they did not go far enough, but he afterwards indicated his alarm at the formidable nature of the resolution. He evidently believes the Army to be an institution mainly kept up for the benefit of clerks, contractors, and politicians. I believe he is perfectly sincere in that belief. He has said himself that he wants a small Army. We have a right to express our opinions here, and I venture to say that we want a large Army; a comparatively large Army, and the difficulty is that we require an army of superior quality. Two reflections occur to me in connection with the South African War; reflections of which I cannot divest my mind at the present moment. One is that we have not been crushing the Boers by superior military ability, or by innate superiority of race. We have been slowly overwhelming them practically by numbers. I think that is profoundly unsatisfactory. What a very different lesson will be taught that enemy from that which was taught to the enemy we met in the Indian Mutiny. The second reflection that occurs to me is that in any contest in which we are likely to be engaged with a civilised and educated Power, we are likely to be inferior in numbers. The conclusion to which I come is that we require both quantity and quality. We can obtain either of these by the sacrifice of the other. The awkward thing is that we really require both. I can understand the position of the hon. Gentlemen opposite who say that we can possibly obtain superior quality by making great efforts to alter the policy of the country in such a way as to sacrifice quantity altogether. The present Commander-in-Chief twenty years ago said our Army was "absurdly small." If it was absurdly small then it must be absurdly small at the present time, as our territory has vastly increased in the interval. All we can do is to make the best of it by an arrangement such as I hope may be found in the new proposals. I look on the six army corps as the irreducible minimum of our requirements. I would like to know whether the first, second and third corps are to be provided with only a nucleus of transport and stores, because I have seen no mention of the cost of providing these transports.

I understand that my right hon. friend, in spite of the criticisms that have been showered upon him, and also the facts and figures brought forward by the Inspector General of Recruiting, is of opinion that he will really be able to obtain the men he wants. I think it is fair to say that that is a subject on which very few Members of the House agree with him. But still the figures in this connection do prove a good deal. I am willing to accept the statement he gives on his official authority. The figures show that there is no difficulty in getting recruits. What I regret is that the recruits should not be of superior quality. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition spoke of getting a higher social class. I believe that has been the object of Ministers from time to time from the days of Mr. Cardwell. I believe it would greatly increase the efficiency of the Army if we could attract them. One of the commonplaces of this controversy with respect to the difficulty of higher pay for soldiers is to say that if you want a better soldier you must pay for him. I do not believe gentlemen who favour that view have really thought out the enormous cost that

would be involved by paying such an increase as would ensure an altogether better class of men. I am afraid these little nibbling attempts by paying a penny here and giving a quarter of a pound of meat there, in order to make the soldier more comfortable in barracks; all of which are excellent things; will only have the effect of making the present class more comfortable. They will not bring into the Army an altogether superior class. I do not think that the superior class of man is attracted mainly by pay. He is attracted mainly by the love of adventure and the romance of active service. When you come to talk about pay, a man of that kind takes 5s. as lightly as the present private soldier takes 1s. I consider that, in continuing our present system of enlistment and our present pay, we are stereotyping our inferiority to other Powers in this respect. Anyone who has served lately in the war will confirm me in saying that the old pipe-clay disciplinarian kind of soldier is really of little use in modern warfare.

We want intelligence, respectability, and initiative, and we ought to make some sacrifices to try and attract a superior class of men to the colours.

I confess I was disappointed at finding that this scheme does not mean the scheme generally known as two armies, and I should have liked to hear at what period it was that Lord Roberts changed his opinion with regard to the merits of the two army system. I listened carefully to what the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant said the other night on this subject, and I gathered from him that the Commander-in-Chief had said that he was not in favour of a separate Indian army. A separate Indian army is not necessarily the same thing as two armies of the kind we have been in the habit of advocating, and though it is too late now to attempt to get any public support for that scheme, I cannot help saying I should have thought that one very well equipped, mobile army of the old-fashioned sort, full of professional soldiers, ready to go anywhere at a moment's notice, might have existed side by side with a very large home army composed principally of young men of a superior class, who would come out in times of emergency and who would follow their ordinary avocations at other times. We have had an indication from the Chief Secretary that it is intended to attract some of these young men through the agency of the Imperial Yeomanry, and my complaint is that these things are not done plainly in the text. I do not understand the object of having any concealment about it. It is hoped in the same way that this Imperial system will in time include colonial troops as well. I don't see why they are excluded at the present moment. The only thing in favour of it is that it is evidence of my right hon. friend's sincerity. I believe, if he had been advocating a sham scheme, instead of having six army corps, he would have proposed twenty. I could explain how he could have twenty army corps on paper with the greatest ease. It could be done by pressing into service all those colonial troops whom he is candid enough to say he only intends to ask in an incidental way. The conclusions which have led me to support the proposals of the right hon. Gentleman are mainly that we should incur a very serious responsibility if we voted against them.

I only hope my right hon. friend fully understands the great and grave responsibility he incurs in telling the country that these are adequate

proposals.

\*MR. GOULDING (Wiltshire, Devizes): No one who heard the Secretary of State for War could fail to be struck with his courage. The proposals which the right hon. Gentleman has put before the House will not attain the object he has in view, while they will impose increased taxation on the people and inevitably postpone those urgent social reforms which many of us desire to see solved. I certainly for one cannot support the Army scheme of the Government. It is only a few weeks ago that the attention of the House was called by the Chancellor of the Exchequer to the growing extravagance and the growing demands of the Departments. In words remarkably pregnant he said that;

"Suppose the war came to an end, our ordinary expenditure would not permit us to remit the additional taxation imposed for the purposes last year, which included an income tax of no less than 1s. in the £;."

That is something for us to contemplate. In times of peace we are to have an income-tax of 1s., payable by people whose incomes range from £;500 to £;1,000. When we remember at what pains the Chancellor of the Exchequer was to justify the tax upon sugar it is not hard for any man to estimate the chances of the solution in the near future of a question like that of old age pensions, which I think the House will remember the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the First Lord of the Treasury, and the Secretary for the Colonies are pledged to carry out. I am confident that if right hon. Gentlemen on the front bench were to visit the constituencies of Essex and Shropshire, in which bye elections were taking place, they would find social reforms and not increase of the Army were the topics of the platform; the inhabitants of the villages wanted social reforms and measures to alleviate and improve the condition of the poor. Five years ago the Army Estimates were £;18,000,000 a year. To-day we are asked to approve an Estimate of no less than £;29,500,000, and I presume we are to console ourselves with the thought that for the future that is to be the normal annual expenditure for the Army. That expenditure does not include our Indian Army, or the troops which are allotted from time to time to the Colonial and Foreign Offices. Surely it is time that Parliament should pause and take account, look at its balance sheet, and ask where this huge expenditure is to stop, and whether the country is getting value for its money. The right hon. Gentleman proposes to add considerably to the Army. Where that increase is to come from I fail to understand. It is known full well how difficult it is to get the right men to join the Army in time of peace. Every Return which has been published shows that unless inducements very considerably different from those now offered are held out we will not get a larger number of men to join the Army. If we are to be successful in obtaining more recruits we must do so in one of two ways. We must either pay the men a better wage, entirely alter the conditions of service, so as to remove many of those obstacles which prevent men from joining the Army, and offer them other attractions, or we must resort to conscription.

I do not envy the task of any party who ventures to propose conscription. It is absolutely un-English. It would rob us of one of the greatest heritages we have; the right every British subject has in times of peace to choose the duty and the profession he should follow; and if any Minister came here to propose in

time of peace this un-English system of conscription, I am perfectly certain that Parliament and the country would give him very short shrift indeed. I consider the 120,000 men the Secretary of State proposes to have ready to go anywhere at a moment's notice far too large; but, whatever number we have, I hope they will be fit in every way, and that we shall not continue to have the large numbers of lad soldiers hitherto to be found in our barracks. But what about the army corps for home? Are they required, and of what use are they? If we once lose command of the sea, of what use will three or four army corps be against an enemy who may have at its disposal twenty or thirty army corps? If we lose command of the sea, is it at all likely that those who won the victory over us would attempt to land their soldiers on these shores? Is it not far more likely that they would use their victory to harass our ships of commerce and to injure us in a multitude

of other ways? I decline to contemplate the possibility of our losing our position as mistress of the seas, for the country will spare no expense to maintain the supremacy of our fleet. I have no authority from my constituents to vote for an increase of the Army. Army reform is what the nation requires. We want quality, not quantity. The reform of the Army is not on our lips, but in our hearts; and we want an efficient and effective Army. The right hon.

Gentleman himself says that;

"reform is needed in the Royal Army medical service, and in our transport service. But there is another question which is not a matter of money. We want less barrack square drill, we want more scouting, we want more independence, more individuality amongst the men."

And again he said he wanted;

"the delegation to the commanders of the army corps of the authority which is now exercised in Pall Mall."

These are the far-reaching reforms which strike even a layman as being absolutely necessary; and if the right hon. Gentleman and the War Office will only devote themselves to the task they will have their hands full. I would like to ask what would be thought of anyone who sent for a builder to come and enlarge a building, and if that builder found the foundations rotten and defective, yet ordered additions to be made to the building irrespective of the rotten condition of the foundations. Again I ask is not this a most extraordinary illustration of putting the cart before the horse. Why are you going to increase your Army before you establish your new system? Why should you teach your recruits in a system which you yourselves say is defective? That is contrary to common sense. The right hon. Gentleman himself says that reform at the War Office is necessary, that great changes ought to be introduced at once. In fact, he found it imperative to announce that one of the staff would be placed on half-pay in order to get an answer to an enquiry he had instituted. The right hon. Gentleman also informed the House that he had been looking after the insanitary barracks, and that these had now ceased to exist. But the War Office had bought Salisbury Plain, where they maintained cottages which for their insanitary condition were a disgrace and a scandal.

\*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman

is wandering far from the question before the House.

\*MR. GOULDING: I was pointing out what I thought showed a want of organisation on the part of the War Office.

\*MR. SPEAKER: The subject under discussion is not the reorganisation of the War Office, but the reorganisation of the Army.

\*MR. GOULDING: I must say that anyone who has studied the question must know that the War Office has displayed an ability in the evasion of its duty which would not be tolerated in a business establishment. The right hon. Gentleman says that;

"it is more important that we should carry on the business of bringing the war to a conclusion, preparing the Estimates and getting ready our scheme for this year, rather than in occupying our minds in mending the machinery by which the scheme is to be carried out."

That is a most extraordinary doctrine. I should have thought that if you want a machine to work well you should put that machine into good working order. I apologise for the length with which I have trespassed on the time of the House, as I cannot support this scheme. What do the Government think will be the effect of their policy on the ultimate fate of the Tory and Unionist party? Do they for one moment believe that they will be able to stand and thrive alone on militarism? Do they despise the lessons of social reform taught by Disraeli, Pitt, and Churchill? These reforms are before the country to-day; but this taxation will prevent them being carried out, and, therefore, I cannot support the motion.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): The hon. Member who has just sat down has made a most excellent speech. We on this side of the House have listened to it with great satisfaction, and I hope it has increased the satisfaction which the right hon. the Secretary of State for War informs us will be found in the result of the debate. I should not have risen to interfere in this debate at all except for the purpose of calling attention to one or two points which have either not been adverted to or, at any rate, not sufficiently discussed in the speeches already delivered. I have no technical knowledge of the Army, and I do not propose to go into any of the technical questions raised. I think it is apparent to everyone what is the real gist and meaning of this scheme. The term "army corps" has now resolved itself into a mere arithmetical expression. It is neither more nor less than a War Office synonym for 30,000 men. What the House has before it is whether there be this reform or not; there is to be a great increased expenditure on the Army, and it is in regard to that increase that I venture to direct the attention of the House. My right hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition in his speech put a question which has not yet been, answered, and which should be answered before the House comes to a division. My right hon. friend asked what is to be the ultimate financial effect of this proposal. We have been told that there has been no extra expense in regard to barracks. We are told that we must have an enormous increase in the number of generals, and we ought to have on the authority of the Treasury, and, if not of the Treasury, certainly on that of the War Office, a detailed and complete statement of the ultimate financial effects of that increase. I submit that the right hon.

Gentleman and the Government have no right to ask the House of Commons to pass a financial judgment on these proposals unless they give us on the authority of a Government Department a full and detailed statement as to what the cost of these proposals, will be next year, the year after, and all the subsequent years. Are we to be favoured with such a statement? We have had no answer, and I do not think it is treating the House of Commons with justice to invite us to pass judgment on a scheme which may cost the country many millions more than the right hon. Gentleman has suggested.

\*MR. BRODRICK: The hon. Gentleman is making a false assumption. The cost of the various army corps; the pay for the Reserves, the Militia, the Yeomanry, and the garrison regiments; is all in the Estimates. It is a matter of £;300,000 for the Yeomanry, and £;100,000 for the other services.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: That is hardly an answer. Take, for instance, the number of the Regulars. There was to be an increase of 11,500, and the right hon. Gentleman told us two months ago that the cost was to be £;115,000.

\*MR. BRODRICK: That was to be for the garrison regiments.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I understood that it was to be for the Regular Army, and these are not provided for. I understood also that under the new scheme a large number of generals were to be introduced. I speak, of course, as a mere layman, but I do not think we should be compelled to dig into these Estimates and find out for ourselves all these details. I should like to have from the Treasury what is the financial effect of this scheme. Why do you want this increase of £;126,000 for various regiments? What do you want it for? The right hon. Gentleman used vague language on the first occasion, and why was he not more specific? The Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant said in order to do again what we have done in South Africa. I should have thought that the motto would have been, "Never again as in South Africa." Then he said that "We want to do in Canada and in Australia what we have done in South Africa." I ask what part do the colonies play in this scheme? And the answer comes from the Chief Secretary for Ireland; that this large increase in our Army is due to our Imperial duty to defend by force of arms our colonial possessions.

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Yes; That is admitted to be the reason for your policy. But have the colonies been asked to bear any portion whatever of this additional expenditure that is to be incurred? Just think of the position in which we are placed in regard to these colonies. There is a population of fourteen millions in these self-governing colonies, and that of the United Kingdom is forty millions. That is, the population of the self-governing colonies of the British Empire is as one to three to that of the United Kingdom. What are we doing now in regard to the Navy? My hon. and gallant friend the Member for Yarmouth has often impressed on the attention of the House the intolerable position of the colonies in relation to the mother country in regard to naval defence. I say that the colonies ought to be paying six millions a year for naval defence. Take the war in South Africa. I do not know what figure the total cost of that war will reach, but put it at £;200,000,000. That will be the amount of the increase of our debt for colonial defence. And are we

to be told that they are not going to pay any portion of this enormous debt? And now, in addition, we are told that the unhappy forty millions of people in the United Kingdom are to load themselves with an additional debt of £200,000,000 sterling for the benefit of fourteen millions of people in the self-governing colonies, who are just as rich and as well able to bear taxation as we are? There is another point. I have spoken of the economic aspect of the case; the mere money question, which is a most serious one. It has been said that conscription is not in this scheme; but it is involved in it as a necessary consequence. The right hon. Gentleman almost pledged himself to resort to conscription. [An HON. MEMBER: No.] Yes, and this is a conscription scheme in its essence. I put this question, "Is there to be conscription in the colonies if here?" Are we to load ourselves with this great burden of taxation and subject ourselves to the burden of conscription in order that our colonies may provide themselves with old age pensions, as they do now, out of the levies which they make on British produce? The hon. Gentleman did allude to a scheme of old age pensions, but the bitterness of the wrong will be intensified when we know that the colonies, who do not pay a farthing for defence, also pay nothing for old age pensions. The Chief Secretary said the other day that the last election had laid the obligation on the Government, and even more on the House, of introducing Army reform. Does the House forget what happened eighteen months ago, when the country was sick of disasters in the field, and threatened to turn out the Government unless there was to be Army reform? But what was the kind of reform that was to be carried out? It had nothing to do with army corps, but concentrated itself on this subject more than another; the determination that the rank of officer should be filled by the best men in the country, and that neither class distinction nor money interest should be longer recognised. I brought this subject up, and the Chief Secretary for Ireland, who was then at the War Office, admitted that my statement was correct, and went on to say that it was a positive scandal, and he pledged the Government to have that matter reformed. Well, nothing more was said, and at the close of the session I raised the question again, when the right hon. Gentleman declared that legislation was necessary, and how could we expect legislation at the end of the session? There is not a whisper of Army reform in the proposal before the House. There is not in the whole scheme of the right hon. Gentleman either the promise or the potency of reform in the rank of officers, which the people of the country will insist upon. You have got to consider the interests of the nation and of the individual. Both are consistent with each other. It is the interest of the nation to have at its command for the rank of officer all the available talent in the country. Every money or other barrier to exclude that talent from the rank of officer is an injury. It is the right of every father, however poor, that his son, if he possesses the necessary talent, should have as free access to every rank in the Army as the son of any duke. I say that in the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman there is not the slightest indication of any desire to deal with that question.

There is only one other point to which I will refer; it has barely been alluded to in the debate, although I consider it the most important of all. In his first



speech the Secretary of State for War made this observation, "Let us not confuse our minds by thinking of the position of the Navy." There has been a contemptuous ignoring of our naval relations throughout the debate. I am sorry that my hon. and gallant friend the Member for Yarmouth was prevented by the rules of the House from developing his views on the subject, as he is generally recognised in the House and the country as one of the highest authorities upon it. We had one marvellous example of the ignoring of the relations between the Navy and the Army which wants explanation. The right hon. Gentleman told us that it was part of the scheme to turn over the defence of the coaling stations to the Navy. It has been said since that he was only expressing his own personal opinion; but he did not put it as a personal opinion.

\*MR. BRODRICK: Yes.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: No; I beg the right hon. Gentleman's pardon. He came down to the House and set out the War Office view; he did not put it as his personal opinion, although he now says that it is his personal opinion. We have had a little too much this session of Ministers getting up and making declarations and expressing sentiments which they afterwards declare are only their personal opinion. I do not think it is right, or decent, or respectful to the House that the Minister should come here and propose these considerable and important changes unless he has behind him not merely the authority of the Committee of Defence, but the authority of the Cabinet at large, because that is the only authority we can look to on this or any side of the House. I wish we could have had an opportunity of discussing another Amendment of the hon. and gallant Member for Yarmouth, which puts the matter right, that;

"this House considers that the constant growth of expenditure on purely military arrangements for the local defence of the United Kingdom calls for a special inquiry into those naval considerations which determine the nature and extent of possible military attacks."

That element has been conspicuously absent from the Government defence to-night. I think that some Member representing the naval element should have got up and told the House the views of the Admiralty as well as the War Office.

The right hon. Gentleman said that he was entirely satisfied with the course the debate had taken. I am not sure that many Members on his own side of the House share his satisfaction. There has been from beginning to end of these discussions not a single or complete defence of the scheme from an hon. Member on the other side of the House. The hon. Member for Fareham Division, who lectured my right hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition on his tact, concluded with a strong attack on many points involved in this scheme. I conclude by maintaining that this debate has been little better than a sham fight, and whatever the result of the division may be, the right hon. Gentleman and the Government will not take away with them to their offices the real assent of this House, however large their majority. [Cries from Ministerial benches: "Yes."] I say no. The evidence is abundant; it has spread itself on the Notice Papers, throughout all the speeches, and even in the newspapers; and if they do not take away with them the real assent of the House, I am perfectly certain they will not get the assent of the country.

\*COLONEL WELBY (Taunton) said the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition, who had moved the Amendment, had unfortunately a negative record as Secretary of State for War. He it was who by a memorandum destroyed the principal recommendation of the Hartington Commission to appoint a chief of staff. There was good reason for his memorandum, but he thought the right hon. Gentleman when again Secretary of State for War should have put a policy in place of that which had been destroyed by that memorandum, and although the right hon. Gentleman had been supported in the past, he had shown he had no trump card with which to win the trick, and therefore the House could not trust him in the future. The resolution before the House aimed at decentralisation and reorganisation. He had always, ever since he had been in the House, advocated both those principles and therefore he welcomed the principle which underlay the Resolution, as it was good for the Army. He only hoped it had been possible that the principles, which the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War had announced that evening might have been so well thought out that all could have given to the scheme their hearty adhesion, and that the country would have seen the end of reorganisation and expenditure; but that, unfortunately, was not the case.

After listening to the speeches of the right hon. Gentlemen the Secretary for War and the Chief Secretary for Ireland it appeared to him that the organisation of army corps was more a question of astronomy than the reorganisation of the Army. When one looked through an astronomical telescope one saw groups of nebulous matter which the astronomers said would eventually be drawn together, and, in the future, would form stars. When they looked through the War Office telescope they were told by the Army astronomers that the nebulous groups of matter which they saw would in the future form six army corps. Instead of army corps there should be army commands. Such a suggestion might appear to many hon. Members a merely technical suggestion, but as a matter of fact there was an enormous difference between this great scheme of six army corps and the scheme of army commands throughout the United Kingdom, army commands comprising any number of divisions it might be necessary to include in the areas. Were we a continental nation with land frontiers wedged in between two other countries like Germany, by all means let us have army corps. They would be great units ready at a moment's notice to be mobilised and launched across the frontier; but what parallel was there between the situation of this country and that of Germany? We could not launch an army corps over the frontiers here, we should have to transport them in ships. We could not be attacked as other nations could be. We were not subjected to the same dangers, and we had different requirements. He ventured to say that for the home defence of this country against invasion army corps were entirely unsuited, and that the scheme presented to the House was absolutely valueless. If there was ever danger of invasion it would be at a time when the army corps had been taken out of the country. The first army corps to leave the country would be taken from the south of England and from Ireland, which were our most exposed frontiers, and if an invasion took place it would be at our weakest point. He did not think that any continental chief of staff would advise such a

scheme. What was to happen when these army corps were sent over sea; was there any organisation to replace them? Of a necessity they would consist almost entirely of regulars; how would the Auxiliary forces in those areas be organised for service? He thought it was all very nebulous, and perhaps it was best that it should be so, because he believed when the scheme was more carefully looked into, and when instead of trying first to put the roof on, as was being done at the present time, the foundations were dug; when the regiments were put together into brigades and divisions it would be found that six army corps would be too much, and that a number of army commands, as were recommended by the Hartington Commission, would be much more serviceable, much more useful, for the defence of the country, and it would be much more easy to take what might be called the cream of the troops for service abroad, for the protection of the colonies or as a striking force. With regard to decentralisation, he believed two or three commands in large army districts would have far more effect in decentralising the power at the War Office than six army corps leaders with independent staffs could possibly have.

The foundation of the whole scheme was undoubtedly the men, and where were the men to come from? The right hon. Gentleman had spoken of the increase of pay in order to obtain a better class of men; he for one would certainly not recommend that any increase of pay should be given to recruits, while there would be a danger of getting the same class of men as at present enlisted. If we were going to raise the tone of the Army, if there were to be improvements in barracks and better social surroundings for the men, we must have men of good character. Men of bad character must not be allowed to come in and damn the regiments, and if to prevent that a rule was made that no man with a bad character should join, recruiting would be bound to fall off, and for three years there would be a shortage of troops. He admitted the great difficulties which confronted the right hon. Gentleman in regard to this matter, and he would suggest to him, as one means of meeting them, that there should be two classes of enlistment. Let there be one class for the men who did not care to reveal where they were born, what were their names, and what had been their past lives, and another class, with a larger rate of pay, for those who would say where they came from, where they were born, and what had been their past lives up to the time of enlistment. Then let the man who had come in under the lower rate of pay, if after serving for a year, he proved himself to be a good soldier, come into the higher rank of pay. His own view was that if that were done, in a very short time there would be a large increase in the good recruits and a decrease in the bad, and the whole character of the Army would be improved. Under such circumstances a right class of man would be obtained, and then, having raised the tone of the Army, they could introduce those social improvements which every soldier who loved the Army looked for. The diffi-

culty of promoting from the ranks was not entirely one of officers' expenses, although that entered too greatly into it, but also arose from those who passed through the ranks knowing too much of the inner life of the barrack room; he therefore suggested whether it was not possible to admit a certain number of men into the Army who desired to pass through the ranks to a commission on some such

principle as the one year's volunteer system in continental armies. If a man desired to join as a Volunteer in the hope of obtaining a commission, let him first pass an educational examination, such as the first-class Army examination, and let him live in lodgings so that he might be free from the contamination of barrack life, and have other privileges. Such privileges would be much valued, and if, eventually, a man failed to obtain a commission he might be given the option of either retiring or joining those ordinarily enlisted. With regard to the Imperial Yeomanry, he said that, as far as he could see, they would neither be Imperial nor Yeomanry, and he urged that the title Imperial should be reserved for troops ready to serve the Empire in any part of the world. He suggested that in place of "Imperial" the title "Royal" should be given to the Yeomanry. Although two regiments already bear that title, he believed that this would detract little from it, that it would be a most gracious act of recognition of the services performed by the Yeomanry in South Africa, and much more likely to be appreciated than a title which was the outcome of a Parliamentary reorganisation. He wished the right hon. Gentleman's scheme had been a little more concerned with the digging of foundations, that there had been a little more certainty about the principles he had laid down, and that there had been a little more certainty that these six army corps would not entail enormous and unnecessary expense on the country.

\*CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.) said that the right hon. Gentleman in his reply did not give any indication of an alteration in our general policy. He based his scheme upon a false foundation. He attempted to deduct from the Navy some 5,000 men by putting the coaling stations under the direction of the Navy. Nobody objected to the coaling stations being handed over to the Royal Marines, except for the strain it put on the Navy in order that the Army might be strong, and this at a time when we were engaged in great complications and when there were not enough men to man the Fleet, if it were mobilised to-morrow. The scheme before the House was based on the scheme which had broken down a short time previously, under which we were supposed to have two army corps ready for active service. When the war broke out the first thing that occurred was that the first army corps sent to the Cape was broken up on its arrival, and the second was never used as an army corps at all, and the fighting line had to be fed from the Reserves. We had been obliged to form our fighting line in the front of the enemy, and had it not been for the Volunteers who came to our rescue we should have been in difficulty. We were compelled to send raw troops to the front, and rely on the Yeomanry as cavalry, and this country was absolutely depleted of troops. The right hon. Gentleman had to call upon the time-expired men, of whom he expected to get 50,000, but he only succeeded in getting 24,000, and that at the expense to the country of £3,000,000. This scheme was based on the question of recruiting. Had there been any advance in recruiting? Was it not notorious that before the war the supply did not meet the demand? When we wanted 45,000 men a year we were only averaging 35,000; in spite of taking men of inferior physique we had not been able to raise the number required. We had always 60,000 boys in the Army, whom we were obliged to keep for two years before they were fit to go on foreign or active

service. It was a well known fact that the bulk of the Army was required for abroad, and yet we had to go to the expense of keeping these youths for two years before we could send them abroad. The reason we did not get the men was because the Government was a bad employer of labour. The financial position would have to be faced, and if it was said that we could not get men with extra pay, how did it come about that the hon. Gentleman increased the pay by 3d. a day some years ago. The scheme of the six army corps resolved itself into this, that whereas, in the first place, it was intended to have six army corps, they were now going to be only district commands. That was what it amounted to, for three were only going to be Reserves. The first three army corps were to be fed from Nos. 4, 5, and 6; and Nos. 4, 5, and 6 were to be composed mainly of Volunteers and Militia, and that being so could not be moved out of the country. He did not think the right hon. Gentleman had done anything to strengthen the Regular Army; that was to say, the force on which alone we could rely if the country was at war, and when he spoke of taking on the Estimates 680,000 men the right hon. Gentleman was simply trifling with the House. Did not the right hon. Gentleman know that half that force; the Auxiliary forces; could not be utilised outside this country? If our Navy met with a mishap, and we wanted a force for the defence of the country, what we wanted was a quick effective mobile force of the highest order which could be moved at once to any point at which we expected to be attacked. We should find ourselves, under this scheme, in the same position as when the war broke out. We should be left without an effective mobile force of 50,000 men to meet a foreign invasion. How was this heterogeneous mass to be trained? The right hon. Gentleman had ridiculed the Boxer movement, but this scheme appeared to be only a glorified Boxer movement. It bore upon it the imprint of sham, and the result would be a failure in consequence of the impossibility of obtaining the requisite number of men.

\*SIR J. DICKSON-POYNTER (Wiltshire, Chippenham): I cannot help feeling that the discussion before the House is of far greater importance and its issues more far-reaching than any that have taken place in this House for many years, and therefore it behoves hon. Members who feel strongly upon the question to express their views upon it. I associate myself with the expressions of regret which have been heard that this Vote should find itself upon the platform of party controversy, and that it was not possible for this great question of national defence to be raised far above that sphere. I do not blame the Leader of the Opposition for bringing forward this Amendment. He has moved it in the orthodox manner, and although there will be a large majority for the Government in the division presently to take place, I cannot help thinking that many hon. Members who will support the Government in the division lobbies will feel considerable apprehension as to whether many of the cardinal features of the scheme can be carried out successfully.

Now, some weeks ago, in a speech of singular eloquence, the right hon. Gentleman introduced this scheme; so eloquent was the speech of the right hon. Gentleman that he almost disarmed his critics, but fortunately during the time that has

elapsed before this matter comes before us again we have had time to probe and investigate this scheme, and although during the last week we have been again almost disarmed I may say by the masterly eloquence which characterises the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland, and the eloquence of the speakers on that bench who followed him; in spite of all those speeches, eloquent as they undoubtedly were, there are many Members upon this side of the House who feel bound to pause and consider whether this is a scheme which will fulfil in the best manner the military requirements of the country in the future. There is to be established in the country a great system of army corps, and that is a question which ought not to be decided by a silent vote. I am not one of those who desire to see the Army in this country reduced to an indefinite degree, but at the same time I have always been brought up to believe that one of the cardinal points to be remembered in matters of this kind is that nothing must be done to minimise the maritime power of this country or to diminish the reliance of the country upon that power, and that this scheme appears to do. We are told that there are to be three army corps ready mobilised, prepared and ready for foreign service, and that these army corps are to be stationed in different areas. In his earlier speech the right hon. Gentleman gave us to understand that they were to be absolutely ready at a moment's notice; this evening we have been given to understand that that is not the case. The scheme has been distinctly modified.

Now I wish to call attention to a matter to which I think the attention of the House has not been directed before. The first three army corps which are to be ready to be used for expeditionary purposes at a moment's notice, so far as I can understand, are to be composed of regular troops. Now it is impossible that the Yeomanry and Volunteers could be abstracted from the areas in which they are placed and put into another; they are indigenous to the soil, and must remain where they are. The first three army corps will be inflated army corps, whereas the second three will be mere skeletons so reduced will they be in the numbers. It should be more clearly understood whether the auxiliary forces are to be allowed to remain in the areas to which they belong or whether they are to be abstracted and placed in the second three army corps, because if they are not those latter army corps, as I have said will be skeletons. The point we have to ask ourselves is whether the requirements of the nation and the conditions of Great Britain necessitate our keeping up to war establishment three army corps. The hon. Member for Oldham asked the Government to put to the House the number of commitments with which England had to contend in order to see whether it was necessary to keep these three army corps ready to send abroad. India I regard as fully self-contained. A good many years ago we had the bogey before us of an invasion of India by Russia, and at that time I had an opportunity of investigating that question more closely than others, because I went all along the frontier. There is no doubt that the fears then entertained were extravagant, for time has shown that by a proper distribution of troops along the frontier Russia can always be kept at a distance. Humanly speaking, if you have one army corps prepared for all possible contingencies in India, that is all that is necessary.

Then when we come to the case of the colonies, it seems idle to suggest that it is necessary to keep three army corps, with all the necessary accompanying expenditure, on the very remote chance of any danger or trouble arising in Australia, Canada, or any other of our colonies. Then we come to the native frontiers, to which we are continually having to send expeditions, and always shall have; it is part of the penalty of our position as a great Empire. In years gone by a brigade or a couple of brigades have been quite sufficient for the task. We talk to-day of army corps in exactly the same way as we talked yesterday of brigades, the only difference being that a brigade is 2,500 or 3,000 men, while an army corps is 40,000. Then we come to the case of the Continent of Europe. To

throw three army corps into the midst of France, Germany, or Russia would be like throwing a wasp into a hornets' nest. As to home defence, we are bound, of course, to depend upon our Navy, but at any rate we shall always have a very fine auxiliary force as well as the regular establishment in the event of an invasion. I cannot, however, believe that an invasion of this country can be seriously apprehended. If such a terrible occurrence took place, it would mean that our fleet had been destroyed, and then, no matter how numerous our auxiliary forces or our army corps might be, such are the conditions under which we live on this island that we could not hold out very long. Therefore, on all points, it seems to me that three army corps are superfluous, whereas two would be quite sufficient. That is the point on which I join issue with the Government, and it is one, I believe, upon which many of my hon. friends on these benches agree with me. ["No, no."] Now I have been assuming all this time that these army corps will be created and the men found; but anyone who believes for one moment that, under existing conditions, the men will be found must be of a very sanguine disposition. My right hon. friend has told us that recruiting has been extremely good during the past year, and is extremely good this year, but in subsequent speeches there has been a considerable conflict of opinion upon the point. It has been shown that recruiting has gone off considerably during the last few months. We have to face facts. With the increasingly prosperous condition of the labour market, with the better conditions under which the people live, with the increased wages they receive now they are better organised, it is impossible to expect that the army, with its present rate of wages, its somewhat uncongenial atmosphere, and unattractive mode of living, can attempt to compete with the great labour markets of the country. The whole question of army reform seems to be one of men. We have been told that our countrymen do not think about money, but I am rather inclined to believe that they do. The Financial Secretary the other night told us that recruiting was a difficult matter in the army, and he went on to argue rather elaborately that because the wages we paid were low, and because even if the pay was raised it would not be so high as the pay given in the higher labour market, it therefore would not be worth while raising it at all. He was assuming in that argument that there was no class of men between the low labour market and the high skilled labour market. But there is a very large class of men between the two, and if you

raised the pay by only a few pennies it would bring a very large number into the army. Therefore, it seems to me that under present conditions the Government are suggesting too large a scheme. If they could show us a scheme by which there would be 80,000 or 90,000 thoroughly effective, well-trained men, ready to go out, and if by making the pay higher they could get those men, it would be a very much better scheme than the one now proposed.

I should like to say a word with regard to the auxiliary forces. With regard to the Volunteers and the Militia, there has been a considerable increase, and I have nothing to say beyond the fact that I think, in reason, it is a very good thing to have a very large auxiliary force in the country. With regard to the Yeomanry, perhaps I may be permitted to say a word, because my right hon. friend did me the honour of placing me on a Committee some months ago which had to report upon the possibility of reorganising that force. I am very glad to see that the proposals with regard to the Yeomanry are identical with the proposals which Lord Dundonald and I had the honour to propose in a kind of minority report. What we aimed at in our proposals, recognising that it was necessary to increase the force, was to reduce as far as possible the expense attaching to it. That force has hitherto been drawn almost exclusively from the agricultural classes. The Secretary of State now asks for an increase of 25,000, and it is almost impossible to expect that the class which has borne the burden for the last hundred years will be able to provide these additional men by itself. It will, therefore, be necessary to call in the wage-earning class. The only point in regard to which the Government have not followed our proposals is that of the yearly training. The Government propose that the Yeomanry should go out for eighteen days;

we proposed that the period should be seven days. It will be very difficult for the wage-earning class to spare the time or to get their employers to release them for that long period. If the present proposal is not successful, I hope the period will be reduced to seven or ten days. There may be a slight reduction of efficiency, but I think that will be more than counterbalanced by the greater numbers who will be able to spare the shorter time. With regard to the increase of Volunteers and Yeomanry, the same weakness underlies this as the other portion of the scheme. No suggestion is made as to how the men are to be obtained.

With all due deference I am going to make a suggestion to my right hon. friend. The Auxiliary forces are going in the future to play a most important and prominent part in our military affairs. We are told that if this scheme fails we shall have to resort to compulsory service. I think if my right hon. friend considers that closely, he will find that the country would not stand it. Compulsory service is positively odious to the people of this country. It is subversive of the first principles upon which our commercial interests are based. If the proposal to bring about conscription was seriously made by a Minister, I believe that such proposals as the Disestablishment of the Church, the licensing laws, or even Home Rule, would pale before it. Therefore, let us put far from us the idea of conscription. It does not mean the Militia ballot for home service. If it is conscription at all it means compulsory service for



every man to serve abroad. ["No, no&#x2021;"] I do not see how it can be otherwise. What will be the alternative? My suggestion is this: You have got to get these men. There is magnificent material in the country. There are thousands and thousands of men ready and willing to pay their service to the Crown in the form of military service, provided that service is not made too onerous. There is a machinery ready to hand if you like to take it up. The great public authorities of England are in touch with every class of the community. The mayors and corporations of our towns are the great powers in those towns. Upon those bodies are represented the best and most influential men of the various districts. I should like to have seen in the first speech of my right hon. friend a quarter of an hour devoted to invoking the great public authorities of England to come forward and help in this great national cause. I believe that if the mayors and corporations, the district and county councils, were asked to form sub-committees to go through their districts, to use their influence and obtain names, you would get thousands of men to join the Auxiliary forces. I have tried to give my views as clearly as possible upon this great question. I believe there is a large amount of good in the scheme, but there is also in it a great deal that is very doubtful, and until we see portions of the scheme modified, and, I hope, in years to come, the expenditure under it reduced, many of us on this side of the House will look upon it with apprehension, and should not be able to give it that unreserved support which we should like to as coming from our leaders.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (MR. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): The interesting speech of my hon. friend who has just sat down is a good specimen of the kind of criticism which has induced the right hon. Member for East Fife to suppose that there is a large body of opinion on this side of the House hostile to the main lines of the Government proposal. I think the right hon. Gentleman is mistaken. My hon. friend who has just spoken has made a great many interesting observations, and he has told us, among other things, that there are some details of the scheme to which he objects; he has also told us that there are a great many of its most important proposals which he cordially supports. I imagine that it is almost impossible on a subject like Army reform to find absolute agreement with any scheme that can be suggested among those who are either professional soldiers or who have served for any time, as my hon. friend has done, in the Volunteer force. So many soldiers, so many opinions. As absolute unanimity is not to be expected and cannot be attained. I do not imagine that the right hon. Gentleman opposite, if he had to propose; which I am bound to say he never has thought it his duty to propose; a scheme of Army reform, would have found more unanimity on his own side of the House upon every item of his proposals than he has found upon other questions where I should have thought unanimity was more easily to be attained. It is not very easy at this hour of the night for the person on whom the duty falls of attempting to summarise the debate to do so with the brevity which I am sure the House earnestly desires at the present time. I shall endeavour to do so and to go through very briefly the main heads of the attack which has been made upon us, observing by way of preface or preamble that that attack has been made

from several sides which are inconsistent with each other, but which from the fact that they are inconsistent with each other necessitate on our part something in the nature of separate replies.

I hope I shall be pardoned if I dismiss with extreme brevity one topic which has been often referred to, and that is the difficulty of recruiting. The difficulty of recruiting is one which must be always present to those who have to manage an army that is purely voluntary in character. We cannot escape from it. It has haunted every successive Secretary of State and every successive Parliament ever since I have had to do with public affairs, and long before, and it will continue to haunt all those who have to control our army system so long as the voluntary arrangement of our Army is found to be adequate. Therefore, if I refrain from dealing with the topic on the present occasion, it is not because I think it is unimportant, but because I think it is not raised by the scheme of my right hon. friend. I admit that the difficulties of recruiting are great. I admit that the actual number of men voted by the House may not be attained next year or the year after. There is no security or certainty that the number will be attained, but the difficulty of obtaining them is not augmented by my right hon. friend's scheme. On the contrary, whatever difficulty exists is diminished and not increased by the scheme he has proposed; and if we are unable to obtain the requisite number of men under my right hon. friend's scheme, still more should we be unable to obtain that number of men under the army system as it existed before my right hon. friend's scheme was introduced.

He has diminished, not increased, the strain on the recruiting market. He has not augmented, but has diminished our difficulties in that respect; and, that being so, I hope I may be permitted to pass by many interesting topics which have been raised and on which I confess in more favourable circumstances I should like to have said a word.

I therefore pass to the criticisms on the scheme as it stands. The first of these is the criticism that comes from the extreme naval school represented by my hon. and gallant friend the Member for Yarmouth, who, in season and out of season, has never ceased with great ability and knowledge to press his views on the House. But, again, I would point out that if my hon. friend's view be correct, and if the Navy is so adequate to every purpose of island defence; of national as distinguished from Imperial defence; then the first economy we are bound to make is to disband the Militia, to cease to give a subvention to the Volunteers, and not to trouble our heads about garrisoning any of the fortresses of this island. ["Oh, oh&#x2021;"]

SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): No.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That is the inevitable logical consequence of the views of the extreme naval school which my hon. friend represents. ["No, no&#x2021;"]

Well, that is my view. If that be so, I think whatever else may be said for that school, it is not worth while to argue the point in this House; because the great majority of the House, on which ever side they may be, are of opinion that, however much we ought to modify our military system, it ought not to be in the direction of economising either in the Militia or in the Volunteers. I will only say one other word about this extreme naval school. I am not going to

dispute their view that a landing in this island is practically impossible while the Fleet exists, and that we should have to surrender without a landing if the Fleet did not exist. That is their whole contention in a sentence. I am not going to argue that, but I would, however, point out this consideration. There are foreign nations whose military experts have devoted much time to considering the possibility and even the case of a descent, a raid, upon this island, and upon the fateful consequences which would ensue if that forlorn hope; or let us grant that it is a forlorn hope; were to succeed. Yes, Sir, but it is much better in the interests of peace that these dreams; if dreams they be; of a raid upon this island should be dissipated once for all. Let it once be understood by every military theorist on the Continent that of all military expeditions the most hopeless, the most fatal, would be a descent upon this island; once let that be brought home to every military theorist on the Continent and you will have the greatest security for peace, as far as we are concerned, that I can imagine. I should be sorry to think that those theorists had to wait for their conversion to sound views of our naval supremacy at sea until they had tried and failed in one of these invasions upon our island. I will leave the naval school, which in its extreme form has not many supporters in this House, and I come next to the Opposition view; the official Opposition view (if there is an official view of hon. Gentlemen opposite) put forward first by the Leader of the Opposition and advocated again to-night by the late Home Secretary in an able and interesting speech. The right hon. Member for East Fife is gifted with a most unhappy lucidity of style. It is perfectly impossible to mistake what he means. You know exactly what his argument is and what it amounts to. You are fighting an enemy in a clear atmosphere, where you can see for an unlimited distance over an unencumbered plain, and you know that there are no ambushes to fear. But after listening to the right hon. Gentleman I came to the conclusion that there was no case against us. I was not certain after the speech of the Leader of the Opposition, because I was not quite sure what he was driving at. I thought that there might be formidable ambushes which I could not see, hidden behind obscure corners of his oration, and that on reflection I might find that he had formidable arguments to bring against us the full effect and force of which I had not at first appreciated. I was under no such illusion as to the speech of the right hon. Member for East Fife; and I therefore feel a peculiar pleasure in dealing with the indictment which he has brought against us. His contention could not have been put more concisely than in the specific question which the right hon. Gentleman addressed to us, How would you have been better off if, before the South African war broke out, these reforms had been carried out than you actually were when that war broke out? That is a specific, clear, and most relevant question, and I have no difficulty in giving the right hon. Gentleman my answer to the question. I say, in the first place, that the troops would have been sent off far better organised and sent off with far greater ease in an organised state than they actually were. I recall a particular criticism of the right hon. Gentleman to justify that observation. When he was discussing my right hon. friend's scheme

he said;

"You profess to have three army corps, one at Aldershot, another on Salisbury Plain, and a third in Ireland, all ready for instant service, but your Irish army corps would have to change a certain number of battalions before they went abroad; four battalions out of twenty-four."

And that in the view of the right hon. Gentleman destroys the value of the third army corps that we should have to send from these shores in case of emergency after my right hon. friend's scheme is adopted. Which of the bodies of troops which we sent out from these shores to the South African war were half as well organised as would be this third army corps which the right hon. Gentleman condemned because it would have four battalions not originally belonging to it? If his condemnation of this third army corps had in it any substance or validity at all, it applies with tenfold force to the existing system, under which, when you sent forth battalions, brigades, divisions, and army corps, there is no pretence that you have anything like the organisation you would have under the scheme now proposed. That is my first answer.

My second answer is that not only would the troops that you sent to South Africa have been incomparably better organised and provided, if this scheme had been then in existence, but the troops that would have been left at home would have been far better organised for home defence. Several speakers have urged, with great force, that the new regiments that we had to call into existence, in view of the late emergency, were costly, and

were in some respects not as effective as we could desire. Quite true, they were costly, they were improvised, their organisation had to be carried out at a moment's notice at a period of great difficulty and military strain. Had my right hon. friend's scheme, as he proposes it, been then in existence the whole plan of home defence would have fallen naturally into place without difficulty and without friction. All the forces would have been supplied with the requisite number of cavalry and guns, with their officers and their transport, and with all that makes an organised body of soldiers and an efficient fighting machine, with staff, generals, artillery, cavalry, and the rest. If those two answers have, as I think they have, real force and validity, am I not justified in saying, in answer to the right hon. Gentleman's question, that we should have been incomparably better in 1899 if our Army had been organised as I hope it will be organised in 1902? But I have not quite done with the right hon.

Gentleman yet. He summarised in a few brief sentences at the end of his speech his objections to the scheme. He said, in the first place, that the scheme held out no prospect of improved recruiting. I am not going to deal with recruiting; I have already put that by; but I would ask one question of the front bench. If they think this scheme is defective and should be voted against because it does not provide a system of improved recruiting, would they be prepared to come forward and vote the millions required for any augmentation in the pay of the Army? I put that question, but I do not expect an answer. They are too wise in their own generation to commit themselves on the point.

I therefore come to the second of the summarised objections of the right hon. Gentleman. He objects to the word "army corps." He said your word "army corps"

is either a sham or it is not what you want. I have observed all through this debate an extraordinary hostility to the phrase rather than to the thing described by the word "army corps." We are told that "army corps" is a foreign expression, that we have borrowed it from other nations. I have not looked into the matter recently, but I wonder how many technical military phrases there are in the English language which we have not borrowed from the French. I do not think there are any. I believe that the whole of our military nomenclature has been borrowed, and almost the whole of it borrowed from the French, and one addition to that long list of borrowed terms does not afflict my soul. But do not let us quarrel about the meaning of "army corps" in the dictionary. Do not let us regard this as a question of nomenclature. It is a question of substance. How do you mean to organise your Army so that that organisation shall be able to serve three great objects; to prepare your Army for an expedition abroad if that be required, to keep it in a proper form for home defence if that be required, and to enable your system to be a decentralised instead of a Generalised system? That cannot be better done, in our opinion, than by the six army corps system of my right hon. friend. Gentlemen opposite would desire to keep the eighteen military districts which now exist. A gallant friend of mine below the gangway would like to see the United Kingdom divided into three districts. Gentlemen opposite are going to vote against us because they want eighteen districts. [Opposition cries of "No, no";] and an HON. MEMBER: Who said so?] They want the existing system, which is eighteen districts. [Opposition cries of "No."] My gallant friend, I think, is not going to vote against us, but he looks on us with suspicion because he likes three districts instead of six. Well, we cannot please everybody. We certainly cannot please all the gentlemen who are going into the lobby against us. But I would venture to point out to the House that the system proposed by my right hon. friend is one which naturally fits in with the existing system, which is a natural development of it, which is open neither to the objection which might easily be urged against my hon. friend's scheme nor to the charge of being subject to microscopic division, such as the scheme which is supported, as I understand it, by the right hon. Gentleman opposite.

What is the third charge? It is that this scheme of ours exaggerates the importance of home defence, and diminishes the importance of our Army for foreign

purposes, diminishes the value of the Fleet;

MR. ASQUITH: No, that is not my argument. What I did say was that the scheme exaggerated the importance of military defence as against the naval defence.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The right hon. Gentleman is perfectly correct. That is what he did say. May I ask what there is in this scheme which exaggerates the Army at the cost of the Fleet? We have added greatly to the efficiency of the Fleet, and I regret to say that while adding to its efficiency we have also been obliged to add to its cost. But what is there in this scheme that diminishes the efficiency of the Fleet? Is it calling these divisions army corps? Is it organising the Auxiliary forces with the Regular forces? Does that diminish the value of the Fleet? Well, then, what is it? The truth is, these objections are fantastic,

they have no substance, they have no ground, they have no plausibility; and I have much more sympathy with, though I do not agree with, the economic school than I have with the objections which seem to be raised by gentlemen who think it necessary when the Government make a proposal that they, being the Opposition, should oppose that proposal, and are obliged to invent reasons which never would otherwise occur to them in order to find some shadowy and unsubstantial excuse for a party division. I have said that I have more sympathy with the economic school, because I do think that the enormous growth of Army Estimates ought to make everybody consider whether that growth is necessary or whether it is not. In my own way, humbly, I have considered it, and I do think that growth is necessary. To what is it due? It can be divided into three heads. There is the growth in the Regular Army. Is that unnecessary? It cannot be said to be unnecessary, at all events, by any gentleman who believes in the Cardwell reform, because the increase is made absolutely necessary by the number of white regiments we have to keep abroad, and the right hon. Gentleman, whose reputation as a military reformer dates back to the Cardwellian era of 1870, and who has spoken in such eloquent terms of the value and importance of that reform, should be the first to say that the business of the Government of the day is to do its best to have that balance between the home and the foreign battalions, which is an essential; the essential element of the Cardwellian system. Then, there can be no charge against the increase of the Army Estimates on the ground of the increase of Regular troops. The next item of cost is the increase in respect of the Militia and Volunteers. From which side of the House, from which section of military opinion, from which party, will come an objection to the money which we have so wisely spent on the Militia and Volunteers? No one will venture to object to it; and one of the chief claims which the scheme of my right hon. friend has upon the approval of the country is that for the first time it does for the Militia and Volunteers what should have been done for them many years ago; it puts them in a position to act on equal terms with the Regular Army. The third element of increased expenditure is barracks. Who is going to say that that is money wasted? Possibly the same men who tell us that our chief business is to give the soldier a more humane and civilised life, to increase his comforts in barracks. Stores and ammunition are the fourth item of expenditure. Who is going to say that that increased expenditure is not known to be absolutely required by recent events in South Africa? I was brought into close contact with the difficulties; the inevitable difficulties; brought upon the War Office by the unexpected strain of the early months of the South African War. We had prepared, with the consent of the House, with the reluctant consent of the economists, to send out a force equivalent to two army corps, and to provide them with guns and ammunition and the necessary stores; but we were asked to do a great deal more than that, as we may in the future be asked again. I remember one moment at the end of 1899 and the beginning of 1900, when in this country there was not more than 3,300 rounds of small arms ammunition, and no reserve of artillery ammunition except that which was actually placed with the guns we retained at home, which in number were sufficient for a single army corps. The right hon.

Gentleman opposite went out of office because there was an insufficient supply of small arms ammunition.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Because you said there was an insufficient supply.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes; I gladly accept the responsibility; because we said there was an insufficiency of small arms ammunition. When the right hon.

Gentleman went out of office there were 92,000,000 rounds, when, according to the official calculation, there ought to have been 146,000,000 rounds. We came into office and we raised that 92,000,000 rounds, not merely to 146,000,000 rounds, which we said ought to have been in store in 1895, but to 170,000,000 rounds; and it was on the basis of 170,000,000 rounds that we found ourselves left in those critical and anxious days of 1899&#x2013;1900 with, as I have said, a bare 3,300 rounds of small arms ammunition in this country. The Government factories, and all private factories, were working twenty-four hours in the day and seven days in the week. I went through that period, and I shall not easily forget it. As far as I am concerned I never mean to go through a like experience, and so far as I am concerned I never will do anything which could by any possibility throw on our successors a trial and strain like that.

An hon. friend of mine thinks our existing military system is on too large a scale. He would like, I suppose, to go back to the period of twenty years ago. As regards our military strength, may I read to the House one extract which I came upon almost accidentally in the War Office records of twenty years ago, and which throws light, I think, upon some of the influences at work in the early days of the South African difficulties. In the life of the late Mr. Childers hon. Gentlemen will find a letter he addressed to Sir George Colley just before the disaster of Majuba Hill. In it he says;

"You will appreciate the trust placed in you by my telegram of this afternoon offering you two regiments and a wing of infantry, two regiments of cavalry and a battery, besides drafts to fill up your infantry regiments. With Ireland on our hands;"

[Loud Nationalist cheers, and Mr. MACNEILL: "And on your necks."] This is twenty years ago. [A NATIONALIST

MEMBER: You have her still.] The letter goes on;

"With Ireland on our hands and a threatened Ashanti war, I cannot say that we can spare so large a force as easily as in quiet times, but we must leave no stone unturned to terminate the unpleasant task to which we are committed."

Two regiments and a wing of infantry; two regiments of cavalry and a battery&#x2013; I do not know whether my hon. friend thinks that that is the kind of position in which this country should be placed.

\*SIR J. DICKSON-POYNDER: I am sorry to interrupt my right hon. friend. I made it clear that I should like to see two army corps, and not three.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is with profound astonishment that I have listened in the course of this debate to those who have said that the military proposals of my right hon. friend have been in excess of our national requirements. I know of people who, after a fire has occurred and has been somehow or another extinguished, have forgotten the incident and refused to improve their fire apparatus. But with 250,000 men still in the field, these gentlemen are still of

opinion that we ought not to go beyond two army corps; that two army corps represents the extreme limit of our national requirements. Is there any miracle which can convince controversialists of this type? You have the actual fact before you, staring you in the face, that you want more than two army corps. You are paying day by day more than two army corps, you are suffering under the strain of having this gigantic force in the field, and with these facts before your very eyes you come down and tell this House that the national necessities can be adequately met by having two army corps ready for foreign service.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Then why stop at three?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: At all events, three is an improvement. I do not mean to go further into the details of this controversy. I would ask the House to remember that the vote to-night is not a vote in favour of a Minister, or of a Commander-in-Chief, or of a Ministry; much more depends upon it than that. Supposing the scheme of my right hon. friend be rejected, by what forces will it be rejected? Will it

be rejected by an organised body who have an alternative scheme, or who are in a position to contrive an alternative scheme? We all know that it is not so. The inherent difficulties of our military system in this country are such that it is inevitable that many solutions of the problem can be suggested; and if we are defeated it will not be by those who have a clear coherent view of some alternative scheme, but by congeries of elements of small sections, each of whom have their own scheme, all of whom are prepared to oppose the Government scheme, but can never agree upon any scheme to substitute for it. Now, let the House mark the result. It must end in administrative impotence. This House assembled under a mandate of the country for Army reform. [Cries of "No, no"] Even the hon. Member for Oldham, who interested us so much two nights ago, told us that he placarded the walls in his constituency in favour of Army reform. We are all pledged to Army reform, and when the House comes pledged to Army reform, and when other suggestions and solutions are mere possibilities, the man who votes against a clear-cut scheme brought forward by a responsible Government without any hope of his own scheme being taken as an alternative is not a man in favour of Army reform, he is opposing Army reform. [Cries of "Oh, oh."] You may differ from that view. The right hon. Gentleman said it is not the business of the Opposition to formulate an alternative scheme, nor is it. I do not quarrel with that. If I thought you had an alternative scheme I would say; "Well and good, by all means turn out the Government if you can and come in yourselves if you have a scheme you think you can carry." Does anybody think that the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition has in his breast pocket a scheme of Army reform? [An HON. MEMBER: Why should he?] Yes, why should he; we know he cannot have it. The right hon. Gentleman may look back to the halcyon days of Lord Cardwell. There is a legendary plant that produces a flower once in thirty years, and then, exhausted by the effort, waits another thirty years for fruit and flower again to develop. I do not know whether the Radical tree of Army reform is about to flower again. I do not know whether a scheme of Army reform they would put before the House would have the magical effect of bringing into the same lobby all those who think there ought to be no



reform, those who think there should be two army corps instead of three, those who think we are spending too much, those who think we are not doing enough for recruiting, and all the others who differ on points of detail. I do not know whether they could propose such a scheme. I do not think so. That is my view for what it is worth. If you reject this scheme, brought forward by the responsible Government of the day; and I say this without any intention of offence; because this or that crotchet of reform does not find a place in it, then I say that is to condemn this assembly to perpetual barrenness in the matter of. Army reform; if you reject this schema you do not merely reject this scheme; you reject every scheme. [Cries of "Oh, oh."] It is folly to tell practical men that you would not combine against any conceivable plan, seeing the strangely allied forces against this plan, forces that have no cohesion, no common ground of principle or object to be attained. If I am right in that, as I think I am, then to reject this scheme would indeed be a crime against the future power and prosperity of the country. If you cannot reform the Army, with all the lessons of this war before you, with the needs of the country before you from day to day, and if you are going to allow the psychological moment to pass, popular enthusiasm to die out, and a moment of dull indifference to come in, then I say heavy indeed will be your responsibility.

We have gone through in the last two years a great experience. I trust that many years may elapse before similar experience comes to us. But if when it comes to us it finds us again unprepared, and if it can be said that the House of Commons, called together to deal with Army reform, was so oblivious to its duties, so indifferent to the mandate of its countrymen, so indifferent to the interests of its country, that it allowed the happy moment to pass, then, Sir, I say the misfortunes that will come upon us will be deserved misfortunes, and those who suffer from them will look back, and rightly look back, to the callous in-

difference of a Parliament which with all the advantages we possess refused to take advantage of them, refused to make the most of them, and refused to adopt a scheme which may not be perfect, which may be capable of development, which may be open to criticism, but which, at all events, is a scheme which does

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)

Halsey, Thomas Frederick

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge

Hambro, Charles Eric

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Cranborne, Viscount

Hamilton, Rt Hn L'd G. (Midd'x

Aird, Sir John

Cripps, Charles Alfred

Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nd'rny

Allsopp, Hon. George

Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)  
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm  
Anson, Sir William Reynell  
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)  
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd  
Archdale, Edward Mervyn  
Crossley, Sir Savile  
Harris, Frederick Leverton  
Arkwright, John Stanhope  
Cubitt, Hon. Henry  
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.  
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.  
Cust, Henry John C.  
Hay, Hon. Claude George  
Arrol, Sir William  
Dalrymple, Sir Charles  
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley  
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis  
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chath'm  
Heath, James (Staffords. N. W.  
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John  
Denny, Colonel  
Heaton, John Henniker  
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy  
Dewar, T. R (T'rH'mlets, S. Geo.  
Helder, Augustus  
Bailey, James (Walworth)  
Dickinson, Robert Edmond  
Henderson, Alexander  
Bain, Col. James Robert  
Dickson, Charles Scott  
Harmon-Hodge, Robert Trotter  
Baird, John George Alexander  
Dickson-Poynder, Sir J. P.  
Hickman, Sir Alfred  
Balcarres, Lord  
Digby, J. K. D. Wingfield-  
Higginbottom, S. W.  
Baldwin, Alfred  
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield  
Hoare, Edw Brodie (Hampstead  
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r  
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph  
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.  
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey  
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon

Hogg, Lindsay  
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds  
Dorington, Sir John Edward  
Hope, J. F. (Shefh'ld, Brightside  
Balfour, Maj K R (Christchurch  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Hornby, Sir William Henry  
Banbury, Frederick George  
Doxford, Sir William T.  
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry  
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)  
Duke, Henry Edward  
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham)  
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin  
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. H.  
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham  
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol  
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton  
Hozier, Hon. Jas. Henry Cecil  
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.  
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas  
Hudson, George Bickersteth  
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.  
Faber, George Denison  
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)  
Bigwood, James  
Fardell, Sir T. George  
Jackson, Rt. Hn. Wm. Lawies  
Bill, Charles  
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.  
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse  
Blundell, Colonel Henry  
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r  
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick  
Bond, Edward  
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst  
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton  
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-  
Finch, George H.  
Johnston, William (Belfast)  
Boulnois, Edmund  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)  
Brassey, Albert  
Firbank, Joseph Thomas  
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)  
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu  
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose  
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)  
Brown, Alex. H. (Shropshire)  
Fitzroy, Hn. Edw. Algernon  
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)  
Brymer, William Ernest  
Flannery, Sir Fortescue  
Keswick, William  
Bull, William James  
Fletcher, Sir Henry  
Kimber, Henry  
Bullard, Sir Harry  
Flower, Ernest  
King, Sir Henry Seymour  
Butcher, John George  
Forster, Henry William  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Campbell, Rt Hn J. A. (Glasgow)  
Foster, Sir Michael (Lond Univ.  
Lawrence, Joseph (Monmouth)  
Carlile, William Walter  
Galloway, William Johnson  
Lawson, John Grant  
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.  
Garfit, William  
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareh'm  
Cautley, Henry Strother  
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H (City of Lond.  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)  
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick  
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie  
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)  
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn  
Leveson-Gower, Fredk, N. S.  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)  
Llewellyn, Evan Henry  
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)  
Gordon, Maj. E.- (Tow'rH'mlets  
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.

Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.  
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine  
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Wore.  
Goschen, Hon. Geo. Joachim  
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham  
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry  
Graham, Henry Robert  
Long, Rt Hn Walter (Bristol, S.)  
Chapman, Edward  
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)  
Lonsdale, John Brownlee  
Charrington, Spencer  
Green, Walford D. (Wednesb'ry  
Lowe, Francis William  
Clare Octavius Leigh  
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds  
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)  
Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.  
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury  
Lowther, Rt. Hon. James (Kent  
Coghill, Douglas Harry  
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Cohen, Benjamin Louis  
Grenfell, William Henry  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)  
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Greville, Hon. Ronald  
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth  
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole  
Groves, James Grimble  
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred  
Compton, Lord Alwyne  
Guthrie, Walter Murray  
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison  
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas  
Hain, Edward  
Macdona, John Curaming  
Corbett, A. C. (Glasgow)  
Hall, Edward Marshall  
MacIver, David (Liverpool)

organise the great military power which we possess, which turns it to the best account, and turns it to that account with the least possible cost to the taxpayer of this country.

Question put.

The House divided::Ayes, 327; Noes, 211. (Division List No. 189.)

Maconochie, A. W.  
Pierpoint, Robert  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)  
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard  
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart  
M'Calmont, Col. H. L. B (Cambs  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.  
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.  
Plummer, Walter R.  
Stock, James Henry  
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)  
Pretymann, Ernest George  
Stroyan, John  
Malcolm, Ian  
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward  
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley  
Maple, Sir John Blundell  
Purvis, Robert  
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier  
Martin, Richard Biddulph  
Pym, C. Guy  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.  
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert  
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J G. (Oxf'd Univ  
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H E (Wigt'n  
Randles, John S.  
Thorburn, Sir Walter  
Maxwell, W. J. H (Dumfriessh.)  
Rankin, Sir James  
Thornton, Percy M.  
Majendie, James A. H.  
Ratcliffe, R. F.  
Tollemache, Henry James  
Melville, Beresford Valentine  
Reid, James (Greenock)  
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray  
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.  
Remnant, James Farquharson  
Tritton, Charles Ernest  
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton  
Renshaw, Charles Bine  
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col Edward  
Mildmay, Francis Bingham

Rentoul, James Alexander  
Tuke, Sir John Batty  
Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir Fred. G.  
Renwick, George  
Valentia, Viscount  
Milton, Viscount  
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalyb.idge  
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)  
Milward, Col. Victor  
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson  
Wanklyn, James Leslie  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)  
Warde, Col. C. E.  
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy  
Robinson, Brooke  
Wason, John C. (Orkney)  
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)  
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.  
Webb, Col. William George  
Morgan, David J (Walthamst'w  
Ropner, Colonel Robert  
Welby, Sir C. G. E. (Notts.)  
Morgan, Hn. Fred. (Monm'thsh.  
Rothschild, Hon Lionel Walter  
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Round, James  
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
Royds, Clement Molyneux  
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne)  
Morrison, James Archibald  
Rutherford, John  
Whitmore, Charles Algernon  
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)  
Mount, William Arthur  
Sadler, Col Samuel Alexander  
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell- (Bir.)  
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.  
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse

Willox, Sir John Archibald  
Muntz, Philip A.  
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert  
Wills, Sir Frederick  
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute  
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col Edw. J.  
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)  
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath  
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Myers, William Henry  
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)  
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)  
Newdigate, Francis Alexander  
Sharpe, William Edward T.  
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath  
Nicholson, William Graham  
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)  
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Simeon, Sir Barrington  
Wrightson, Sir Thomas  
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens  
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)  
Wylie, Alexander  
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)  
Skewes-Cox, Thomas  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Parkes, Ebenezer  
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)  
Young, Commander (Berks, E.  
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington)  
Smith, H C (Northum. Tyneside  
Younger, William  
Peel, Hon. Wm. R. Wellesley  
Smith, James P. (Lanarks.)  
Pemberton, John S. G.  
Spear, John Ward  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;  
Penn, John  
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk  
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
Percy, Earl  
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset  
NOES.  
Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)



Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.  
Emmott, Alfred  
Abraham, William (Rhondda)  
Carew, James Laurence  
Esmonde, Sir Thomas  
Allan, William (Gateshead)  
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton  
Evans, Sir F. H. (Maidstone)  
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc. Stroud  
Causton, Richard Knight  
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)  
Asher, Alexander  
Cawley, Frederick  
Farquharson, Dr. Robert  
Ashton, Thomas Gair  
Channing, Francis Allston  
Farrell, James Patrick  
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert H.  
Clancy, John Joseph  
Fenwick, Charles  
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)  
Colville, John  
Ferguson, R. C. M. (Leith)  
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Ffrench, Peter  
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.  
Craig, Robert Hunter  
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond  
Bell, Richard  
Crean, Eugene  
Flavin, Michael Joseph  
Black, Alexander William  
Cremer, William Randal  
Flynn, James Christopher  
Boland, John  
Crombie, John William  
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)  
Bolton, Thomas Dolling  
Cullinan, J.  
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry  
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.  
Daly, James  
Fuller, J. M. F.  
Brigg, John  
Dalziel, James Henry

Furness, Sir Christopher  
Broadhurst, Henry  
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)  
Gilhooly, James  
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)  
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson  
Delany, William  
Griffith, Ellis J.  
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James  
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)  
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles  
Haldane, Richard Burdon  
Burns, John  
Dillon, John  
Hardie, J. K. (Merthyr Tydvil)  
Burt, Thomas  
Donelan, Capt. A.  
Harmsworth, R. Leicester  
Buxton, Sydney Charles  
Doogan, P. C.  
Harrington, Timothy  
Caine, William Sproston  
Duncan, J. Hastings  
Harwood, George  
Caldwell, James  
Dunn, Sir William  
Hayden, John Patrick  
Cameron, Robert  
Edwards, Frank  
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Elibank, Master of  
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir A. D.  
Healy, Timothy Michael  
Norman, Henry  
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)  
Helme, Norval Watson  
Norton, Capt. Cecil William  
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)  
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.  
Nussey, Thomas Willans  
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)

Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)  
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)  
Shipman, Dr. John G.  
Holland, William Henry  
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)  
Sinclair, Capt John (Forfarsh.)  
Hope, John D. (Fife, West)  
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)  
Smith, Samuel (Flint)  
Horniman, Frederick John  
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)  
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants)  
Jameson, Maj. J. Eustace  
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)  
Stevenson, Francis S.  
Joicey, Sir James  
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)  
Strachey, Edward  
Jones, David B. (Swansea)  
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)  
Sullivan, Donal  
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)  
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)  
Taylor, Theodore Cooke  
Joyce, Michael  
O'Dowd, John  
Tennant, Harold John  
Kearley, Hudson E.  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)  
Kinloch, Sir John George S.  
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.)  
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.)  
Labouchere, Henry  
O'Malley, William  
Thomas, Dr. Alfred (Merthyr)  
Lambert, George  
O'Mara, James  
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings)  
Langley, Batty  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower)  
Layland-Barratt, Francis  
O'Shee, James John  
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)  
Leamy, Edmund

Palmer, Sir Chas. M. (Durham)  
Tomkinson, James  
Leigh, Sir Joseph  
Palmer, George Wm. (Reading)  
Trevelyan, Charles Philips  
Leng, Sir John  
Partington, Oswald  
Tully, Jasper  
Levy, Maurice  
Paulton, James Mellor  
Ure, Alexander  
Lewis, John Herbert  
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.  
Wallace, Robert  
Lloyd-George, David  
Pease, Alfred E. (Cleveland)  
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.  
Lough, Thomas  
Pease, Sir Joseph W. (Durham)  
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)  
Lundon, W.  
Perks, Robert William  
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.  
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.  
Philipps, John Wynford  
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan  
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift  
Pirie, Duncan V.  
White, George (Norfolk)  
M'Cann, James  
Power, Patrick Joseph  
White, Luke (York., E. R.)  
M'Crae, George  
Price, Robert John  
White, Patrick (Meath, North)  
M'Dermott, Patrick  
Priestley, Arthur  
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)  
M'Kenna, Reginald  
Rea, Russell  
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer  
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin  
Reckitt, Harold James  
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)  
Mansfield, Horace Rendall  
Reddy, M.

Wilson, F. W. (Norfolk, Mid.)  
Mather, William  
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)  
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)  
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)  
Mooney, John J.  
Reed, Sir Edw. James (Cardiff)  
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Hudd'rsf'd)  
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)  
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries)  
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)  
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)  
Rickett, J. Compton  
Yoxall, James Henry  
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose)  
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)  
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)  
Robson, William Snowdon  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;  
Murphy, J.  
Roe, Sir Thomas  
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. M'Arthur.  
Nannetti, Joseph P.  
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
Schwann, Charles E.  
Main Question put.  
AYES.  
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.  
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.  
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Woc'r  
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte  
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.  
Chaplin, Rt. Hn. Henry  
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel  
Bigwood, James  
Chapman, Edward  
Aird, Sir John  
Bill, Charles  
Charrington, Spencer  
Anson, Sir William Reynell  
Blundell, Colonel Henry  
Clare, Octavius Leigh  
Archdale, Edward Mervyn

Bond, Edward  
Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.  
Arkwright, John Stanhope  
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith  
Coghill, Douglas Harry  
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.  
Boulnois, Edmund  
Cohen, Benjamin Louis  
Arrol, Sir William  
Brassey, Albert  
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis  
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John  
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole  
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John  
Brookfield, Col. Montagu  
Compton, Lord Alwyne  
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy  
Brown, Alex. H. (Shropsh.)  
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)  
Bailey, James (Walworth)  
Brymer, William Ernest  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Bain, Colonel James Robert  
Bull, William James  
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge  
Baird, John George Alexander  
Bullard, Sir Harry  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Balcarres, Lord  
Butcher, John George  
Cripps, Charles Alfred  
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r  
Campbell, Rt. Hn J. A (Glasgow  
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)  
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)  
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.  
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)  
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds  
Cautley, Henry Strother  
Crossley, Sir Savile  
Balfour, Maj K R (Christchurch  
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.  
Cubitt, Hon. Henry  
Banbury, Frederick George  
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)

Cust, Henry John C.  
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Dalrymple, Sir Charles  
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin  
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich  
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chath'm  
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.  
Denny, Colonel  
The House divided:;Ayes, 305; Noes, 163. (Division List No. 190.)  
Dewar, T. R (T'rH'mlets S Geo.  
Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)  
Penn, John  
Dickinson, Robert Edmond  
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse  
Percy, Earl  
Dickson, Charles Scott  
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick  
Pierpoint, Robert  
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-  
Jessel, Capt. Herb. Merton  
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard  
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield  
Johnston, William (Belfast)  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph  
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh  
Plummer, Walter R.  
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon  
Kenyon, Jas. (Lancs., Bury)  
Pretymann, Ernest George  
Dorington, Sir John Edward  
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.  
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edw.  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Keswick, William  
Purvis, Robert  
Doxford, Sir William Theodore  
Kimber, Henry  
Pym, C. Guy  
Duke, Henry Edward  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert  
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart  
Lawrence, Joseph (Monmouth)

Randles, John S.  
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton  
Lawson, John Grant  
Rankin, Sir James  
Faber, George Denison  
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareh'm  
Ratcliffe, R. F.  
Fardell, Sir T. George  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Reid, James (Greenock)  
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.  
Leigh, Bennett, Henry Currie  
Remnant, James Farquharson  
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r  
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.  
Renshaw, Charles Bine  
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst  
Llewellyn, Evan Henry  
Renwick, George  
Finch, George H.  
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.  
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge  
Finlay, Sir Rbt. Bannatyne  
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine  
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green  
Firbank, Joseph Thomas  
Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham  
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Long, Rt Hn Walter (Bristol, S.)  
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney  
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-  
Lonsdale, John Brownlee  
Robinson, Brooke  
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward A.  
Lowe, Francis William  
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.  
Flannery, Sir Fortescue  
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)  
Ropner, Colonel Robert  
Fletcher, Sir Henry  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Rothschild, Hn. Lionel Walter  
Forster, Henry William  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowest oft)  
Round, James



Foster, Sir Michael (Lond. Univ  
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth  
Royds, Clement Molyneux  
Galloway, William Johnson  
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (City of Lon.-  
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison  
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander  
Godson, Sir Augustus Fred.  
Macdona, John Cumming  
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert  
Gordon, Hn J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)  
MacIver, David (Liverpool)  
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. E. J.  
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)  
Maconochie, A. W.  
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.  
Gordon, Maj Evans- (T'rH'ml'ts  
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)  
Seely, Chas. Hilton (Lincoln)  
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon  
M'Calmont, Col. H. L B Cambs.  
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew  
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim  
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)  
Simeon, Sir Barrington  
Graham, Henry Robert  
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edin., W.)  
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)  
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)  
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)  
Skewes Cox, Thomas  
Green, Walford D. (Wetoege W)  
Majendie, James A. H.  
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)  
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds  
Malcolm, Ian  
Smith, H C North'mb. Tyneside  
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)  
Maple, Sir John Blundell  
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks  
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.  
Martin, Richard Biddulph  
Spear, John Ward  
Grenfell, William Henry

Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.  
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk  
Greville, Hon. Ronald  
Maxwell, Rt Hn. Sir H E (Wigt'n  
Stanley, Edward J. (Somerset)  
Groves, James Grimble  
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Guthrie, Walter Murray  
Melville, Beresford Valentine  
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart  
Hain, Edward  
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.  
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.  
Hall, Edward Marshall  
Middlemore, John T.  
Stock, James Henry  
Halsey, Thomas Frederick  
Mildmay, Francis Bingham  
Stroyan, John  
Hambro, Charles Eric  
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Mid'x)  
Milton, Viscount  
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ  
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nde'y  
Milward, Colonel Victor  
Thorburn, Sir Walter  
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert Wm.  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Thornton, Percy M.  
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Tollemache, Henry James  
Harris, Frederick Leverton  
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)  
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray  
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.  
Morgau, David J (Walth'mst'w  
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward  
Hay, Hon. Claude George  
Morgan, Hn. F. (Monmouthsh.  
Tuke, Sir John Batty  
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley  
Morrell, George Herbert

Valentia, Viscount  
Heath, Jas. (Staff., N. W.)  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)  
Heaton, John Henniker  
Morrison, James Archibald  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Helder, Augustus  
Morton, Arthur H. A (Deptford)  
Warde, Colonel C. E.  
Henderson, Alexander  
Mount, William Arthur  
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)  
Hermon-Hodge, Robert T.  
Mowbray, Sir Rbt. Gray C.  
Webb, Col. William George  
Hickman, Sir Alfred  
Muntz, Philip A.  
Welby, Lt.-Cl. A. C E. (Taunton)  
Higginbottom, S. W.  
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)  
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts)  
Hoare, Edw Brodie (Hampstead)  
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)  
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-  
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.  
Myers, William Henry  
Wharton, Rt. Hn. John Lloyd  
Hogg, Lindsay  
Newdigate, Francis Alexander  
Whiteley, H. (Ashton u. Lyne)  
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield Brightside)  
Nicholson, William Graham  
Whitmore, Charles Algernon  
Hornby, Sir William Henry  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)  
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry  
O'Neill, Hn. Robt. Torrens  
Williams, Rt. Hn. J. P. (Birm)  
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh.  
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)  
Willox, Sir John Archibald  
Howard, J. (Mid., Tottenham)  
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington)  
Wills, Sir Frederick

Hozier, Hn. Jas. Henry Cecil  
Peel, Hon. Wm. Rbt. Wellesley  
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)  
Hudson, George Bickersteth  
Pemberton, John S. G.  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)  
Wylie, Alexander  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES.;  
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-  
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)  
Wrightson, Sir Thomas  
Younger, William  
NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.  
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydv'l  
Palmer, Sir Chas. M. (Durham  
Abraham, William (Rhondda)  
Harrington, Timothy  
Partington, Oswald  
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud  
Hayden, John Patrick  
Paulton, James Mellor  
Asher, Alexander  
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-  
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.  
Ashton, Thomas Gair  
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.  
Pease, Alfred E. (Cleveland)  
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)  
Healy, Timothy Michael  
Pease, Sir Joseph W. (Durham)  
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)  
Helme, Norval Watson  
Pirie, Duncan V.  
Bell, Richard  
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)  
Power, Patrick Joseph  
Black, Alexander William  
Holland, William Henry  
Price, Robert John  
Boland, John  
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)

Priestley, Arthur  
Bolton, Thomas Dolling  
Horniman, Frederick John  
Rea, Russell  
Brigg, John  
Jameson, Major J. Eustace  
Reckitt, Harold James  
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)  
Joicey, Sir James  
Reddy, M.  
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson  
Jones, David Brynmor (Swans'a  
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)  
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James  
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Joyce, Michael  
Rickett, J. Compton  
Burt, Thomas  
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth  
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)  
Caldwell, James  
Labouchere, Henry  
Roe, Sir Thomas  
Cameron, Robert  
Lambert, George  
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Layland-Barratt, Francis  
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)  
Carew, James Laurence  
Leamy, Edmund  
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)  
Carvill, Patrick Geo.-Hamilton  
Leigh, Sir Joseph  
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)  
Cawley, Frederick  
Levy, Maurice  
Shipman, Dr. John G.  
Channing, Francis Allston  
Lough, Thomas  
Smith, Samuel (Flint)  
Churchill, Winston Spencer  
Lundon, W.  
Sullivan, Donal

Clancy, John Joseph  
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.  
Taylor, Theodore Cooke  
Colville, John  
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift  
Tennant, Harold John  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
M'Crae, George  
Thomas, A. (Glamorgan, E.)  
Craig, Robert Hunter  
M'Dermott, Patrick  
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)  
Crean, Eugene  
M'Kenna, Reginald  
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings  
Cremer, William Randal  
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin  
Thomas, J. A (Gl'm'rgan Gower  
Cullinan, J.  
Mansfield, Horace Rendall  
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.  
Daly, James  
Mather, William  
Tomkinson, James  
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)  
Mellor, Rt. Hn. John William  
Trevelyan, Charles Philips  
Delany, William  
Mooney, John J.  
Tully, Jasper  
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)  
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen  
Ure, Alexander  
Dillon, John  
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)  
Wallace, Robert  
Doogan, P. C.  
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport  
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)  
Duncan, James H.  
Murphy, J.  
Warner, Thos. Courtenay T.  
Dunn, Sir William  
Nannetti, Joseph P.  
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan  
Edwards, Frank

Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
White, George (Norfolk)  
Elibank, Master of  
Norton, Capt. Cecil William  
White, Luke (York, E. R.)  
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)  
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'ry Mid  
White, Patrick (Meath, North)  
Farquharson, Dr. Robert  
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)  
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)  
Farrell, James Patrick  
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)  
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer  
Fenwick, Charles  
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)  
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth  
Ffrench, Peter  
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)  
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.  
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond  
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)  
Wilson, John (Durham Mid)  
Flavin, Michael Joseph  
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)  
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd  
Flynn, James Christopher  
O'Dowd, John  
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)  
Fuller, J. M. F.  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Yoxall, James Henry  
Furness, Sir Christopher  
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.)  
Gilhooly, James  
O'Malley, William  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
O'Mara, James  
Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.  
Griffith, Ellis J.  
O'Shanghnessy, P. J.  
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton  
O'Shee, James John  
Resolved, that it is expedient that six army corps be organised in the United  
Kingdom, with the requisite staff, stores, and buildings; that a Reserve for the

Militia be enrolled not exceeding 50,000 men; that the establishment of the Yeomanry be raised from 12,000 to 35,000; and that eight regiments be enrolled for garrison service.

FISHERIES (IRELAND) BILL.

Read a second time, and committed for Monday next.

Adjourned at a quarter after One of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 17th May, 1901.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

DUBLIN CORPORATION (MARKETS, ETC.) BILL. (BY ORDER).

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N), in moving to recommit the Bill in respect of a new clause (Pensions to Fire Brigade men), thanked the Chairman of Committees and Officers of the House for the great consideration they had given him in endeavouring to repair a very small slip in the Committee on this Bill. The motion was approved by the Dublin Corporation, as the clause was quite accidentally omitted.

MR. HARRINGTON (Dublin Harbour): I beg to accept the motion on behalf of the promoters of the Bill.

Order of the 14th instant for Consideration of the Bill, as amended, read, and discharged; Bill re-committed to the former Committee; Committee to have leave to sit and proceed forthwith.; (Mr. T. M. Healy.)

INCLOSURE (SUTTON) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL (BY ORDER).

Order for Second Reading read.

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

\*MR. PURVIS (Peterborough) opposed the Second Reading of this Bill, the object of which was, he explained, to confirm a Provisional Order to enclose 477 acres of open fields and 133 acres of open heath, situated about six miles from Peterborough. As representative of that city he desired to give some explanation of the matter. As regarded the enclosure of 477 acres of open fields, he had no objection to offer, for he and those on behalf of whom he was speaking willingly allowed that to hedge in fields hitherto unhedged meant at least better cultivation. If nobody else cried "Hold," he certainly was not going to do so. But the inhabitants of Peterborough did object most strongly to the proposed enclosure of 133 acres of open heath. Peterborough was a most important railway centre, and its suburbs had grown to an extraordinary extent within the last few years. A large number of extensive brick works, employing very many working men, had been established, and, in short, the whole place had become an active, swarming, growing community. Now, the heath which it was proposed to enclose was close to the railway station of Wansford Road, connecting it with Peterborough. Moreover, in these days of cycling, a distance of six miles was as nothing, and if the heath were let alone it would year by year grow a more popular resort for botanising, picnicing, and other modes of recreation and healthy pastime for the working classes. Such pleasant places as now remained open to the public of Peterborough and neighbourhood were already far too few, and he took leave to say that they ought not to be made fewer. It would be a serious loss to the whole district if this heath were enclosed. The only compensation which it was



even alleged was to be made to the people for the shutting up of the heath was to be the making of a road across it to connect Sutton with Stamford. But Stamford lay away from Peterborough. It was situated N.W. from Sutton, while Peterborough was east of that place. Stamford and Peterborough thus, in this matter, had nothing whatever to do with each other, and the proposed road would be no imaginable recompense to Peterborough for the enclosure of so large a common to which the public had hitherto had access. The gentleman who sought to enclose the whole land in question was the lord of the manor, the Rev. William Hopkinson, a clergyman and gentleman for whom he, like everyone else who knew him, entertained the sincerest respect. He said that the 133 acres he proposed to enclose for his own use and behoof were to be Compensation for the expense he incurred in making the road. But the public never asked for the road to be made. They did not want it. The thing was not good enough, and they preferred to keep the land open for all comers. Moreover, if the rev. gentleman made the road, he himself would reap the advantage, in so far as it would afford easier access from his own property to Stamford Town by the Great Northern road. It might be said that the municipal corporation of Peterborough, the members of which had unanimously requested him to oppose the Bill, and had under their common seal petitioned against it, were afraid of the expense, and were, consequently, not taking the proper steps, a course of procedure which was of course rank heresy and sacrilege in the eyes of the Parliamentary Bar, and all their belongings. It was true that the corporation were late in taking action in opposing, but they were not too late, or he would not be in order in addressing the House at that moment. Again, tardiness in action constituted no reason for depriving the people of the use of the common, and one function of the House of Commons was to secure that, where any of its Standing Orders were deficient by reason of their generality, right should be done in accordance with the merits of each particular case. He therefore begged to move that the Bill be read a second time this day six months.

Amendment proposed;

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

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

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.) said he had great pleasure in supporting the Amendment. This seemed to be one of the cases which the House might very well be asked to postpone for consideration to another year.

Peterborough had been accidentally excluded from having a locus standi before the Committee, and consequently only one side of the case had apparently been heard. He had no wish to pass any criticism on the action of the lord of the manor, who, he believed, was a most excellent landlord. But undoubtedly the passing of this Bill would confer solid advantages on his estate. He wished to take this opportunity of entering a caveat against the way in which public rights seemed to be disappearing, and against the gradual absorption in private estates of common lands and open fields. This was a matter which deserved the consideration of the House. There was one fact which had not yet been alluded to, and that was that of the number of cottages which had common rights in

respect of these open fields and heath (five in all) a short time since, three had been allowed to fall into disrepair, and as the tenants had given up possession the common rights had fallen through. He thought it was lamentable that rights with regard to the user of common lands should be allowed to lapse in that way. He had a theory with regard to all these lands that power should be given to county councils to acquire them in the public interest.

\*MR. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.), as chairman of the Committee before which the Provisional Order came, explained that it was a very large Committee and that there was a good attendance of Members on the day on which the Inclosure Award was considered. Had it been an ordinary Select Committee, evidence would not have been taken, because there was no opposition to the scheme, and when his hon. friend suggested that possibly the absence of opposition in this case was due to unwillingness to incur expense, he was afraid he was not aware that there was no expense either for parliamentary fees or lawyers beyond that of railway fares incurred in appearing before such a Committee. Although there was no opposition to the Order, the Committee went carefully through the whole of the evidence which

had been taken in regard to it, asking questions on particular points in order to make sure that there was no mistake about the award. It might be well to explain that when an Inclosure Award was asked for, the Board of Agriculture sent down an inspector, who held public meetings in the parish, and notices of such meetings were circulated over a radius of six miles, so that everybody who felt that they had any concern in the matter might attend and protest against the enclosure if they thought it desirable. He particularly asked the inspector at the outset if due notice were given of these meetings and if the gatherings took place. He was told in reply that the meetings both morning and evening were held after full notice, and that no opposition whatever was offered to the scheme. The witness was also asked about existing common rights, and replied that there were none in the ordinary sense of the word so far as the open fields were concerned, while as to the heath the Committee were told that although there were originally five cottages possessing such rights, three had been pulled down and the others belonged to Mr. Hopkinson, who, as owner of the land, let the cottages together with the right. His hon. friend had described the heath as a charming place for the people of Peterborough to visit. But the witness the Committee had before them said the only time he could remember the heath being resorted to for recreative purposes was when the London and North Western Railway was being laid forty-five years since, and then the navvies used to resort to the place on Sundays to fight out their battles. Nobody in Peterborough or neighbourhood ever used the land as a recreation ground, and undoubtedly according to the evidence the making of the road across the heath would be a great advantage to the inhabitants of Sutton and other parishes. Although nobody offered any opposition before the Committee, a gentleman did, towards the close of the proceedings, say he was a member of the Peterborough town council, and would like to give evidence. But he admitted that he had no representative authority, and that the Peterborough Town Council, although notice had been duly received by its clerk, had

not considered the award and had not deemed it worth while to attend before the Committee. As this gentleman had not given any notice of opposition or of his intended appearance before the Committee, the chairman decided that, according to the Rules of Committee, he had no locus standi, and therefore could not be heard. It should be remembered that the heath was only just within six miles of Peterborough. The Committee were unanimous in approving the Order, and he must observe that the hon. Member for Peterborough was that day adopting a most unusual course in asking the House to dissent from their decision. He would be very much surprised if it did so.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE (Wiltshire, Cricklade) said that in former years he had the honour of being a member of the Committee which dealt with these Orders, and, indeed, he took some humble part in framing the procedure on which it now acted. There were always two aspects to a question of this nature, however, one technical and the other a broader one. As for the technical aspect, his hon. friend the chairman of the Committee had got an unanswerable case. Proper notices had been served, and meetings had been held, no opposition had been offered at the local inquiry, and the Provisional Order had been made in the usual course. But, looking at the matter from the broader aspect, he hoped the House would be induced to postpone the question for another year. In so doing it would not imply any kind of censure either on the Committee or on its chairman. It had been shown by the hon. Member for Peterborough that the corporation and other public bodies of Peterborough were not represented at the local inquiry, and should the House decide to send the Bill over for another year it might accompany its decision with an expression that the Peterborough Corporation should "execute" its own town clerk for his lack of zeal in the matter. The House had to consider was it right or fair that a great number of working men should suffer because of a lack of duty on the part of the town clerk, who had not thought it worth his while to bring the matter before the corporation. It was his business to have seen that the town council were represented at the inquiry, of which he had due notice. But he did nothing of the kind, and, therefore, would it not be reasonable for the House to postpone the Bill another year and give the public of Peterborough a full opportunity of placing their views before the commissioners and before Parliament? The House should not forget that under the Act of 1876, which was passed at the termination of a long controversy, they had to consider, not merely the interests of owners of land, but also those of the neighbourhood generally, and of the public at large. That was distinctly set forth in the preamble of the Act. He thought it was desirable that the House should postpone the matter another year.

\*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): As long as I am connected with the Board of Agriculture I shall take care that no common is enclosed without sufficient reasons. It struck me as peculiar that the noble Lord, who was so much interested in the preservation of commons at the time the Bill on that subject was before the House, and who is responsible for the special form of procedure adopted in regard to these Bills, should now come forward and ask that the Committee, which he was instrumental in establishing,

should be treated as practically of no consequence. No Bills, except money Bills, are treated with the same solemnity of procedure in this House. No Bill referring to a Provisional order for the enclosure of a common can be passed without the appointment ad hoc of a Committee of a particular character to consider whether there is good reason for the enclosure being made. What happened in this case? Such a Committee was set up, and took evidence. There was no opposition before that Committee, and they were unanimous on the subject. There was no opposition at any other stage of the proceedings, and it is all very fine for the noble Lord to say that the Town Clerk of Peterborough did not give notice to the Town Council of Peterborough; but that city is only six miles off, and is presumed to have a great interest in this common. It is said that they knew nothing whatever about it. There was not only one opportunity offered to the Town Council of Peterborough to protest against the enclosure, but they had no less than four opportunities. Notices were sent to them formally, but they never once took any notice of them. After all, it is only by a mere technicality that Peterborough comes into the matter at all, because the law presumes that no place beyond six miles from a common proposed to be enclosed has any interest in it. A portion of the parish of Sutton is within six miles, so that it is by a mere technicality that Peterborough comes in. It so happens that Mr. Hopkinson, the lord of the manor, is the owner practically of the whole of this parish. There are no common rights at all, except one, and even in regard to this the Committee had grave doubts whether it should be dealt with by the Board of Agriculture; but it was decided ultimately that certain rights might arise if Mr. Hopkinson sold his property. When Mr. Hopkinson took the procedure he has taken, it was understood that certain conditions would be imposed on him, which he was perfectly willing to accept, and I am bound to say that the conditions imposed on him will certainly more than recoup the parish for the enclosure of the common. In the first place, the whole of the district round about is perfectly satisfied with this proposal. No objection has come from any other place than Peterborough, which did not think it worth while to take notice of any of the notices sent. We have had representatives from every parish round about in support of this Bill, and for this reason. Mr. Hopkinson is going to give five acres of his own land for a recreation ground, and six acres more for allotments for the cottages in the parish, which have already a quarter of an acre attached to each. He is going to spend nearly £1,000 in making a road through the heath, which will be a great advantage, not only to the parish, but to the whole district round. The commissioner informs me that Mr. Hopkinson could have enclosed the whole property without having conditions of any kind imposed on him. He need not have given a recreation ground or spent £1,000 on a road. Therefore, it is by a mere technicality that the whole procedure has come before the Board of Agriculture in this matter. What are the facts? Peterborough is six miles off, and is just at the extreme limit of distance which is supposed to qualify a district for having an interest in a common. This, after all, is a place where, as the Chairman of the Committee has said, practically nobody goes; no picnics take place there, and it is never used

for the purpose of recreation. On the whole, therefore, I think that Peterborough's interest is exceedingly small in this common. On the other hand, we have the great advantages I have mentioned accruing to the whole parish. Mr. Hopkinson is conferring a great boon on the neighbourhood, and therefore I ask the House to pass the Bill.

\*MR. ROBERT SPENCER (Northamptonshire, Mid) said the right hon. Gentleman had tried to dazzle the House with the munificent liberality of Mr. Hopkinson, but had quite omitted to state the cause of the whole dispute, namely, that Peterborough wished to have this common as a recreation ground. He asked the House to reject the Bill.

MR. SACKVILLE (Northamptonshire, N.) said he had the honour to represent the district of Sutton, and he believed that not a single dissentient note had been raised there with respect to the scheme of the present Bill. His recollection of the House of Commons went back to 1876, when the Commons Bill became law. He asked the House whether they would not be reversing previous legislation if they reversed the decision of the Committee appointed ad hoc. In the present day there was too much tendency to revise and reverse

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)

Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Bowles, TGibson (King's Lynn

Dalrymple, Sir Charles

Allsopp, Hon. George

Brassey, Albert

Dickson, Charles Scott

Anstruther, H. T.

Brookfield, Colonel Montagu

Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Campbell, Rt Hn J. A. (Glasgow

Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-

Arrol, Sir William

Carew, James Laurence

Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield

Bain, Col. James Robert

Cavendish, B. F. (N. Lancs.)

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-

Baldwin, Alfred

Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.

Doxford, Sir William Theodore

Balfour, Rt.Hon. A. J. (Manc'r)

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.

Duke, Henry Edward

Banbury, Frederick George

Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r  
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin  
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)  
Chapman, Edward  
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.  
Bartley, George C. T.  
Coghill, Douglas Harry  
Fergusson, Rt Hn Sir J. (Manc'r  
Beach Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol  
Cohen, Benjamin Louis  
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst  
Bill, Charles  
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Blundell, Colonel Henry  
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole  
Fletcher, Sir Henry  
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith  
Corbett, A. C. (Glasgow)  
Flower, Ernest  
Boulnois, Edmund  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Forster, Henry William

in the House itself small questions which had been before Committees. He knew the whole circumstances of this case. Mr. Hopkinson had shewn the utmost liberality in the matter. He had increased the original offer with respect to the recreation ground and the allotments, and he was going to spend a sum of money in improving communication between the village of Sutton and the city of Peterborough.

MR. THOMAS BAYLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield) said the House had not received such information from the Government as they ought to have got. They had been told that five acres were to be given for recreation purposes, but they had heard nothing as to what the county council said on this question. Five acres out of 130 to be enclosed was only about 4 per cent. for recreation grounds. Something was also said about certain allotments, but had the people who had rights in this common been put on these allotments? They must look round with suspicion when the rights of the public were being invaded without the knowledge of the county council. It was quite time that the House should look at this question of commons enclosure seriously, and he thought more time should be given to the county council and the local authorities for consultation with the borough of Peterborough as to whether this was a fair and reasonable bargain. Question put.

The House divided::Ayes, 151; Noes, 144. (Division List No. 191.)

Galloway, William Johnson  
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth  
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.

Garfit, William  
Macartney, Rt Hn. W G Ellison  
Rollit, Sir Albert  
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.  
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)  
Ropner, Colonel Robert  
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)  
M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.)  
Royds, Clement Molyneux  
Gordon, Maj Evans- (T'rH'ml's  
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)  
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse  
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim  
Malcolm, Ian  
Saunderson, Rt. Hn Col. Edw. J.  
Goulding, Edward Alfred  
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William  
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)  
Green, Walford D. (Wednesb'ry  
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.  
Sharpe, William Edward T.  
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)  
Grenfell, William Henry  
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)  
Simeon, Sir Barrington  
Greville, Hon. Ronald  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Smith, H C. (North'd., Tyneside  
Hain, Edward  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks  
Hamilton, Rt Hn. Ld. G (Midd'x  
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford  
Spear, John Ward  
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robt. Wm.  
Mount, William Arthur  
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk  
Hardy, Laurence (Kent Ashfrd  
Muntz, Philip A.  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Hay, Hon. Claude George  
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)  
Stewart, Sir Mark J M'Taggart  
Hope, J. F. (Sheffi'ld, Brightside

Myers, William Henry  
Stroyan, John  
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh.  
Nicholson, William Graham  
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings  
Howard, J. (Midd., Tortenham)  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Thorburn, Sir Walter  
Hozier, Hn. Jas. Henry Cecil  
Nussey, Thomas Willans  
Tuke, Sir John Batty  
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)  
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens  
Valentia, Viscount  
Kay-Shuttleworth, Rt Hn Sir U  
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay  
Walrond, Rt Hn. Sir William H.  
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh  
Parker, Gilbert  
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)  
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)  
Pease, Herbt. P. (Darlington)  
Welby, Lt.-Col. A C E (Taunton)  
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool  
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley  
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell (Birm  
Lawson, John Grant  
Pemberton, John S. G.  
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks)  
Lee, Arthur H (Hants, Fareham  
Penn, John  
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn E. R. (Bath)  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm  
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.  
Plummer, Walter R.  
Wrightson, Sir Thomas  
Loder, Gerald W. Erskine  
Randles, John S.  
Younger, William  
Lonsdale, John Brownlee  
Rankin, Sir James  
Lowther, Rt. Hon. Jas. (Kent  
Ratcliffe, R. F.  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Mr. Jeffreys and Colonel Stopford-Sackville.



Lowther, Rt Hn JW (Cum. Penr.  
Reid, James (Greenock  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Renshaw, Charles Bine  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)  
Ridley, Hn. M.W. (Stalybridge  
NOES.  
Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.  
Dillon, John  
Leamy, Edmund  
Allan, William (Gateshead)  
Donelan, Captain A.  
Leng, Sir John  
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud  
Doogan, P. C.  
Lough, Thomas  
Ambrose, Robert  
Duncan, J. Hastings  
Lundon, W.  
Asher, Alexander  
Dunn, Sir William  
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift  
Ashton, Thomas Gair  
Edwards, Frank  
M'Cann, James  
Austin, Sir John  
Emmott, Alfred  
M'Crae, George  
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)  
Esmonde, Sir Thomas  
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin  
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)  
Farquharson, Dr. Robert  
Mansfield, Horace Rendall  
Beoumont, Wentworth C. B.  
Farrell, James Patrick  
Mooney, John J.  
Big wood, James  
Ffrench, Peter  
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)  
Blake, Edward  
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond  
Murphy, J.  
Boland, John  
Flavin, Michael Joseph  
Nannetti, Joseph P.

Boyle, James  
Flynn, James Christopher  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.  
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)  
Norman, Henry  
Brigg, John  
Fuller, J. M. F.  
Norton, Capt. Cecil William  
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson  
Gilhooly, James  
O'Brien, Kendal (T'pp'rary Mid  
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton  
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)  
Caldwell, James  
Hardie, J. K. (Merthyr Tydvil)  
O'Connor, J. (Wicklow, W.)  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Harwood, George  
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)  
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.  
Hayden, John Patrick  
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)  
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton  
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-  
O'Dowd, John  
Cawley, Frederick  
Healy, Timothy Michael  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Channing, Francis Allston  
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Clancy, John Joseph  
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol E.)  
O'Shee, James John  
Colville, John  
Holland, William Henry  
Palmer, Sir C. M. (Durham)  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Hope, John D. (Fife, West)  
Partington, Oswald  
Craig, Robert Hunter

Horniman, Frederick John  
Paulton, James Mellor  
Crean, Eugene  
Jacoby, James Alfred  
Philipps, John Wynford  
Crombie, John Willian  
Jameson, Major J. Eustace  
Power, Patrick Joseph  
Cullinan, J.  
Joicey, Sir James  
Price, Robert John  
Daly, James  
Jones, Dav. Brynmor (Swansea)  
Rea, Russell  
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan  
Joyce, Michael  
Reddy, M.  
Delany, William  
Kinloch Sir John George Smyth  
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)  
Dewar, J. A. (Inverness-shire)  
Lambert, George  
Rickett, J. Compton  
Dilke, Rt. Hn. Sir Charles  
Layland-Barratt, Francis  
Rigg, Richard  
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)  
Taylor, Theodore Cooke  
White, Luke (York, E. R.)  
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)  
Tennant, Harold J.  
White, Patrick (Meath, North  
Roche, John  
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gow'r  
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)  
Schwann, Charles E.  
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)  
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)  
Scott, Chas. P. (Leigh)  
Tomkinson, James  
Wilson, John (Durham. Mid)  
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)  
Trevelyan, Charles Philips  
Wilson, J W (Worcestershire N.  
Shipman, Dr. John G.  
Tully, Jasper

Woodhouse, Sir J T (Hudders'fd  
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire  
Wallace, Robert  
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)  
Soames, Arthur Wellesley  
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)  
Yoxall, James Henry  
Soares, Ernest J.  
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES;

Strachey, Edward  
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan  
Mr. Purvis and Mr. Chas. Spencer.  
Sullivan, Donal  
White, George (Norfolk)  
Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed.

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

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

Sutton-in-Ashfield Urban District (Water) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill 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.:

Cromer Water Bill.

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

BEXLEY TRAMWAYS BILL.

MANSFIELD CORPORATION BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

ARLESEY GAS BILL [Lords].

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

BRITISH GAS LIGHT COMPANY BILL.

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

GLASGOW AND SOUTH WESTERN RAIL-WAY BILL.

LANCASHIRE AND YORKSHIRE RAIL-WAY (DEARNE VALLEY JUNCTION RAILWAYS) BILL.

SWANAGE GAS AND WATER BILL.

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

TOTTENHAM AND HAMPSTEAD JUNCTION RAILWAY BILL.

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

PEMBROKE URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL (COUNTY OF DUBLIN) BILL (BY ORDER.)

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

DUBLIN (EQUALISATION OF RATES) BILL (BY ORDER.)

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

DERBY CORPORATION BILL.

Ordered, That the Minutes of Evidence taken before the Committee on the Derby Corporation (Extension of Borough, &c.) Bill, of Session 1877, be referred to the Committee on Group L in respect of the Derby Corporation Bill.;(Mr. Caldwell.)

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDER (PORT).

Bill to confirm a Provisional Order of the Local Government Board relating to the Port of Manchester, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Grant Lawson and Mr. Long.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDER (PORT) BILL.

"To confirm a Provisional Order of the Local Government Board relating to the Port of Manchester," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions

for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 192.]

METROPOLITAN WATER COMPANIES (AMENDMENT OF ACTS) BILL.

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

METROPOLITAN ELECTRIC SUPPLY BILL

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

MOND GAS BILL.

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

CLYDE VALLEY ELECTRICAL POWER (SUBSTITUTED) BILL.

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 3) BILL.

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

Bill to be read the third time upon Monday next.

IRISH PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH BILL.

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

Bill to be read the third time.

CAMBRIAN RAILWAYS BILL.

ALDEBURGH CORPORATION (WATER) BILL.

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

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (MONEY) [BILL.

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

Bill to be read the third time.

TORRINGTON AND OKEHAMPTON RAILWAY BILL.

ALFRETON GAS BILL [Lords].

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

OMAGH GAS BILL [Lords].

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

SHEFFIELD DISTRICT RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

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

BRISTOL, CLIFTON, AND WEST OF ENGLAND ZOOLOGICAL SOCIETY BILL [Lords].  
Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time.

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confer further powers upon the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of the City of Manchester, with reference to the construction of tramways and streets, and the acquisition and appropriation of lands, and with respect to children trading in the streets, and other matters affecting the health and good government of the city, and for other purposes." Manchester Corporation Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act for incorporating and conferring powers on the Faversham Water Company." Faversham Water Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to empower the Urban District Councils of Cowes and East Cowes to take on lease the existing Royal Perry across the River Medina between their respective districts, and to work and manage the same; and for other purposes." Cowes Ferry Bill [Lords].

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to enable the South Eastern Railway Company to make new works; to acquire additional lands; to provide for the application of capital of the South Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Companies; to make further provisions as to the Managing Committee of those Companies; and for other purposes." South Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill [Lords].

MANCHESTER CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

FAVERSHAM WATER BILL [Lords].

COWES FERRY BILL [Lords].

SOUTH EASTERN AND LONDON, CHATHAM, AND DOVER RAILWAYS BILL [Lords].

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

PETITIONS.

FINANCE BILL.

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

HOUSING OF WORKING CLASSES (RE-PAYMENT OF LOANS) BILL.

Petitions, in favour, from South-molton; Plymouth; and Halifax; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION BILL.

Petition from Stoke-upon-Trent, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.

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

MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.

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

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petitions, in favour, from West Kensington; Benson; Loughborough; Dewsbury Moor; Birmingham; Hingham; Sheffield; Holbeach (four); Scarborough (two); Whaplode; Scalby and Whaplode St. Catherine's; to lie upon the Table.

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

Petitions, in favour, from Launceston (six); Longton; Barrow-in-Furness; Barrow; Cardiff; Prestwich; Brentwood; Walkden; Clydach; Bays water; Woburn Sands; Portsmouth (two); Notting Hill; Plymouth; Weardstone; Halifax; Highgate Hill; Dunfermline;

Blackheath; Driffield; Chelsea; Traw-; den; Seven Kings; Yorkshire; Ilford (two); Little Ilford; York; East London; . Moulton; Holbeach (five); and Whaplode St. Catherines; to lie upon the Table.

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

Petitions, in favour, from Biggar; Tarves; Longside; Peebles (two); Kirkmichael; Comrie; and Logicrait; to lie upon the Table.

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

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

#### RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

#### TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 2599 to 2601 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

#### REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE (ENG-LAND, SCOTLAND, AND IRELAND).

Copy ordered, "of Provisional Statement showing for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1901; (1) the Estimated Amount contributed by England, Scotland, and Ireland respectively to the Revenue collected by Imperial Officers; (2) the Estimated Expenditure incurred, on English, Scottish, and Irish Services, chargeable against such Revenue; and (3) the Consequent Balances of Revenue which were available for Imperial Expenditure."; (Mr. Austen Chamberlain.)

Copy presented accordingly; to lie; upon the Table, and to be printed. [No-182.]

#### QUESTIONS.

#### SOUTH AFRICAN WAR-FARM BURNING.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Government intend on the restoration of peace or at any other time to rebuild the 600 farmhouses approximately stated to have been burnt in the Transvaal and Orange Free States in the Return recently published.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): No, Sir.

MR. FLAVIN: May I ask whether the right hon. Gentleman would approve of Mr. De Wet burning Highbury?

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

#### SOUTH AFRICAN CONCESSIONS COMMITTEE-REPORT.

MR. THOMAS BAYLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can state when the Report of the South African Concessions Committee will be laid upon the Table of the House.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I am not able at present to fix the date.

#### WAR HONOURS; WARRANT OFFICERS OF THE NAVY.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can now state whether any decision has been arrived at as to the participation of warrant officers of the Navy in the promotions and honours recently awarded

and officially announced in connection with the South African campaign; and whether the statutes of the orders governing the Distinguished Service Order have been so revised as to enable naval warrant officers to be eligible for this distinction, and so place them upon a similar footing to non-commissioned officers and men in the Army.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): The question of a decoration for officers of warrant rank in the Royal Navy has now been settled, and steps will be taken at the earliest possible opportunity to give effect to the decision. The arrangements made do not affect the statutes of the Distinguished Service Order.

ROYAL ARMY MEDICAL CORPS.

SIR JOHN TUKE (Edinburgh and St. Andrew University): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he proposes to adopt the suggestion contained in the Report of the Royal Commission appointed to consider and report upon the care and treatment of the sick and wounded during the South African campaign to appoint a departmental or other Committee of experts to inquire into and report upon the steps needed to effect certain reforms in the Royal Army Medical Corps; and, if so, whether he is prepared to state the composition of such Committee.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): The Secretary of State is preparing various proposals to submit to a Committee of experts, but the composition of the Committee cannot be at present stated.

VOLUNTEER SERVICE COMPANY, WELSH REGIMENT; REGIMENTAL PETS.

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL PRYCE-JONES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he will grant a dispensation entitling the goat recently presented to the Volunteer Service Company of the Welsh Regiment in South Africa, and now quarantined on board the "Tagus" at Southampton, to be handed over to the officer commanding, notwithstanding the restrictions laid down in the Foreign Animals Order of 1896.

\*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): An exception can only be made if the War Office recognise the goat as a regimental pet, in the same way as the goats of the Regular battalions.

NORTH QUEENSFERRY FORTIFICATIONS.

MR. JOHN HOPE (Fifeshire, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether it is proposed to carry the north boundary fence of the proposed fortifications at Carlingnose, North Queensferry, down to the sea at Port Laing; and whether he is aware that such boundary fence would be an interference with a public right of way from Cruickness to North Queensferry.

LORD STANLEY: There is no intention of interfering with any right of way from Cruickness to North Queensferry, nor have any instructions been given to carry a continuous boundary fence along the north limit of the War Department property.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): Will steps be taken to fence in the fortification, seeing that the public now have access, and can make drawings and measurements of the work as it proceeds?

LORD STANLEY: I cannot answer that without notice, but I think that what the



noble Lord says tends to show that there is a necessity for doing something of the kind.

WEST SOMERSET YEOMANRY TRAINING.

COLONEL WELBY (Taunton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War why the special permission granted to the West Somerset Yeomanry on 9th May to go into lodgings at Taunton and do their training from there was revoked by telegram on 13th May, forty-eight hours before the regiment was to assemble; and whether he is aware that this sudden change at the last has caused the regiment much expense, and the inhabitants of Taunton expenditure in preparations of welcome, and whether he can see his way to granting the officers and men a special allowance to cover the unusual expense they have been put to.

LORD STANLEY: I am afraid I can not at the present moment give an answer to this question. The matter is under consideration, and I hope to be able to give a favourable reply in the course of the next two or three days.

EXPORTS OF MUNITIONS OF WAR AND WAR SHIPS.

MR. JACOBY (Derbyshire, Mid): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if the Government will grant a Return showing the exportation of munitions of war and war ships during the last five years.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The most complete informa-

tion available as to the exports from the United Kingdom of "Arms, ammunition and military and naval stores" during the last five years is contained in the recently published "Annual Statement of the Trade of the United Kingdom" for 1900, Vol. 1 (Parliamentary Paper, Cd. 549), at pages 307&#x2013;321, as regards exports of the produce or manufacture of the United Kingdom, and at pages 569&#x2013;570 as regards exports of foreign and colonial produce. There are no separate particulars as to the value of war ships exported; but figures as to the number and tonnage of such vessels built in the United Kingdom for foreigners are given in the volumes of the "Annual Statement of the Navigation and Shipping of the United Kingdom" for each year. In these circumstances I do not think it necessary that a separate Return should be prepared dealing with this subject.

BURMESE RUBBER-PRODUCING TREES.

MR. SHARPE (Kensington, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he can state what steps, if any, the Indian Government is taking to develop the cultivation of rubber-producing trees in Burma; is he aware that in Ceylon and other eastern colonies attempts are being made by private proprietors to develop the same cultivation; and will he say what precautions, if any, it is proposed to take to prevent the results of the Government operations interfering with the success of private enterprise.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): The Government of India have recently authorised an extensive experimental plantation of the Para-rubber tree in the Tenasserim Division of Burma, where the climate and the other conditions are believed to be favourable. I am aware that attempts are being made to develop the production of rubber in Ceylon and elsewhere by private enterprise, but I do not think that this is a reason why

the Government of India should not do their best to develop the resources of that country and encourage private enterprise by showing that this tree can be profitably cultivated in parts of India.

INDIAN TELEGRAPH RATE;THE GERMAN EMDEN-IRELAND CABLE.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether, in view of the fact that the reduction in the Indian telegraphic rate is being delayed in consequence of the obstruction offered by Germany, he would state the reasons which militate against the grant to the German Post Office of the right to land their Emden-New York cable at Waterville.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): The cable of the German Post Office from Emden to the West of Ireland at present lands at Valentia. Germany has no cable of its own between Ireland and New York. The question of the transfer of the landing place from Valentia to Waterville is at present the subject of negotiation, and it would not be expedient that any statement should be made on the subject.

EDUCATION IN TRINIDAD.

\*MR. COMPTON RICKETT (Scarborough): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that it has been proposed by the Committee of Education in Trinidad to close eight of the Government schools, to transfer fifteen others to Roman Catholic, seven to Church of England, and one to Presbyterian management, and to only maintain the remaining twenty-six Government schools for the present; whether this change in educational policy has been discussed and approved by the inhabitants of the colony; whether it has received the sanction of the Colonial Office; and whether the correspondence on the subject can be produced.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I am aware of the proposals referred to by the hon. Member. Objections to these proposals have now been raised in the Legislative Council, and I am awaiting a further report by the Governor before arriving at a final decision in the matter.

TURKEY;MASSACRES OF CHRISTIANS AT MOSUL.

MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if information has reached the Foreign Office concerning a massacre of Christians by Kurds in the Tiyari district, vilayet of Mosul; whether a Kurdish chief named Reschid Bey, after murdering fifteen Christians in the said district, has, with 1,000 Kurds, withdrawn to the mountains, with the object of attacking other Christians; and whether any representations to the Porte have been or will be made.

\*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRANBORNE, Rochester): The British Consular Agent at Mosul reported towards the end of April that 10,000 Kurds had gone to the Tiyari mountains with the intention of robbing and killing Christians, of whom fifteen were said to have been already massacred. His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople at once brought the matter to the notice of the Porte, and was informed that peremptory instructions had been sent to the local authorities to hold the Kurds in check, and to prevent outrages. Sir N. O'Connor has since been informed by the Turkish Government that

there had been a long-standing feud between the people of Tiari and some neighbouring tribes, and that on learning recently that there was danger of an outbreak the Vali of Mosul had taken steps to prevent a collision. He had also addressed a warning to the Kurdish Chief, which had resulted in the removal of the cause of dispute between the two parties. The reported massacre of fifteen Christians was denied.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): On the occasion referred to were any Kurds massacred?

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: I do not know.

FOREIGN POST OFFICES IN CON-STANTINOPLE.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware of any treaty or any other international document giving either to Great Britain or to any other foreign nation the right of maintaining its own post office in Turkey; if not, by virtue of what authority is the British post office maintained there; does the maintenance of foreign post offices in Turkey deprive the Turkish Government of any portion of the postal revenues which would otherwise accrue to it; is he aware that the mails consigned to these foreign post offices, and distributed by them, often convey packets of watches and other valuable articles, which thus evade the Turkish customs duties; and do His Majesty's Government propose themselves to continue to maintain in Turkey a system of foreign post offices which lends itself to an evasion of duties and a diminution of a portion of the securities pledged to foreign bondholders.

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: In pursuance of the provisions of the treaty of 1783 the Russian mails have been distributed by a special Russian post office in the Consulate General for many years. French, British, and German post offices were subsequently established on the ground that those countries are entitled under their Treaties with the Porte to the same privileges as are enjoyed by others. These arrangements, therefore, are of long standing, and have been necessitated by the absence of any security that the Turkish Government can efficiently replace the foreign post offices. No doubt the Turkish revenue suffers to some extent in consequence, but it is quite understood that articles which would otherwise be liable to Turkish Customs dues are not transmissible by letter post through our post office in Constantinople, and articles sent by parcel post are delivered through the Turkish Custom House. In accordance with what I have said above, His Majesty's Government are not prepared to admit that any portion of the securities pledged to the bondholders are infringed. With regard to the continued maintenance of the foreign post offices, I have nothing to add to my answers of the 9th and 13th instant, in which the attitude of His Majesty's Government was fully explained.&#x2020;

MOREA;IMPORTS OF BRITISH GOODS

MR. BRIGG (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley): I beg to ask the Under Secretary @&#x2020; See preceding volume, pages 1152 and 1457.; of State for Foreign Affairs if he will kindly request the British Consul at Patras to supply, if possible, some details, of the imports into Morea of British-made goods.

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: Some information on this subject is contained in the Report

No. 2,573, Annual Series, issued last month. If the hon. Member desires further particulars, and will specify them, I shall be happy to endeavour to procure them.

CHINA;YANG-TSZE PROVINCES;TRIENNIAL LITERARY EXAMINATIONS.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, owing to disquieting rumours, of possible disturbances in the Yang-tsze provinces, the usual triennial literary examinations to be held this summer are to be abandoned by Imperial decree; and whether the Government have any further information as to the source of the expected trouble.

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: We have not heard of the issue of any Imperial decree to the effect mentioned. With regard to the last paragraph of the question, I would refer the hon. Member to the answer which I gave him on this subject on the 6th instant&#x2020;;we have no later information.

ANGLO-RUSSIAN DISPUTE AT TIENTSIN.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is in a position to make a statement as to the settlement of the question of ownership of the land at Tientsin which occasioned the recent Anglo-Russian railway dispute; whether, despite the temporary agreement agreed to by the two Governments to suspend work on the land referred to, the Russians are proceeding to make roads through the land claimed by the railway company; and whether, in view of the grave issues, at stake, the Government are able to give an assurance to the House that a speedy settlement will be arrived at and that the rights of the railway company will be fully maintained.

@&#x2020; See preceding volume, page 749.

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: No settlement has yet been arrived at with regard to the ownership of the land referred to; but under the agreement with the Russian Government all questions of title and proprietary rights are reserved for discussion between that Government and ourselves; and the claim of the railway administration cannot be prejudiced by any work carried on by the Russian authorities meanwhile.

\*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): Was it not stated there was to be some kind of arbitration on this matter?

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: I have no information beyond that contained in my answer. CHEEFOO;WEI-HAI-WEI CABLE.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether a public tender for the construction of the Chefoo;Wei-hai-wei cable was asked for; and whether he can explain why, in the interests of the public service and in view of the terms granted to the contracting company, the Government did not undertake the construction and working of the cable.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: (1) The question of calling for public tenders was carefully considered, but it was found that the arrangements between the Chinese Government and the Eastern Extension and Great Northern Telegraph Companies as to landing rights in China, etc., rendered competition impossible. (2) The Chefoo;Wei-hai-wei cable forms a spur to the existing system of the Eastern

Extension Company in China, and the advantages of having it worked by them, under due restrictions as to the nationality of the staff, etc., are held to greatly outweigh any disadvantages resulting therefrom. The agreement provides for the termination of the working agreement at any time at short notice if the arrangement is found unsatisfactory. (3) At the time the cable was laid the need for communication was urgent, and the Eastern Extension Company were in an exceptionally good condition to do the work expeditiously on behalf of His Majesty's Government. I should like to add that we have every reason to be satisfied with their readiness to meet our wishes.

#### SUGAR DUTY; INCREASED CHARGES BY DEALERS.

MR. YOXALL: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that the London Wholesale Sugar Dealers Association, a body of influence upon the trade, has decided to add an extra charge of 6d. per cwt. to the 4s. 2d. duty per cwt. placed on sugar by the Budget resolution, and whether he is prepared to allow rebate on contracts, made under the rules of this association which were current before the duty was imposed.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): I have no knowledge of any such extra charge as that indicated in the question; but, if such addition were made, it would be outside the letter of the law, and its payment must depend upon the free will of the contractees. I see no ground whatever for allowing any such rebate as suggested.

#### LEAD POISONING RETURNS.

\*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the increase in the more serious forms of lead poisoning, and decrease in the less serious, shown by the Return Lead Poisoning (Parliamentary Paper, No. 126), can be accounted for by any reasons which can be stated to the House in reply to a question.

\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): I cannot accept without qualification the hon. Baronet's statement that the more serious cases of lead poisoning have increased. The most serious cases; the fatal ones; have, as appears from the Return, been reduced by one half; from sixteen in 1899 to eight in 1900. In the current year, up to the present only two deaths, have been reported. With regard to other serious cases, there was an increase among males and a decrease among females of cases of paralysis; a decrease among males and an increase among females of cases presenting brain symptoms. These are the accidental fluctuations which will always occur in dealing with small numbers. The truth seems to be that, owing to the greater precautions now adopted, there has been a general decrease of lead poisoning, which in the more serious cases is qualified to some extent by the effects of conditions extending back to former years.

#### CONVEYANCE OF PRISONERS; DEATH IN A PRISON VAN.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to a recent death in a prison van, and whether he will consider the propriety of abolishing or improving this method of conveyance.

\*MR. RITCHIE: No death, so far as I am aware, has occurred in a prison van. I presume, however, that the hon. Member is referring to the case of James Atkin, who died in Holloway Prison on the 2nd instant. This man, who was suffering from delirium tremens, had a violent struggle with the police in the prison van while being conveyed from the police court to prison, and died in prison from syncope on the same day; but his death does not appear to have been in any way due to the construction of the van, and I see no reason for making any alteration in the present arrangements.

TRUCK ACTS;SQUIRE v. SWEENEY.

MR. TENNANT (Berwickshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that in the case of Squire v. Sweeney, Under the Truck Acts, the judgment of the Irish court was based upon the decision in Ingram v. Barnes; and, as this was an English case, whether he is advised that his Department may safely continue to take proceedings, if necessity arise, in circumstances similar to those recently found in Cornwall.

\*MR. RITCHIE: The course which, in answer to the hon. Member some days ago, I indicated my intention of pursuing  
See preceding volume, page 429.

in regard to proceedings under the Truck Acts in England was deliberately adopted after full consideration of the whole question and all the cases bearing on it, and to that course I propose to adhere.

BUTTER ADULTERATION.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether his attention has been called to the fact that new milk, heavily charged with boracic acid, is forced by means of a spiral machine into butter to defraud the consumer by greatly increasing its weight and bulk; that a prosecution against Pearks, Ginston, and Lee, Limited, at Bath, for selling fresh butter containing 24 per cent. of water failed because the added water might have found its way into the butter by means of milk; and whether, under these circumstances, he will take steps to prevent such practices in the future.

\*MR. HANBURY: The facts as stated in the question are, I believe, accurate. At Longton, on the day following the Bath decision, a conviction was obtained against the same firm;and I understand that it is to be appealed against. Other prosecutions are being held over until the decision on appeal has been given.

BUTTER STANDARDS.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture will he explain why the Board of Agriculture have not yet fixed the standard of water in butter which they have been empowered to do by legislation.

\*MR. HANBURY: The power of fixing what is somewhat inaccurately described as a standard of milk and butter was first given to the Board in January of last year. It was then decided that a Committee should first inquire into the question of milk, and that Committee was appointed 29th January, 1900, and reported in January of this year. We are now working in concert with the Irish Department in preparing the necessary evidence to submit to a Committee dealing with butter.

#### AGRICULTURAL LABOUR CONTRACTS.

MR. LLOYD MORGAN (Carmarthen, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he has received a copy of a resolution, passed by the members of the Carmarthen Chamber of Agriculture, calling attention to the difficulties in which farmers in the county of Carmarthen and elsewhere are frequently placed owing to agricultural servants in breach of their contract leaving the service of their masters after the winter months are over and before the harvest begins; and whether, owing to the fact that such servants are always engaged by the year, and that they refuse to sign any written agreement, he will consider the question of introducing a Bill to amend the fourth section of the Statute of Frauds so as to make it unnecessary (in order to recover damages for breach of contract) for any agreement of service between farmer and servant to be in writing, even though it be an agreement which cannot be performed within a year of the time of the making thereof.

\*MR. HANBURY: I do not think that Parliament can reasonably be asked to place contracts for agricultural labour on a different footing to other contracts in respect of the evidence required to prove the contracts by the Statute of Frauds.

#### LOCAL TAXATION; AID FROM IMPERIAL SOURCES.

MR. ASHTON (Bedfordshire, Luton): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury will he state what sums, during the last financial year, were contributed out of revenue derived from Imperial taxation in relief of local taxation, and through what channels were they paid; and in particular, what payments in relief of local taxation were made otherwise than through the local taxation accounts.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I am not sure that I quite understand the hon. Gentleman's question, but I think he will find the information he requires in the Return of National Public Income and Expenditure annually presented to Parliament. The figures for last year are not yet available.

#### SCOTTISH CONGESTED DISTRICTS; ISLAND OF CAVA.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if the Congested Districts Board will inquire into the circumstances of the Island of Cava, with the view of affording some relief to the parish of Orphir, of which the said island forms a part, the charges borne by the parish in respect of the said island amounting to £;86 19s. 10d., the total gross rent of the island being only £;31 5s.

\*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): I am informed by the Local Government Board for Scotland, within whose province the matter primarily rests, that in 1891 the population of the island was thirteen; five males and eight females, and there are only three inhabited houses; the island being only a mile long. Without further information as to the data on which the figures stated in the question are based I am unable to give any reply; but the Local Government Board's general superintendent will make inquiry into the circumstances when he next visits the parish.

#### NATIONAL GALLERY; FIRE PRECAUTIONS.

DR. FARQUHARSON: I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works, whether he can state to the House the precise nature of the steps he intends to take, by the

acquisition of adjacent land or otherwise, to ensure the collection of pictures in the National Gallery from a repetition of the dangerous fire referred to in the last report of the trustees.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): I am taking steps for the acquisition of the premises immediately adjacent to the National Gallery, so as to secure the isolation of that building. Parliamentary powers are needed for this purpose, and a Bill has been for some weeks before the House awaiting Second Reading.

LOANS TO IRISH FARMERS.

MR. DALY (Monaghan, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state if the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction would be prepared to advance money to farmers; in Ireland to help them to purchase machinery for either crop saving or dairying purposes; and, if so, whether he can state the terms of repayment of such advances.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The question of granting loans to farmers for either of the purposes mentioned is under consideration by the Department.

MR. DALY: When is the right hon. Gentleman likely to be in a position to make an announcement of the point?

MR. WYNDHAM: I hope shortly. I am in communication with the Department.

BALLIVOR PETTY SESSIONS; HEDGE-CUTTING PROSECUTIONS.

MR. CAREW (Meath, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether he can explain why the magistrates at petty sessions held in Ballivor, county Meath, on 12th January last, dismissed four summonses brought by Toad contractors, acting under the county surveyor's instructions, to compel the defendants to cut and trim their hedges along the roadside; is he aware that, while the small occupiers obey the surveyor's orders, some of the largest owners neglect to do so, to the injury of the roads in the district; and whether he will take steps, by legislation or otherwise, to empower magistrates to enforce obedience to the surveyor's orders by both occupiers and owners.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): The four summonses referred to were brought against two defendants, one of whom is a landowner and the other a tenant farmer. Both defendants had endeavoured to comply with the road contractor's requirements to a certain extent. The summonses were dismissed on technical grounds and mainly because the notices which the moving party is bound to serve, and upon which the proceedings were founded, were informal. The law is clearly laid down in such cases in Section 9, Sub-section 8, of the 14 & 15 Vict., cap. 92, and no further legislation is called for.

IRISH INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION EXAMINATIONS.

MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can explain why the programme and rules for the intermediate examinations of 1902, due about 1st April, are not published yet, though the announcement of some important changes, and the prospect of others, makes ample notice particularly necessary; and whether, as the delay in this and



previous years has been complained of as causing inconvenience, the introduction of changes will be deferred until notice can be given.

MR. WYNDHAM: The programme and rules for 1902 required very careful consideration by the Intermediate Education Board. They are now, I understand, practically settled, and will shortly be made public.

VESEY STONEY'S ESTATE, CO. MAYO.

DR. AMBROSE (Mayo, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the estate of Mr. Vesey Stoney, of Rosturk Castle, county Mayo, has been sold to the Congested Districts Board; and that, since the purchase, Mr. Stoney has prevented the tenants taking seaweed off the shore adjoining to and part of the estate; whether such action has been taken with the knowledge or by the authority of the Board; and whether the Board will take steps to prevent such action in the future.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Congested Districts Board is negotiating for the acquisition of the seaweed rights on this property, already purchased, and until these rights have been acquired the Board could not intervene as suggested.

LABOURERS' COTTAGES IN THE RATH-DRUM UNION.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a sworn inquiry was, twelve months ago, held in Rathdrum (county Wicklow) Union into a scheme for the erection of labourers'

cottages, and that no arbitrator has yet been sent down by the Local Government Board; that an inquiry into a second scheme has been held, and that a third inquiry is pending; and whether he will advise the Local Government Board to remove the block in the way of erecting labourers' cottages in the Rathdrum Union by sending an arbitrator to complete the necessary preliminaries.

MR. WYNDHAM: A Provisional Order was made by the Local Government Board on the 28th February last confirming the scheme which formed the subject of inquiry in July, 1900. An arbitrator can only be appointed upon the application of the district council, and no such application has yet been made. A second inquiry was held in March last; a third inquiry is not pending. The responsibility for delay in appointing an arbitrator does not rest with the Local Government Board.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY PENSIONS.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the number of police officers and head constables of the Royal Irish Constabulary in receipt of pensions, and amounts paid respectively to each.

MR. WYNDHAM: The numbers and amounts are:;Officers, 99, £;27,207; head constables, 588, £;46,320.

CENSUS;IRISH SPEAKERS IN IRELAND.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Returns regarding the number of Irish speakers in Ireland, as disclosed by the last Census, could be laid before the House before Tuesday next.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am informed that it would be quite impossible to give this information before Tuesday next.

## LAND PURCHASE IN COUNTY WEXFORD.

MR. FFRENCH (Wexford, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, as the sale of land is blocked in Wexford for want of funds, and as he has promised to bring in a Bill to make special arrangements for such cases, he can inform the House when he will be able to bring in the Bill.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (North Wexford): I beg also to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state what are the intentions of the Government with regard to facilitating land purchase in county Wexford; and when he proposes to introduce a Bill to deal with the situation in that county.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Government has framed a Bill to remove the existing obstruction to further sales in county Wexford, and to provide against similar contingencies in the event of their arising elsewhere. I propose to ask leave to introduce the Bill on Monday at the commencement of public business.

MR. FFRENCH: Are there any funds at present available?

MR. WYNDHAM: There are some funds available, which the Bill will release.

## GREAT SOUTHERN AND WESTERN RAIL WAY OF IRELAND; THROUGH RATES FOR IRISH PRODUCE.

MR. MOONEY (Dublin County, S.): On behalf of the hon. Member for the St. Patrick Division of Dublin, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, owing to the Great Southern and Western Railway Company omitting to carry out their statutory obligations to put through rates in force in Dublin, Irish produce from that district is debarred from the most expeditious and safe service; and whether he will take steps to remedy this state of affairs.

I beg also to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the question of the provision of facilities by the Great Southern and Western Railway Company, Ireland, under Section 34, 63, and 64 Vic, of 1900, for through traffic to and from stations on what was originally the Waterford, Limerick, and Western Railway, through the port of Dublin and port of Waterford respectively; whether he can state what facilities are being provided by the Great Southern and Western Railway Company for the stations aforesaid, and whether he is aware that the Port of Dublin is being injuriously affected; and whether he will take any steps to have the Act of Parliament duly carried into effect.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I will answer these questions together. If the hon. Member will be good enough to read Sub-section 5 of the section to which he refers he will see that a special remedy is provided and can be applied at the instance of the Dublin Port and Docks Board or other persons or bodies named therein.

## KILRUSH POSTMASTERSHIP

MAJOR JAMESON (Clare, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, with reference to the vacancy for a postmaster or postmistress in Kilrush, will he state whether any appointment has yet been made; and, if so, who has been appointed; if not, can he say whether it is intended to fill the office by appointing the person now in the employment of the postal service.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: No appointment has yet been made to fill the vacancy for

a postmaster at Kilrush, nor can it yet be stated who will be appointed.

CORK POST OFFICE;PROVINCIAL CLERKS IN CHARGE.

MR. J. F. X. O'BRIEN (Cork): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether the grade of provincial clerk in charge is still in existence at Cork post office; whether the duties of this class are confined to the same portion of the staff; and what are the qualifications necessary to entitle one of the staff to those duties; and whether he will have the names of those possessing the necessary qualifications placed on a list, and the list posted in the office, and the qualified officers deputed to fill those duties in turn.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The class of provincial clerks in charge is being allowed to die out, and no new appointments are made to it. There are officers of the Cork staff who still retain the title. The duties of the class are performed by those persons who still remain on it, and also by any other officer who may be selected by the surveyor from time to time to take charge of an office, and a list of suitable officers is kept by the surveyor. Those persons, are selected for the duty whose character and knowledge of the duties to be performed are held to justify their selection. It is not proposed to make any alteration in the existing system.

EDUCATION BILL;EFFECT OF REPEAL CLAUSE ON IRISH TECHNICAL EDUCATION.

MR. LOYD (Berkshire, Abingdon): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether the exclusion of Ireland from the extent of the Bill in Clause 11 (1) of the Education Bill will suffice, under the general rule for construing a statute by its intent, to keep alive the Technical Instruction Acts, 1889 and 1891, in Ireland, notwithstanding the unqualified terms in which those Acts are repealed by Clause 10 and the Schedule.

\*THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. GRANT LAWSON, Yorkshire, N.R. Thirsk) (for Sir J. GORST): My right hon. friend wishes me to say that the answer to this question is in the affirmative.

AGRICULTURAL RATING AND TITHE-RENT ACTS.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will state whether it is the intention of the Government to ask the House to renew the Agricultural Rating Act and the Tithe-Rent (Rates) Act this session in one Bill, or will separate measures be introduced for this purpose.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I hope the hon. Gentleman will wait till the Bill is introduced. It is not very convenient to give a preliminary account of the form which legislation is to take. The proper occasion is when the Minister brings in the Bill and declare the policy of the Government.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he will state when he proposes to conclude the debate on the Second Reading of the Finance Bill, and whether he proposes to have a morning sitting of the House on Friday next. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will also say what will be the course of business next week.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is not possible to forecast accurately the course of

business next week. We propose to begin on Monday the discussion of the Finance Bill, and I think, from such inquiries as I have been able to make, that there ought to be no difficulty in arriving at a decision on the Amendment to be moved from the front Opposition bench at or before the conclusion of the morning sitting on Tuesday. If the House would be content to allow the Second Reading to be taken at the same time, it would be, I think, for the general convenience of Members. With regard to the remainder of the week I propose to take the motion for the holiday adjournment as first Order on Thursday; and I hope before we separate to get the Second Reading of the Civil List Bill, the very small fragment of the Committee stage of the Demise of the Crown Bill which still remains to be taken, and Vote 10, and, if possible, the Ordnance Vote for the Army. The House will rise on Friday, but I do not know whether it will be possible to have a morning sitting on that day. There is an intention, I believe, on the part of the Irish Members to raise the question of the financial relations upon the Second Reading of the Finance Bill. That would not be a very convenient opportunity for taking issue upon that subject, because the possibility of dividing on an Amendment will be exhausted by the division which will take place on the Amendment of the right hon. Member for East Wolverhampton. But this is a new Parliament, and I think that an opportunity should be given for the discussion of the question. I therefore propose to find a day for that discussion before the end of the session.

\*SIR CHARLES DILKE: Will the Army Votes be taken on Friday?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: On Thursday or Friday.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Is it proposed to continue the discussion on the Finance Bill after twelve o'clock on Friday night?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not contemplate a long sitting, but I do not think the debate need stop when the clock strikes twelve.

MR. FLOWER (Bradford, W.): Can we have notice when the Local Government Board Vote will be taken?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I will endeavour to give notice. I suppose the hon. Member will be content with the ordinary notice at the commencement of the week, when I usually state the business for the following Friday.

NEW BILLS.

COUNTY COUNCILS (LEGISLATION).

Bill to enable County Councils to promote Legislation, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Bigwood, Mr. Joseph Howard, Sir John Dorington, Mr. Henry Hobhouse, Mr. Broadhurst, and Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice.

COUNTY COUNCILS (LEGISLATION) BILL.

"To enable County Councils to promote Legislation," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday next, and to be printed.

[Bill 193.]

BURGH POLICE AND PUBLIC HEALTH (SCOTLAND).

Bill to amend the Law relating to the Police and Public Health Administration of Burghs in Scotland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Asher, Sir Robert Reid, Sir Herbert Maxwell, Mr. Parker Smith, Mr. M'Crae, and Mr. John Dewar.

BURGH POLICE AND PUBLIC HEALTH (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"To amend the Law relating to the police and Public Health Administration of Burghs in Scotland," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 19th June, and to be printed. [Bill 194.]

#### STEAMSHIP SUBSIDIES SELECT COMMITTEE.

Ordered, That Mr. William Field be discharged from the Select Committee on Steamship Subsidies.

Ordered, That Mr. William Redmond be added to the Committee.;(Sir Thomas Esmonde.)

#### SUPPLY. [7TH ALLOTTED DAY.]

Considered in Committee.;

(In the Committee.)

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

#### CIVIL SERVICE AND REVENUE DEPART-MENTS ESTIMATES, 1901&#x2013;2. CLASS II.

1. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £;7,300, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Department of His Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council."

MR. GODDARD (Ipswich) said he desired to move a reduction of the Vote by £;1,000 for several reasons, the first of which was that of economy. In these days of very large Estimates one could not reduce the expenditure of the country by great sums, and it was therefore their duty to scrutinise the Votes, and especially the smaller ones, very closely, in order to see if there were money now being expended which could be saved. This Vote afforded a reasonable opportunity of doing that. The office to which it referred was more or less a sinecure. The President of the Council had very little work to do, and while, formerly, no doubt, it was a very important position, at the present time the duties were of a very slight character. When the last Liberal Government was in office it was held that the office was so little required, and the duties were so light, that they might be performed by the Secretary of State for India. Lord Kimberley accordingly

filled the two posts, but he drew no salary in respect of this particular office. That was an example which might well be followed now. He knew it was argued in 1893 that this was an ancient office and ought not, therefore, to be abolished. But that surely was no reason for maintaining it, and spending £;2,000 a year on it. The Lord President of the Council was supposed to be answerable for all Orders in Council, but there was no reason why the heads of respective Departments should not be made answerable for such Orders as affected their respective Departments. The Lord President of the Council, too, was head of the Education Department. It was not at all clear what duties he rendered to the State in that capacity. Their experience in this House was that when the Vice-President was driven into a corner, he found it convenient to hide himself behind the broad back of his noble friend. But no one would maintain that it was reasonable to pay £;2,000 a year merely in order to provide such a defence for the Vice-President. They ought to have some explanation of the duties of the

Lord President, because really the practical work was carried out by the Vice-President. He hoped the Committee would agree to the reduction of the Vote which he advocated, on the ground that this was an unnecessary office, and that the occupier of it, having little to do, should require no salary from the State.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item A (Salaries) be reduced by £;1,000, in respect of the Salary of the President of the Council.";(Mr. Goddard.)

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.) said the reduction of the Vote had been moved on the ground that the office of Lord President was a sinecure, and that the occupant of it did no public work in return for the salary he received. Now, whatever might be said of former Lord Presidents, he did not think it could be asserted of the present holder of the office that he was in such a position. He had, indeed, very important duties in connection with the education of the country, and the interest he had shown and the trouble he had taken in regard to that were well known to all Members of the House. Besides that, the Lord President was responsible for many other most important matters to which he was compelled to give his personal attention, and he did not think, therefore, it could be seriously contended that the salary placed on the Votes in accordance with practice for an office held in connection with another high office was not deserved.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.) said the Lord President of the Council was President of the Committee of Council on Education, a body which constituted one of the greatest absurdities of the day. There was, in fact, no Committee of Council. All the work was done by the Lord President and by the Vice-President, and he ventured to assert that, in view of the great necessity for economy in these days, there were many public men in this House who would gladly fill the position with advantage to the highest educational interests of the country, without asking a salary for the performance of the duties. Why should the Lord President get £;2,000 a year for carrying out merely nominal duties? Men in high places were very apt to decry the Radical idea of economy, that money should only be paid for work done. It was not surprising, for whenever there was a fat salary to be obtained without good work being done for it they were the very ones to secure the posts. He hoped that those who, sitting above the gangway on that side of the House, had during the last few weeks been loud in their demands for retrenchment, would assist the hon. Member for Ipswich in getting a reduction of the Vote for a large sum of money for an office which practically had no duties attached to it.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) said he had intended to move the reduction of the Vote in order to raise another question, but it would save time perhaps if, on the present motion, he brought forward the subject in which he was more particularly interested;an item in the second line of the Vote, as to the salary of the Clerk of the Council.

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.

Barry, E. (Cork, S.)

Boyle, James  
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud)  
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)  
Brigg, John  
Ambrose, Robert  
Blake, Edward  
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson  
Asher, Alexander  
Boland, John  
Burke, E. Haviland-

\*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order; It is not my business to save time. I have to see that the rules of the House are observed. That point must be reserved until the present Amendment has been disposed of.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) said he thought that there were a good many salaries which might be cut down with more advantage than that of the Lord President of the Council. The Financial Secretary to the Treasury had stated that the Lord President showed an interest in education. They all showed an interest in education, but they had no opportunity of developing it. He imagined that the real business of the Lord President was to look after the Vice-President. He was paid a salary because he was one of the odd men of the Cabinet who was ready to make speeches in the House of Lords and the country, and to receive deputations. An hon. friend reminded him that the Lord President was a sleeping partner; and certainly he was not a very wakeful partner; but still he fulfilled the duties expected of him by the Cabinet. There was a good deal to be said for the view expressed by his hon. friend that all these salaries should be cut down. He had, however, observed in history that, at the time of the war with Napoleon, Ministers of the Crown contributed a considerable part of their salaries to relieve the burdens of the people, and he believed that the present Ministers were doing the same. They were modest men, and did not like it known, but when he saw conscience money acknowledged in the newspapers he believed it came from one or other of them. No doubt even the Vice-President contributed a part of his modest salary in the form of conscience money to wards the relief of the taxpayers. He knew it would be an agreeable task for the Vice-President to defend the Lord President, and he would listen with the greatest pleasure to him.

Question put.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 128; Noes, 178. (Division List No. 192.)

Burns, John  
Healy, Timothy Michael  
Partington, Oswald  
Caine, William Sproston  
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.  
Power, Patrick Joseph  
Caldwell, James  
Holland, William Henry  
Rea, Russell

Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)  
Reddy, M.  
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton  
Horniman, Frederick John  
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)  
Cawley, Frederick  
Jacoby, James Alfred  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Channing, Francis Allston  
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)  
Rickett, J. Compton  
Clancy, John Joseph  
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)  
Rigg, Richard  
Colville, John  
Joyce, Michael  
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth  
Roche, John  
Craig, Robert Hunter  
Lambert, George  
Schwann, Charles E.  
Crean, Eugene  
Layland-Barratt, Francis  
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)  
Crombie, John William  
Leamy, Edmund  
Shipman, Dr. John G.  
Cullinan, J.  
Leng, Sir John  
Sinclair, Capt John (Forfarshire)  
Daly, James  
Lundon, W.  
Soames, Arthur Wellesley  
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan)  
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.  
Soares, Ernest J.  
Delany, William  
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)  
Sullivan, Donal  
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh)  
M'Cann, James  
Taylor, Theodore Cooke  
Dillon, John



M'Crae, George  
Tennant, Harold John  
Donelan, Captain A.  
Mooney, John J.  
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.  
Doogan, P. C.  
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen  
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings  
Duncan, J. Hastings  
Morton, Edw. J.C. (Devonport  
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)  
Dunn, Sir William  
Murphy, J.  
Trevelyan, Charles Philips  
Edwards, Frank  
Nannetti, Joseph P.  
Tully, Jasper  
Emmott, Alfred  
Norman, Henry  
Ure, Alexander  
Esmonde, Sir Thomas  
Norton, Capt. Cecil William  
Wallace, Robert  
Farquharson, Dr. Robert  
Nussey, Thomas Willans  
Walton, Joseph (Barnsbury)  
Farrell, James Patrick  
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Md  
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.  
Ffrench, Peter  
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)  
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan  
Flavin, Michael Joseph  
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)  
White, Luke (York, E. R.)  
Flynn, James Christopher  
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)  
White, Patrick (Meath, North)  
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.  
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)  
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)  
Fuller, J. M. F.  
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)  
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)  
Gilhooly, James  
O'Dowd, John

Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)  
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)  
Harmsworth, R. Leicester  
O'Malley, William  
Yoxall, James Henry  
Harrington, Timothy  
O'Mara, James  
Harwood, George  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;  
Hayden, John Patrick  
O'Shee, James John  
Mr. Goddard and Mr. Charles Hobhouse.  
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-  
Palmer, Sir Chas. M. (Durham  
NOES.  
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.  
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)  
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel  
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc.  
Gordon, Maj Evans- (T'rH'ml'ts  
Allsopp, Hon. George  
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry  
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.  
Arkwright, John Stanhope  
Chapman, Edward  
Goschen, Hn. George Joachim  
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.  
Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.  
Goulding, Edward Alfred  
Arrol, Sir William  
Coghill, Douglas Harry  
Grenfell, William Henry  
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John  
Cohen, Benjamin Louis  
Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G (Mid'x  
Austin, Sir John  
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Hamilton, Marq.of (L'd'nd'rry)  
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy  
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready  
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert W.  
Bain, Col. James Robert

Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole  
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashfd.  
Baird, John George Alexander  
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)  
Hay, Hon. Claude George  
Balcarres, Lord  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.  
Baldwin, Alfred  
Cross, Herb. S. (Bolton)  
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)  
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r  
Cubitt, Hon. Henry  
Heath, James (Staffs., N. W.)  
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds  
Dalrymple, Sir Charles  
Heaton, John Henniker  
Balfour, Maj. K. R. (Christch.)  
Dickson, Charles Scott  
Hickman, Sir Alfred  
Banbury, Frederick George  
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles  
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.  
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)  
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred. D.  
Hope, J. F. (Sh'ffield, Brightside  
Bartley, George C. T.  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh.)  
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol  
Doxford, Sir William Theodore  
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil  
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.  
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin  
Johnston, William (Belfast)  
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.  
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart  
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)  
Big wood, James  
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas  
Kay-Shuttleworth, Rt Hn Sir U  
Bill, Charles  
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.  
Kenyon, James (Lancs. Bury)  
Blundell, Col. Henry  
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc.

Kimber, Henry  
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-  
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Boulnois, Edmund  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)  
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Lawson, John Grant  
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn)  
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond  
Lee, Arthur H (Hants, Fareham)  
Brassey, Albert  
Fletcher, Sir Henry  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. A (Glasgow)  
Flower, Ernest  
Leveson-Gower, Fredk. N. S.  
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)  
Foster, Sir M. (Lond. Univ.)  
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.  
Cayzer, Sir Charles William  
Garfit, William  
Long, Rt. Hon. Walter (Bristol, S)  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.  
Lonsdale, John Brownlee  
Lowe, Francis William  
Peel, Hon. Wm. Robert W.  
Simeon, Sir Barrington  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside)  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)  
Plummer, Walter R.  
Smith, James P. (Lanarks.)  
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)  
Purvis, Robert  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Macartney, Rt. Hon. W G Ellison  
Pym, C. Guy  
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.  
Macdonald, John Cumming  
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert  
Thorburn, Sir Walter

Maconochie, A. W.  
Randles, John S.  
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray  
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)  
Rankin, Sir James  
Tritton, Charles Ernest  
M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.)  
Ratcliffe, R. F.  
Tuke, Sir John Batty  
M'Killop, James (Stirlingsh.)  
Reid, James (Greenock)  
Valentia, Viscount  
Majendie, James A. H.  
Remnant, James Farquharson  
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)  
Malcolm, Ian  
Renshaw, Charles Bine  
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. CE(Taunt'n  
Maxwell, W.J.H(Dumfries-sh.  
Rentoul, James Alexander  
Whiteley, H (Asht'n-und Lyne  
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John Wm.  
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge  
Whitmore, Charles Algernon  
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.  
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green  
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)  
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)  
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson  
Williams, RtHnJ Powell-Birm.  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.  
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh, N.  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye  
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)  
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford  
Ropner, Col. Robert  
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm  
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute  
Royds, Clement Molyneux  
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-  
Nicholson, William Graham  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Nicol, Donald Ninian

Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)  
Younger, William  
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay  
Saunderson, Rt. Hon. Col Edw. J.  
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)  
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
Parker, Gilbert  
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)  
Parkes, Ebenezer  
Sharpe, William Edward T.  
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington)  
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)  
Original Question again proposed.

MR. WHITLEY said he desired to call attention to an item with regard to which he thought the Committee was entitled to some explanation. He noticed in the Estimates an item of £1,250, salary for the Clerk to the Council. This gentleman was appointed at a salary of £1,200, rising at the end of five years to £1,500; but it appeared to him the Committee was being asked before the five years had expired to vote an amount of £50 in excess of his salary. Another item with regard to which he should like some explanation was "Private Secretary to the Lord President, £300." The Committee would notice that that amount was paid to a senior examiner of the Board of Education. He objected to the multiplying of offices in this manner, which he thought was most undesirable. The Estimates showed that there were nine senior examiners, but there was nothing to show which of these gentlemen was the one referred to. He understood that it was the rule when a gentleman occupied a dual appointment to put a star against his name, but that had not been done in this case. There was another item on page 56; "A temporary acting allowance of £100" For all he knew, that might be a third salary for this particular gentleman. He thought the Vice-President of the Council should give some explanation of these items, and say how it came about that this senior examiner had so little to do that he was enabled to

take up this additional duty. He also hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would undertake that in future the names of any persons receiving extra salaries should be properly starred. The salaries of the senior examiners were by no means small. These gentlemen started at £650, and rose to £800 a year. He moved the reduction of the vote by £300.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item A (Salaries) be reduced by £300, in respect of the salary of the Private Secretary to the Lord President."; (Mr. Whitlaw.)

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): The hon. Gentleman is, perhaps, unaware that a few years ago the House of Commons sanctioned the appointment of a private secretary to the Lord President. I can assure the Committee that the office of President of the Board of Education is no sinecure. The noble Lord who at present fills that office has

very responsible duties to perform, and requires the assistance of officials cognisant of the whole of the intricate system known as the Education Department of this country. For many years past the noble Lord, as President of the Council, has had a private secretary from among the examiners of the Education Department. This is not the only duty the noble Lord has to perform. A very onerous part of his duty is to preside at the Council and do such work as that con-

nected with the periodical examinations. He also has to read a great quantity of papers and consider minutes and questions of considerable importance, and it is absolutely essential that he should have this assistance. The gentleman referred to is one of the examiners, and, from personal knowledge, I can say he is extremely well versed in the intricacies of the Department. Without this assistance my noble friend would be quite incapable of conducting the affairs of the Board in the manner in which it is necessary to conduct them. [Ironical cheers.] I know why hon. Members cheer in that ironical fashion. It is because it has been said in comic papers that the Lord President of the Council has nothing to do as President of the Board of Education. If hon. Members opposite would take my place for a week they would find that the Lord President has a great deal to do. The position is by no means the dignified sinecure which it is the fashion to represent it to be, and it would be unfortunate for the Board of Education and for the interests of the country if this salary were cut off and the President deprived of the assistance of an expert official.

MR. BLAKE (Longford, S.) said he agreed that the position of the President of the Board of Education was not a sinecure. The President had to manage the Vice-President, and that was a task which, *prima facie*, it was difficult to perform. The gentleman who had been put in this high position, who inspired the President and helped him to manage the Vice-President, should not be allowed to blush unseen; what was his name?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Mr. Walrond.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) asked whether this gentleman, while acting as private secretary, continued his duties as a senior examiner.

SIR J. GORST said he did not act as an examiner. He could not attend to two duties. There was not a Minister on the front bench who had not as his private secretary an official of the Department with which he was connected.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Then I understand he has no other duties to perform?

SIR J. GORST: No; he could not do anything else.

SIR BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.) regretted that an old rule seemed to have fallen into abeyance which prohibited a senior clerk from acting as private secretary. It was not a good thing that senior officials should be allowed to act as private secretaries, and the old rule was that if they were permitted to do so, it was only upon the condition that they gave up a part of their salaries.

MR. GODDARD thought the reply which had been given did not meet the point of the objection. This gentleman held two positions; he appeared in the Vote under consideration as receiving £300 a year; he was "starred," and the star referred to the Education Department. In the Vote for that Department, however, he was

not "starred." It might be a small matter, but it was an offence against one of the regulations which had been laid down by the House to prevent the plurality of offices which had been such a mistake in times gone by. This gentleman received a large salary as one of the examiners under the Education Department, but the Committee were now told that he did no work for that salary, because the whole of his time was taken up by his secretarial duties. The explanation was not at all satisfactory, and if the reduction was pressed to a division he should vote for it.

SIR J. GORST said that this officer certainly ought to be "starred" in the Education Estimates, and he would take care that that was done next year.

MR. FLYNN complained that the Committee were discussing on the Privy Council Vote an item which really ought to be discussed on the Education Vote. This official was described as senior examiner in the Education Office, and he ought, therefore, to be paid by that Office. He should have thought that an intelligent shorthand writer and typist would have been very well able to do the work required of a private secretary, but if an educational specialist was required his salary should be borne on the Educational Vote. The accounts were hopelessly entangled, and the mover of the reduction would be justified in going to a division as a protest.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) thought that as the President of the Council was also President of the Board of Education and President of the National Defence Committee of the Cabinet, he was thoroughly entitled to a private secretary. But he never had before heard of a private secretary getting as much as £;300 a year on one Vote and £;800 on another. A private secretary at £;1,100 was too costly a luxury, and probably the Financial Secretary of the Treasury, who, as a guardian of the public purse, was always ready to prevent excessive expenditure, would be prepared, if the Amendment was withdrawn, to reconsider the ease. The usual salary of a private secretary was, at the outside, £;200 or £;300 a year all told, and if the salary was more than that the gentleman was not a private secretary, but an official secretary or a permanent official.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: This gentleman is a permanent official.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: If that is so he should appear as such, and not as private secretary.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I think the hon. Member is under some misapprehension. This is the way in which on every Vote private secretaries of the same class as this gentleman appear. They are permanent civil servants of the Crown, who are taken away from the ordinary routine of office duties in order to act as private secretaries to Ministers. They are not personal private secretaries who come and go with the Ministers in the sense in which the hon. Member

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.  
Channing, Francis Allston  
Farquharson, Dr. Robert  
Allan, William (Gateshead)  
Clancy, John Joseph  
Farrell, James Patrick



Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud  
Colville, John  
Ferguson, R. C. M. (Leith)  
Ambrose, Robert  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Ffrench, Peter  
Asher, Alexander  
Craig, Robert Hunter  
Flavin, Michael Joseph  
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)  
Crean, Eugene  
Flynn, James Christopher  
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)  
Crombie, John William  
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)  
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.  
Cullinan, J.  
Gilhooly, James  
Blake, Edward  
Daly, James  
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton  
Boland, John  
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan  
Harmsworth, R. Leicester  
Bolton, Thomas Dolling  
Delany, William  
Harrington, Timothy  
Boyle, James  
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)  
Harwood, George  
Brigg, John  
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles  
Hayden, John Patrick  
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson  
Dillon, John  
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-  
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James  
Donelan, Captain A.  
Healy, Timothy Michael  
Barke, E. Haviland-  
Doogan, P. C.  
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)  
Burns, John  
Duncan, J. Hastings  
Holland, William Henry  
Caine, William Sproston

Dunn, Sir William  
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)  
Caldwell, James  
Edwards, Frank  
Horniman, Frederick John  
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.  
Emmott, Alfred  
Jacoby, James Alfred  
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton  
Esmonde, Sir Thomas  
Joicey, Sir James  
Cawley, Frederick  
Evans, S. T. (Glamorgan)  
Jones, Dav. Brynmor (Swansea)

is speaking; they are official private secretaries.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES thought the Financial Secretary was in error. These private secretaries did come and go with Ministers. If a new Lord President of the Council took office he might or might not, as he pleased, reappoint this private secretary; it was a purely personal office. He strongly objected to these dual appointments. If they had no other inconvenience, they frequently forced Members to discuss the merits of a gentleman upon a Vote to which it really did not belong. That was the case in the present instance. If this particular private secretary was a necessity for the Lord President of the Council in respect of education, the salary ought to be on the Education Vote. It was inconvenient that a public servant should be on two Votes at all, but if he had to be, he should be on the Vote to which he most properly belonged. This gentleman evidently did not belong to the Privy Council, because he did no Privy Council work whatever, and yet the Committee were discussing his salary on the Privy Council Vote. While he certainly hoped the reduction would not be pressed, he as certainly thought the Financial Secretary of the Treasury should reconsider in the first place the salary of this private secretary, and in the second place, whether this sum of £;300 should not be placed on the Education Vote.

Question put.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 141; Noes, 187. (Division List No. 193.)

Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)  
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)  
Soames, Arthur Wellesley  
Joyce, Michael  
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)  
Soares, Ernest J.  
Kay-Shuttleworth, Rt Hn Sir U.  
O'Dowd, John  
Strachey, Edward  
Kinloch, Sir John Geo. Smyth  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Sullivan, Donal

Lambert, George  
O'Malley, William  
Taylor, Theodore Cooke  
Layland-Barratt, Francis  
O'Mara, James  
Tennant, Harold John  
Leamy, Edmund  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.  
Leng, Sir John  
O'Shee, James John  
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)  
Lundon, W.  
Palmer, Sir C. M. (Durham)  
Trevelyan, Charles Philips  
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.  
Partington, Oswald  
Tully, Jasper  
M'Cann, James  
Pease, Sir Joseph W. (Durham)  
Ure, Alexander  
M'Crae, George  
Power, Patrick Joseph  
Wallace, Robert  
M'Kenna, Reginald  
Rea, Russell  
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.  
Mooney, John J.  
Reddy, M.  
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)  
Morgan, J. L. (Carmarthen)  
Redmond, J. E. (Waterford)  
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.  
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan  
Murphy, J.  
Rickett, J. Compton  
White, Luke (York, E. R.)  
Nannetti, Joseph P.  
Rigg, Richard  
White, Patrick (Meath, North)  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)  
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer  
Norman, Henry

Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)  
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)  
Norton, Capt. Cecil William  
Roche, John  
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)  
Nussey, Thomas Willans  
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)  
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)  
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary M'd  
Schwann, Charles E.  
Yoxall, James Henry  
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)  
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Mr. Whitley and Mr. Goddard.  
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)  
Shipman, Dr. John G.  
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)  
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)  
NOES.  
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.  
Cripps, Charles Alfred  
Kimber, Henry  
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel  
Cross, H. Shepherd (Bolton)  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Allsopp, Hon. George  
Cubitt, Hon. Henry  
Lawrence, Joseph (Monmouth)  
Anson, Sir William Reynell  
Dairymple, Sir Charles  
Lawrence, Wm F. (Liverpool)  
Arkwright, John Stanhope  
Dewar, T R. (T'rH'mlets, S. Geo.  
Lawson, John Grant  
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.  
Dickson, Charles Scott  
Lee, Arthur H (Hants, Fareham  
Arrol, Sir William  
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Leveson-Gower, Fred. N. S.  
Austin, Sir John  
Doxford Sir William Theodore  
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.

Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy  
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin  
Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham  
Bain, Colonel James Robert  
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. H.  
Lonsdale, John Brownlee  
Baird, John George Alexander  
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas  
Lowe, Francis William  
Balcarres, Lord  
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Baldwin, Alfred  
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)  
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r  
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst  
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsm'th)  
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred  
Balfour, Maj K R (Christchurch  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Macartney, Rt. Hon. W. G. E.  
Banbury, Frederick George  
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward A.  
Macdona, John Cumming  
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor  
Flannery, Sir Fortescue  
Maconochie, A. W.  
Bartley, George C. T.  
Fletcher, Sir Henry  
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)  
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol  
Flower, Ernest  
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W  
Bell, Richard  
Forster, Henry William  
M'Killip, James (Stirlingshire)  
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.  
Foster, Sir Michael (Lond. Univ.  
Majendie, James A. H.  
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.  
Garfit, William  
Malcolm, Ian  
Bigwood, James

Godson, Sir Augustus Fred.  
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire  
Blundell, Colonel Henry  
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)  
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.  
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-  
Gordon, Maj Evans- (T'rHmlets  
Milton, Viscount  
Boulnois, Edmund  
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon  
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)  
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex  
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn  
Goulding, Edward Alfred  
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)  
Bull, William James  
Hain, Edward  
Mowbray, Sir Robt. Gray C.  
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J A (Glasgow  
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Mid'x)  
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute  
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)  
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nd'y)  
Nicholson, William Graham  
Cayzer, Sir Charles William  
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robt. W.  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)  
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens  
Chamberlain, Rt.Hon. J. (Birm.  
Hay, Hon. Claude George  
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay  
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r  
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)  
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)  
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry  
Heath, Jas. (Staffords., N.W.)  
Parker, Gilbert  
Chapman, Edward  
Heaton, John Henniker  
Parkes, Ebenezer  
Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.  
Henderson, Alexander

Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington)  
Coghill, Douglas Harry  
Hobhouse, Hy. (Somerset, E.)  
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard  
Cohen, Benjamin Louis  
Hope, J. F. (Sheffi'ld, Brightside  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh.  
Plummer, Walter R.  
Colomb, Sir John Charles R.  
Hozier, Hon James Henry Cecil  
Pretymann, Ernest George  
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. A.  
Hudson, George Bickersteth  
Purvis, Robert  
Corbett, A. C. (Glasgow)  
Johnston, William (Belfast)  
Pym, C. Guy  
Cox, Irwin Edward B.  
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)  
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)  
Randles, John S.  
Rankin, Sir James  
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)  
Welby, Lt.-Col. A C E (Taunton).  
Ratcliffe, R. F.  
Seely, Charles H. (Lincoln)  
Whitley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne)  
Reid, James (Greenock)  
Sharpe, William Edward T.  
Whitmore, Charles Algernon  
Remnant, James Farquharson  
Simeon, Sir Barrington  
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)  
Renshaw, Charles Bine  
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.  
Williams, Rt Hn J. Powell. (Bir.  
Rentoul, James Alexander  
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)  
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)  
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (St'lybridge  
Spear, John Ward  
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath

Ridley, S. F. (Bethnal Green)  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm  
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson  
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.  
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-  
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.  
Stroyan, John  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye  
Thorburn, Sir Walter  
Younger, William  
Ropner, Col. Robert  
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray  
Royds, Clement Molyneux  
Tritton, Charles Ernest  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
Valentia, Viscount  
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)  
Warde, Colonel C. E.  
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw J.  
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)

Original Question again proposed.

MR. SOAMES (Norfolk, S.) called attention to the salary of the chief clerk in the Judicial Department. His commencing salary was £;500 a year, rising by annual increments of £;20 until £;650 was reached. In the last column but one it was stated that this official was to have a rise of £;50 and not £;20. He thought this point required a little explanation.

\*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order; The hon. Member is going back to an item before that upon which the Committee has just pronounced an opinion.

MR. SOAMES: No. Sir, it is lower down.

\*THE CHAIRMAN: I beg the hon Member's pardon. I thought he was referring to an item higher up in the list.

MR. COGHILL (Stoke-upon-Trent) thought £;600 a year was a very large sum for the work which the chief clerk was called upon to perform. The salary of the registrar of the Privy Council was £;1,500, and he did not think they could afford to pay such large salaries to the registrar, and to the clerk to the Privy Council as well. The Chancellor of the Exchequer was very fond of lecturing them upon economy, but he wished the right hon. Gentleman would carry his principles out in his own Department. Each year they cheerfully voted large sums for the Army and Navy, and as regarded the Civil Service Estimates he thought they ought to have a very considerable reduction this year. So long as they had these heavy demands made upon them by the Army and Navy he did not think they could do better than begin economising upon the Vote for the Privy Council Office. He begged



to move a reduction of the salary of the registrar of the Privy Council by £;100; for it was clear that in the Privy Council Office there was a large number of gentlemen enjoying large salaries with very little to do.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item A (Salaries) be reduced by £;100, in respect of the Salary of the Registrar of the Privy Council."; (Mr. Coghill.)

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.) said the registrar of the Privy Council, like all other civil servants, ought to enter his name in the book when he commenced work in the morning and when he finished work in the evening. It was laid down that in any Government Department, whether it was the lowest clerk or the Permanent Under Secretary of State, he had to write his name in the book, put down the time he commenced duties at the office, and the time he finished his work. His vote would be very much influenced by the amount of time this official devoted to his duties.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I cannot say whether that is the practice or not in regard to this official, but I think such a regulation is entirely unnecessary in this case. The registrar has entirely separate and distinct duties to perform, mostly connected with the judicial work of the Council. I think it will be apparent to hon. Members that it is not necessary for this official to record in a book the time of his arrival and departure, as is done in the case of junior clerks.

\*MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: But it is done in the case of Permanent Under Secretaries of State also. I believe I am right in this statement.

MR. JOHN BURNS (Battersea) said he did not object to the hon. Member knowing what time this official entered upon his business and left it, and he thought every State officer ought to sign the book, as every other public official did. But the mere fact of signing the book at ten or eleven o'clock in the morning, or when he left at four or five in the evening, was no indication whatever of his capacity for work in the interval. He might be reading three-volume novels or The Times, or taking a long luncheon hour. He wanted to know what the official did between signing the book in the morning and leaving at night. They ought to have a little more information from the Minister responsible to the House as to whether the Registrar of the Privy Council earned his salary. There might be a satisfactory explanation, but so far they had not received it. What did he do? If they were doing this officer an injustice unintentionally, some information should be given with regard to his duties, so that he might be reinstated in the good opinion of the House.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: This gentleman is in attendance on the Privy Council whenever it sits as a judicial body. He is responsible for the

AYES.

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

Dalziel, James Henry

Jacoby, James Alfred

Allan, William (Gateshead)

Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)

Joicey, Sir James

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

Delany, William  
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)  
Ambrose, Robert  
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.  
Joyce, Michael  
Asher, Alexander  
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles  
Kinloch, Sir John George S.  
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)  
Dillon, John  
Lambert, George  
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)  
Donelan, Captain A.  
Layland-Barratt, Francis  
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.  
Doogan, P. C.  
Leamy, Edmund  
Bell, Richard  
Duncan, J. Hastings  
Leng, Sir John  
Boland, John  
Dunn, Sir William  
Lundon, W.  
Bolton, Thomas Dolling  
Esmonde, Sir Thomas  
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.  
Boyle, James  
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)  
M'Cann, James  
Brigg, John  
Farrell, James Patrick  
M'Crae, George  
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson  
Ffrench, Peter  
M'Kenna, Reginald  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Flavin, Michael Joseph  
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin  
Burns, John  
Flynn, James Christopher  
Markham, Arthur Basil  
Caine, William Sproston  
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)  
Mooney, John J.  
Caldwell, James  
Gilhooly, James

Morgan, J. L. (Carmarthen)  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)  
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton  
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton  
Murphy, J.  
Cawley, Frederick  
Harrington, Timothy  
Nannetti, Joseph P.  
Channing, Francis Allston  
Harwood, George  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
Clancy, John Joseph  
Hayden, John Patrick  
Norman, Henry  
Colville, John  
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-  
Norton, Capt. Cecil William  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Healy, Timothy Michael  
Nussey, Thomas Willans  
Craig, Robert Hunter  
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.  
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)  
Crean, Eugene  
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)  
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'y, Mid  
Cremer, William Randal  
Holland, William Henry  
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)  
Crombie, John William  
Hope, John D. (Fife, West)  
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)  
Cullinan, J.  
Horniman, Frederick John  
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W

records of the court, and has to discharge duties similar to those performed in the high court by the masters. He is a very important official, charged with very important and responsible work.

MR. COGHILL asked what duties were performed by another gentleman in the same Department, who received a salary of £450.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said these officers assisted the Registrar in keeping the records of the court, and for the performance of their duties they required some legal knowledge.

MR. TAYLOR (Lancashire, Radcliffe) asked how many months of the year these

officials were occupied. Was the Privy Council always exercising judicial functions, and if not, what duties were these officials performing during the intervals?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said they were employed only when the Privy Council discharged judicial functions. The duties attached to the offices were, in his opinion, quite sufficient to justify the salaries paid.

Question put.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 136; Noes, 203. (Division List No. 194.)

O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)

Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)

Wallace, Robert

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

Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)

Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)

O'Dowd, John

Roche, John

Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.

O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)

Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)

Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)

O'Malley, William

Schwann, Charles E.

White, Luke (York, E. R.)

O'Mara, James

Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)

White, Patrick (Meath, North)

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.

Shipman, Dr. John G.

Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)

O'Shee, James John

Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)

Whittaker, Thomas Palmer

Palmer, Sir Charles M (Durham)

Soames, Arthur Wellesley

Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)

Partington, Oswald

Soares, Ernest J.

Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)

Power, Patrick Joseph

Sullivan, Donal

Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)

Priestley, Arthur

Taylor, Theodore Cooke

Yoxall, James Henry

Rea, Russell

Tennant, Harold John

Reddy, M.  
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Mr. Strachey and Mr. Coghill.  
Redmond, J. E. (Waterford)  
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Tully, Jasper  
Rickett, J. Compton  
Ure, Alexander  
NOES.  
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.  
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin  
Lowe, Francis William  
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel  
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Allsopp, Hon. George  
Emmott, Alfred  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft  
Anson, Sir Wm. Reynell  
Farquharson, Dr. Robert  
Lucas, R. J. (Portsmouth)  
Arkwright, John Stanhope  
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward  
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred  
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.  
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r  
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. E.  
Arrol, Sir William  
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst  
Macdonald, John Cumming  
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Maconochie, A. W.  
Austin, Sir John  
Fisher, William Hayes  
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)  
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy  
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon  
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)  
Bain, Colonel James Robert  
Flannery, Sir Fortescue  
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinb'gh, W.  
Baird, John George Alexander  
Fletcher, Sir Henry  
M'Killop, J. (Stirlingshire)

Balcarres, Lord  
Flower, Ernest  
Malcolm, Ian  
Baldwin, Alfred  
Forster, Henry William  
Martin, Richard Biddulph  
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)  
Garfit, William  
Maxwell, W. J. H (Dumfriessh.)  
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds)  
Gibbs, Hn. A. G H (CityofLond.  
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.  
Balfour, Maj. K R (Christchurch  
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John  
Milton, Viscount  
Banbury, Frederick George  
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick  
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy  
Barry, Sir F. T. (Windsor)  
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)  
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)  
Bartley, George C. T.  
Gordon, Maj Evans-(TrH'mlets  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir. M H (Bristol)  
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.  
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)  
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.  
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim  
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.  
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.  
Goulding, Edward Alfred  
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute  
Blundell, Colonel Henry  
Hain, Edward  
Nicholson, William Graham  
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-  
Haldane, Richard Burdon  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Boulnois, Edmund  
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Mid'x  
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens  
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn)  
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'derry)  
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay  
Butcher, John George

Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert Wm.  
Parker, Gilbert  
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A (Glasg'w  
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd  
Parkes, Ebenezer  
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.  
Harmsworth, R. Leicester  
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.  
Cautley, Henry Strother  
Hay, Hon. Claude George  
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington)  
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)  
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley  
Pease, Sir J. W. (Durham)  
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)  
Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.  
Pemberton, John S. G.  
Cayzer, Sir Charles William  
Heaton, John Henniker  
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Henderson, Alexander  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)  
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.  
Plummer, Walter R.  
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r  
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside  
Pretymann, Ernest George  
Chapman, Edward  
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry.  
Purvis, Robert  
Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.  
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham  
Pym, C. Guy  
Cohen, Benjamin Louis  
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil  
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert  
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Hudson, Geo. Bickersteth  
Randles, John S.  
Colston, Charles Edw. H. A.  
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton  
Rankin, Sir James  
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)  
Johnston, William (Belfast)

Ratcliffe, R. F.  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)  
Remnant, James Farquharson  
Cox, Irwin Edw. Bainbridge  
Jones, Dav. Brynmor (Swansea)  
Renshaw, Charles Bine  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Kay-Shuttleworth, Rt Hn Sir U  
Rentoul, James Alexander  
Cripps, Charles Alfred  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge  
Cross, Herbert S. (Bolton)  
Lawrence, Joseph (Monmouth  
Ridley, S. F. (Bethnal Green)  
Cubitt, Hon. Henry  
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)  
Rigg, Richard  
Dairymple, Sir Charles  
Lawson, John Grant  
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson  
Dewar, T. R. (T'rH'mlts, S. Geo.  
Lee, Arthur H (Hants, Fareham  
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.  
Dickson, Charles Scott  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye  
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon  
Leveson-Gower Frederick N. S  
Ropner, Colonel Robert  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.  
Royds, Clement Molyneux  
Doxford, Sir William Theodore  
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
Duke, Henry Edward  
Lonsdale, John Brownlee  
Sadler, Col. Saml. Alexander  
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)  
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.  
Whitmore, Charles Algernon  
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert  
Thomas, Alfred (Glam organ, E.  
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)



Saunderson, Rt. Hon. Col Edw J  
 Thorburn, Sir Walter  
 Williams, Rt Hn J Powell- (B'rm.  
 Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)  
 Thornton, Percy M.  
 Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh, N.)  
 Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)  
 Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray  
 Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)  
 Sharpe, William Edward T.  
 Tritton, Charles Ernest  
 Wodehouse, Rt. Hon E R (Bath)  
 Simeon, Sir Harrington  
 Tuke, Sir John Batty  
 Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm  
 Sinclair, Louis (Romford)  
 Valentia, Viscount  
 Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-  
 Smith, H C (N'rth'mb., Tyneside  
 Walton, John L. (Leeds, S.)  
 Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
 Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.  
 Warde, Colonel C. E.  
 Smith, Samuel (Flint)  
 Wason, John C. (Orkney)  
 TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
 Spear, John Ward  
 Welby, Lt.-Col. A C E (Taunton  
 Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
 Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u. Lyne)  
 Original Question put, and agreed to.

2. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £;21,650, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, for the salaries and expenses of the Charity Commission for England and Wales."

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston) called attention to the new scheme of the Charity Commissioners for the Hospital of St. Cross, near Winchester. He said this hospital was a very ancient foundation, dating back to the middle ages. It was a foundation started in pre-Reformation times. Under the wise guidance of the trustees this foundation was becoming a scheme for giving old-age pensions to deserving persons. The policy of the Charity Commissioners in using the funds for that purpose was one which ought to receive the support of the House. For many years the Charity had been managed by a board of fourteen trustees; five of whom were ex officio, and nine of whom were co-opted. It was a growing charity; in a few years its income would be between £;8,000 and £;10,000

a year. An increasing number of persons were supported out of the funds in the shape of pensioners and brethren who lived in the hospital. The first fault he had to find with the Charity Commissioners was that when they drew up the new scheme, which came into force at the beginning of the year, they did not increase the number of representative trustees. The five ex officio trustees under the old scheme were the Master of the hospital, the Warden of the college of Winchester, the Dean, the Rector of a neighbouring parish, and the Mayor of Winchester. Under the old scheme the Mayor of Winchester was obliged to be a member of the Church of England. A year or so ago the mayor for the time being was a Nonconformist, and so was disfranchised. That was regarded at the time as a hardship, and the town, council felt that it should be remedied for the future. Those distinctions were not only injurious to the Church of England, but entirely out of harmony with the spirit of the times, especially as the recipients of this charity were not limited to the Church of England, but were persons of any religious denomination. It would have done no harm if the Mayor of Winchester had been able to take his seat as a trustee, but there was a statute which prevented him from doing so. A Select Committee of this House in 1884 was appointed to consider these questions, and they unanimously recommended that in future the Charity Commissioners should give more attention to the representative element in drawing up schemes for the administration of charities, but in this case that recommendation had not been followed, for the scheme gave only one additional member to a body consisting of fourteen. That member was to be selected by the town council of Winchester, and there still remained nine co-opted members. He did not think that was in accordance with modern views, and it certainly was not in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Committee of 1884, who were especially anxious, in order to give the public confidence in the administration of such charities, that the representative element should be increased, so as to secure men of wide experience and knowledge of public affairs. The Chairman of the Select Committee, Mr. Shaw-Lefevre, criticised this scheme when it was first promulgated, but unfortunately his objections were handed in rather late. The Charity Commissioners practically ignored his representations by retaining the scheme in the form in which it was issued. Mr. Shaw-Lefevre suggested that in a charity managed by fifteen trustees certain county and town councils should have representation, instead of retaining so many co-opted members. If this new scheme had provided five or six representative trustees; three from the county council, one from the council of the city of Winchester, and two others from representative bodies in the area of the county of Hampshire; they would have had a more efficient body of trustees. He believed at the present time the trustees elected by co-option were very good men, but if they were more representative and elected every three or four years, instead of being chosen for life, they would take a keener interest in the charity. Mr. Shaw-Lefevre had put forward another suggestion, that the Charity Commissioners should do away with the restrictions which they had put on the only new representative they gave, namely, that he should be a member of the Church of England. He thought that that restriction, embodied in a new scheme, was its second fault. In this new

century we ought to rise above an unnecessary restriction which was an insult to the Nonconformist Churches. It was recognised by those who had petitioned the Charity Commissioners on the subject that it was a slight upon them, and it was also resented by the town council of Winchester as a slight upon them. It should be remembered that this charity dated back to pre-Reformation times, and it showed a petty spirit of exclusion to disqualify as trustees the very people who might claim to represent the religion of the people which prevailed when the charity was founded. They had done away as far as they could with all religious tests. These tests no longer existed in the universities or the governing bodies in the universities, which were open to Roman Catholics and Nonconformists, and which had to perform duties similar to those of the trustees of this charity, perhaps more serious, since they had to do with education. Surely, it would not have mattered very much in the administration of the charity if one Nonconformist were present in a body of fifteen, and he thought it would have been a wise concession. He spoke as a member of the Church of England who loved his Church, and who had sought to do all he could or it. He believed the Church of England would have an infinitely greater chance of rising to that great position of being the Church Universal of this country if they could do away with the spirit of petty exclusiveness in the administration of bodies like this. The two faults he had to find with this scheme was that it failed to carry out the two great principles laid down by the Select Committee, namely, a sufficiently large proportion of the representative element in the government of the charity, and, in the second place, it continued the old spirit of petty exclusiveness in the qualification of trustees by requiring that the new member to be elected by the town council of Winchester should be obliged to subscribe himself a member of the Church of England before he obtained office. They had seen how the Mayor of Winchester, who had the confidence of the whole city, could not be a trustee of the charity of St. Cross because he happened to be a Dissenter. In fact, by this rule they might put aside the best men from the office because they happened to be Nonconformists. That was a bad condition of things for the charity; and because the Charity Commissioners had not risen to take a higher, broader, and more liberal view of the scheme he moved to reduce the vote by £100.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £21,150, be granted for the said service.";(Sir Walter Foster.)

\*MR. EUGENE WASON (Clackmannan and Kinross) said he felt grateful to the right hon. Gentleman who had brought this question before the House. He referred more especially to the clause in the scheme that no trustee could be a Nonconformist. Now, the majority of the members of that House became Nonconformists when they crossed the border of Scotland, and when Members from Scotland crossed the Tweed southward they were equally Nonconformists. Under this very narrow action of the Charity Commissioners it might so happen that a Scotchman who went to Winchester;and he had no doubt there were Scotchmen in Winchester;might possibly become

mayor of that city. That man might be a member of the Church of Scotland, as established by law, and yet under this narrow clause he would not be able to

give his services to the hospital of St. Cross. He spoke as a member of the Church of England, but he asked what in the world did it matter to any human being to what faith, or creed, or nationality a trustee belonged so long as he was an honest man. The Charity Commissioners spoke of heretics and schismatics, but he did not know in what category they would put a member of the established Church of Scotland. He did not say that the trustees had done anything but what was right; but he protested against the Charity Commissioners having broken the spirit of the agreement entered into in 1884, and by so doing having deprived the hospital from getting the services of possibly the best man in the place, simply because he happened to be, in England, a Nonconformist.

\*MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN (Kent, Tunbridge) said he could not help thinking that the hon. Gentleman who had brought forward this most interesting question, and his supporters, were under a complete misunderstanding in regard to it. The matter looked very simple at first sight. It was all very well to say "What did it matter what faith, creed, or nationality a trustee might be"; but the whole question was, "What were the Charity Commissioners allowed to do by law?" It must be judged, not by an ideal scheme, but by the existing circumstances as to whether the Charity Commissioners had taken the right course or not. The two great points made against the Charity Commissioners were, in the first place, that they did not increase the number of representative trustees, and in the second place that they required that the one additional trustee given should be a member of the Church of England. He had a complete answer to both these points. As to the first, it was perfectly true that in 1884 evidence was given before a Select Committee of the House that it was desirable that the principle of representative trustees should be introduced into schemes, and that the Committee reported in favour of that proposal. But that evidence and that recommendation applied only to

local trusts. But St. Cross Hospital at Winchester was not a local trust; its benefits extended all over the kingdom, and when the hon. Gentleman said, "Why not put on local representatives?" he was advocating the localising of the trust. The hon. Gentleman said, "Put on representatives of the county council and other local bodies in Hampshire"; but if they did that they would turn the trust into a local Hampshire charity, which would be absolutely contrary to the spirit of the original foundation. There was another point in connection with this matter. The Charity Commissioners, in the case of charities of fifty pounds annual value and upwards, could not act unless application was made by the trustees themselves for an alteration of the scheme. Now the trustees in this instance did not ask for any great alteration in their trust; all they asked for were minor alterations and the consolidation of the various schemes under which they acted. It would not have done to have forced on the trustees, against their will, a new scheme which would have entirely changed the character of the trust. He passed to the second point, which was really the gravamen of the charge, namely, that in adding one additional trustee they required that he should be a member of the Church of England. The hon. Member opposite told them that it was not in accordance with present practice to do so; but they had got to look not only to present practice in general, but to the character of the trust itself in

particular. What was the character of the trust? The trust had always been held in connection with the Church of England. The Master of the hospital must, by the trust deed, be a clergyman in priest's orders; he must be the incumbent of the parish appointed by the Bishop of Winchester, and subject in all respects to the jurisdiction of the Ordinary. Provision was also made for the maintenance of the fabric of the parish church and for divine services being carried on in it according to the rites of the Church of England. In other words, a great and important part of the duties of these trustees was absolutely concerned with the maintenance of worship according to the rites of the Church of England. He asked whether it was not rather a tall order that on such a trust Nonconformists should claim to have a trustee appointed? The hon. Member opposite tried to persuade them that it should not be exclusively a Church of England trust because it was a pre-Reformation trust. Well, he was not there on the present occasion to discuss religious questions with the hon. Member; but it was a new light to him to be told that a pre-Reformation trust was founded by a different Church from the Church of England. Certainly he had always believed that the Charity Commissioners, acting according to law, must follow the practice that there was a perfect legal continuity of the Church of England with the pre-Reformation Church. He passed from the question of the character of the trust, and the express provision of the trust deed, to the present practice. They were asked by the hon. Member that, in accordance with the present practice, they should allow one or more of the trustees to be people who did not belong to the Church of England. Now he ventured to say that the hon. Member, in declaring that that was the invariable present practice, had not really studied the precedents. There were plenty of precedents in connection with all sorts of charities.

SIR WALTER FOSTER: Modern charities?

MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN said he could not say whether they were all modern charities; but he had got the case of the Springhill College with twenty-four trustees elected in various ways. The trust deed provided that not only should the trustees be members of a particular denomination, but they had actually to sign a declaration that they belonged to the denomination of Protestant Dissenters called Independents.

SIR WALTER FOSTER said he knew that college. It was founded for Nonconformist students and was limited for their use. It was not like St. Cross Hospital, which was to give relief to no particular class or creed.

\*MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN said most emphatically that St. Cross was a charity founded in connection with the Church of England. It was only those funds which were over; he admitted that they were large; which were to be devoted to pensioners from any part of England. What they had got to consider was, what it was legal to do. The hon. Member opposite said that they ought not to have made the provision that the additional trustee should be a member of the Church of England. He ventured to say that, if the Charity Commissioners had not made that provision, it was probable that the new scheme could have been upset by the Court of Chancery. There was a very remarkable case in the law reports in the year 1873. A voluntary school at Sandhurst-Ulph, Norfolk, had ceased to carry on

its work and it was about to be transferred to the school board. In order to obtain the transference it was necessary to appoint three new trustees. These three trustees, who were appointed by the Charity Commissioners, agreed to the transfer, but they were all members of the Church of England. Objection was taken to the scheme and appeal made on the ground that the effect of it was to convert a Church of England school into an undenominational school, and that that was contrary to the expressed declaration of the original trust deed, and therefore prohibited by the 46th section of the Act of 1853. The matter came before the Master of the Rolls, Sir George Jessel, who said that the appeal would not be valid because it was not the fact that under the 46th section of the Act of 1853 there were restrictions which prevented trustees from being appointed who might use their powers to the prejudice of the Church of England, but that the real restriction was on the appointment of any trustees who were not actually members of that Church themselves, and he added that the action of the Charity Commissioners would have been invalid if the trustees had not been members of the Church of England. He ventured to say that that case was on all fours with the present. If the Charity Commissioners had not appointed trustees all of whom were members of the Church of England, their scheme could have been upset. They were bound to consider precedents, and what was the proper thing to do, quite irrespective as to whether their action would be popular or approved of by hon. Gentlemen opposite. He thanked the hon. Gentleman opposite for the exceedingly courteous manner in which he had brought forward this matter, but he ventured to think that there had been a complete misunderstanding of the duty of the Charity Commissioners and of the nature of the charity; and, therefore, he thought the action of the Charity Commissioners was fully justified.

\*MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE said that the objection raised to placing a Nonconformist on this board of trustees were of a double character; legal and ethical. The hon. Gentleman told them that when the trustees sent this scheme to the Charity Commissioners they did not ask for much change in the constitution of the trust. He had never yet heard of existing trustees who did want much change. They always considered themselves absolutely superior to any possible successors, and naturally they were disinclined to mistrust their own powers to deal with property. The hon. Member who was responsible for the Charity Commissioners had told them that this was a Church of England scheme, but he had omitted to tell them anything about the religion of the beneficiaries or whether any religious test was put on these beneficiaries.

\*MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN said it was true that, so far as the out-patients went, they need not be members of the Church of England, or of any particular denomination; but the in patients were obliged to attend Church of England services.

\*MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: Quite so; but he was acquainted with that fact, for he knew something about this charity. But surely the presence of one Nonconformist on a governing body of fifteen trustees was not going to proselytise in any way the out-patients? And surely, if he might say so, the trustees or any body of this sort were more concerned with the property of the trust than with the

religion of the people who received the benefits of the trust. If some local body such as the county council or the district council were represented on this trust they would always have within a short distance of the trust men who would attend the business meetings of the trust, which really controlled the property, and that was the most important part of their duty. If the proposal of his hon. friend had been to include anything like a change of religion on the part of the Master of this charity, that would have been a different thing. It was the duty of the Master, and not of the trustees, to see that the religious exercises of the Church of England were properly carried out in the hospital at stated intervals; but it was not the business of the trustees to go down to the hospital to see whether the patients attended the services of the Church of England. The hon. Gentleman opposite took objection to the proposal of the hon. Member for Ilkeston on the ground that this was not a modern charity; but the whole reason for a change in these charities was to bring them up to date and make their government and administration more in accordance with modern opinion and thought. He did not know what the proportion of the inhabitants of the city of Winchester was of Members of the Church of England to Nonconformists. But say that the proportion of Nonconformists was one third or a half, why should they not allow one Nonconformist to take a practical interest in the scheme of the charity as a representative trustee?

MR. GODDARD said he joined with his hon. friends who had already expressed the opinion that the answer of the hon. Gentleman was most inadequate. He had never listened to a weaker answer to such a strong case. The hon. Gentleman said that a new scheme was not wanted, and that only one or two alterations were required, but the Parliamentary Paper referred to a new scheme, and gave the Charity Trustees an opportunity of making alterations in accordance with modern thought. Then the hon. Gentleman referred to the suggestion of his hon. friend as an attempt to localise what was now a general charity; that the charity opened its doors to people from all parts of the country, and that it was wrong to suggest that someone on the Town Council of Winchester, or the County Council of Hampshire, should be elected to the Board. But all the trustees were local men, and it would be

no departure from principle to appoint a representative of the people from either the county council or the borough council a trustee. He understood that under the existing scheme the trustees were limited to residents in the county. It might appear a strong point to the hon. Gentleman, but it appeared a very weak point to him that the charity was a Church of England charity. They had had that explanation before, and they knew the value of it. He himself had been elected to serve in a charity trust where formerly all the trustees were members of the Church of England. The practice had been in all modern alterations for the Charity Commissioners to open the doors so that a charity should have a more representative body of trustees not only in regard to the general population, but also in regard to the different religious denominations. The hon. Gentleman said that the charity was a Church of England charity, and that the recipients had to attend services in that Church, but there were a great many charities in the country where the recipients had to attend Church of England services, but

where the trustees were not necessarily members of that Church. In these old charities bread and other things were given out at the church doors after certain services, not because the donor was an attendant at the church necessarily, but because the church doors were the only places where such gifts could be distributed. Surely the time had arrived when the old barriers of intolerance should be broken down, and when they should widen their views in regard to representation on public charities. The hon. Gentleman said that the recipients should be members of one particular Church, but no question at all was raised with reference to out-patients at the hospitals, although the in-dwellers had to attend Church of England services, but that did not make it a Church of England trust. The answer of the hon. Gentleman was altogether inadequate, and the views he expressed were not the kind of views hon. Members were in the habit of expressing when they addressed their Nonconformist constituents.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) said it was certainly not the idea of the original trust that Nonconformists should be debarred, because there could have been no question of Nonconformists when it was established, as there was only one Church in the country. The comparison which had been made between this charity and a denominational school was utterly fallacious. A denominational school was established at a time when there were many sects in the country, and when money was allocated to a particular purpose, whereas this charity dated back to an epoch when the Church was the national Church of the country, and there was no question of any denominational differences at all. The charity was distinctly a local charity, because even under the revised scheme the trustees must be local men, and therefore the objection of the hon. Gentleman to elected trustees because they would be local men fell to the ground. The claim of his hon. friend was that there should be more elected trustees, and that they should not be limited to members of the Church of England. That was a very moderate demand. It was necessary to keep up the popularity of these charities, and if they were made to appear to be Church charities, which in reality they were not, they would be unpopular with Nonconformists. The charity would not be injured in the least by having a few elected trustees on the board, and he hoped some better explanation would be given of the very curious position which had been taken up by the Charity Commissioners in the matter.

MR. CREMER (Shoreditch, Haggerston) said he hoped the hon. Member who moved the reduction would proceed to a division, as it was the only chance they had of protesting against the proposed action of the Charity Commissioners. The charity had a singular and very interesting history. He lived in the neighbourhood when he was a boy, and he remembered very well the tremendous scandal connected with it, and the statement he was about to make would, he thought, afford conclusive evidence that where the whole of a governing body belonged to a particular denomination they had no guarantee that the recipients of the charity would be any other than members of that denomination. A clerical peer was many years ago the Master of St. Cross Hospital.

How he was appointed to the office no one was able to understand, and he was



also the Vicar of one or two parishes. For a long series of years that interesting institution was shorn of its useful proportions, and it became a public scandal. After a great deal of agitation upon the subject an inquiry was instituted by the Government of the day, and the result was that the clerical peer was made to disgorge a great part of the funds he had been appropriating for years, and he was dismissed from his office, although he was not prosecuted, as he should have been, for the frauds he had committed. He was a member of the Church of England and a spiritual guide, and it would have been thought when a man of such distinction in the clerical world had been appointed that would have been a guarantee that the charity would be honestly and honourably administered, but it was not. He hoped the Charity Commissioners would see their way to have all sorts and conditions of men on the governing bodies of these charities, because it was the only guarantee that could be afforded them that members of all denominations who were entitled to be recipients should not be excluded. He remembered in his boyhood that every traveller who went to the hospital

AYES.

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

Cullinan, J.

Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.

Allan, William (Gateshead)

Daly, James

Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.

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

Dalziel, James Henry

Holland, William Henry

Asher, Alexander

Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)

Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)

Asquith, Rt. Hn Herbert Henry

Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan

Jones, David Brynmor (Swans'a

Austin, Sir John

Delany, William

Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)

Barry, E. (Cork, S.)

Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.

Joyce, Michael

Bayley, Thos. (Derbyshire)

Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles

Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth

Bell, Richard

Dillon, John

Lambert, George

Black, Alexander William

Donelan, Captain A.

Layland-Barratt, Francis

Blake, Edward  
Doogan, P. C.  
Leamy, Edmund  
Boland, John  
Duncan, J. Hastings  
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)  
Bolton, Thomas Dolling  
Edwards, Frank  
Leng, Sir John  
Boyle, James  
Emmott, Alfred  
Lloyd-George, David  
Brigg, John  
Esmonde, Sir Thomas  
Lundon, W.  
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson  
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)  
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Farquharson, Dr. Robert  
M'Crae, George  
Burns, John  
Farrell, James Patrick  
M'Dermott, Patrick  
Caine, William Sproston  
Ffrench, Peter  
Mooney, John J.  
Caldwell, James  
Flavin, Michael Joseph  
Morgan, J. L. (Carmarthen)  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Flynn, James Christopher  
Morton, Edw. J.C. (Devonport)  
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.  
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)  
Murphy, J.  
Channing, Francis Allston  
Gilhooly, James  
Nannetti, Joseph P.  
Clancy, John Joseph  
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
Colville, John  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
Norton, Capt. Cecil William  
Condon, Thomas Joseph

Hardie, J Keir (Merthyr Tydvil  
Nussey, Thomas Willans  
Craig, Robert Hunter  
Harmsworth, R. Leicester  
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)  
Crean, Eugene  
Harwood, George  
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'ry Mid  
Cremer, William Randal  
Hayden, John Patrick  
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)  
Crombie, John William  
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-  
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)

was entitled according to the will of the pious founder to a loaf of bread and a jug of beer. Now all that was given was a piece of bread about an inch and a-half square and a tumbler full of weak beer. When the clerical peer was Master no bread or beer was to be had at all. He objected to the governing body being members of one denomination, not because they were members of the Church of England, because he believed that if they were Methodists or Congregationalists, or members of any other section, a similar result would follow. A member of the Endowed Schools Committee informed him that his experience led him to the conclusion that wherever a body of men had to administer a charity or an endowment for educational purposes, and belonged to one particular section, there was no chance of anyone getting anything out of it unless he were a member of the same sect. After all, it was human nature, and he did not complain of it at all, but he wanted to avoid it. He hoped the result of the division would be to induce the Charity Commissioners to place at least one Nonconformist in the position of a trustee.

Question put.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 132; Noes, 157. (Division List No. 195.)

O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.  
Reddy, M.  
Tully, Jasper  
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)  
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)  
Wallace, Robert  
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S  
O'Dowd, John  
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)  
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Roche, John  
White, Luke (York, E. R.)

O'Malley, William  
Schwann, Charles E.  
White, Patrick (Meath, North)  
O'Mara, James  
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)  
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Shipman, Dr. John G.  
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer  
O'Shee, James John  
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh.  
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth  
Palmer, Sir Chas. M. (Durham  
Soares, Ernest J.  
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)  
Partington, Oswald  
Strachey, Edward  
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)  
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.  
Sullivan, Donal  
Yoxall, James Henry  
Power, Patrick Joseph  
Taylor, Theodore Cooke  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Mr. Charles Hobhouse and Mr. Warner.  
Priestley, Arthur  
Tennant, Harold John  
Rea, Russell  
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)  
NOES.  
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.  
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S)  
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)  
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel  
Gordon, Maj Evans (T'rH'mlets  
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington  
Allsopp, Hon. George  
Gorst, Rt.Hon. Sir John Eldon  
Pemberton, John S. G.  
Arkwright, John Stanhope  
Goulding, Edward Alfred  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.  
Hamilton, Rt Hn Ld G. (Midd'x  
Plummer, Walter R.  
Arrol, Sir William  
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm

Pretyman, Ernest George  
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John  
Hardy, Laurence (Kent Ashf'rd  
Purvis, Robert  
Bain, Colonel James Robert  
Harris, Frederick Leverton  
Randles, John S.  
Baird, John George Alexander  
Hay, Hon. Claude George  
Remnant, James Farquharson  
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r  
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanl'y  
Renshaw, Charles Bine  
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)  
Heath, Jas. (Staffords N. W.)  
Rentoul, James Alexander  
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds  
Heaton, John Henniker  
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge  
Balfour, Maj K. R. (Christch'ch.  
Henderson, Alexander  
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green  
Banbury, Frederick George  
Hermon-Hodge, Robt. Trotter  
Rigg, Richard  
Bartley, George C. T.  
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightsd.  
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson  
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol  
Hudson, George Bickersteth  
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.  
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.  
Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)  
Ropner, Colonel Robert  
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.  
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse  
Royds, Clement Molyneux  
Bigwood, James  
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
Blundell, Colonel Henry  
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)  
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander  
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)

Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)  
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)  
Sharpe, William Edward T.  
Cautley, Henry Strother  
Lawson, John Grant  
Simeon, Sir Barrington  
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)  
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)  
Leveson-Gower, Fredk. N. S.  
Smith, H C (North'mb Tyneside)  
Cayzer, Sir Charles William  
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.  
Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks.)  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine  
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)  
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)  
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (Bristol, S.)  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart  
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc')  
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
Chapman, Edward  
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred  
Thorburn, Sir Walter  
Clare, Octavius Leigh  
Macartney, Rt. Hon. W. G. E.  
Thornton, Percy M.  
Coghill, Douglas Harry  
Macdona, John Cumming  
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray  
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Maconochie, A. W.  
Tritton, Charles Ernest  
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole  
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim E.)  
Valentia, Viscount  
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas  
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinb'rgh, W)  
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)

M'Killop, Jas. (Sterlingshire)  
Warde, Colonel C. E.  
Cox, IrwinEdwardBainbridge  
Majendie, James A. H.  
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Malcolm, Ian  
Webb, Col. William George  
Cripps, Charles Alfred  
Martin, Richard Biddulph  
Welby, Lt. CIA. C. E. (Taunton)  
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)  
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh  
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne  
Dickson, Charles Scott  
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.  
Whitmore, Charles Algernon  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Milton, Viscount  
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)  
Doxford, Sir William Theodore  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Willox, Sir John Archibald  
Duke, Henry Edward  
Moore, William (Antrim N.)  
Wilson-Todd. Wm. H. (Yorks.)  
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin  
Morgan, Dvd. J (Walthamstow  
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath  
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm  
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r  
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford  
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C.B. Stuart-  
Finch, George H.  
Mowbray, Sir Robt. Gray C.  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Nicholson, William Graham  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Fletcher, Sir Henry

O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens

Flower, Ernest

Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay

Original Question again proposed.

SIR WALTER FOSTER desired to call attention to the large amount of landed property belonging to various charities which had been sold during the year. He felt that land ought as far as possible to be retained by the charities. The conversion of land into consols was not in his opinion in the interests of the charities or the country, which lost by the transaction. He brought the question before the Committee because he saw that last year a sum of £;530,000 had been realised this way, and although that was less by a large amount than was realised in the previous year, the amount somewhat alarmed him. He would like to hear from the hon. Gentlemen responsible for the Vote how that sum had been realised, whether by the sale of town property or property in the rural districts, and what kind of charity property had been sold by the trustees to private individuals. He understood the explanation given last year was that a good deal of money had been realised by the sale of church sites and public-house property, and he would like to know whether any of the £;530,000 appearing in the Report of the Charity Commission represented money derived from any such properties.

\*LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) called attention to the action of the Commissioners with regard to the ancient leper hospital at Cowley, near Oxford. The property belonged to Oriel College. The buildings in question were only a small group near Oxford, which were, however, not very well known, because they lay a little off the high road, but they were unusually beautiful. According to the scheme of the Commissioners the property was now being opened up for building, for the profits of Oriel College, and it was to be hoped that the buildings which were to replace this group would not be as ugly as the addition which had been made to the Charity Commissioners' office. Some of the best of the buildings of this interesting group would be destroyed. The Charity Commissioners were a powerful body, and when Oriel College came forward and asked permission for this scheme he thought the Commissioners might have done more than they did for the preservation of these interesting buildings. One rood of land and the chapel was the only part to be saved from destruction. The chapel was almost intact, and therefore valuable, and although he congratulated the Commissioners on having saved that, he thought they might have gone further and preserved more than thirty yards of land and the chapel.

\*MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN said that, with regard to the sale of lands, that question was decided on its merits. In some cases it was better that the investment of the charity fund should be in land, and in others that it should be in stock. The principle on which the Commissioners acted was this; they judged each case on its merits. When a charity possessed lands which could be opened up for building, and which would realise a large sum of money, it was obviously better for the charity to sell the land for building purposes. But in all cases the Commissioners were bound to do the best they could for a charity. With



regard to a question put by the noble Lord, he admitted that this was a beautiful old chapel, and he thought the Commissioners were to be congratulated on having succeeded in preserving it, and the rood of land with which it was surrounded. The property was, as it happened, not charity property at all, but belonged to Oriel College, which had the right to deal with it as it chose; except the chapel. A compromise had been arranged between the Charity Commissioners and the college whereby the chapel and the rood of land were preserved for such uses as the Commissioners might direct, and it could not now be sold without the consent of the Commissioners, and there was no chance of their giving their consent.

MR. HOLLAND (Yorkshire, W. R. Rotherham) expressed the opinion that it was time that the item for the Endowed Schools Commission was removed from the Estimates, though the amount, £3,000, was not a large one. When the Commission was formed in 1869, Mr. Forster said he thought four years would be sufficient time to complete the work, yet the Commission still existed, although thirty-two years had expired since that time. He desired to know whether the Commission could not now be closed. He also wished to know how many schemes had been dealt with by the Commission

in the last year, and how many deeds revised.

\*MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN pointed out that very large economies had already been effected in connection with the Commission, and said there were now only three Chief Commissioners for both branches. But so long as the Charity Commissioners had a certain amount of endowed school work to do, it was necessary they should have assistant commissioners for that branch of the work and the necessary staff. It was intended shortly to transfer the work to the Board of Education, and then he had no doubt this item would disappear.

\*MR. CREMER moved the reduction of the Vote by £100 for the purpose of calling attention to the appropriation of the funds of St. Katharine's Hospital, which, he said, had been more than once described as little short of a public scandal. He admitted that the Commissioners had a great deal of difficulty in dealing with this institution because it was under Royal patronage; but he did not believe that Her late Majesty knew how the funds were misappropriated, and he felt assured that, if the matter were brought under the notice of the King, His Majesty would decline to sanction it. Had anything been done to endeavour to get rid of this scandal since he brought the subject before the House two years ago? This charity, which was one of the most ancient institutions of the land, was founded in 1273 by Queen Matilda. For a time its funds were insignificant, and the site it occupied was the one now occupied by St. Katharine's Docks. When the promoters of St. Katharine's Docks took the site they paid this institution £127,000 for the little building which then occupied the site, and the institution immediately became a wealthy one, and was removed to the Regent's Park, where it still remained. In 1886 the income was £7,097, and since that period it had doubled. What was done with that money? Many inquiries had been made as to how the money was expended. In 1893 he asked whether any effort had been made to give effect to the recommendations contained in the report prepared by a Charity Com-

missioner, Andrew Skerrow. He also asked whether the master received £;1,200, and lived in the house assigned to him as his official residence, or whether he let it, as his predecessor did, for £;700 a year. What were the duties of his office? How many boys and girls were being educated at the institution out of the funds? How much of the fund was spent in education, and how much was spent in management, and why none of the various schemes which had been prepared by eminent men for the reform of the institution had been carried into effect. The answer he received from the Charity Commissioners was that the expenditure of the endowment in 1892 was apportioned as follows: education, £;561; salaries, £;3,209; gifts, £;190; expenses of management; £;3,193. Such a state of things appeared to him to be a very great scandal, and he had moved the reduction for the purpose of asking the Commissioners whether anything had been done to check it, and if not whether the hon. Gentleman would give a guarantee that something would be done to stop such a shameful waste of charitable funds.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum not exceeding £;21,150 be granted for the said service.";(Mr. Cremer.)

\*MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN complained that he had had no notice that this question was going to be asked, and that he therefore had had no chance of going into this particular case. The Committee would understand that there were 70,000 or 80,000 charities under the Charity Commissioners, and it was impossible to answer off-hand with regard to any particular one. He had, however, made such inquiries as were possible in this particular case, and he believed that an unsatisfactory state of affairs had been alleged to exist at this institution, but it was one of those charities over which the Charity Commissioners had no jurisdiction, unless the governing body applied to them for a scheme. The only other course open to the Commissioners in such cases was to certify them to the Attorney General.

\*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) asked why the Attorney General was not instructed in the matter many years ago, and who were the present trustees.

\*MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN said he would make an inquiry into the matter, and if the case was of the nature which the hon. Member described he would consider what steps could be taken.

MR. CREMER said he would withdraw his Amendment, having regard to what had been said, but before doing so he expressed the hope that the Charity Commissioners would inquire whether the Master of this institution received at present £;1,600 a year;£;1,200 salary and £;400 for a house which he did not occupy; and how many sermons he preached during the year. He had inquired over and over again whether he had done anything more, and he had never got any satisfactory answer. Original Question again proposed.

MR. WHITLEY said he had been looking through the Report of the Charity Commissioners, and was rather surprised to find the nature of some of the securities in which some trust funds were invested. For instance, there were investments in the Aerated Bread Company, the Bodega Company, the Calico Printers' Association, the New Zealand Shipping Company, the Mexican Central Company, Ransome and Napier, Limited, the Salt Union, Limited. He was not a

financial man himself, but with a modest knowledge of business matters it did seem to him that these were very curious investments for trustees to hold. He knew that if he were a trustee he should be very nervous in dealing with such securities. He could only suppose that these securities had been left by some pious benefactors, and that there had not been time to convert them into more satisfactory securities. He hoped that as soon as possible these trustees would have their money invested more nearly in accordance with what were regarded as trust securities.

\*MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN said that the hon. Gentleman was quite correct. The Charity Commissioners never made such investments as those he mentioned. These securities represented funds transferred by trustees.

MR. WHITLEY said the hon. Member must be aware that private trustees were compelled as soon as might be to convert the funds into trust securities.

\*MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN said that was perfectly true. But he had never heard of a case in which money had been lost in the way suggested through the carelessness of the Charity Commissioners, and he thought they might be trusted to look after the money. In the case of each charity they considered whether it were better to retain the investments or to change them on the application of the trustees. The matter really was whether the investments were changed in accordance with the desire of the trustees. Sometimes the trustees wished that the investments should not be changed, and if that were so, and the investments seemed to be desirable ones, they did not insist on their being changed.

Question put, and agreed to.

3. £;5,019, to complete the sum for Friendly Societies Registry.

4. £;9,962, to complete the sum for Lunacy Commission, England.

5. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £;91, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Mint, including the Expenses of Coinage."

MR. WHITLEY said there were several matters which ought to be discussed on this motion. First of all, he wanted to know the reason for the addition of two to the clerical staff. But he wished more particularly to call the attention of the Committee to the extraordinarily complicated way in which the Estimates were presented. If hon. Members would look at the bottom of the page in the Estimates, they would see certain very puzzling references by letters from "a" down to "k," explaining how clerks, managers, chemists, etc., got additions to their salaries in all sorts of peculiar ways. He must protest against the figures being presented to the House in that most unsatisfactory way. Why could they not be told, before they voted these salaries, what the total salaries were? For instance, they found in the second Vote the letter "b" attached to no fewer than six employees in this department of the Royal Mint; and the letter "b" meant "with official residence, some of which will not be continued when vacancies arise." Now, his experience had been short, but he found that the tendency was that these frequent promises were not fulfilled. Any business man who looked at that page of the Estimates must feel

that there was a need for a new spirit in this Government Department. A little further down the page there was a salary for "chemist and assayer for the Mint," with two letters after his name;"b," which meant that he had an official residence, and "d," which meant that he was also the professor of metallurgy and metallurgist at the Royal College of Science at a salary of £;300 a year. That was just one of the pluralists of which his hon. friend complained. It was most objectionable that these salaries should be divided in that way; and they ought to have an assurance from the Financial Secretary to the Treasury that he would look into the matter and present the Estimates in a simpler form for the future. For example, the chemist and assayer's salary began at £;700, rising to £;900, which was the amount he at present received. He did not know what the qualifications of that gentleman were, but he should have thought that £;900 would have been sufficient salary, even if it included the lectureship in the Royal College of Science. Until they got the proper assurance that these Estimates would be simplified they ought to try and get this Vote reduced, and for that purpose he moved that it be reduced by £;300 in respect of the salary of the chemist and assayer to the Mint as professor of metallurgy in the Royal College of Science.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item A be reduced by £;300, in respect of the Salary of Chemist and Assayer of the Mint.";(Mr. Whitley.)

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that the hon. Gentleman was a little difficult to please, hit high or hit low. He complained at one moment that he was anxious for information, and that the accounts were not explained by notes, and when supplied with notes he complained the next moment of complications, The hon. Gentleman must make up his mind as to which course he ought to run. He was very ready to receive suggestions from hon. Members as to the form in which the Estimates were presented, but it was for the convenience of the Committee that all the Votes should be arranged in the same way and on the same system. It would not tend to give the information to the Committee which the hon. Gentleman desired if one Vote were marked in one way and another Vote marked in another way. The hon. Gentleman asked in respect to the salary of the assayer and chemist of the Mint, which at the present time had reached the maximum of £;900, and had moved a reduction of £;300 a year in respect of his salary as professor of metallurgy at the Royal College of Science. The gentleman who discharged those duties; Sir W. Roberts-Austen; was a very distinguished man, and it was of the utmost importance that for such a position as that we should have a gentleman of the very highest reputation and scientific attainments. But while the work was of a very responsible kind, it was not such as to occupy the whole of his time, and the Government were very glad to take advantage of his services at the Royal College of Science. He did not think the hon. Member would consider the remuneration given under these two heads was too much for the work which Sir W. Roberts-Austen had done, and for the attainments which that distinguished gentleman brought to bear upon his labours at the Mint and the Royal College of Science. He trusted that the hon. Member would not press his motion to a division, and he was sure the advocates of economy would not advance their cause by moving such a reduction.

\*SIR WALTER FOSTER thought the hon. Member who had moved the reduction deserved credit for the careful analysis to which he had subjected the Estimates. The way to get Estimates through the Committee was to be courteous and good tempered towards critics. During his fifteen or sixteen years experience of the House, he had watched the action of many Secretaries of the Treasury, and had always noticed that a kindly word turned away criticism.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I hope the hon. Member does not suggest that I have been other than courteous. If I have been discourteous to anyone I should desire to apologise at once, as certainly it is very far from my wish to be so.

\*SIR WALTER FOSTER said it was a question of manner rather than words to which he referred. The Financial Secretary was somewhat severe on the hon. Member for Halifax, who, as a new Member of the House, ought to be encouraged rather than discouraged in going through these matters so carefully. The hon. Member had shown very fair grounds for criticism, and had studied the Estimates, not only carefully and industriously, but also very ably. He had, however, in this instance, moved a reduction in an unfortunate place. The distinguished man who filled this scientific post at the Mint was well worth the salary he was paid, and the extra £;300 which he received for acting as a professor in the Royal College of Science was doubtless equally well earned. At the same time, it naturally struck as peculiar an hon. Member actuated with a desire for economy that there should be so many cases of individuals holding more than one appointment. Such things ought always to be criticised, but when a fair explanation was given, as in this instance, it was only right that the hon. Member who made the criticism should withdraw his motion for a reduction of the Vote, and he hoped that that would be done.

MR. WHITLEY hoped the Financial Secretary would understand that he chose this particular item merely to bring the matter before the Committee, and to get a reply to the question he had raised. The reply on this point was perfectly satisfactory, and he had no charge of discourtesy to make. With the permission of the Committee he would withdraw the Amendment, and simply move a reduction of the whole Vote

by £;100, without referring to any specific item.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Original question again proposes.

\*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member cannot move a reduction of £;100, as the Vote is only for £;91.

SIR CHARLES DILKE asked on what principle the artistic part of the work of the Mint was done. The work on the whole was disgracefully bad, as compared with that of almost any other country. Not only the great artistic countries, but even the new countries, turned out much better artistic work than our Mint. The medals were even more disgraceful than the coins. The coins had not been very successful of recent years, but the medals were absolutely beneath contempt. The medals were struck at the Mint, but the charge for them was borne by the various Departments requiring them. If the Admiralty or the War Office required medals, who was responsible, as between the Department and the Mint, for the design?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN thought the designs were prepared by the Mint and submitted to the Departments concerned.

SIR CHARLES DILKE said that every country was now beginning again to realise, as in the seventeenth century, that there was no higher form of art than the medallists' art, and the medallists' art was a specialists' art. Painters and sculptors were not medallists; they required to be specially trained. In foreign countries, especially in France, the art had revived almost to the height at which it stood in the seventeenth century, but we in this country were absolutely and conspicuously behindhand in the matter.

MR. TAYLOR, referring to the increase of £20,000 in regard to the loss on worn silver coin withdrawn from circulation, asked whether it was in consequence of more being in circulation, or because of the adoption of a higher standard. He also alluded to the fact that this year there was undoubtedly a larger demand for coins bearing her late Majesty's imprint, and asked whether it was not perfectly legitimate for the Mint to take advantage of that fact and to issue as large a quantity as possible of coins of all kinds.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that the issue by the Mint was regulated by the demand, so that if there was the special demand to which the hon. Member had referred, it would be met, as it were, automatically. As to the loss on worn silver coin withdrawn from circulation, a larger sum was asked for on the present occasion, because last year they were not able to withdraw from circulation as much as they had expected to do.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.) asked why, when the amount in the Estimate was given as £101, the question put from the Chair was for only £91. Frequent complaints had been made as to the manner in which the Estimates were prepared, and of insufficient information being given to enable Members to understand why particular increases were asked for. He also inquired whether there was any profit on the gold and silver purchased in bulk and subsequently coined. There ought, surely, to be particulars given, so that the Committee might know whether the Mint was worked at a loss or a profit. If such information was given, it would greatly simplify matters, and frequently render unnecessary the criticism which the Financial Secretary seemed to resent. Personally, he had generally found the hon. Gentleman very courteous in his replies, and therefore he was rather surprised to find a disposition on his part to resent the criticism of the hon. Member for Halifax. Members, whether on the Government or the Opposition benches, being present as the custodians of the public purse, were entitled to the amplest information, and Ministers should be prepared to give it when asked in a fair and reasonable way.

MR. WHITLEY desired to raise a point of order. The reduction of £100 which he wished to move was a reduction of the expenditure which, if carried, would result in a profit instead of a loss to the Mint. If the incomings of a Department were greater than the outgoings, the Committee would have no check whatever, as the Minister concerned would not require to come to Parliament for a Vote. He submitted that as a point of order it would be a very serious matter as affecting the control of the House of Commons if it was not competent to move a reduction of £100 on a total expenditure of no less than £134,000, although

it was perfectly true that the incomings nearly balanced the outgoings.

\*THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think there is any point of order in that. It is the practice of this House to have what are known as "token" Votes. If the hon. Member will look at the Estimate he will see that the gross total is £;134,401, whereas the amount of the appropriations in aid is £;134,300. In order to bring the Vote under the competence of the House, the total Vote is taken at £;101. Of that sum £;10 has already been voted, and that leaves £;91 to be voted. If the hon. Member objects to that sum he can vote against it, but he cannot move to reduce a Vote of £;91 by £;100.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The hon. Member for North Longford asks for some information as to whether there has been a loss or a profit upon the working of the Mint. At the bottom of page 152 of the Estimates he will find the estimated extra receipts, which are in addition to this Vote. They are set down as £;665,700, and that is the estimated profit on the Mint in addition to the £;134,300 which is taken to meet the expenses.

MR. J. P. FARRELL said there was not a word in the Estimate about profit. It said, "Estimated Extra Receipts (Cash)" and he could not gather from that that it was profit. Why could it not be put down as "estimated extra profit"?

Question put.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 126; Noes, 84. (Division List No. 196.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Fellowes, Hn. Ailwyn Edward

Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Finch, George H.

Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Finlay, Sir Robt. Bannatyne

Nicholson, William Graham

Arrol, Sir William

Fisher, William Hayes

O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Fitzroy, Hn. Edw. Algernon

Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay

Austin, Sir John

Fletcher, Sir Henry

Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)

Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy

Flower, Ernest

Parkes, Ebenezer

Bain, Colonel James Robert

Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)

Platt-Higgins, Frederick

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manc'r.)

Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.  
Pretymann, Ernest George  
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)  
Grenfell, William Henry  
Purvis, Robert  
Balfour, Rt Hon Gerald W. (Leeds)  
Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord G (Middlesex)  
Pym, C. Guy  
Balfour, Maj. K. R. (Christchurch)  
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert W.  
Randles, John S.  
Banbury, Frederick George  
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley)  
Rentoul, James Alexander  
Bartley, George C. T.  
Heath, Jas. (Staffordshire, N.W.)  
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge)  
Beach, Rt. Hon. Sir M. H. (Bristol)  
Henderson, Alexander  
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)  
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.  
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield Brightside)  
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. T.  
Bigwood, James  
Hudson, George Bickersteth  
Ropner, Colonel Robert  
Bill, Charles  
Hutton, John (Yorkshire, N.R.)  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford  
Bond, Edward  
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse  
Sharpe, William Edward T.  
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-  
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)  
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)  
Bowles, Capt. H.F. (Middlesex)  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Smith, H. C. (Northumbria. Tyneside)  
Bull, William James  
Lawson, John Grant  
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)  
Cautley, Henry Strother  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Spear, John Ward  
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire)  
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.



Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Cayzer, Sir Charles William  
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine  
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart  
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)  
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.  
Thorburn, Sir Walter  
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. (Birm.  
Lowe, Francis William  
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray  
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Tritton, Charles Ernest  
Chapman, Edward  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)  
Tuke, Sir John Batty  
Clare, Octavius Leigh  
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W G Ellison  
Valentia, Viscount  
Coghill, Douglas Harry  
Macdona, John Cumming  
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)  
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Maconochie, A. W.  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole  
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.  
Wanklyn, James Leslie  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinb'rgh W.  
Warde, Col. C. E.  
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge  
M'Killop, Jas. (Stirlingshire)  
Webb, Col. William George  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Majendie, James A. H.  
Whiteley, H. (Ashton un.Lyne  
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)  
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E (Wigt'n  
Wilcox, Sir John Archibald  
Dickson, Charles Scott  
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire  
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath  
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

Dorington, Sir John Edward  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
Doxford, Sir William Theodore  
Morgan, David J. (Walthams'w  
Duke, Henry Edward  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
NOES.  
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)  
Flavin, Michael Joseph  
O'Dowd, John  
Allan, William (Gateshead)  
Flynn, James Christopher  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Asher, Alexander  
Gilhooly, James  
O'Malley, William  
Bell, Richard  
Harwood, George  
O'Mara, James  
Black, Alexander William  
Hayden, John Patrick  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Blake, Edward  
Holland, William Henry  
O'Shee, James John  
Boland, John  
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)  
Power, Patrick Joseph  
Boyle, James  
Joyce, Michael  
Rea, Russell  
Brigg, John  
Kinloch Sir John George Smyth  
Reddy, M.  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Layland-Barratt, Francis  
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)  
Caldwell, James  
Leamy, Edmund  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)

Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington  
Roche, John  
Clancy, John Joseph  
Leng, Sir John  
Schwann, Charles E.  
Colville, John  
Lundon, W.  
Shaw, Thomas (Hrwick B.)  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.  
Shipman, Dr. John G.  
Crean, Eugene  
M'Dermott, Patrick  
Sinclair, Capt John (Forfarshire  
Cremer, William Randal  
Mooney, John J.  
Soares, Ernest J.  
Cullinan, J.  
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)  
Sullivan, Donal  
Daly, James  
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)  
Taylor, Theodore Cooke  
Delany, William  
Murphy, J.  
Tully, Jasper  
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.  
Nannetti, Joseph P.  
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan  
Dillon, John  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
White, Luke (York, E. R.)  
Donelan, Capt. A.  
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)  
White, Patrick (Meath, North)  
Doogan, P. C.  
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid)  
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer  
Esmonde, Sir Thomas  
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)  
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)  
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)  
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)  
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)  
Farquharson, Dr. Robert  
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Mr. Goddard and Mr. Whitley.

Farrell, James Patrick

O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)

Ffrench, Peter

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

6. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £;7,107, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, for the Salaries and Expenses of the National Debt Office."

MR. J. P. FARRELL moved a reduction of £;1,000. The total Vote showed a decrease for the year of £;990, but he held that the decrease should be a great deal more if the National Debt Office was managed on more economical principles. Of course, the hon. Gentleman in charge of the Vote would offer the official explanation which was always given, namely, that these officials were appointed at certain fixed salaries and that the salaries had to be provided according to arrangements made by the Treasury at the time of the appointment. But, apart from the fixed salaries, there were other expenses which required some explanation. The details given in the Vote were not at all sufficient. The sum asked originally was £;13,107, of which £;6,000 had already been voted. There were various sub-heads showing how the balance of £;7,107 was made up, but it seemed to him that, if the Department responsible for the preparation of the Vote would give an explanatory schedule, a great deal of criticism would be obviated. The Comptroller General received a salary of £;1,500, but no particulars were given as to who the gentleman was. The hon. Member had just been to the library endeavouring to get some particulars of the terms of the appointment, and to find out whether this official was appointed as the result of examination or as the nominee of some Government; but the officials of the library, who were always most obliging, could not supply him with any particulars, except the skeleton Reports. He could not find out where the office was, who the Comptroller was, or, in fact, any particulars about the office. There was an assistant with a salary of £;800, rising, by annual increments of £;50, to £;1,000. There were four principal clerks with salaries of £;550, rising by annual increments of £;25 to £;700, and one of these clerks, who was described as "actuary," received in addition £;250 a year. There were four assistant principal clerks at £;400 a year, and another assistant principal clerk at £;350 a year. The most extraordinary thing was that there was a "senior clerk (redundant)" who received a salary of £;340 a year. He never saw such a description of an official before. In addition to his salary, the senior clerk redundant received "an allowance of £;10 7s. 6d. for assessing income tax on life annuities, included in the sum taken for temporary salaries." He flattered himself that he understood the English language fairly well, but he could not understand what was meant by that explanation at all. He asked the Secretary to the Treasury to explain the meaning of the word "redundant" after "senior clerk." If the official was redundant it would be proper to say that he was altogether unnecessary. The Nationalist Members had a right to object to this Vote. The National Debt Commissioners were a body of whose existence they knew

nothing at all. Ireland had no part in the creation of the National Debt, and the Nationalist Members, who were a minority in the House, were totally ignored when they opposed the national expenditure. On that ground alone they were entitled to protest against these salaries. Dealing with the question of management, he asked whether any money was to be voted for rent. They were given to understand that the public offices in London were Crown property, but there was a charge in the Estimates of £;4,370, and he wanted to know how it was accounted for.

\*THE CHAIRMAN pointed out that this sum was not in the Vote now under consideration. The hon. Member would be able to criticise that when it was asked for under another class.

MR. J. P. FARRELL said he bowed to the ruling of the Chairman. This was an evidence of how the Estimates were prepared. If this belonged to another class it was misleading. He noticed that the humble office of "temporary pensioner messenger" was held by a man who received 21s. a week and an army pension of 1s. 1d. a day. It might be said that it was a small thing to attack the salary of a man in such a position. He did not wish to do the man any harm, but he objected to the

policy which lay at the bottom of the appointment. That policy was being enforced in Ireland, and young men who applied to the post office for positions as rural messengers were refused, while pensioners who had been employed in South Africa and elsewhere were sent down to fill the positions although they knew nothing of the localities. The young men who knew the district had to go to America and elsewhere for employment. It was the principle which underlay the appointment of this man, or any similar appointment, which made him call attention to it. He seriously appealed to the hon. Gentleman the Financial Secretary to take a note of this objection from Ireland, and to take steps to remedy the state of things as regarded this particular grievance. He would like to know why £;300 a year was paid to the Bank of England as agents for the National Debt Office and only £;100 to the Bank of Ireland; and whether these sums were paid direct to the banks or to persons in their employment. He had no interest in the Bank of Ireland and did not know much about its standing except that he understood that it occupied in Ireland the same position which the Bank of England occupies in England. Was it because the volume of business in connection with the National Debt was relatively greater in England than in Ireland? On broad principle he objected, as an Irish representative, to voting this money. He was quite aware, of course, that hon. Gentlemen might reasonably maintain that English Members had a direct personal interest in the question, but Members from Ireland had no such interest. They never assented in any degree to the principle on which the National Debt had been created; but while Irish Members were out-voted when they protested against the creation of the National Debt for war on the Continent and in South Africa, they had been arguing for financial economic reform. Moreover, they had no representation on this Board. It was his duty as an Irish representative to move the reduction of this Vote by the sum of £;1,000.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum not exceeding £;6,107 be

granted for the said service.";(Mr. J. P. Farrell.)

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.) wished to ask the Secretary to the Treasury two questions. He found the salary of the Actuary to the Pensions Commutation Board was £250. Was that the Mr. Dynham who was responsible for the breaking down of the National Teachers' Pension Scheme? He understood the gentleman was not now an officer; but was the gentleman who discovered the error, Mr. Finlaison, still in office?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: No; he is retired.

MR. TULLY said he was sorry the Gentleman was retired. Was the actuary available for constructing tables in connection with the police pension scheme in Ireland as well as in Scotland? It was very important when they were asked to vote money of this kind to know the scope of these gentlemen's duties. He thought this gentleman's salary appeared to be rather small considering the great responsibility thrust upon him. Could the hon. Gentleman give him any assurance as to what would be the effect of the superannuation of the poor law officers in Ireland?

MR. DALY (Monaghan, S.) supported the hon. Member who had just sat down in thinking that this officer was underpaid, and that it was on account of that underpay that he was liable to make mistakes. He objected to £1,000 being paid to a broker in the National Debt Office. He did not know that Stock Exchange business was carried on in the National Debt Office, although he supposed that every man in a Government Department was more or less of a gambler. The hon. Gentleman the Financial Secretary to the Treasury might explain what duty the broker discharged. Then he saw that the Comptroller General received a salary of £1,500 a year, but he had actually an assistant secretary. He did not know whether the Comptroller General did any amount of work at all, but why should he require an assistant secretary, when he had an Assistant Comptroller, a chief clerk, an

actuary, and principal clerks, receiving in all £2,800 a year? It struck him that this was a most extravagantly overpaid office, and that there were quite too many officials in it. He hoped his hon. friend would be successful in carrying his motion to reduce this Vote. It would at the same time be a check on extravagance and a protest against the manner in which the accounts were placed before the Committee. It was the duty of Members on that side of the House to get the Estimates reduced as much as possible, and he thought it was unfortunate that the Estimates in the past had not been scrutinised more closely by hon.

Gentlemen on the Liberal benches.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The hon. Gentleman who spoke first asked me who was the present Comptroller General, what was his name, and how he entered the service. His name is Hervey; he entered the service in the usual way through the Treasury. He rose after years of continuous service to the post of Assistant Comptroller, and from that post was appointed Comptroller General.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: Did this Gentleman enter the service in the usual way by examination?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Yes; it is probable that he did not enter the service under the examination now in force, because he entered many years ago, but he

entered under the examination then in vogue. The hon. Gentleman then asked me as to the senior clerk. An enquiry has been made with regard to this office, and it has been found that there has been an unsatisfactory record, and we have come to the conclusion that whenever there is a vacancy in this division we should replace the senior clerk by a second-class clerk. A senior clerk was marked "redundant" when he was in excess of the staff, and to show that when his post is vacated that a man of lower position and lower salary is to take his place. I do not think it would be economical to let this clerk retire at once, but when he does retire the office will be filled up in the way I have stated.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: Can the hon. Gentleman say when that will be?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I cannot say without notice; it depends upon the age and other considerations. I was further asked as to the temporary messenger. The objection, as I understand it, is that we have taken a soldier instead of a civilian, and that possibly thereby a civilian has been displaced. Is it suggested that the Government is to lay down a rule that because a man has been in the Army or the Navy he should be debarred from serving the Government? I cannot lay down any rule of that kind. Over and over again this House has expressed its opinion that it is the duty of the Government, it is obligatory on the Government, to see that men who have served in the Navy or the Army, having due regard to their ability to perform the work to be done, shall be given special preference in the Civil Service. I can hold out no hope that this Government will depart from a practice so just in itself, and which commends itself so much to the House. I pass then to the item of agents at the Banks of England and Ireland. It was formerly unnecessary to have agents in Ireland, the business being transacted in England, but in 1881 it was found necessary to appoint agents in Ireland. Their salaries are placed lower than those in England because their work is less, and we did not think it would be just to pay them at the same rate. Then as to the brokers. The hon. Member for South Leitrim asked me whether the actuary referred to in this Vote was connected with the calculation about which he asked a question the other day in this House, and whether he would be available to make the investigation. No, Sir; his duties at the National Debt Commissioners would not enable him to give any time to any such investigation. If the Irish Government think it desirable to obtain this assistance it will be necessary to obtain it altogether outside. We shall not be able to ask it of the gentleman whose salary has been referred to. The brokers to the National Debt Commissioners have to deal with the whole civil funds, and discover means of reducing the National Debt, and other matters. There is nothing of a gambling nature in their transactions.

MR. JOHN WILSON (Durham, Mid) said he should not have risen but for the statement which had been made by the hon. Gentleman as to employing soldiers in preference to civilians. The assumption of the hon. Gentleman was too large. It was not the unanimous opinion of the House that a soldier should be employed simply because he had been a soldier; if a civilian showed himself to be qualified for the office it was unjust to pass him over and prefer a soldier as a sort of reward for his having served in the Army. Everybody admired the gallantry of our Army, but there were heroes also in our industrial life, and in

the ordinary way they underwent more dangers than the class whom the Government preferred. Many lives were annually lost in the mines of this country, and upon the railways a sort of eternal sacrifice was going on every day, and there were many dangers to be faced in factories. These men also served the State by the work they did, and he thought that they should be considered and have an equal chance of any appointment which the Government had to give.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The hon. Gentleman on this particular point raises a discussion ranging over a wide field. But the hon. Gentleman a little misunderstood me. I do not claim that all posts should be reserved for soldiers, or that where there are two different competitors, one a soldier and another a civilian, the soldier should have the post merely because he was a soldier. The first thing that has to be considered is that a man should be got who is able to discharge satisfactorily the duties of the post to which he is appointed, and that fact alone disqualifies a soldier from filling many appointments. The hon. Member asked, Why should preference be given to the soldier? I think where a man has served his country, and another has given no service to his country, the man who has served his country should have the preference. By taking soldiers young, and by discharging them young, we make it difficult for them to get employment, and consequently more difficult for them to earn a living, than it is to a man who has always been in employment. That the civilians who labour in the great industries of this country are useful to the country nobody will deny, but their labour brings its own reward. To the miner and the skilled worker the skill which they have acquired is a valuable asset which they can sell; but we take the soldier and teach him no trade which will be useful to him in after life. We require his service for the country, and he having given his service deserves some consideration of the country. It is not a great number of posts which can be offered to these men, but when there is a post which they can fill it is the express desire of this House and of the country that the Government should remember, so far as possible, the men who have served in the Army or the Navy, and upon their being found clearly fitted for the place to give it to them in preference to a civilian who has rendered no direct service to the country.

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.) asked for information concerning the duties of the broker referred to in the Vote. Did this gentleman advise the Chancellor of the Exchequer as to the conditions of the money market, and at what price he should issue his loans, and through whom he should issue them?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: No, Sir.

MR. O'MARA: What I really want to know is, is he what is called a bucket-shopkeeper or a member of the Stock Exchange? I think the Committee should have a good deal more information as to the duties of this broker.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: May I add one word to what I said just now with regard to its being the wish of the House that the Government should make all possible provision for employing Reserves and time expired soldiers. On April 1st, 1896, the House passed a resolution to that effect by 136 to 24. The name of the brokers is Messrs. Mullens, Marshall and Company; it is their duty to advise the Chancellor of the Exchequer when he requires their advice, but he does not act on their advice alone in such matters as the hon. Gentleman mentioned.



MR. O'MARA: I should like to know whether they advised the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and, if they did not, who did, with regard to the issue of the last loan.

\*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order; The issue of the loan does not arise on this Vote.

MR. JOHN WILSON (Durham, Mid) contended that a vote of the House of Commons did not make the employment of soldiers by the State just, and, besides, only 160 out of 670 Members voted upon it.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.) said that the ear-marking of certain positions in the AYES.

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

Gladstone, Rt Hon Herbert John

O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)

Allan, William (Gateshead)

Goddard, Daniel Ford

O'Malley, William

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

Harmsworth, R. Leicester

O'Mara, James

Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)

Harwood, George

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.

Bell, Richard

Hayden, John Patrick

O'Shee, James John

Black, Alexander William

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

Partington, Oswald

Blake, Edward

Holland, William Henry

Pearson, Sir Weetman D.

Boland, John

Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)

Power, Patrick Joseph

Bolton, Thomas Dolling

Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)

Priestley, Arthur

Brigg, John

Joyce, Michael

Reddy, M.

Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)

Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth

Redmond, John E. (Waterford)

Burke, E. Haviland-

Lambert, George

Redmond, William (Clare)

Caldwell, James  
Layland-Barratt, Francis  
Rigg, Richard  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Leamy, Edmund  
Roche, John  
Channing, Francis Allston  
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington  
Schwann, Charles E.  
Clancy, John Joseph  
Leng, Sir John  
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)  
Colville, John  
Lloyd-George, David  
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Lundon, W.  
Shipman, Dr. John G.  
Craig, Robert Hunter  
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.  
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh'e  
Crean, Eugene  
M'Cann, James  
Soares, Ernest J.  
Cremer, William Randal  
M'Crae, George  
Sullivan, Donal  
Cullinan, J.  
M'Dermott, Patrick  
Tennant, Harold John  
Daly, James  
M'Govern, T.  
Tully, Jasper  
Delany, William  
Mooney, John J.  
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)  
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)  
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)  
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.  
Dillon, John  
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)  
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)  
Donelan, Captain A.  
Murphy, J.  
White, Luke (Yorks, E. R.)  
Doogan, P. C.

Nannetti, Joseph P.  
White, Patrick (Meath, North)  
Duncan, J. Hastings  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)  
Esmonde, Sir Thomas  
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid  
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)  
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)  
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)  
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)  
Ffrench, Peter  
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)  
Yoxall, James Henry  
Flavin, Michael Joseph  
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)  
Flynn, James Christopher  
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Mr. J. P. Farrell and Mr. John Wilson (Durham).  
Foster, Sir W. (Derby Co.)  
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)  
Gilhooly, James  
O'Dowd, John  
NOES.  
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.  
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.  
Arkwright, John Stanhope  
Bigwood, James  
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc.  
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.  
Bill, Charles  
Chapman, Edward  
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John  
Bond, Edward  
Clare, Octavius Leigh  
Austin, Sir John  
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-  
Coghill, Douglas Harry  
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy  
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John  
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Bain, Col. James Robert  
Bull, William James  
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole  
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)

Cautley, Henry Strother  
Compton, Lord Alwyne  
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds  
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)  
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas  
Balfour, Maj K R (Christchurch  
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Banbury, Frederick George  
Cayzer, Sir Charles William  
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge  
Bartley, George C. T.  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)  
Beach, Rt Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)  
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)  
Dickson, Charles Scott

Post Office for soldiers was a development of militarism which the country would protest against when the present war feeling had subsided;

THE CHAIRMAN: I think this discussion is going a great deal beyond the point. It arises on the employment by the Department of one temporary messenger.

Question put.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 104; Noes, 151. (Division List No. 197.)

Dorington, Sir John Edward  
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S  
Pretymann, Ernest George  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Long, Rt. Hn Walter (Bristol, S.  
Purvis, Robert  
Doxford, Sir William Theodore  
Lowe, Francis William  
Pym, C. Guy  
Duke, Henry Edward  
Lowther, Rt. Hon. James (Kent  
Randles, John S.  
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Ratcliffe, R. F.  
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)  
Renshaw, Charles Bine  
Finch, George H.  
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W G Ellison  
Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Macdonald, John Cumming

Ridley, S. F. (Bethnal Green)  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Maconochie, A. W.  
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson  
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward A.  
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool  
Ropner, Colonel Robert  
Fletcher, Sir Henry  
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
Flower, Ernest  
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W  
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander  
Forster, Henry William  
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)  
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)  
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, South  
Majendie, James A. H.  
Smith, H C (N'rth'umb Tynes'de  
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir J. Eldon  
Malcolm, Ian  
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand  
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)  
Martin, Richard Biddulph  
Spear, John Ward  
Green, Walford D (Wednesbu'y  
Maxwell, Rt. Hn Sir H E (Wigtn  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)  
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire  
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart  
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lrd G. (Midd'x  
Mildmay, Francis Bingham  
Stroyan, John  
Hamilton, Marqof (L'nd'nderry  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Thorburn, Sir Walter  
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert W.  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Tollemache, Henry James  
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd)  
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)  
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray  
Harris, Frederick Leverton  
Morgan, David J. (Walthams'w  
Valentia, Viscount

Hay, Hon. Claude George  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
Wanklyn, James Leslie  
Heath, James (Staffords, N.W.  
Morrison, James Archibald  
Warde, Colonel C. E.  
Heaton, John Henniker  
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford  
Webb, Colonel William George  
Henderson, Alexander  
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.  
Whiteley, H. (Aston und. Lyne  
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield Brightside  
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute)  
Whitmore, Charles Algernon  
Hudson, George Bickersteth  
Nicholson, William Graham  
Willox, Sir John Archibald  
Hutton, John (Yorks., N. R)  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Wills, Sir Frederick  
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse  
Norton, Capt. Cecil William  
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh., N.  
Johnston, William (Belfast)  
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens  
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath  
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)  
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay  
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm  
Keswick, William  
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Parkes, Ebenezer  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)  
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert W.  
Lawson, John Grant  
Pemberton, John S. G.  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick

Original Question put, and agreed to.

7. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £12,938, be

granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Public Record Office."

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.) said that the Vote was a very important one, and one which they had rarely an opportunity of discussing. It was some years since the interesting subjects connected with the Vote had been discussed. He desired to make a suggestion which he thought would meet with the approval of the Committee. Why should not the calendars and historical documents published by the Record Office be given to Members, as were the Reports of the Historical Manuscripts Committee? The calendars

did not stand on the same footing as the Reports of the Historical Manuscripts Committee because they were brought out under different auspices, and therefore Members could not claim to have them supplied free, but, inasmuch as the House of Commons voted the money for the publication of the calendars, hon. Members had a perfect right to say under what conditions they should be published, and also that they should be supplied to hon. Members as were the Reports of the Historical Manuscripts Committee. There was another point he wished to raise. These calendars were supplied gratis to a number of public institutions and to certain colleges and public libraries. He should like to know on what system the allocation was made, and what qualification entitled a public institution to obtain the calendars free. He thought the calendars ought to be given free to all college libraries, and to all schools above a certain standard. In Ireland, at all events, there was a

great desire on the part of a number of colleges to have the calendars, and several of them had applied to the gentleman at the head of the department to be supplied with them free, but the applications were refused. He thought that hon. Members had a perfect right to receive the calendars free, and that they also ought to be given to all public libraries. In Sub-head C a sum of money was taken for the investigation of documents in the archives of Rome. As to that he had nothing to say. An extremely able man, who worked with great industry and energy, was entrusted with the work, and the result of his labours was very satisfactory. Then there was the investigation of documents in the archives of Simancas, in Spain, for which £;150 was allocated. The only complaint he had to make regarding it was that it was a very small sum indeed for the investigation of historical manuscripts in Spain, where there were many valuable collections which related to England as well as to Ireland, and he thought a larger sum should be devoted to their investigation. In the college of Salamanca there was an enormous mass of historical manuscripts which were untouched up to the present, and he thought it would be well worthy of the consideration of those responsible for the working of the Record Office whether a sum should not be allocated for their investigation. He was glad to see that a sum of £;220 was allocated for the investigation of documents in the archives of Venice, and he should like to know when the next publication regarding them would be published. He observed that the publication of the State Papers of the time of William III. preceded the publication of the State Papers of the time of Henry VIII. It would be much better if the publications were carried out in sequence, so that all the

information would be properly available. His principal grievance in connection with the Vote was, however, that the money allocated for the publication and calendaring of Irish State Papers was extremely inadequate. Only £;240 was devoted to that purpose. There was an enormous mass of most valuable historical Papers in Ireland which were not yet published. The request he would urge on the Government, and he hoped the Secretary to the Treasury would consider it, was that there should be an Irish Record Commission, independent of the English Record Commission, which should have a certain sum of money allocated to it, and should be formed of men who took an interest in Irish historical documents and Irish history generally, and who would be entrusted with the work of publishing various Irish historical manuscripts and State Papers. At present Irish State Papers were only published occasionally, and the lion's share of the money was spent in publishing English records. In England there was a magnificent Record Office, where public documents were kept in an admirable way. In Ireland there was no such satisfactory arrangement, and Irish records had met with terrible losses from fire and other causes. He wanted to preserve them from similar losses in future, and he thought it was a matter of urgency that some definite steps should be taken in regard to the publication of Irish State records. He therefore urged the establishment of an Irish Record Commission, and to emphasise his request, and also his suggestion that the publications of the Record Office should be supplied gratis to hon. Members and also to college libraries, he would move the reduction of the Vote by £;500.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £;12,438, be granted for the said Service.";(Sir Thomas Esmonde.)

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that everyone must recognise the interest the hon. Baronet took in the subject, as well as the interest of the subject itself, and also sympathise with his desire that these publications should proceed more rapidly. No doubt many hon. Members shared the desire of the hon. Baronet that these volumes should be obtainable in the same way as the publications of the Historical Manuscripts Commission. He was sorry that the hon. Baronet had not given him some indication beforehand of the points he intended to raise, because he would then have taken care to have prepared himself, and been able to speak with more confidence than he was. Not knowing the difference between the publications of the Record Office and the Historical Manuscripts Commission, he did not like to pledge himself, but he would look into the matter. The same remark applied to the request of the hon. Baronet that the publications should be supplied free to college libraries. He would like to inquire as to the number of the volumes to be supplied. He was not able to answer the hon. Baronet's question as to the terms and conditions on which the present distribution was made, but he would inquire into that point also. The hon. Baronet would see that his demands tended in the opposite direction to all the criticisms they had heard during the evening. Hitherto the Government had been reproached for not being more economical, but the hon. Baronet's speech was the other side of the picture. He confessed he felt *prima facie* indisposed to establish a separate Record Commission for Ireland unless there were real necessity. He thought it would inevitably lead to greater expense for the same



production. The sums allocated to the various investigations to which the hon. Baronet referred were framed so as to enable the work to be carried on on the lines on which it had hitherto been carried out. A considerable number of records had been published in recent years, and at present there were nine or ten sets of volumes, of which a  
AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.  
Edwards, Frank  
M'Dermott, Patrick  
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc, Stroud  
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)  
M'Govern, T.  
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)  
Farrell, James Patrick  
Mooney, John J.  
Black, Alexander William  
Ffrench, Peter  
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)  
Blake, Edward  
Flavin, Michael Joseph  
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)  
Boland, John  
Flynn, James Christopher  
Murphy, J.  
Bolton, Thomas Dolling  
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)  
Nannetti, Joseph P.  
Brigg, John  
Gilhooly, James  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
Nussey, Thomas Willans  
Caldwell, James  
Harmsworth, R. Leicester  
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'ry Mid  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Harwood, George  
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)  
Cawley, Frederick  
Hayden, John Patrick  
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)  
Channing, Francis Allston  
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-  
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)  
Clancy, John Joseph

Holland, William Henry  
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)  
O'Dowd, John  
Craig, Robert Hunter  
Joyce, Michael  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Crean, Eugene  
Lambert, George  
O'Malley, William  
Cremer, William Randal  
Layland-Barratt, Francis  
O'Mara, James  
Cullinan, J.  
Leamy, Edmund  
O'Shee, Jas. John  
Daly, James  
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Delany, William  
Lloyd-George, David  
Partington, Oswald  
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.  
Lundon, W.  
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.  
Dillon, John  
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.  
Power, Patrick Joseph  
Donelan, Captain A.  
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.  
Priestley, Arthur  
Doogan, P. C.  
M'Cann, James  
Reddy, M.  
Duncan, J. Hastings  
M'Crae, George  
Redmond, John E. (Waterford

certain number were expected to be issued during the present year. With reference to Irish State Papers, two volumes had been published relating to the period between 1310 and 1320, eight volumes relating to the period between 1370 and 1379, eight volumes relating to the period between 1509 and 1600, and five volumes relating to the period between 1606 and 1625. He should be very glad to hear any further representations that the hon. Baronet desired to make to him on the subject.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE said he was much obliged to the hon. Gentleman. The present

system started very well in Ireland, but for some reason or other, whether it was the expense or the inability to decide on the documents to be published, it stopped short. He recognised the goodwill with which the Secretary to the Treasury had answered him, and he was sorry he had not given the hon. Gentleman notice of the points he intended to raise. In order, however, to emphasise the anxiety he felt for the establishment of an Irish Record Commission he would divide the Committee.

Question put.

The Committee divided. Ayes, 96; Noes, 166. (Division List No. 198.)

Redmond, William (Clare)

Sullivan, Donal

Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)

Rigg, Richard

Tennant, Harold John

Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.

Roche, John

Tully, Jasper

Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)

Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh

Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)

Yoxall, James Henry

Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)

White, Luke (York, E. R.)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir Thomas Esmonde and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

Shipman, Dr. John G.

White, Patrick (Meath, North)

Soares, Ernest J.

Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

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

Nicholson, William Graham

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon

Nicol, Donald Ninian

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Gray, Ernest (West Ham)

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Green, Walford D (Wednesbury

O'Neill, Hon. Rbt. Torrens

Austin, Sir John

Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)

Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay

Grenfell, William Henry

Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy

Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)

Bain, Colonel James Robert  
Hamilton, Rt Hn. Ld. G (Midd'x  
Parkes, Ebenezer  
Balfour, Rt Hon. A. J. (Manch'r  
Hamilton, Marqof (L'nd'nderry  
Peel, Hn. Wm Robert Wellesley  
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey  
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.  
Pemberton, John S. G.  
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds  
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Balfour, Maj K R (Christchurch  
Harris, Frederick Leverton  
Plummer, Walter R.  
Banbury, Frederick George  
Hay, Hon. Claude George  
Pretymann, Ernest George  
Beach, Rt. Hn Sir M. H. (Bristol)  
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley  
Purvis, Robert  
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.  
Heath, James (Staffords., N. W.  
Bigwood, James  
Henderson, Alexander  
Randles, John S.  
Bill, Charles  
Hickman, Sir Alfred  
Rankin, Sir James  
Bond, Edward  
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.  
Ratcliffe, R. F.  
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith  
Hope, J. F. (Sheff'ld, Brightside  
Renshaw, Charles Bine  
Brodrick, Rt. Hn. St. John  
Howard, John (Kent, Faversham.  
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge  
Bull, William James  
Hudson, George Bickersteth  
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green  
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)  
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Charles T.  
Cautley, Henry Strother  
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.  
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)

Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse  
Ropner, Colonel Robert  
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.  
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton  
Cayzer, Sir Charles William  
Johnston, William (Belfast)  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)  
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.  
Keswick, William  
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)  
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r  
Simeon, Sir Barrington  
Chapman, Edward  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)  
Clare, Octavius Leigh  
Lawrence, Joseph (Monmouth  
Smith, H. C (Northmb Tyneside  
Coghill, Douglas Harry  
Lawson, John Grant  
Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks.)  
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)  
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready  
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S  
Spear, John Ward  
Colston, Chas. Edw.H. Athole  
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Compton, Lord Alwyne  
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.  
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart  
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas  
Lowe, Francis William  
Stroyan, John  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
Cranborne, Viscount

Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray  
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)  
Macartney, Rt. Hon. W. G. E.  
Macdona, John Cumming  
Valentia, Viscount  
Dairymple, Sir Charles  
Maconochie, A. W.  
Dickson, Charles Scott  
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Dorington, Sir John Edward  
M'Calmont, Col, J. (Antrim, E.  
Warde, Colonel C. E.  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. Akers-  
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W  
Warner, Thos. Courtenay T.  
Doxford, Sir William Theodore  
Majendie, James A. H.  
Webb, Col. Wm. George  
Duke, Henry Edward  
Malcolm, Ian  
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u-Lyne  
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin  
Martin, Richard Biddulph  
Whitmore, Charles Algernon  
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. H.  
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H E (Wigt'n  
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)  
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.  
Willox, Sir John Archibald  
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.  
Mildmay, Francis Bingham  
Wills, Sir Frederick  
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc.  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestereh, N.)  
Finch, George H.  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Moore, William (Antrim N.)  
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Morgan, David J (Walthamst'w  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon

Morrell, George Herbert

Flower, Ernest

Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.

Younger, William

Forster, Henry William

Morrison, James Archibald

Morton, Arthur H A. (Deptford

TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.

Galloway, William Johnson

Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.

Gordon, J. (Londonderry, South

Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute

Original Question again proposed.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) asked for an explanation with regard to a

footnote stating that certain officials received from £;30 to £;40 per annum out

of the Vote for Temporary Commissions for calendaring the Cecil manuscripts.

What exactly were these Cecil manuscripts, and would they give the record of the Cecil family up to date? For instance, would they show how many members of the family were in the present Government?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN replied that these manuscripts were not modern documents.

They were published by the Historical Manuscripts Commission, being Papers of great historical interest.

Question put, and agreed to.

8. £;4, to complete the sum for Public Works Loan Commission.

9. £;36,430, to complete the sum for Registrar General's Office, England.

10. £;33,450, to complete the sum for Works and Public Buildings Office.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND called the attention of the First Commissioner of Works to the accommodation provided for the telegraph department in the House. That accommodation was outrageously bad, sixteen men and boys having to live, eat, and work for the greater part of the day and night in a small room which really was not fit for the accommodation of one person.

\*THE CHAIRMAN pointed out that the question should be raised on Vote 3, House of Commons Buildings.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): As a matter of courtesy, I may say that we are going to consider the matter referred to by the hon. Member.

Resolution agreed to.

Resolutions to be reported upon Monday next; Committee to sit again upon Monday next.

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn.";(Mr. Austen Chamberlain.)

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) protested against the motion, as there were a number of important Bills on the Paper, particularly the Roman Catholic Disabilities Removal Bill, the passage of which the Government had expressed themselves as specially anxious to facilitate. When the House united to give the Government a

certain amount of Supply by an early hour, after discussions which were short and concentrated, the least that private Members could expect was that they should have the benefit of the remainder of the sitting. The present motion was a monstrous innovation; there was absolutely no precedent for it earlier than the present or the previous session. It was putting a premium on obstruction, as the result would be that, if Members were to gain no benefit by granting Supply at an early hour, they would talk up to midnight.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that the motion was made in accordance with a pledge that, when an arrangement was entered into to give the Government a certain Supply, legislation would not afterwards be proceeded with. The next Order on the Paper was the Demise of the Crown Bill, and if the House continued its sitting that was the Bill it would have to consider. To do that, however, would be a breach of the arrangement which had been entered into for the general convenience of the House.

Question put, and agreed to.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 20th May, 1901.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

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

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

Bethlem Hospital Bill [Lords].

Bideford and Clovelly Railway (Abandonment) Bill [Lords].

Bridewell Hospital Bill [Lords].

Mersey Docks and Harbour Board Bill [Lords].

Mersey Docks and Harbour Board (Canada Dock Works, &c.) Bill [Lords].

Prestatyn Water Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

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

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

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill.

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

BINGLEY URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL BILL.

BURTON-UPON-TRENT CORPORATION BILL.

DERBYSHIRE AND NOTTINGHAMSHIRE ELECTRIC POWER BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

DORKING GAS BILL.



KINGSTON-UPON-HULL CORPORATION BILL.

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

CITY AND SOUTH LONDON RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

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

MILFORD DOCKS BILL [Lords].

NEW SWINDON GAS BILL [Lords].

NITRATE RAILWAYS COMPANY BILL [Lords].

SHEFFIELD CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

SHREWSBURY GAS BILL [Lords].

Read a second time, and committed.

BELFAST AND NORTHERN COUNTIES RAILWAY.

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

BIGGLESWADE WATER BOARD.

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 3) BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

HAMILTON BURGH PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL [Lords].

Consideration, under Section 7, Sub-section (2), of the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, deferred till Friday.

ARIZONA COPPER COMPANY, LIMITED, ORDER CONFIRMATION

Bill to confirm a Provisional Order under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to the Arizona Copper Company, Limited, ordered to be brought in by the Lord Advocate and Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland.

ARIZONA COPPER COMPANY, LIMITED, ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL.

"To confirm a Provisional Order under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to the Arizona Copper Company, Limited," presented accordingly; to be read a second time upon Monday, 10th June, and to be printed [Bill 195].

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP L).

Mr. BILL reported from the Committee on Group L of Private Bills, That the parties opposing the Derby Corporation Bill had stated that the evidence of James Hardy Smith was essential to their case; and, it having been proved that his attendance could not be procured without the intervention of the House, he had been instructed to move that the said James Hardy Smith, of Alvaston, Farmer, do attend the said Committee to-morrow, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Ordered, That James Hardy Smith do attend the Committee on Group L of Private Bills to-morrow, at half-past Eleven of the colock.

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (TRAMWAYS AND STREET WIDENINGS) BILL

WALLASEY IMPROVEMENT BILL.

BURY CORPORATION BILL.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to Honley Urban District Council (Gas) Bill, without amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to provide for the transfer of

the undertaking of the Poulton-le-Fylde Gas, Coal, Lime, and Coke Company, Limited, to the Poulton-le-Fylde Urban District Council, and to authorise that council to supply gas; and for other purposes." Poulton-le-Fylde Gas Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to confer powers on the Corporation of Chester to reconstruct the existing tramways in the city of Chester; to construct additional tramways in and adjacent to the city; to work tramways; and for other purposes." Chester Corporation Tramways Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to confer further powers on the London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Company; and for other purposes." London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to enable the Mayor and Commonalty and Citizens of the City of London, Governors of the House of the Poor commonly called Saint Bartholomew's Hospital, near West Smithfield, London, of the Foundation of King Henry the Eighth, to acquire certain lands necessary or desirable for the extension of the hospital; and for other purposes." St. Bartholomew's Hospital Bill [Lords].

And also a Bill intituled, "An Act to constitute and incorporate a Joint Water Board, consisting of representatives from the Councils of the borough of Southport, the urban district of Birkdale, and the rural district of West Lancashire, all in the county palatine of Lancaster, and to transfer to and vest in such Board the undertaking of the Southport Waterworks Company; and for other purposes." Southport Water (Transfer) Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act for conferring further powers on the Weston-super-Mare Gaslight Company; and for other purposes." Weston-super-Mare Gas Bill [Lords].

And also a Bill intituled, "An Act to enable the Great Southern and Western Railway Company to make an extension railway to Cashel and a branch railway to the Curragh Siding; to execute certain other works; to acquire additional lands; to transfer to and vest in the Company the undertakings of the Limerick and Kerry Railway Company and of the Rathkeale and Newcastle Junction Railway Company; to raise additional capital; and for other purposes." Great Southern and Western Railway Bill [Lords].

POULTON-LE-FYLDE GAS BILL [Lords].

CHESTER CORPORATION TRAMWAYS BILL [Lords].

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

ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S HOSPITAL BILL [Lords].

SOUTHPORT WATER (TRANSFER) BILL [Lords].

WESTON-SUPER-MARE GAS BILL (Lord].

GREAT SOUTHERN AND WESTERN RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

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

PETITIONS.

COAL MINES (EMPLOYMENT) BILL.

Petition from Altham in favour; to lie upon the Table.

COMPENSATION FOR DAMAGE TO CROPS, ETC., BILL.

Petition of Highland and Agricultural Society of Scotland in favour; to lie upon the Table.

DOUGLAS, HENRY EDWARD.

Petition of Henry Edward Douglas, for inquiry into his case; to lie upon the Table.

HABITUAL DRUNKARDS.

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD INQUIRIES.

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

MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.

Petition from Altham in favour; to lie upon the Table.

ROMAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY IN IRELAND.

Petitions against establishment, from Inverness; Dumfries; and Rothesay; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Settle; Middleton-in-Teesdale; Bolsover; West-houghton; Accrington; Clayton-le-Moors; Salterforth; Wibsey; Ivegill; and Bildeston; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Comrie; Crieff; Galashiels (two); Aberdeen; Huxham; Didsbury (two); Brixton; Leigh; Norton; Fuller; Yardley; Stockport; Rotherham (two); Carlisle; Whitby; Newcastle-on-Tyne; Brigham; North-West Gloucester; Hammersmith; Kettering (ten); Toller; and Todmorden; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Monkton; Scottish Temperance League; and Annan; to lie upon the Table.

SCHOOL BOARD ELECTIONS (SCOTLAND).

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

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

WELLINGTON COLLEGE.

Copy presented, of Report of the Governors of Wellington College for the year ending 31st December, 1900, with Accounts [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS (CONDITIONAL LICENCE).

Copy presented, of Licence granted to Margaret Lynch, a Convict under detention in Aylesbury Prison, permitting her to be at large on condition that she enter the East End Refuge, Finchley [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 28th March; Sir Edgar Vincent]; to lie upon the Table.

CIVIL LIST PENSIONS.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 16th May; Mr. Gibson Bowles]; to lie upon the Table.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (PROCEEDINGS).

Copy presented, of Return of Proceedings during the month of January, 1901 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

CENSUS OF IRELAND, 1901.

Copy presented, of Preliminary Report, with Abstract of the Enumerators' Summaries [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

MERCHANT SHIPPING (MERCANTILE MARINE FUND) ACT, 1898.

Copy presented, of Draft Order in Council altering the Scale or Rules and Exemptions set out in the Second Schedule to the Act, for the purpose of the levying of Light Dues with respect to voyages made by Home Trade Sailing Ships and Steamers, and for Yachts which are laid up during the whole of any year ending 31st March [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).

Copy presented, of Report, No. 322 (Bermuda, Annual Report for 1900) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ARMY

Copy presented, of Return of Military Forces in South Africa, 1899&#x2013;1901 (in continuation of [C. 462]) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

AFRICA (No. 2, 1901).

Copy presented, of Despatch from His Majesty's Special Commissioner in Uganda relating to Travellers in the Protectorate [by Command]; to lie upon, the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 2602 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR;DESTRUCTION OF CROPS AND GRASS.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he has any official information to the effect that large areas of Kaffir crops left standing by General French's various columns are now to be destroyed, and that a military movement is taking place for the purpose of burning the grass throughout the territories of the two Republics; and, if so, whether he will communicate it to the House.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): In reply to inquiry, Lord Kitchener telegraphs as follows;

"Mealie crops are destroyed as much as possible in districts infested by the enemy. Burning is not general, but at this time of year grass fires are of common occurrence."

FARM BURNING.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, in reference to the Return of buildings burnt in South Africa, whether the reasons for destruction of sixteen or seventeen houses in Ventersburg, in the Orange River Free State, are correctly stated to have been that the owners were on commando; and, if so, was the destruction of these houses in accordance with the regulations adopted at the Hague Conference, and subscribed to by the British representatives.

I beg also to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that, in the Return of buildings burnt in the Transvaal, it appears that several farm houses were burnt, the reasons for destruction being given as proximity to places where the telegraph line was cut; and will he state whether the cutting of telegraph lines is in accordance with the conditions laid down by the Hague

Convention, and does the War Office sanction the destruction of houses and property because of the reasons stated.

MR. BRODRICK: In reply to the first question the whole district of Ventersburg was being used as a military base for the enemy's operations, as is clearly shown in the Return. Article XXIII. (g) of the Hague Convention lays down that the destruction of an enemy's property is permissible when imperatively demanded by the necessities of war. In reply to the second question, the Boers used certain houses in the vicinity of the telegraph lines as bases from which they could raid to cut the lines. The necessities of war therefore required the destruction of these houses. The Hague Convention does not lay down any special rules as to the cutting of telegraph lines.

MR. FLYNN: But is it not the fact that in the cases I have quoted the sole reason given in the Returns is that the owners of the places were out on commando? Do the Army authorities hold that it is justifiable to burn these men's property simply because they are in arms against this country?

MR. BRODRICK: There is also the fact that the buildings were used as the base of military operations against us.

#### RESERVE OF SMALL-ARM AMMUNITION.

\*MR. NORMAN (Wolverhampton, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that the Government Small Arms Ammunition Factory at Woolwich can produce 4,000,000 cartridges a week; that Messrs. Kynoch can produce 3,000,000 cartridges a week; and that, with the additional output of other makers, the total supply of cartridges may be from 10,000,000 to 12,000,000 rounds per week; will he state on what day, and at what hour of the day, the reserve of small arm ammunition stood at 3,300 rounds; how many rounds were at that time en route to South Africa; and how many rounds were being received per day by the Government from all sources; how many rounds of small arm ammunition were in reserve in South Africa and other Imperial stations at the outbreak of the war; how many rounds of this reserve were Mark IV. ammunition or other cartridges found to be unsuitable for use; how many rounds of Mark IV. ammunition were sent to South Africa after the outbreak of war; and how many rounds of Mark IV.

or other unsuitable ammunition were brought back to this country.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): When the right hon. Gentleman answers the question, will he also state who is the high official responsible for the state of things alluded to by the First Lord of the Treasury?

MR. BRODRICK: In reply to the hon. Gentleman, obviously in all matters of this character the Secretary for War is primarily responsible. As to the question on the Paper, I am fully aware of the possible output of the various makers of cartridges in the United Kingdom. I do not think it would be for the advantage of the public service to give all the details demanded by the hon. Member.

\*MR. NORMAN: Is not the right hon. Gentleman of opinion that it would be advantageous to allay the almost universal alarm that has arisen owing to the statement of the First Lord?

MR. BRODRICK: I do not think there is any cause whatever for alarm. Under the very great strain of providing a large number of additional men at short notice,

at one time the supply, which was in excess of the actual amount required to be kept by regulations, ran down very low, but that has long since been put straight.

\*MR. NORMAN: Then may I ask if the right hon. Gentleman is of opinion that, in connection with the First Lord's statement concerning the reserve of ammunition, departmental information of a confidential nature may be used by a member of the Government for party purposes;

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The hon. Member must not ask as to a matter of opinion.

PAY ALLOTMENTS TO SOLDIERS' WIVES.

MR. CAINE (Cornwall, Camborne): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he has yet received any reply to his repeated cable messages to the Cape with regard to the neglect of the authori-

ties to advise home particulars of allotted pay by Private W. J. Mankee, No.

25,330 Medical Staff Corps, Base Hospital, Woodstock, and Private Edwin J.

Paynter, No. 25,336 C. M. and C, Base Details, Woodstock, and many others.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire,

Westhoughton): The General Officer Commanding has informed the War Office that

the delay was due to the fact that remittance sheets had not been forwarded by

the units concerned. I have not received any reply to a further telegram dealing

with the special cases mentioned, but the hon. Member must take into

consideration the enormous difficulties of communication with the widely

scattered units in South Africa. Further I must remind the hon. Member that I

told him that any applications to the War Office for assistance would be

considered, and that money would be advanced if the woman could produce reliable

evidence that it was her husband's intention to remit money. No such

applications have been received from the relatives of the men mentioned.

MR. CAINE: What would the noble Lord consider reliable evidence?

LORD STANLEY: When the evidence is produced I will say whether it is reliable.

MR. CAINE: Is the noble Lord aware that in the months of December and January about forty Cornish miners enlisted at Cape Town in non-combatant corps and were induced to do so by the promise that they could allot £4 per month of their pay through the War Office to their wives at home, and that none of the women had received any of the pay although more than six weeks have elapsed since they applied;

LORD STANLEY: I must ask for notice.

MR. CAINE: I will give notice for Thursday, and if the answer is not satisfactory I will make use of the forms of the House to raise the question.

REGIMENTAL TITLES; IMPERIAL SERVICE OF COLONIAL TROOPS.

SIR CHARLES CAYZER (Barrow-in-Furness): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in recognition of the services rendered by the colonial forces in South Africa to the mother country, he will name some of the regiments on the permanent establishment of the British Army after the colonies who have sent forces to South Africa, for example the Imperial Canadian Regiment and other similar titles; and, if so, will he endeavour to arrange with the Colonial Governments to afford facilities in the respective colonies for men who

may desire to do so to engage for service in the regiments so named.

LORD STANLEY: The regiments of the British Army have already a territorial connection and bear corresponding titles. It would hardly appear expedient to break this connection. Facilities for such Imperial service will, it is hoped, be created for the colonies in connection with the Imperial Yeomanry.

COLONEL LEGGE (St. George's, Hanover Square): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will consider the advisability of inviting the colonies to raise Regular corps for service in the Imperial Army at home and abroad both in peace and war.

MR. BRODRICK: The proposal has been repeatedly considered, but has not hitherto been found practicable. I hope a beginning of such a connection may be made through the Imperial Yeomanry.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): And will the right hon. Gentleman also invite the colonies to pay towards the expense of the war?

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

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: They would not do it.

VOLUNTEER OFFICERS' CAMP ALLOWANCES.

MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether his attention has been directed to the case of Volunteer Officers who do not receive while attending camps of instruction the same pay and allowances as those received by Militia Officers attending such camps; whether this difference has been made

during the present year only; and whether it is intended that this difference should be permanent.

\*LORD STANLEY: Volunteer Officers attending camps receive an allowance calculated as being sufficient to cover their expenditure. The payments made for last year's camps were wholly exceptional.

ARMY RECRUITS; AGE REGULATIONS.

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will state the exact terms of the clause which leaves the decision to the district commanding officer, or the commanding officer of a regiment, as to whether a recruit who may be under the age of eighteen, but who has given his age as over eighteen years, shall or shall not be set free from military service if he be unwilling to remain in the service; will he state the circumstances on which the decision of the commanding officer depends; is the consent of the parents of a youth, when his age is under eighteen years, necessary before he can enlist; if so, would the fact that a recruit has overstated his age alter the fact that he is under the proper age when he enlisted; and are recruiting sergeants instructed not to suggest to youths that they should overstate their age in order to be accepted.

\*LORD STANLEY: The clause will be found in Table VI. of paragraph 1805 of the King's Regulations. The commanding officer would be guided by what is best for the public service and by the circumstances of the case. It has been decided in courts of law that the consent of the parents is not necessary. If, however, a lad states that he is under eighteen, then the written consent of the parents is obtained. Recruiting sergeants are instructed not to suggest to youths that they

should overstate their age in order to be accepted. It is obvious that any decentralisation of business is impossible if the case of every recruit who chooses to overstate his age is to be decided at headquarters.

ROYAL ARMY MEDICAL CORPS; COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

SIR JOHN TUKE (Edinburgh and St. Andrew's University): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will undertake that the Report of the Committee to be appointed to consider the reconstruction and organisation of the Royal Army Medical Corps will be in the hands of Members before the Army Medical Vote comes up for discussion.

\*LORD STANLEY: It is impossible for me to give any pledge as to the time which such a Committee as that proposed may think it proper to give to its duties.

MILITIA DISEMBODIMENT.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state the method adopted to ascertain the wishes of the embodied Militia battalions as to whether they desired to be disembodied, and whether the views of the officers and men as a whole were taken on the matter; also whether any battalions which have expressed such a desire are still embodied; and, if so, can he name them.

\*LORD STANLEY: The following instructions were sent to general officers commanding: "You are requested to ascertain confidentially the wishes of the officers and men of all Militia units serving in your command as to being disembodied or remaining embodied during the winter." The general officers duly reported that the views of officers and men were taken. All battalions which were reported as wishing to be disembodied were so disembodied in December.

MALTA AND GIBRALTAR GARRISONS.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, before substituting the royal garrison battalions at Malta and Gibraltar for Regular battalions, he consulted the Governments of either of those places or the Colonial Defence Committee; and, if so, what answer he obtained from them.

LORD STANLEY: No, Sir. The selection of troops to defend a fortress rests with the Commander-in-Chief.

KING'S BASTION, PORTSMOUTH.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if it has been determined to destroy the historical fortification known as the King's Bastion at Portsmouth.

LORD STANLEY: No, Sir. Some slight modifications have been made in the eastern portion of the bastion which were absolutely necessary, but the main portion of the bastion will remain untouched.

WEST INDIA DOCK NAVAL STORES-PACKERS' PAY.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that some men are now employed at the West India Dock Naval Stores packing at a weekly wage of 21s., under the supervision of others who receive only 20s.; and whether, seeing that this arrangement gives rise to dissatisfaction, he will take steps to raise the wages of the latter.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): I imagine the



hon. and gallant Member refers to two classes of men known respectively as storehouse-labourers and packers. The storehouse labourers receive from 20s. to 22s. 6d., and the packers 20s. per week; but 25 per cent. of the packers, namely, those who are employed in packing fragile or valuable articles, receive 21s. Both the storehouse labourers and the packers are under the direct supervision of a store-houseman, whose pay varies from 24s. to 36s. a week. There appears, therefore, to be no cause for dissatisfaction on the grounds suggested.

CAPTAIN NORTON: Does the hon. Gentleman say there are not two classes of men doing precisely the same work but getting different rates of pay?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: No, Sir; those who get the higher rate of pay do supervising duty.

CAPTAIN NORTON: But my point is that there are two classes of men doing exactly the same work; one class receiving 20s. and the other 21s.

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I will put down another question.

DEPTFORD VICTUALLING YARD; RUM DRAWERS.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, seeing that men employed at Woolwich in drawing off rum receive 6d. a day extra pay, which brings their weekly wage up to 24s., he will consider the advisability of extending similar treatment to those employed in the Deptford Victualling Yard who not only draw off but previously blend the rum which is dealt with at Woolwich.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I have no information as to what wages are paid at Woolwich to men engaged in drawing off rum. Labourers when employed on the duty in question at Deptford receive their ordinary pay without any special allowance, and no grounds appear to exist for the payment of such an allowance. The term "blend" as applied to the work performed by these labourers seems inappropriate. The process of reducing the rum to issuing strength by the addition of water is entirely controlled by a leading man of stores; and the labourers are merely employed in the manual operation of adding such quantities of water as he may direct.

VICTORIA TECHNICAL INSTITUTE OF BOMBAY.

SIR MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGGREE (Bethnal Green, N.E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, seeing that the Victoria Technical Institute of Bombay is an establishment carried on at public expense and under the management or control of Government, can he state why a mechanical engineer is being sent out from Europe for the training of students in that institution in theoretical and practical mechanical engineering at a salary of about £300 per annum; and whether an engineer fit to give such training cannot be secured in India; and, if not, will he state if the Government of India contemplates action in the direction of providing such engineering and other technical instruction as might supply hereafter teachers of the capacity required in the instance mentioned from among the people of that country.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): I have no information as to any request from the Victoria Technical Institute that a

mechanical engineer may be sent out from this country. The institute, as my hon. friend is no doubt aware, though aided by Government funds, is not a Government institution, but is administered by a Board. The list of teachers appears to show that most of them are natives of India. Engineering and technical instruction is already supported by Government at four engineering colleges in India, and at several technical schools. I have no doubt that, among the persons trained in these institutions, some will be fit to become teachers, although it may still be desirable from time to time to obtain instructors from Europe.

#### MANUAL INDUSTRIES OF INDIA-MADRAS SCHOOL OF ART.

SIR MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGGREE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, in view of the fact that Mr. Chatterton, of the Madras School of Arts, has drawn up a memorandum in reference to a project undertaken by the Government of India with the view to encourage a revival of the indigenous manual industries of the country, whether he will state what funds are intended to be devoted annually for this purpose and what are the details of its working, and will he place the papers relating thereto upon the Table of the House.

LORD G. HAMILTON: I have seen a copy of the memorandum to which my hon. friend refers in the newspapers, and I believe the question of taking further steps for the development and revival of indigenous manual industries in India is under the consideration of the Viceroy and his colleagues, but I have no official information on the subject. When I learn the results of the deliberations of the Government of India I shall be glad to communicate it to my hon. friend.

#### FRENCH AND CANADIAN STEAMSHIP SERVICE.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has any official information to the effect that the Canadian Government, whose concession of a preference of 33½ per cent. to British goods entering the Dominion has so far met with no corresponding action on the part of His Majesty's Government, is negotiating with the French Republic for the establishment of a subsidised steamship service between Canadian and French ports.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): I have no official information to the effect stated, but a direct line of steamers, subsidised by the Canadian Government at the rate of £10,000 per annum, ran between France and Canada during part of last year.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER: Has the right hon. Gentleman any information of negotiations between the Dominion of Canada and any other foreign Power?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No, Sir.

#### MALTA;THE LANGUAGE QUESTION.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is now in a position to lay before the House a copy of the correspondence relating to the Maltese language question; and whether, if he is unable to do so before Whitsuntide, he will undertake to present it before the Vote on the Colonial Estimates is taken.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Since I stated that I hoped to be able to lay the correspondence before Whitsuntide I have received further despatches, and it

would be undesirable and contrary to precedent to present portions only of a correspondence still proceeding. Under the circumstances I fear that the presentation of the correspondence must be deferred. I will lay the Papers as soon as possible, but I cannot at present name any particular date.

#### FINANCE;INTEREST ON DEFICIENCY BORROWINGS.

\*MR. MCCRAE (Edinburgh, E.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can state if any portion of the interest charged for deficiency borrowings in the years ended 31st March, 1900 and 1901, is included in the interest for war expenditure in South Africa; and, if so, whether he can state the amounts so charged for the financial years 1900 and 1901 respectively.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): No portion of the interest charged for deficiency borrowings for the period mentioned in the question is included in the interest for war expenditure in South Africa. It would be impossible to say how much of such borrowing was due to war expenditure and how much to ordinary expenditure. The amounts paid for interest on deficiency advances were:;1899&#x2013;1900, £;23,553 3s. 8d.; 1900&#x2013;1901, £;20,082 3s. 7d.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Can the right hon. Gentleman say on what account these sums were charged?

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: They come in the interest that appears in the accounts of the year.

#### COAL TAX.

SIR JAMES JOICEY (Durham, Chester-le-Street): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his attention has been called to a resolution, passed unanimously by the Mining Association of Great Britain, to the effect that to meet the requirements of the Government this year, and to give time for full inquiry, the money to be produced by the tax should be raised this year by a tax on the whole output of the Kingdom for last year, and that an impartial tribunal be appointed by Parliament invested with the fullest powers to consider and report on the advisability of the proposed tax on export coal, its incidence and its probable effects upon the coal trade, the workmen employed therein, and the country generally; and whether, if such a proposal is submitted to him, he will be disposed to consider it favourably.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER: Before the right hon. Gentleman answers the question, may I ask whether it has been brought to his knowledge that the resolution referred to was submitted to the various branch mining associations, and that some of them dissented from it?

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I do not think that the facts are quite accurately represented in the question. I understand that the Council of the Mining Association have made a suggestion of this kind, the precise nature of which I do not quite understand, to their local associations, with the view of considering the answers that may be received; but I have seen it stated that one at any rate of these local associations is opposed to it. The hon. Baronet's question is therefore too hypothetical for it to be possible for me to reply to it, except by saying generally that any proposals that might be made by the

Mining Association on behalf of the whole trade would be respectfully considered by His Majesty's Government.

S.S. "RUNIC";CASE OF SEAMAN DEAN.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade is he aware that a seaman named Dean was so badly wounded by a revolver shot, fired by the fourth officer of the steamship "Runic" on her last voyage between Australia and Cape Town, that he had to be put in hospital at Cape Town when the ship arrived at that port; and what steps, if any, he has taken to have this case investigated; and if it is the intention of the Board of Trade to prosecute, will he secure the attendance of the seamen who witnessed the shooting and are now in Liverpool, but will no doubt be at sea again if not summoned in time.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): I am in communication with the owners of the "Runic," and have seen extracts from the official log with regard to the occurrence to which the hon. Member refers. I understand that the vessel is expected to arrive at Liverpool to-day, when further inquiry shall be made, and the matter, if necessary, placed in the hands of the police.

REGULATION OF USE OF FIREARMS.

MR. M'DERMOTT (Kilkenny, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been called to the circumstances attending the recent death of William

Wynberg Dodd, at Hammersmith, caused by a shot from a revolver, the property of a private in the Medical Staff Corps, who recently returned from South Africa; and whether he will take any steps to carry out the recommendation of the coroner's jury as to the sale, care, and use of firearms, so as to prevent accidents resulting from returned soldiers and other persons unacquainted with the use of firearms having them in their possession.

\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): To carry out the recommendation referred to would, even if it were practicable, require legislation, and, as my right hon. friend has said several times already this session, it is not possible to promise that.

CANADIAN LIVE CATTLE TRADE.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he will lay upon the Table of the House a memorandum from the Department of Agriculture in Canada protesting against the continuance of the embargo on the admission of Canadian live cattle into this country; and whether, since that embargo was imposed, there has been one case of pleuro-pneumonia in the 800,000 Canadian cattle landed at British ports.

The following Question (36) also stood on the Paper;

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR (Forfarshire): To ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether His Majesty's Government and the Board of Agriculture have received and considered the memorandum recently announced as despatched by, and containing the protest of, the Government of the Dominion of Canada against the continued exclusion from British ports of Canadian live cattle; if so, whether he can now state the substance of the reply or indicate the policy of His Majesty's

Government; and whether papers will be laid upon the Table.

\*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): Perhaps I may answer this and Question 36 at the same time. No such memorandum has as yet been received. There were various cases of pleuro-pneumonia between the imposition of the embargo in 1893 and the legislation of 1896. Since that time no cases have been discovered, but, of course, there has not been the same necessity to make the same close examination of the lungs of slaughtered animals.

#### ARBITRATIONS UNDER THE AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS ACT

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture if he will state in how many cases have the Board of Agriculture been asked to exercise, and have exercised, their powers of appointing an arbitrator or umpire to settle disputes between landlord and tenant under the provisions of the Second Schedule of the Agricultural Holdings Act, 1900.

\*MR. HANBURY: Ten applications have been made to us to appoint arbitrators or umpires under the provisions of the Second Schedule to the Agricultural Holdings Act, 1900. Two of these applications were subsequently withdrawn. Appointments have been made in three cases.

#### ICE CREAMS IN LONDON;PTOMAIN POISONING.

MR. THOMAS DEWAR (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that at an inquest held at Hackney on the 2nd May on a boy who died from ptomaine poisoning, the coroner remarked that the ice cream purchased at street barrows had caused several deaths in London, and that the symptoms had been the same in this case; and in view of the large sale of such articles in East London, will he say whether the inspectors take any steps to secure the occasional analysis of eatables of this description when hawked in the streets.

\*THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): I have seen a newspaper report of the inquest referred to. The London County Council, some time since, caused special inquiry to be made into the conditions under which ice-creams are prepared and sold, and analyses of samples of this article have from time to time been made by the sanitary authorities in London. I am not, however, able to state whether recent action has been taken on the subject.

#### BILLINGHAY INFANT SCHOOL, LINCOLNSHIRE;EXCESSIVE CANING.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER (Cheshire, Northwich): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether it has been reported to him that in the punishment book of the Billingham Board Infant School, Lincolnshire, 378 cases of corporal punishment were recorded as having occurred between 12th November, 1900, and 12th February, 1901, making, on an average attendance of seventy-eight, ten cases per cent. daily; and, if so, whether he has taken, or intends to take, any action in the matter.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): My attention was called by the officers of the Board of Education to the excessive caning in this infants' school. The punishment book was sent for; but it proved that a new book had been commenced on February 13th, and that on the old book (which had been taken away by the inspector) being returned it

had been destroyed. The new book disclosed the punishment of caning to have been inflicted for very trivial offences in eighteen cases during the fortnight which the new record covered. The managers have been warned that the grant will be withdrawn if such a state of things is not remedied.

BOARD OF EDUCATION;WOMEN SUB-INSPECTORS.

MR. YOXALL: I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education, seeing that the women sub-inspectors employed by the Board of Education have recently all been promoted to be junior inspectors, with advancement in status, pay, and rate of allowances, whether the same promotion is to be extended to the men sub-inspectors, and if not, can he explain why similar treatment is not given to them; whether appointments to the junior inspectorate

are to be limited, wholly or partly, to persons who have graduated, or have passed examinations equal to graduation at the universities of Oxford or Cambridge; and will he lay upon the Table the regulations to be in force for appointments to the inspectorate of schools.

SIR J. GORST: The women sub-inspectors have never been regarded by the Board of Education as belonging to the same category as the men sub-inspectors. The latter are eligible for promotion to inspectorships. It is not intended to restrict the choice of junior inspectors to any particular class. The responsibility of the Lord President for making these appointments cannot be limited by regulations previously laid on the Table of the House.

EDUCATION CODE, 1901;COOKERY AND COTTAGE GARDENING.

MR. MORRELL (Oxfordshire, Woodstock): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether, having regard to the requirements of parents of children in rural schools, the prevalence of mixed schools in rural districts, and the early withdrawal of children from the day school, he will give reconsideration to the N.B. at the end of Article 101, Code 1901, under which no attendance at a class for cookery or cottage gardening made by scholars under twelve years of age after March 31, 1902, will be taken into account for the purposes of any grant under Article 101, g. k.; and allow a grant for scholars of eleven and over, instead of twelve and over; and for boys and girls alike, both in cookery and cottage gardening, and a grant for boys of eleven and over for manual instruction, instead of twelve and over, as in Schedule 9.

I beg also to ask whether the Board of Education will consider a grant for cottage gardening for scholars of eleven and over in cases where the circumstances of the school in the opinion of the inspector make it desirable that horticulture, under Article 15 (b) ii., should be taken up.

SIR J. GORST: With regard to the supplemental question, I will carefully consider that point. In reply to the question on the Paper, I beg to say that it is not intended to raise the age for grants in cookery, etc., till the Code of 1902. Meanwhile careful consideration will be given to all representations made to the Board of Education. The suggestion is made entirely on educational grounds and in the interest of the children. There is no intention of lowering the age for grants in manual instruction.

## PENSIONS IN THE POST OFFICE.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether there is any, and, if so, what, regulation in regard to pensions held by officials of the Post Office; and, seeing that the postmaster of Bristol has a pension of £;460, the postmaster of Hastings a pension of £;460, the postmaster of Manchester a pension, the nautical assistant in the office of the Secretary of the Post Office a pension of £;185 10s., and the officer in charge of eastern mails of India and Australia a pension of £;69, whether any deduction is made in consequence in their salaries; if so, will he state the amount.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): There are two regulations bearing on the point raised:;(1) Act 4 and 5 William IV., Cap. 24, Section 20, under which the salary and pension of a civil servant when re-employed must not exceed the amount of his former pay. The deductions under this Act are made from the pensions, not from the salaries of the officers affected. Thus, the postmaster of Bristol suffers a deduction of £;200 from his full pension of £;600, and the postmaster of Hastings a deduction of £;40 from his full pension of £;500. No deduction is at present necessary in the case of the assistant surveyor whose emoluments do not as yet exceed his former pay. (2) The second authority is found in the rules applicable to naval or military pensioners holding a civil employment of profit, drawn up by the Treasury under Section 6 of the Superannuation Act of 1887. Under these rules, the nautical assistant in the Secretary's office, and the officer in charge of eastern mails suffer, an abatement of 10 per cent. from their civil emoluments.

## POSTMEN'S WALKS IN NOTTINGHAM.

MR. YOXALL: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he can arrange for the vacancies on postmen's walks at Nottingham to be exhibited on the notice board in the letter carriers' room, with a view to the senior men having the first choice, as the practice has been for years at centres such as London, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Bristol, Brighton, Liverpool, Sheffield, Birmingham, Hull, Dublin, and Belfast; whether in the public interest, he can abolish the practice of appointing men by rotation on different walks in diverse parts of the town, and thus avoid the confusion experienced under existing arrangements; and whether he can arrange the duties in such a manner that the Tweedmouth recommendation of nine hours rest at home out of the twenty-four may be carried into effect.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The practice of advertising such vacancies on a notice board does not exist at most of the towns mentioned, nor is it necessary in order to secure that the senior men should have the first choice in regard to any vacant walk. At present it is a matter of local arrangement in each case, and it is proposed to allow it to remain so. The system of employing men partly on outer walks and partly on inner walks was adopted at Nottingham to prevent any postman being obliged to walk an excessive distance. No confusion is caused by it, and it is proposed to continue it. The duties are arranged as far as possible with the view of allowing each man nine hours rest per diem, and in the

few cases in which it has not yet been possible to secure this end, measures are being taken to secure it.

#### PUNISHMENT FOR TELEGRAPHISTS' ERRORS.

MR. SCHWANN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether his attention has been directed to an order issued to the telegraph staff, stating that errors in certain words will be punished by the receiving telegraphist performing extra duty without pay; whether any steps are to be taken with a view to discover whether it may be the forwarding operator who is at fault; whether the Postmaster General, with a view to secure efficient working of the telegraphs, will direct that in future no learners, paid or unpaid, shall be employed in the transmission of the public work, the more so that by the new order referred to loss might be caused to the efficient staff; and whether it has been duly considered whether the infliction of extra duty without pay is equivalent to a fine, and may be illegal, unless consented to by the staff on entering the Post Office service, or entering on the duties of a telegraphist.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General presumes that the order to which the hon. Member refers is one recently issued by the Controller of the Central Telegraph Office respecting certain errors which have been of frequent occurrence. Due enquiry is; always made in such cases with a view to fixing the responsibility for the errors upon the proper officer. The rule of the telegraph department is that no learner is to be employed in the transmission of public telegrams unless capable of passing a satisfactory test. The answer to the latter part of the hon. Member's question is in the affirmative. The Postmaster General sees no reason for varying the practice referred to.

#### CENSUS;POPULATION OF SCOTLAND.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate for Scotland whether he is in a position to state the population of Scotland at the recent Census.

\*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): I am informed by the Registrar General for Scotland that approximately, and subject to corrections after the Census returns have been thoroughly examined, the population of Scotland at the Census day may be given as 4,471,957.

#### CENSUS;SCOTTISH ENUMERATORS' PAY.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether he is aware that Census enumerators in Scotland are complaining of not having received payment of the money due to them for Census work, and whether he can state when payment is likely to be made.

\*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The Census accounts for all Scotland are necessarily voluminous, and their examination and audit is obviously a work of very serious dimensions. I am, however, informed by the Registrar General that the accounts to the amount of one-third for all Scotland have been examined and settled, and that every effort will be made to complete the settlement as soon as possible consistently with the requirements of a proper examination.

#### REFRESHMENT ARRANGEMENTS FOR LATE SITTINGS.

MR. MALCOLM (Suffolk, Stowmarket): I beg to ask the hon. and gallant Member for



the Epping Division, as Chairman of the Kitchen Committee, whether he will undertake to see that, on such evenings as the 12 o'clock rule is suspended, arrangements are made by which Members desiring supper in the House shall be able to obtain it.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping): As a rule supper is only provided when a late sitting of the House is expected, but if hon. Members will communicate with the manager on any evening when the 12 o'clock rule is suspended, by 11 p.m., every endeavour will be made to meet their convenience.

BUSHEY PARK; REFRESHMENT KIOSK.

MR. THOMAS DEWAR: I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works, having regard to the fact that during the summer months a number of persons, chiefly from London, visit Hampton Court Palace, will he consider the advisability of erecting in that part of Bushey Park adjacent to the gardens a small refreshment kiosk similar to that in Kew Gardens.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent St. Augustine's): I will gladly consider the suggestion of my hon. friend; but must point out to him that there are this year no available funds for such a purpose.

RENTS ON THE WARDEN ESTATE, CO. KERRY.

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the rent of Patrick Sullivan, residing at Derryleigh, on the Warden estate, Sneem, county Kerry, was fixed by the sub-commission in 1882 at £21 15s., the previous rent having been £23; that in 1898 the second term rent was fixed by the sub-commission at £19 14s.; and that recently the valuers, acting for the head commission, have raised the rent to £22 15s., an increase of £1 over the rent originally fixed in 1882; is he aware that one of the valuers was one of the sub-commissioners in 1882, and has now, after a lapse of nineteen years, in spite of the fall in agricultural prices and the rise in the price of labour, appraised the rent at £1 in excess of his previous valuation; and will he say whether he proposes to take steps in this case.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): An appeal is pending in the case referred to, and this being so, I am precluded from making any statement on it.

AGRICULTURAL INSTRUCTION IN MUNSTER; MALLOWS CONFERENCE.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been called to the proceedings at a conference in MalloWS on the 14th inst. between the representatives of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction and delegates from the county councils of Munster and from the Munster Dairy School, in reference to the provision for agricultural instruction in Munster; is he aware that a resolution was passed at the conference to the effect that there should be no unnecessary delay in giving effect to the provisions of the Act of 1899, Section 16, Sub-section (1), which has allocated a capital sum of £10,000 to extend the Munster Dairy School and Agricultural Institute; and whether, in view of the result of this conference, and

of the fact that the Cork County Council has voted a sum of £1,000 a year

towards the upkeep of the institute, immediate steps will be taken by the Department to give effect to the above-mentioned provisions of the Act of 1899.  
MR. WYNDHAM: No unnecessary delay will take place in giving effect to the conclusions arrived at.

#### LAND PURCHASE IN COUNTY LONGFORD.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland how many cases of land purchase are now pending from county Longford; can he give the number of estates sold, and the number of tenants who have become peasant proprietors; and whether he can state if any applications are pending for the application of the 40th Section of the Act of 1896 for the purpose of completing sales in that county.

MR. WYNDHAM: 2,718 applications for loans under the various Land Purchase Acts were received from the county Longford to the end of last month. Loans have been sanctioned in 2,227 cases; 89 cases are pending; and 402 applications were refused. No request has been received in the Land Commission under the 40th Section of the Act of 1896.

#### GRANARD UNION-TRAINED NURSE

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland will he explain on what grounds the Local Government Board have required the medical officer of Granard Union to employ a trained nurse at £;1 11s. 6d. a week to nurse a baby whom he found in charge of a pauper inmate; is he aware that the nurse in question refused to live in the workhouse and took a room in the principal hotel in Granard; and can he state when such orders of the Local Government Board will be withdrawn.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Local Government Board did not require the medical officer to employ a nurse at the remuneration stated. The master was directed by the medical officer to procure a nurse for a sick child whom he found in charge of a pauper inmate. There is no apartment available for the nurse in the workhouse, and she has obtained temporary accommodation in a hotel outside. I am making further inquiry in the matter.

#### GRANARD UNION; LABOURERS' COTTAGES.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, in October, 1899, the Granard Rural District Council adopted a scheme under the Labourers (Ireland) Acts to provide for the erection of 150 houses for labourers in Granard Union, but that only fifty of these have been passed; and will he, as in the case of the Longford Rural District Council, be prepared to direct the Local Government Board to receive further representations, without cost to the ratepayers, with a view to including in the new order about fifty additional houses, provided the Granard Rural District Council can satisfy them that these houses are absolutely necessary.

MR. WYNDHAM: The scheme proposed 113 cottages and forty-one allotments; thirty-eight cottages and twenty-six allotments were approved. Forty-four representations were informal, and although this was explained to the council no steps were taken to amend the representations. Under the circumstances a new scheme is necessary, and a fresh inquiry essential.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: But the hon. hon. Gentleman has already promised that the Local Government Board will consider such cases as these.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have said a new scheme is necessary.

LONGFORD RURAL DISTRICT COUNCIL; LABOURERS' COTTAGES.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in October, 1899, the Longford Rural District Council adopted representations for the building of over 100 new labourers' cottages and providing seventy-six labourers with additional half-acre plots; that, after the lapse of a year, an inquiry was held by Captain Connellan, Local Government Board inspector, whose report has only just now been issued; and that of this large number of houses and plots applied for barely one third has been granted; will he state whose fault it is that such is the case; and whether the Local Government Board are prepared to consider, without additional cost to the ratepayers or incurring further legal costs, the advisability of issuing a supplementary order for the erection of thirty-five additional houses and the granting of thirty additional half-acre plots on the evidence already before it.

MR. WYNDHAM: The scheme of the district council was not received by the Local Government Board until the 24th September last. The inquiry was held on the 13th December. The grounds upon which the inspector reported against a number of the applications have been communicated in detail to the district council. If the council considers it can establish a case for the thirty-five additional houses and thirty additional half-acres it can make a new scheme for the purpose. The cost would be inconsiderable. Any other Course would delay the issue of the existing Provisional Order.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the cost in all these cases is very considerable? Seeing that he has promised;

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The hon. Member cannot argue the question.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I will put down another.

LAND (IRELAND) ACT, 1896, SECTION 40.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he intends during this session, and, if so, how soon, to introduce legislation dealing with the estates in Ireland which come under the scope of the 40th Section of the Land Act of 1896; whether he will take steps to provide that the uncontrolled action of mortgagees and incumbrancers on these estates should not render almost useless the beneficial tendency of the 40th Section; and whether the block in the court will be removed so as to afford relief to both landlord and tenant.

MR. WYNDHAM: I cannot anticipate by way of question and answer statements which are proper to a motion for leave to introduce a Bill.

IRISH INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, considering the fact that the effect of the circular of the Lord Lieutenant of October, 1898, has been to reduce committals to Irish industrial schools by 28 per cent., the Government will consider the

advisability of compensating the owners or managers of those schools for the loss to vested interests entailed, particularly as those schools are mainly in the hands of religious communities and worked for charitable purposes.

MR. WYNDHAM: No, Sir.

#### KNOCALLASSA GRAZING FARM DISTURBANCE.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that two young men named Leonard were, while returning from divine service at Riverstown, county Sligo, on Sunday, the 3rd February last, assaulted by the caretaker of Knocallassa grazing farm, a man named M'Guinness, and his two sons; that Joseph Leonard, who witnessed the scene at a distance, succeeded in making peace, all parties going to their respective homes, but that afterwards M'Guinness followed these young men and renewed the attack, one of them firing a shot from a gun at Joseph Leonard when six yards distant, the pellets tearing his clothes, and that he was only prevented from firing again by the gun being taken from him and broken; and whether this M'Guinness holds a gun licence, and whether the police have arrested or prosecuted M'Guinness for this conduct; if not, will they be instructed to do so.

MR. WYNDHAM: Roger M'Guinness, who is alleged to have discharged the gun at Leonard, is not licensed under the Peace Preservation Act. He was arrested by the police, and has been returned for trial at the assizes on the charge of firing at the person. There are other proceedings arising out of the occurrence awaiting magisterial investigation, and in the circumstances I cannot make any further statement in the matter.

#### LAND JUDGE'S COURT; SALARIES OF RECEIVERS.

MR. FFRENCH (Wexford, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the salaries of the receivers, the officers in the Land Judge's Court, and the solicitors on each estate are paid out of the estates in the Land Judge's Court, and seeing that such a system of payment delays or prevents sales, only slow progress being made in the sale of such estates, the Government will endeavour to devise some other method of payment.

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes, Sir, but the change suggested would involve an addition to charges on public funds, which are already very heavy in respect of land purchase. I am assured that the present method of remuneration does not entail delay. I cannot discuss previous or future legislation.

#### BOYLE TOWN COMMISSIONERS' BYE LAWS.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether any record exists at Dublin Castle or in the offices of the Local Government Board as to bye-laws having been adopted at any time by the Boyle Town Commissioners under the Towns Improvement (Ireland) Act, 1854, or any of the Acts incorporated therewith; and whether he can state if the Boyle Town Commissioners can make regulations as to fairs and markets under Sub-section 2, Section 21 of the Public Health (Ireland) Act, 1896.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): At the request of my right hon. friend I will reply to this question. There are no records

either at Dublin

Castle or in the Department of the Local Government Board of the adoption of the bye-laws mentioned in the first paragraph. With reference to the second paragraph, it contains an abstract question of law depending on the construction of several statutes in no way affecting the Executive Government, and I must respectfully decline to answer it.

CENSUS;POPULATION OF IRELAND.

MR. JOHN ELLIS: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is in a position to state the total population of Ireland at the recent census.

MR. WYNDHAM: The population was 4,456,546. These figures show, I regret to say, a decrease of 5&#x00B7;3 per cent. as compared with the population in 1891. But the decrease for the previous decade was 9&#x00B7;08 per cent., and the number of emigrants for the last decade was 50 per cent. lower than the number in the preceding decade.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): Do you propose to alter the policy in Ireland which has caused this decrease of population?

MR. WYNDHAM: We are making every effort in that direction.

INNS QUAY, DUBLIN, POST OFFICE.

MR. NANNETTI: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he is aware of the inconvenience caused to solicitors and others by the closing of the post office at Inns Quay, Dublin, and that complaints have been made of the absence it any place to post letters along the quays except in the hall of the Four Courts, which is closed at an hour unsuitable to solicitors and other professional men, who require to post their letters later in the evening; whether his attention has been directed to a memorial signed by influential people and solicitors, on behalf of a lady who carries on a stationery business at Upper Ormond Quay, asking for the opening of a post office at her establishment; and whether the Postmaster General will grant the prayer of the memorial in view of the inconvenience caused by the closing of the post office referred to above.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: No complaints have been received of inconvenience caused by the closing of the Inn's Quay office, Dublin. A memorial such as that described was received, but the person therein recommended was not eligible for appointment, inasmuch as she did not reside on the premises in which she carried on business, and was merely a weekly tenant. Arrangements have now been made for an office to replace the Inn's Quay office, and a sub-postmistress has been appointed.

CORK POST OFFICE;EXCHANGE OF DUTIES.

MR. J. F. X. O'BRIEN (Cork): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether the same facilities for exchange of duties as are allowed in the sorting office, Cork, could be extended to the telegraph department; whether he is aware that exchanges were refused in the latter department recently, although no inconvenience would have been caused to the department thereby, and would have been of convenience to their staff; and will instructions to sanction and regulate such exchanges be now issued to the

Cork post office authorities, and to give reasons for any future case of refusal.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: All reasonable facilities for exchange of duties are allowed in the telegraph office as well as in the sorting office at Cork, but it is necessary that applications for exchange should be made in good time and on grounds that can be recognised. In two instances recently such applications have been refused, because in one case sufficient notice was not given and in the other no adequate grounds were stated by the applicant.

QUESTIONS IN PARLIAMENT.

MR. RANGLES (Cumberland, Cockermouth): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will consider the desirability of making arrangements for questions to be asked at the conclusion of public business or at eleven o'clock instead of before public business.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (MR. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester E.): I think the suggestion of my hon.

friend is an exceedingly ingenious one, and if, or perhaps I ought to say when, the subject of questions comes to be considered by the House in a practical shape this suggestion should have attention.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: May I suggest that it might be desirable to hold a special sitting of the House for questions, say, at half-past nine in the morning.

PRESERVATION OF LOCAL RECORDS.

\*MR. BULL (Hammersmith): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Government intend to take any steps to ensure the better preservation of local records in order to prevent the destruction and falsification of wills, parish registers, and other records, such as the recent Shipway case demonstrates can in their present custody be perpetrated; and, if no scheme has been decided upon, will the Government take steps in conjunction with local authorities to gradually establish suitable local records for counties or groups of counties in convenient centres, similar in their scope to the Register House at Edinburgh or the Record Office at Dublin; and can he state whether the Treasury Committee appointed in 1900 to consider the better preservation of local records has yet made any report thereon; if not, when will such report be made.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The investigations of this Committee are far advanced, but its final Report has been delayed owing to the lamented death of the late Bishop of London. Still, I understand that it is likely to be published before the end of the session.

CHINESE INDEMNITY.

MR. HARWOOD (Bolton): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the sum to be exacted from China by the Powers exceeds the expenses to which those Powers have been put, and whether the Government will do its best to secure such arrangements for the payment of that sum as will be least injurious to the trade between this country and China.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: In reply to this; question, I have to say that the sum to be asked by this country from China is based entirely upon the expenses actually incurred. I cannot give any detailed information as to the course taken by other Powers. As to the last part of the hon. Member's question, we have had the

consideration present to his mind very much before us in determining the policy we ought to pursue.

#### HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES IN LONDON.

\*MR. CHAPLIN (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if his attention has been called to the difficulties which arise, under Standing Order 22, in the making of tramways in London in order to facilitate the housing of the working classes; and, whether, having regard to the pledges which were given by the Government in relation to that subject during the last Parliament, immediately before its close, the Government propose at an early opportunity to take measures to give effect to those pledges.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am not aware of any specific pledge of the nature referred to, though of course there are strong arguments in favour of the course my right hon. friend wishes to see adopted. I ought to remind my right hon. friend that, even if we effected an alteration in the Standing Orders, that alteration would not complete the reform he desires to see carried out; legislation would be required in addition.

\*MR. CHAPLIN: Is my right hon. friend not aware, or has he forgotten, that on the Third Reading of the Housing of the Working Classes Bill, and with the sanction of my colleagues, I gave such a pledge on behalf of the Government myself?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have not that in my memory, and my attention has not been called to the fact.

#### COMMITTEE ON MUNICIPAL TRADING.

MR. KIMBER (Wandsworth): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is now able to say when he will propose the reappointment of the Committee on Municipal Trading, having regard to any useful purpose during the present session.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I should like to see the Committee reappointed, but I may point out that there are one or two Committees of an even less controversial nature which we have been prevented reappointing this session by the action of hon. Gentlemen who take objection after twelve o'clock.

#### BEER BILL.

\*MR. CHAPLIN: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if his attention has been directed to a memorial addressed to him, on the 23rd of April last, on behalf of a great number of members of both parties in the House of Commons, praying that facilities might be given to refer the Beer Bill to a Grand Committee, by the concession of an hour of the time at the disposal of the Government, and whether he will accede to that request.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: My attention has been called to the memorial of 23rd April. I do not think it is desirable at the moment to give any other answer than that already given to similar questions. The time of the session has not come when it is usual or convenient to make any definite statement on the subject.

#### GIBRALTAR WORKS; THE RECENT INQUIRY.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can now give the House any information as to the result of the recent inquiry into the naval works at Gibraltar.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am not in a position to do that, but I can assure the hon. Gentleman that due notice will be given of any alteration of policy on the part of the Government.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Can the right hon. Gentleman give any indication as to when the House will have information?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I imagine that it will not be a very long time, but I cannot give my hon. friend the day or the hour.

#### CHURCH DISCIPLINE BILL.

MR. CHARLES M'ARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, seeing that the House is to adjourn over 5th June, on which day the Church Discipline Bill is set down for Second Reading, he can state whether the Government intend to introduce any legislation for the suppression of illegal practices in the Church of England, or to afford any facilities for dealing with this matter during the present session.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is quite true the Bill to which my hon. friend refers is put down for the 5th June, but it does not stand first order; it is second to the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill, and my hon. friend has sufficient experience of the House of Commons to know that the second Order will not have the remotest chance of coming on upon that day. I do not think it is possible to provide the special facilities for a debate such as the hon. Member desires to see initiated.

MR. CHARLES M'ARTHUR: I shall call attention to the subject on the motion for adjournment for the Whitsuntide recess.

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): It would be convenient to hon. Members to know if the Government intend to take Supply after 12 o'clock.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, Sir, we do.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER: With regard to the arrangements for the debate on the Second Reading of the Finance Bill, can the right hon. Gentleman say whether facilities will be afforded for a general discussion, in addition to that on the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is my hope that the debate on the Second Reading of the Finance Bill will be ended on Tuesday; but, if not, Thursday is at the disposal of the House. I do not pledge myself, however, not to put down the motion for the holidays as the first Order on Thursday.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): Will it be competent for hon.

Members to enter upon a general discussion on the Amendment?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That question should not be addressed to me.

\*MR. SPEAKER: It appears to me that the Amendment of the right hon. Member for East Wolverhampton is one that covers the whole ground.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: If it should be the case that the Amendment will allow a discussion on all points connected with the Finance Bill, will the right hon. Gentleman undertake not to close the debate before Thursday?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It does not rest with me whether the debate is closed or not. Personally, I should hope it will finish at seven p.m. to-morrow. That will be for the general convenience of Members; but if the House insists on going on,



Thursday is at its disposal.

NEW BILL.

PURCHASE OF LAND (IRELAND).

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): I beg leave to move to introduce a Bill to amend Sub-section 1 of Section 9 of the Purchase of Land (Ireland) Act, 1891, and Sub-section 2 of Section 43 of the Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1896. I can explain what the Bill is in very few words. It is almost of greater importance to explain what the Bill is not. The Bill is not the measure mentioned in the gracious Speech from the Throne. The general object of that measure I have already indicated to the House. It is to extend the facilities for, and consequently to increase the pace of, voluntary purchase in Ireland. This Bill is not a substitute for such a measure. Still less is it a dilatory proposal brought in to justify any delay in bringing forward the measure referred to in the Speech from the Throne, at the first opportunity available in view of other demands on the time of the House. On the contrary, this Bill is necessary in order to prevent the cessation of land purchase in Ireland under the existing system; and a for

tiori, I argue that it is necessary, as a preliminary to any change in the law which may be brought in hereafter, to accelerate the existing system of voluntary land purchase. The Bill is to amend Sub-section 1 of Section 9 of the Land Purchase (Ireland) Act of 1891, which provides that any advances for the purchase of holdings in any county shall not exceed twenty-five times the share of the county guarantee fund. In Wexford loans have been issued to the amount of £;737,000. The credit of Wexford, calculated in accordance with the provisions of Section 9 of the Act of 1891, was estimated to be £;742,000. That being so, the advances to the county of Wexford had to be suspended until the credit of Wexford had been recalculated. This has now been done, and it is found that the sums paid by instalments did increase the credit of Wexford beyond the estimate of 1891, but did not increase it so far as to effect any substantial diminution in the present or prospective excess of the loans applied for over the credit of the county. Therefore I am asking for leave to bring in a Bill which will give a discretionary power, under which the advances to any one county can be increased when two conditions are fulfilled; first, that the Lord Lieutenant shall recommend such an extension, and, second, that the Treasury is of opinion that further advances can be made without risk of loss to the Treasury. Another object is provided for. By a parity of reasoning it is proposed to give a like discretion to the Lord Lieutenant and the Treasury in respect to advances to the Congested Districts Board made under Section 43 of the Land Act of 1896. Under that section advances may be made to the Board for the purchase of land and holdings from landlords, and also the Board is empowered to resettle and resell. This provision is all but indispensable for the working of voluntary purchase by the Congested Districts Board, and since it might be imperilled in other counties by the same causes as in Wexford, the remedy is provided for in this Bill which I am now asking leave to introduce.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I recognise that this Bill is an absolutely necessary proposal to prevent the whole machinery of land purchase in Ireland

coming to a standstill. The right hon. Gentleman made an extraordinarily interesting explanation to an expectant House that this Bill is not the Bill promised in the Speech from the Throne. That is very well so far as it goes. We are glad to know that the Bill mentioned in the Speech from the Throne is something more serious and substantial than this; but I cannot help regarding the introduction of this Bill as a clear indication that the Bill mentioned in the Speech from the Throne is about to share the fate of so many other Bills, and will be included in the massacre of the innocents. None of us from these benches ever believed that there was any serious intention from the first of proceeding with the Bill mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. We regarded from the first that announcement as a piece of political humbug, which was forced from the Government by the activity of the movement in Ireland generally, and in Ulster in particular, in favour of compulsory land purchase. I have no doubt this Bill is absolutely necessary, and we do not intend to oppose it; but it is a clear indication that we were right in our opinion, and that the Irish people will look in vain for the fulfilment of the illusory promises of the Government.

Bill to amend Sub-section 1 of Section 9 of the Purchase of Land (Ireland) Act, 1891, and Sub-section 2 of Section 43 of the Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1896, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Wyndham and Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.  
PURCHASE OF LAND (IRELAND) BILL.

"To amend Sub-section 1 of Section 9 of the Purchase of Land (Ireland) Act, 1891, and Sub-section 2 of Section 43 of the Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1896," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday, 6th June, and to be printed. [Bill 196.]

FINANCE BILL.

Order for the Second Reading read.

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

\*SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): The Budget embodied in the Finance Bill which we are now asked to read a second time has been described as a momentous Budget and as a disastrous Budget. I will not quarrel with either of those descriptions; but I regard the Budget as more the result of the financial policy which has been pursued by the present Administration since 1896. I think it is the harvest of what they have been sowing, and we ought not to be surprised at the point which has now been reached. I say the policy of the present Administration, and I wish to emphasise that. I do not myself accept, to the complete extent to which modern usage apparently has developed it, the supreme and departmental authority of Ministers in the various departments. I think we ought to uphold, especially in finance, as well as in other matters, the solidarity of the Cabinet, and that we ought not to individualise the Chancellor of the Exchequer as if these were, so to speak, his personal and private proposals, and as if he alone was to be subjected to criticism, or was to have the credit or discredit of the acceptance or rejection of the proposals by the House. I regard this as a Cabinet proposal, and as such I intend to discuss it, although I can assure the right hon. Gentleman that I have no desire in any way to undervalue his position or authority in this question, or to undervalue the

position and authority of the Treasury.

I have to complain, as I have had to complain on previous occasions, of the confused and inaccurate manner in which the national accounts are presented to the House; a manner which necessarily confuses debate, gets the House and the country into the habit of using wrong figures, and, I may say, involves the Chancellor of the Exchequer himself in that unfortunate proceeding. I have said so much on that subject before that I should not repeat it if it were not for what happened in connection with the Budget this year on the day after the finance accounts for the year were published. The Times on the day after the close of the last financial year commenced a leading article with a censure of the Chancellor of the Exchequer for the inaccuracy of his Estimates. They said that Sir Michael Hicks Beach had underestimated to an extent which was probably without parallel in English finance; by something like twelve and a half millions; the receipts for the year. They said that he estimated a total revenue of £127,520,000, while the actual receipts were £140,018,000. Of course, there were experts who in the evening papers ventured to point out to The Times that they were wrong; and the next morning The Times commenced their article as follows;

"We are sorry to say that the revenue returns, on which we commented yesterday, were not as satisfactory as we assumed them to be. We have to apologise to the Chancellor of the Exchequer for charging him with an excessive under-estimate of the yield of taxation. Out of the total yield of taxation in 1900&#x2013;1901, amounting to over 140 millions sterling, upwards of £9,600,000 was paid over out of the proceeds of the estate duties, Excise, and Customs to the local taxation account. This latter sum does not enter, therefore, into the calculations of the national Budget, and the real excess over the estimate of Sir Michael Hicks Beach on last year's revenue is something over £2,800,000. In this and in other respects the form of the public accounts has been complicated of late years by the policy of grants-in-aid of the ratepayers out of the general taxation of the country."

I quite agree that much has been complicated by that unfortunate policy, but what I complain of now is the continuance by the Treasury of this misleading statement of accounts. The country is allowed to believe it is paying less taxation than it really is paying. Now this last year, as has been pointed out, the estimate of revenue was twelve millions less than what it really amounted to. Not only was the estimate inaccurate, but we are confused with the receipts of certain sources of taxation which the House, and naturally the country, wish to watch. The Chancellor of the Exchequer told us in his Budget speech that Customs and Excise produced £59,000,000; they produced £65,000,000. He told us that the death duties produced £13,000,000; they produced £17,000,000. These are taxes imposed by this House, imposed by the Imperial authority, collected by the Imperial authority, paid by the taxpayers as one sum. When a spirit distiller pays his tax in respect of spirits, he does not draw two cheques, but one cheque, which covers the whole of his duty. And so also in reference to the payment of the death duties. I complain that the Chancellor of the Exchequer or the Treasury should persist in this misleading practice. These

sums form part of the national revenue; payments to local taxation is the euphemism by which they are called, which means subventions to local taxation. All that is wanted to put our accounts right is to state what is the true receipt from the Customs, from the estate duties, and from the Excise, and to add to the payments a separate item, stating the payment to local taxation account.

For the sake of the criticism which I shall make upon the financial proposals of the year I shall disregard the inaccurate statement of receipts and payments, this pretended make-believe that taxation is really less than it is. The history of the question, as the House knows, is connected with the Local Government Act, 1888, and the death duties of 1894. There was a sort of make-believe that the gentlemen on whom the succession duty was being increased were going to be repaid. Again in 1894 the death duties were going somehow or other to be repaid by grants to local taxation. So far as that is concerned, the Chancellor of the Exchequer will pardon me if in going through these figures I make the necessary addition to his receipts. There is another point of inaccuracy in these figures.

The country not only levies taxation and pays away taxation, but raises also a large sum of money called non-tax revenue. That really means in the main the proceeds of the Post Office. The Post Office, of course, has to be carried on at considerable-cost. In 1896 the total receipts of the Post Office were fourteen millions and a quarter, and it took ten millions and a half to earn that, so that the real receipts were only three millions and three-quarters. I have observed in a criticism of the Chancellor of the Exchequer's proposals that he is described as increasing the Estimates by something like three or four millions, which really is an increase upon the ordinary expenses of the Post Office. The Post Office is earning more than in 1896, and it costs more to earn it. The receipts that were fourteen millions have gone up to over seventeen millions, and the expenditure has increased to

13½ millions. A Return, with which I have the honour of my name being associated, was prepared at the Treasury some fourteen or fifteen years ago, and has received the stamp of approval of the subsequent Chancellors of the Exchequer. It is that Return which enables the country really to know what is paid in taxation and what is expended in taxation. It will be hopeless for me to attempt to deal with these figures now, because that Return was only carried to 1900, and we are now dealing with 1902, and I must therefore deal with gross figures.

Subject to these two remarks, I propose to take three epochs in our national finance. The House can hardly appreciate the change that has taken place during the last few years by taking the matter year by year. They must take distinctive epochs and contrast the position now with the position then. I propose to take first the year ended 31st March, 1893, for the finance of which Lord Salisbury's Administration, though it retired in 1892, was responsible; secondly, the year ended 31st March, 1896, when Lord Rosebery's Administration retired from office; and, thirdly, the year ended 31st March, 1900, before any war expenditure began. I want to draw the attention of the House to what I may call the normal or peace expenditure of the country. Taking those three epochs, I

will give the House the figures as nearly accurate as I can. I take first the income. In 1893, when Mr. Goschen left office, the Imperial income; and I include in this the sum for local taxation purposes; was 97½ millions. In 1896 it was 109½ millions. In 1900 it was 130 millions. Therefore the House will see the enormous sum by which our expenditure has been increased; from 97½ millions to 130 millions. But now let us come to the more important question of the expenditure of these three epochs. The expenditure of 1893 was practically the same as the revenue; 97½ millions; although there was a surplus of £20,000 at the end of the year.

\*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): Is the right hon. Gentleman going

to include in his comparison of expenditure the money paid to the local taxation account, just as he includes the receipts for that purpose in revenue?

\*SIR HENRY FOWLER: Certainly.

\*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: Then I think he ought to state it.

\*SIR HENRY FOWLER: I am doing so, but I am only just approaching the expenditure. In 1896 the House will remember that the income was increased by the death duties coming into operation. In that year the expenditure was increased towards the end of the year by including a good many items which my right hon. friend the Member for West Monmouth would, if he were here, probably say ought to be added to the surplus. The expenditure amounted in that year to 105 millions. Therefore the right hon. Gentleman took office in 1896 with an expenditure of 105 millions and an income that gave him a surplus of four and a quarter millions. Now I come down to 1900. The expenditure in 1900; including not a single item connected with the war; the peace expenditure in 1900 reached 120½ millions. I put the income at 130 millions, and so the right hon. Gentleman had a large surplus, which might be put at nearly ten millions, which he applied afterwards to war expenditure. The House will see that we have raised our peace expenditure during the present Administration before the war began by over 15 millions sterling. I ask, where have these increases arisen? What are the items? They can be given in a very few figures. The Army and Navy expenditure in 1896 was thirty-eight millions; in 1900 it had risen; the peace expenditure; to forty-six and a half millions, an increase of over eight millions and a quarter. The grants to local authorities were in 1896 £7,250,000. In 1900 they were £10,000,000. The education expenditure increased from £9,000,000 to £11,250,000, and the ordinary expenditure accounts for the rest of the difference. So that the House will put its finger very readily on two or three points.

The first question I would ask is, Is the policy of the Government on these items of increase defensible? Have they acted rightly? Are these increases necessary? So far as the Navy is concerned they had in 1900 increased the expenditure from £19,600,000 to £26,000,000. I have no hesitation in answering the question I put just now and saying "Yes," so far as the Navy is concerned. I believe that it is not only the sense of the House, but of the country that the Navy must at all risks and at all costs be kept up to that point which experts deem to be necessary in order that we may remain supreme mistress of the seas.

The Navy, I venture to think, is our first, our second, and our third line of defence. Do not let us confuse these issues with any imputation or suggestion that there is any desire to reverse the policy which was initiated by the noble Lord the Secretary of State for India, carried on under circumstances of great difficulty but with most courageous perseverance by Lord Spencer, and then completed by Mr. Goschen and his colleagues. I dissociate myself from any adverse criticism so far as the Navy expenditure is concerned. But when I come to the military expenditure a different question is raised. The amount we spend on our Navy is in a great extent our insurance against a very large military expenditure. We cannot, we ought not, and we do not rival the great military Powers of the Continent. Any attempt to rival them must fail. Our frontier is not the land. It is theirs and they require large armies to defend it. Our frontier is the sea, and we have to defend our Empire and to insure our commerce with our Navy. Therefore the conditions are not analogous. Up to 1900, before the sky was disturbed with signs of war, our military expenditure had increased to an alarming extent. Our military expenditure in 1896 was 18½ millions, in 1900 before the war it was 20½ millions. In 1901, exclusive of war expenditure, it was 24½ millions, and the estimate for 1902 is 30 millions. The naval and military estimates for the current year exclusive of all war expenditure have reached the enormous sum of 61 millions. The Secretary of State for War told us the other night that the country demanded an increase in our military expenditure. I do not deny that at the General Election the country was very much dissatisfied with the condition of the Army. I do not deny that the country made a loud demand for such reform. I do not think it was so much a reform of the Army as it was a reform of the War Office. The mandate was from both parties, and hon. Members of all shades of political opinion were nearly pledged to recognise the general feeling of dissatisfaction there was with reference to Army administration, and to do their best to effect a reform. But the crux of my argument is whether it was necessary, in order to effect necessary army reform, to incur an annual expenditure of upwards of 30 millions. The country was ready, and is ready, to pay a proper sum for its military necessities; but it believes, rightly or wrongly, that it does not get its money's worth. The country believes that there has been an atmosphere of extravagance in connection with military expenditure, and those who entertain this view are justified in taking this occasion to discuss the subject. With reference to this expenditure I should like to ask whether there has been any report presented from the Committee which sat on the reorganisation of the Army, and which, if common rumour is to be credited, presented its Report last week. I ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he has seen it?

\*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: No, Sir.

\*SIR HENRY FOWLER: I happen to know that the Report has been presented, and I think it ought to be in the possession of the House.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): It is the organisation of the War Office, and not the Army.

\*SIR HENRY FOWLER: Yes; but there is a question behind which perhaps the First Lord of the Treasury does not appreciate. That Report, I believe, put its finger

on the causes of the extravagant expenditure of the War Office, and points out where that expenditure might be, and could be, reduced; and I say it is an astounding thing that that Report is not in the hands of Members as it ought to be when we are discussing this increase in our expenditure. It touches the very essence of the controversy; namely, the bad, the extravagant administration which ought to be dealt with. I do not know whether the hon. Member for King's Lynn will give us an interesting piece of autobiography about the Gibraltar question; but there is another rumour; he has not said anything to me; I am only speaking as one of the ignorant, outside public; that there is a proposal that that Committee should rewrite its Report. And possibly proposals may have been made to the Army Committee to rewrite its Report. This is a Government of rewriting Reports and despatches.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: There is not a shadow of justification for saying that.

\*SIR HENRY FOWLER: I do not say anything about the Gibraltar Report; but I do say that the Report with reference to the Army or the War Office has been presented, and I think it is time that the House was put in possession of its recommendations. I come to the third item; the Education Vote; in which there has been a large increase. The Education Vote since 1896 has gone from £9,000,000 to what is rapidly approaching £12,000,000. I am one of those who hold that we cannot spend too much money on education; but we can spend the money foolishly and we can spend it wisely, and I say that here again we do not get our money's worth. A large sum of money is voted readily, enthusiastically, by the House for educational purposes, but there is no proper control over that expenditure. There is in reference to a great portion of it no public control and no public responsibility, and, without desiring in the slightest degree to impair the efficiency, the extent, or the quality of our education, I say there is room for economy in the administration of the public money for that purpose. In 1901 the gross expenditure (exclusive of the war) was 125½ millions; in 1892 it is estimated at upwards of 137 millions; and this does not include either war expenditure or interest on the war debt.

I come now to the point as to how the Chancellor of the Exchequer proposes to meet this extraordinary and increased expenditure. The right hon. Gentleman, in his Budget speech, said that the taxation which in 1896 yielded £102,000,000 would, if it had remained on the same basis, have produced £118,000,000 now. But with the expenditure which we have now reached that would not meet the case. The Chancellor of the Exchequer in his Budget speech the other night stated that, with the ordinary expenditure, the ordinary revenue for 1901-2 based upon the results of 1900-1 would show a surplus of £2,850,000. I join issue with him there because, in the first place, that was not ordinary income. The income of 1901 included a large amount for war taxation, the increase of income tax to 1s., and the additional taxation of last year.

Therefore the actual state of the case is this, that if he had deducted from the income of 1900-1 and his extra war taxation taken at, say, 12 millions, his income would have shown a very large deficit. Assume that there had been no war; assume that there had been an ordinary normal peace expenditure and income:

the Chancellor of the Exchequer would have had to have constructed his Budget this year on a peace basis for an enormous deficit and to impose new taxation to meet it.

\*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I said I should have had to impose some.

\*SIR HENRY FOWLER: I am glad to hear the Chancellor of the Exchequer admit that, because it will affect the future argument as to the amount of taxation which should be called war taxation. This taxation which is called war taxation is really peace taxation. The actual result, so far as I work it out, is that the estimated expenditure for 1902 is £197,602,000. From this has to be deducted the war expenditure of £58,200, showing the normal expenditure to be £139,400,000. The Chancellor of the Exchequer in his Budget has not provided solely for a war deficit; he has provided for a peace deficit, and we have to deal with his proposals on those lines. Supposing this war had not occurred, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer had had to come down to the House and say, "I want to propose a Budget in order to meet this additional peace expenditure." I think that the House of Commons would have been alarmed at the enormous increase of the Estimates which has gone on year after year, and having regard to the surplus which he had when he came into office, the increase in the death duties and other branches of revenue, that there should still be so large a deficit. In the absence of final figures I can only estimate that deficit. I am sure it is more than five; I think it is upwards of seven millions. I want to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer what he might have proposed under these circumstances. Let us consider the imaginary proposal that he might have made. Supposing he had said, "For this expenditure of £7,000,000 in excess of the present taxation of the country, I want to renew an expenditure which was a temporary expenditure, and for which Parliament has not as yet provided beyond the present year. There are two classes of ratepayers in this country who bitterly complain of the pressure of local rates. One class pays 6s. in the £, and the other class 2s. 2d. Well, I propose to relieve those who pay 2s. 2d., but not those who pay the 6s., and I propose to levy an additional tax for that purpose, and it will take pretty nearly £2,000,000." Under those circumstances what would the House have thought of the Chancellor of the Exchequer if he had come down and said, "I propose to raise this money in an entirely novel way. There is a class of people in this country who are very wealthy. They are the producers of coal, the colliery proprietors; they are unpopular at the present moment, because they have charged very high prices for coal. I think they are a very fair object for taxation. I think it would be a legitimate thing to tax their products for the benefit of the community." But assume he went a step further, and said, "I am going to sub-divide these into two classes. There are a great many wealthy coal proprietors who export their coal; there are a large number who do not export, but who have been making quite as large a profit on the inland coal market as the exporting coal proprietors; they have been sharing in the prosperity, but I shall not tax them. I ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he would not have rejected such a proposal. I want to ask him whether he would have proposed what he is proposing now. The deficit on the year is entirely a peace deficit.



It is called a war deficit, but it is really a peace deficit. We are hiding a peace deficit under a war deficit, and a peace expenditure behind a war expenditure.

Now I come to another branch of my Amendment; the branch of my Amendment in which I challenge the mode in which he proposes to meet the war expenditure included in the Estimates for the present year. The total war expenditure is estimated at £153,250,000, and of this, I think, £3,250,000 the Chancellor of the Exchequer attributed to China; therefore we practically have a total war expenditure of something under £150,000,000. How is that to be met? I am told that I have no right to object to the proposals of the Chancellor of the Exchequer for meeting that war expenditure in view of the position I have taken up with regard to this war; views to which I do not shrink from saying I adhere. Many friends of mine, friends for whom I have the greatest possible respect, have their conscientious opinions about the war. I conscientiously differ from them. I have impugned no man's motives, I have attacked no man's character, and I only ask that the same treatment should be accorded to me that I have measured out to others; but the fact that I hold these opinions, whether they are right or wrong, does not compel me also to support all the financial proposals which the Chancellor of the Exchequer intends to apply to that expenditure. In Committee of Supply I voted and would vote again for supplies which the Chancellor of the Exchequer has asked for, but that does not bind me to vote for him in "Ways and Means." I do not object to the payment for the war, but to the mode of payment. I object in the first instance to the proportion between debt and taxation.

Our net Debt in 1898 was £613,000,000, in 1901 it was £672,000,000. Now, with the loan the Chancellor of the Exchequer has issued this week, it will be £732,000,000. After the Crimean War the Debt stood at £827,000,000. Now, these being the figures, I want to ask whether the surplus, including the surplus of 1900-1 and the additional war taxation of last year and this, which do not amount to more than £33,000,000 or £34,000,000, is a fair proportion for the country to pay out of taxation, and whether it is fair to defray all the rest by debt. When the Queen came to the Throne the people of this country paid an annual charge for the National Debt at £29,500,000; in 1875 Sir Stafford Northcote put it at a fixed sum of £28,000,000. That was not disturbed until Mr. Goschen reduced that £28,000,000 first of all to £26,000,000, and then to £25,000,000, and the present Chancellor of the Exchequer has since reduced it to £23,000,000; and if you take into account the suspension of the Sinking Fund the amount charged for the Debt this year is very low. It is not easy to propose new taxation, and I can quite understand that it is easier to vote supplies and then say the money must be borrowed, but I do not think that is sound finance. The Chancellor of the Exchequer might say, "If you are not prepared to vote for borrowing we must have increased taxation; how are you going to do it?" But that is not the business of the Opposition; I do not think it is the business of the House of Commons. It is their business to settle the principles of taxation and debt, and to leave it to the Government to work out those principles. So far as taxation is concerned, I think the Chancellor of the Exchequer was right with regard to spirits, but I dissent from him so far as beer is concerned, and I

dissent from him so far as wine is concerned, and so far as tobacco is concerned. At the present moment we have actually reduced the duty on tobacco to below what it was before the war. In the Chancellor of the Exchequer's Budget of 1898&#x2013;9 we took 6d. off tobacco, and then as a war tax we put on 4d., so that the wholesale manufacturers and the retailers of tobacco benefit to the extent of 2d. a pound. I know that the Chancellor of the Exchequer will say that the tobacco is better.

\*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: There is less water in it.

\*SIR HENRY FOWLER: Yes, much to the annoyance of the people who smoke tobacco, especially the working men. At all events, what I have said shows that there are spheres of taxation which are not shut out. I have not said anything about the sugar tax.

A NATIONALIST MEMBER: You ought to say something about it.

\*SIR HENRY FOWLER: That is the hon. Member's opinion. I am only responsible for my own opinion. I am not prepared to say that there are no anomalies in this tax upon sugar. But I know that both Mr. Gladstone and Sir George Cornewall Lewis, when they had to deal with war taxes, imposed a tax upon sugar, as well as upon beer and other articles. I do not like the tax upon sugar; but, at the same time, I have no right to complain of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, when we are pressing him to raise more by taxation, if he puts a tax on an article which the whole of the community will feel.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): Put a tax on wheat.

\*SIR HENRY FOWLER: I do not think the Chancellor of the Exchequer would have the courage to do that. When he does we shall be prepared to deal with it. I should like to repudiate the notion which I have seen expressed that it is our duty to penalise working men with reference to the prospective taxation, and that they specially should be made to pay their share of the expenses of the war. ["Hear, hear" from Nationalist Members.] Hon. Members behind me cheer that statement. I do not think, if they pay the sugar tax, they will be paying their share of the expenditure on the war; I think they will be paying their share of the ordinary peace expenditure of the country. I do not like the phrase, perhaps used incautiously, of making people, because they have taken certain views, pay their share, or more than their share, of what those views have involved. I think all classes in this country have participated in the sorrows and the bereavements of the last eighteen months. The highest and the humblest homes have alike been darkened by the shadow of death. The rank and file; the common soldiers, as they are called, the Englishmen, the Scotchmen, and the Irishmen, whose uncomplaining endurance, whose chivalrous self-sacrifice, whose splendid courage, have rivalled the noblest traditions of the British Army; have paid their full share of the terrible total of wounded and dead which has been recorded in the official return circulated to-day. Disease, ruined health, and loss of life are heavier burdens to the soldier and his family, and I think that in the adjustment of the burden of taxation, which I frankly admit all should bear, they are entitled to have no heavier burden than justice absolutely demands.

I have already said something with reference to the proposal of the Chancellor

of the Exchequer for imposing a coal tax, and it is to the coal tax that my Amendment points. I regard the tax as calculated to do injury to trade and commerce. In other words, I do not think that the game of imposing this tax is worth the candle, so to speak, which it will produce. I do not know if Members of the House have read the Finance Bill; I read it only this morning; but I find in the Finance Bill a still more ominous indication of the intention of the Government. The income tax is renewed for one year, and the increased duties on beer and spirits are continued for one year, but the sugar tax and the coal tax are perpetual. The Chancellor of the Exchequer has made them part of the permanent fiscal system of this country. I do not think he said he would enact that in the Finance Bill. When the subject comes up next year, it will be out of the power of this House to discuss it; only an Act can deal with it.

\*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: You can move that the clause be repealed.

\*SIR HENRY FOWLER: Then I withdraw that, but the point to which I was directing attention was that the tax was.

not a temporary tax, but a permanent tax.

\*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I said so.

\*SIR HENRY FOWLER: The right hon. Gentleman did not say it in the Budget speech. He said it in the subsequent debate, in Committee on the coal tax. He only used the word "permanent" once. He did not say in proposing the tax that he was proposing it as a permanent addition to the revenue of the country. If that be so, we are at once entitled to say this is not a war tax; it is a peace tax; and then we are entitled to press arguments upon the right hon. Gentleman which we should not have pressed in a temporary emergency. Why do I object to this being a permanent part of our fiscal system? I do so, first, because in sound finance you have no right to levy an export duty except upon an article of which you have a monopoly, which a customer elsewhere is compelled to buy from you because he cannot buy it anywhere else. In those circumstances must inevitably pay. Export duties, he except in those circumstances, have been abandoned by all the authorities on political economy for the last half-century. I say further that this tax will check home industries. I think it will diminish the export of coal, and, so far, it will affect trade and shipping and railway and other industries. It cannot be both a revenue tax and a prohibitive tax. If you mean to prohibit your coal from going abroad your export tax is of no advantage to you. I object to it, further, because the wealthiest coalowners are not touched, The great bulk of the collieries will be exempted from this tax; their trade and their their profits will not be interfered with. This tax has every vice which I think a tax can have, and it produces only something like £2,000,000 a year. The last clause of my Amendment alludes to the alarming increase in our expenditure; whether you include or exclude the war expenditure. Our Imperial expenditure is increasing by leaps and bounds. But our Imperial expenditure is not all. In dealing with the burdens of the people of this country you should not forget that the taxpayers are not the only people who pay taxes; there are ratepayers, and the rates of this country are increasing with extraordinary rapidity. While we are increasing the National Debt, the local debt is increasing also at something like a rate of £10,000,000

a year. In 1898 the local debt was £262,000,000, and it is, I believe, now nearly £300,000,000, and rates are steadily rising. Of course, the House will remember that a great portion of that local debt is reproductive debt, which will not only pay good interest, but will pay itself. So far as the increase of that portion of the debt is concerned, it is not a burden but an advantage to the community; but I am sorry to say there is a very large amount of expenditure which is not reproductive and necessarily adds to the burden of the people. I do not know whether the Chancellor of the Exchequer will repeat the invitation to-night, but he has said;

"I hope the new taxation will turn the thoughts of the country, as it has already turned the thoughts of the House, in the direction of economy."

That is exactly what I am endeavouring to do. That is my main object. I would not have interposed in this debate except for the purpose of directing the attention of the House and of the country towards economy. I think economy has been ignored. There has been a lavish expenditure going on in all Departments of the State, and I think the time has come to check it.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): Stop the war.

\*SIR HENRY FOWLER: Ah, stop the war! If the war was stopped to-morrow you would have to impose nearly all this additional taxation for your ordinary expenditure. In 1885 the Chancellor of the Exchequer made a similar motion to that which I am making to-night. He proposed that the House should not reject the Budget, but he took great exception to the proposals in the Budget. He said; "I do not move a vote of want of confidence, but I want to ask the consideration of the House to my arguments, and to invite the Chancellor of the Exchequer to remodel his Budget."

I should not presume to use that language to him. I know what he is smiling at. He

is going to say the Government of that day did not take that view. The right hon. Gentleman sitting next to him will tell him better than I can how that Government fell, and why it fell. It did not fall on account of the Budget. There were external and internal causes; which, I think, form a regrettable chapter in our history; which brought that Government to an end. What was the Chancellor of the Exchequer alarmed at then? He was appalled at a hundred millions Budget. Now, I will not say he is appalled, but he is obliged to produce a two hundred millions Budget. He was dissatisfied with the 6d. duty on tea; he thought it ought to have been increased; but he very much objected to increasing the duty on wine and on beer.

\*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I opposed the Budget because it did not increase the duty on wine.

\*SIR HENRY FOWLER: I was mistaken. Mr. Childers did not increase the duty on wine, but he did increase the duty on beer. I think the best remarks made in that debate in support of the Chancellor of the Exchequer were made by the noble Lord the Secretary of State for India. He gave three strong reasons for supporting the recasting of the Budget, and I think history has wonderfully reproduced itself. He said the normal expenditure had reached many millions more than had ever hitherto been the case. That was in 1885; and I think it is so in

1902. He also said that the average annual increase had taken place by leaps and bounds, and that the Supplementary Estimates had attained to an extraordinary high figure.

Now, Sir, the right hon. Gentleman will say that this is a vote of want of confidence in the Government. They make everything a vote of confidence. The Government appears to require a vote of confidence every week. All efforts to dot the "i's" and cross the "t's" of their schemes and plans are treated as matters of confidence. I do not know what the new Members think, but I think they will have already learned that there are now three questions on which the House of Commons is always asked to vote; the first is the suspension of the 12 o'clock rule, the second is the closure, and the third confidence in the Government. The Government is a plant which requires pulling up by the roots and looking at every week. This is a mistake from a constitutional point of view, and it strikes at constitutional government altogether. There should be more freedom for the expression of opinion in the House. The noble Lord the Member for Greenwich said the other day, in a speech which was somewhat misunderstood, that the power of the Cabinet was increasing and the power of the House was decreasing.

LORD HUGH CECIL (Greenwich): I did not connect that with the present Government.

\*SIR HENRY FOWLER: Well, the noble Lord's own experience is limited, I think, to the past six years. But I think that this is a great constitutional danger. The old-fashioned doctrine that a Government should not go out except on a distinct vote of want of confidence on a main principle of policy or on a vital proposal was a good one. The course which the present Government adopts reduces the House of Commons to a farce. They assume with respect to the details of their measures the infallibility of the Vatican and the autocracy of the Tsar. Last week the Government carried their proposals against the general opinion of the House because they were made a vote of want of confidence. I should have thought that it would have been desirable for the House to have had a freer hand in the discussion of Ways and Means, but from that we are excluded. I have no doubt that this Amendment will be rejected. The House will again affirm its confidence in the Government; in a Government that can never make mistakes, that can never bring in a Bill which needs amendment, and cannot make a proposal which cannot be regarded as almost of divine origin. I do not expect to shake that belief; but the day will come when the House will wake up to the fact that this policy of concentrating all wisdom and power in the Executive is a mistake, that it is time the House of Commons asserted its individuality and its right of criticism. I believe the mature judgment of the

country is that our expenditure is increasing at an unnecessary and dangerous rate; that our taxation is, in the main, raised by the brain labour and the hand labour of the bulk of the nation; and that it is the supreme duty of the House of Commons to require unflinching economy in all departments of the State, to prevent, as far as possible, the waste of public money, and to insist that the public shall have that full value for its expenditure which would be demanded in every well-managed business concern. It is because I believe that that I venture to move the Amendment which stands in my name.

Amendment proposed;

"To leave out from the word 'That,' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'this House, while ready to make adequate provision for the naval and military requirements of the Empire, is of opinion that the financial proposals of His Majesty's Government are objectionable both with regard to taxation and debt, are calculated injuriously to affect industry and commerce, and do not exhibit that regard for economy which the alarming increase that has recently taken place in the normal expenditure of the country imperatively demands.'";(Sir Henry Fowler.)

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

\*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The right hon. Gentleman commenced his speech with a short dissertation on a subject of which he is very fond; namely, the manner in which the financial accounts of the country are presented to the House of Commons. He accused me of confusing those accounts. He condemned me for not including in my statement of Exchequer revenue the revenue which goes to the Local Taxation Fund, and he blamed me because I did not include it on both sides of the account in introducing my Budget. The right hon. Gentleman failed to do me justice in that matter. I have, in accordance with his own wish, presented monthly, nay, weekly, accounts to Parliament, showing precisely how it stands. I have in every Budget I have had the honour to introduce explained to the House at the time precisely the amount which is devoted to the Local Taxation Fund from taxation, as well as the amount devoted to the ordinary purposes of the expenditure of the country. But I will venture to say that now, after the practice of presenting the accounts which the right hon. Gentleman has complained of has gone on, as he has stated, for thirteen years, to enter on a new departure by presenting the accounts as he has presented them to-night would be simply misleading the House and the country, and make all statistical comparisons in this matter impossible. We are bound by law, whether it be right or wrong, to allocate certain receipts from taxation, from the death duties, from the spirit duties, from the beer duties, to the Local Taxation Fund. Part of that law was in existence when the right hon. Gentleman and his friends were in office for three years, and they never touched it except to confirm it by continuing that allocation. Therefore, though he may now find fault with the system I should not be acting in accordance with the established custom and in accordance with the law if I presented to Parliament the accounts of finance in the manner in which he has presented them to-night.

SIR HENRY FOWLER: The Chancellor of the Exchequer of that day said it was his intention to alter it.

\*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: Then I am surprised that the right hon. Gentleman did not prevail on his colleagues to alter it during those three years, whereas, as a matter of fact, it has remained in that position ever since and must remain so until the law is altered. But this is only a small part of the right hon.

Gentleman's speech, and it has nothing to do with the subject matter of the Amendment which he has submitted to the House. With respect to the Amendment, I do not think I ever remember a time when the notice paper on the Second Reading

of a Budget Bill was more crowded with Amendments. They are appalling both in number and variety. But there is only one of them that is absolutely inconsistent with itself, and that is the Amendment which the right hon. Gentleman has just presented to the House, which is the first-born offspring of a united and renovated Opposition. I do not venture to inquire into the parentage of that Amendment. I am afraid it showed traces of that connubial discord which sometimes unfortunately happens in married life when a child represents the faults of both its parents. But who the parents of this Amendment are is entirely beyond me. The right hon. Gentleman said that above all things this action of a reunited and renovated Opposition, which, according to the right hon. Gentleman who sits next to him, is now to undertake a great and serious function, is not intended as a vote of want of confidence in His Majesty's Government. We are blamed by him for constantly demanding from the House of expressions of confidence. I have never done so yet. We are blamed by him for being ready to accept the success of such a motion as this on the Second Reading of the Finance Bill as tantamount to a vote of want of confidence, and that from a member of a Government which went out upon the question of cordite upon a snatch vote in Supply. I have never known an Amendment of this description moved on the part of a responsible Opposition to the Second Reading of the Budget Bill treated as anything else than a vote of want of confidence. What, Sir, is the main feature, after all, of the Budget of this year? I venture to say that it is the war expenditure. Yet that is the one thing on which the right hon. Gentleman never said a word, and which by the very terms of his motion and speech it is absolutely clear he entirely approves of. This motion if adopted by the House would condemn His Majesty's Government in a great many things, but there is one thing which it affirms, and that is the necessity for the war expenditure. When I introduced the Budget this year I spoke very plainly to the House upon the great expenditure on war; on the war in South Africa and, though to a very much less extent, on the war in China. I saw no reason for concealment. I was not ashamed of it, and I mentioned it to the House. My statement was received with demonstrations which rather puzzled me at the time. But I understand better now what they meant, for they are interpreted in the Amendment which the hon. Member for East Northamptonshire has placed on the Paper. In his opinion the expenditure upon the war is a needless expenditure, the money spent on the war has been wasted, probably he would say worse than wasted, and I dare say he would go on to argue that the magnitude of the expenditure is proof that the war is wrong. Well, that would be a most inconsistent argument. The expenditure of 140 millions upon the war is a matter of great importance to this country; I admit that to the full; but the question is whether it is necessary expenditure or not, and if the issue was whether Briton or Boer should be supreme in South Africa, why, even the expenditure of 140 millions is a trifle in comparison to the importance of that issue. I do not want to go back, of course, to the policy of His Majesty's Government as before the war; that has been discussed here over and over again, has been repeatedly affirmed by a majority of the House of Commons, and has been sanctioned by the verdict of the country at the General

Election. Nothing now remains but the judgment of history upon it. [An HON. MEMBER: And payment of the bill.] But as soon as the Boer ultimatum was delivered, as soon as British territory was invaded, one thing was absolutely clear, as clear to the right hon. Gentleman as it was to us; namely, that the war must be brought to a complete and successful conclusion. The question was solved in a wrong way, in our opinion, in 1881, and it had to be solved in the right way now. If it had not been so solved, why South Africa would have been lost to us and the disintegration of the British Empire would have begun. Compared with such an evil as that, Chancellor of the Exchequer though I am, I say the expenditure of 140 millions is a small thing. The right hon. Gentleman has spoken out, as he always has spoken out, plainly and courageously to-night. He approves of the war. He does not agree with certain stray sheep from the Liberal fold, such as the hon. Member for Northampton, who thinks that we are altogether wrong and should make peace on any terms. The right hon. Gentleman approves of the war and so far approves of the main features of this year's Budget. All that he disapproves of in the arrange-

ment of the war expenditure is the manner in which it is proposed to be raised. He blames me for raising too much by loan and not enough by taxation. He very properly said he was not Chancellor of the Exchequer, and therefore it was not his business to suggest what the taxation should be by which the expenditure should be met. But one thing he will admit; it is this; that the war charge of fifty-eight millions could not be met by taxation alone. I am justified, then, in borrowing, in his opinion, to a certain extent, and the difference between us is a difference of degree. Now let us see what is the proportion of the cost of the war which has been raised during three years by taxation. I will include both the cost of the China and South Africa wars, and I hope the House will understand that in the cost of the war I include not only the cost of military operations, but the interest on the amount borrowed for the purposes of the war, and in the taxation I include, of course, all kinds of taxation; not merely increased taxation, but all taxation devoted to war purposes, including that which has been or will be so devoted by the suspension of the Sinking Fund.

MR. DILLON: The suspension of the Sinking Fund is the same thing as borrowing.

\*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The suspension of the Sinking Fund borrowing&#x0021; Why, the hon. Member can hardly know what the Sinking Fund is. What is the Sinking Fund? It is simply a surplus;

MR. DILLON: It is laid by for the purpose of paying off debt, and if you cease to pay off debt you are borrowing.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: Well, I do not know how that may be in Ireland. In England ceasing to pay off debt is not the same thing as borrowing. In any case the Sinking Fund is simply surplus revenue derived from taxation, which the country chooses from time to time to devote to the paying off of old debt. If you were not to include this as taxation, which is just as much taxation as any other kind of taxation, because it is ordinarily devoted to the Sinking Fund, it seems to me, with all

deference to the hon. Member, it would be absurd. In the year 1899&#x2013;1900 we devoted £9,335,000 from the surplus revenue of the year to the purposes of the



war from taxation. Last year we devoted £15,413,000 of excess revenue above ordinary expenditure raised by taxation for the purposes of war. This year, according to the Estimates before the House, we propose to devote £20,523,000 excess revenue above ordinary expenditure in the same way to the same purpose. These make £45,271,000 altogether, while the total estimated cost of the South African and Chinese wars is put down as £153,317,000. Therefore we have devoted towards this from the taxation of the country £45,271,000, and we have borrowed £108,046,000. Now, I quite admit that the proportion raised out of taxation is less than our predecessors raised for the cost of the Crimean War. But I think that I have imposed a sufficient proportion of the burden on the taxpayers of the present day. This year, at any rate, trade is not so generally prosperous, and it is not a good time to impose an excessive burden of taxation on the country. For that reason I have moderated my demands on the taxpayers this year, and have proposed, and this the right hon. Gentleman has blamed me for, an addition to our system of indirect taxation of a permanent character which will go on beyond the war, and will, therefore, be available towards the formation of a sinking fund in order to pay off the money which has been, or may be, borrowed for payment of the cost of the war. That, I think, is better finance than an attempt to impose excessive taxation in the year in such circumstances as I have described. The right hon. Gentleman practically said in his speech that this is not a fair argument, because the new taxation, according to him, is to go almost as much towards ordinary expenditure as towards war expenditure. Well, I entirely demur to his argument on this head. Let me try to state to the House how the matter appears to me. He would not apparently consider for a moment the taxation of last year as anything but war taxation; but I put it plainly to the House in my Budget speech that a great part of the taxation of last year, originally, of course, intended to be only a temporary war taxation, would be necessarily devoted now if there were no war to the ordinary purposes of the country. I never attempted to conceal this at all; and you must take this additional taxation into account in dealing with this matter. Now, what would be the ordinary expenditure of the present year according to the Estimates if there were no war expenditure at all? I calculate it would be £127,373,000.

SIR HENRY FOWLER: The ordinary expenditure reduced by suspension of Sinking Fund?

\*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: No. That includes the amount ordinarily allocated to the Sinking Fund, but, of course, does not include that which ought not to be included; the amount paid towards the Local Taxation Fund. Assuming no war expenditure, and adding the interest on the new war loan; £3,350,000; the total ordinary expenditure would be, in round figures, £130,500,000. Now, as against that, I should have to set on the old basis of taxation, before the increase of taxation last year, the actual revenue receipts in the year, which I estimated in my Budget speech at about £118,000,000, but which was not a fair statement of what I may call the proper revenue of the year, because, as hon. Members who have followed these matters know very well, the proper revenue of the year was diminished this year by large forestalments, to the amount of £3,250,000, in the months of January and February. Therefore the £118,000,000 only represents

what I anticipate the Exchequer would receive from the revenue on the old basis of taxation this year if there are no similar forestalments next January and February. If there are not the proper revenue for 1902&#x2013;3, augmented to that extent, would amount, all other things being equal, to £;121,500,000. But taking the actual revenue receipts for this year on the old basis of £;118,000,000, and deducting that amount from £;130,500,000 of ordinary expenditure, I find a deficit of £;12,500,000. Very well.

Now, what are the additional taxes that were imposed last year, and that I purpose to impose this year? Their estimated yield together amounts to about £;25,000,000. Therefore, as against this deficit of £;25,000,000, I have to set £;12,500,000 of that to meet ordinary expenditure, leaving a balance of £;12,500,000, which might be devoted to the Sinking Fund for the redemption of the new war debt, to the remission of taxation, or any other purpose the financial position at the moment might seem to require. That, I think, is a fair statement of the case as it really stands. But now the right hon. Gentleman objects not merely to the proportion between the amount which I propose to raise by loan and by taxation, he also objects to the war taxes. Very well, but he did not object to the income tax; he hardly said a word about it. A good many Members on his side, I think, would have liked to have seen the income tax a little higher still. [Opposition cheers.] But I knew the right hon. Gentleman would not take that view; he was not speaking on behalf of the united party in that matter, because only two or three years ago he censured me a good deal for not reducing the income tax, which then stood at 8d. in the £;. Then he did not find fault with the sugar duties; I thank him for his support. But I am not quite sure that the right hon. Gentleman who sits next to him, the Leader of the Opposition, was so grateful. [An HON. MEMBER: No.] Yes. There we have not got a united Opposition either, because I observed the other day that the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition, in addressing an audience in the north of England, spoke of the sugar tax as a dreadful tax upon women and children; though why women and children should not share taxation I really do not know; and as a tax that would cost the ordinary working man earning 15s. a week, with a small family, 4&#x00BD;d. a week, an enormous amount of taxation? That is a most exaggerated estimate of the amount of sugar that would be consumed in such a family; and the right hon. Gentleman entirely forgets what the right hon. Member for East Wolverhampton so properly reminded him of to-night; namely, Mr. Gladstone's views and action on the matter of the sugar duty and the tea duty at the time of the Crimean War.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): Existing taxes.

\*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: What is the difference in principle between maintaining and increasing, as Mr. Gladstone did, an existing tax and imposing a new one? I do not believe that if it were possible for Mr. Gladstone to be here among us now he would have opposed this sugar duty, any more than has the right hon.

Gentleman who moved the Amendment. [A MEMBER on the Opposition benches: We should not have had any war then.] I will venture to say that on this matter the working men are a little more reasonable than the Leader of the Opposition; they are perfectly willing to bear this taxation, they are proud to bear it. They

know perfectly well that the duty I propose will not increase the price of sugar more than to the amount at which the price of sugar without the duty stood no longer ago than 1893; they know that their wages have risen since that time, and that they are perfectly well able to bear this tax without stinting themselves or their children in anything that is necessary. But there was a part of the taxation, and the only one, in spite of the terms of the Amendment, to which the right hon. Gentleman objected, and that is the coal duty. Well, we have already discussed the coal duty at very considerable length. The right hon. Gentleman did not say much about it to-night; but what he did say was that he objected to an export duty altogether unless it was a duty upon a monopoly.

SIR HENRY FOWLER: A commodity.

\*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: Well, a commodity which was a monopoly. I believe, as a matter of fact, that our export coal may be very largely so described.

[Opposition cries of "No."] I expected to hear that assertion questioned from the other side; but it is not seriously questioned by those who have spoken moderately with regard to the coal tax as far as regards the best kinds of our coal. The hon. Baronet opposite, the Member for the Berwick Division of Northumberland, went so far the other night as to suggest that this export duty on coal would rather tend to increase the export of the best classes of coal. And as to the other classes of coal, the more I look into it the more I am convinced that those countries of Europe which do not themselves produce coal cannot get coal so cheaply from any other source as they can from this country, even with the additional duty, and that the same thing is true of large parts of countries like France or Russia, for example, which do produce coal for themselves, but also import coal very largely from this country, imported in spite of the fact that they impose an import duty of 1s. or 2s. upon the coal that comes to them from us. The amount which the coal importers of the countries of Europe and the Mediterranean require, even in a slack year such as this, is so large that I believe it would be absolutely impossible to supply it from any other European source except our coalfields. We are the only country in the world that, with regard to coal, not only supplies its own needs without any importation at all, but also exports largely to other countries; and, although I do not want to go into this argument to night, I will venture to say that there is nothing in this duty on coal which, as far as the discussion has hitherto gone, has in the least shaken my conviction that it can be safely imposed without any injury to the industry or commerce to which the right hon. Gentleman has referred. Why, what is the strongest case of all against this coal duty? That of the Northumbrian coalfield, which was ably put forward by the right hon. Baronet the other night, and which has often been put forward in this matter. What are stated to be the circumstances in that coalfield? Simply these; that the natural outlet of the Northumbrian coalfield is Northern Europe, and not this country, as one would suppose; and that if it is produced at all it must be exported, because there is no demand for it here. And why is there no demand for it here? Because the Scottish coalfield on the north and the Yorkshire coalfield on the south prevent it being consumed in England or Scotland. But why? Because the railway rates from

Northumberland to such places as York and Leeds are more than half again as much for that short mileage as the seaborne freights are from Northumberland to places like Hamburg and Cronstadt. I would advise Northumberland coalowners to agitate for a reduction of their railway rates. We are told that there are 150 ships exporting coal from the north of England to the nearest European ports, and coming back only in ballast, many of which would be thrown out of employment if the export of coal from the Northumbrian coalfield were seriously diminished. Well, I live in the south of England; I know something of the price of railway-borne coal in the south of England, and if these ships cannot find a good market in European ports they might do worse than bring Northumbrian coal to the ports in the south of England to compete with the railway-borne coal there. I do not believe in these assertions as to the injury that is to be done to this great industry by a 1s. export duty on coal, still less do I believe in what the right hon. Gentleman suggested to-night as the injury that would be done to our commerce. We have heard a good deal about the way in which this duty could not be imposed on the foreigner, and must therefore fall on the coalowner, and through him upon the miner; but now we are told it is to be borne by the shipowner, and that, because freights have gone down since the commencement of the year, the depression in freights is due to this duty, although the exports of the month of April have really been larger than they were in the month of April of 1900, and although in regard to a large portion of those exports, under existing contracts, no duty will be paid at all by anybody concerned. I do not wish to delay the House with arguments on a matter which I do not think they want to discuss to-night; but I have felt obliged to allude to it shortly, because I differ altogether from the right hon. Gentleman's estimate of the effect of the duty on coal.

Now I come to the remarkable part of the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman. He is willing to make "adequate provision for the naval and military requirements of the Empire," but he thinks our financial proposals "do not exhibit

that regard for economy which the alarming increase in the normal expenditure of the country imperatively demands." I do not understand the connection between those two sentences; they look like two policies. I do not quite understand how he combines them. Now, what is the cause of this increase? He told us: in the first place, he said, the increase of the Navy Estimates, and he spoke out manfully and rightly upon that subject. But did he voice the opinion of the united Liberal party? I noticed that the opinions of the right hon. Gentleman upon the importance of a large Navy were uttered without a single cheer from that side of the House. [Opposition cries of "No."] Yes; then he went on to the only two heads of our expenditure, on which he suggested economy. One was education, but he did not mean to spend less money on education, he did not suggest that for a moment; he thought that the money might be better spent than it is.

SIR HENRY FOWLER: More economically.

\*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: Well, that it might be spent so as to secure better results.

SIR HENRY FOWLER: That results could be secured at a less cost.

\*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: Yes; but I think I am not doing the right hon. Gentleman an injustice if I say that he would go on to expend money on other kinds of education than those on which it is at present expended, and that he does not wish to see the diminution of the total expenditure of the State on education, but would rather like to see it increased. That, at any rate, I am convinced, is the opinion of the opposite side of the House. One thing is clear; that if economy means less expenditure, you cannot find it in the matter of education. But the right hon. Gentleman suggested, and I think it was rather an unfair suggestion, that there might be some economy in our grants for the purposes of local taxation; our old friend the "doles." I was glad to notice he did not use that word, because a greater misnomer than to describe the Agricultural Rating Act as a dole to landlords I do not think was ever invented.

SIR HENRY FOWLER: I regard them as doles or donations.

\*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: Why is it a dole to remit a portion of local taxation to the occupier of agricultural land; which was unjust taxation; [Opposition cries of "Oh, oh."]; out of the Exchequer, if it is not also a dole to remit entirely local taxation to the owner of stock in trade by annual Act out of the pockets of the other ratepayers? I see no difference in principle whatever between the remissions. [Opposition cries of "Oh."] But more than that, it has been a favourite argument of hon. Members opposite in the course of our debates on the Budget that if we impose a duty on coal it is not paid by the foreigner but has to be paid by the coal-owner, and that he will pass it on to the miner who works for him, in the shape of reduced wages. Very well. If that be true, if a tax gets to the workman in that way, may not the remission of taxation also get to the workman? This dole, as it is called, under the Agricultural Rating Act, has gone into the pocket of the occupier of agricultural land. [Opposition cries of "No."] I defy any hon. Member to produce a single instance in which it has gone into the pocket of his landlord. Well, if it has gone into the pocket of the occupier of agricultural land has it not enabled him in these times when the wages of the agricultural labourer have happily increased, to employ more labour and to pay his men better than he could afford to pay them when he had higher rates? Why is that argument not true in the case of the agricultural labourer, if the converse is true in the case of the miner? I do not think, if the matter comes to be fairly examined, that these grants can be called doles to the landlord. But the point is this, How are we to economise? If the right hon. Gentleman opposite were standing at this box now, in the office which I have the honour to hold, how could he economise with regard to them? Will he venture to say that he really believes that he could restore to the Exchequer the million and a half, or whatever it is, which is devoted under the Agricultural Rating Act to this purpose? No, Sir; he knows very well that the Members for agricultural constituencies in England and Wales who sit on his side of the House would have nothing to say to such a proposal as that. Does he think that he could deprive Scotland or Ireland of the sums which under corresponding Acts have been devoted

to local purposes in Scotland and Ireland out of taxation? I should like to see him try it. No doubt Irish and Scotch Members on that side of the House might desire to see those sums devoted to other purposes than those to which they go now, but as for handing them back to the Exchequer for the general expenditure of the country, the thing is impossible. Then you cannot save on education; you cannot save on these doles, as they are called. The right hon. Gentleman thinks you can save on the Army. He considers that our military expenditure is excessive, and he supported that proposition by the astounding assertion that we have no land frontier to defend. Why, Sir, he is a little Englander indeed in that respect; And yet he was Secretary for India. Has he not spent any money in defending India? Why, do we not keep up a very large part of our Army for the simple purpose of defending India?

\*SIR HENRY FOWLER: And India pays more than she ought to do.

\*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: India pays only that portion of the British Army which may happen to be there at the time; but if India were attacked on its land frontier, as India may be attacked some day, as nobody knows better than the right hon. Gentleman, surely it would be necessary for us to be prepared to defend her with a much larger army than that which happens in peace time to be in India. Has Canada no land frontier? Are there no other parts of our Empire which have land frontiers; Hoes the right hon. Gentleman of all men;no, it was a mistake on his part to make such an assertion as that. He knows full well that we keep up our Army not merely for the defence of these islands, but for the defence of the Empire as a whole.

And what are the responsibilities of that Empire? They have been largely increased in recent years. Yes, not merely under the present Government. We did not go to Egypt; we did not accept the protectorate of East Africa. I do not blame our predecessors for either of these actions. The Empire expands in spite of the Government of the day, and as it expands our military responsibilities for its defence increase. We look out from these islands on a world very different to that which presented itself to us a generation ago. Then there was only one great civilised Power which could give us cause for anxiety either as a rival or as a possible opponent. Now there are four, if not five, who have increased in wealth and strength beyond even the increase that has been vouchsafed to us. I will say that there is reason, and good reason, for military expenditure in advance of the standard which was sufficient for this country ten or fifteen years ago. But at the same time I am disposed to be jealous of military expenditure when compared with naval expenditure. I never would be a party to any such military expenditure as would be vying with the great military Powers of the Continent;never. I do not believe it is necessary for this country. I believe it would be the utmost folly to engage in anything of the kind, and I would never be a party to it. But it is the first duty of every Government, whatever its political opinions;it would be the duty of the right hon. Gentlemen who sit on that Bench if they succeeded us to-morrow;to provide for the safety of the country. That need not mean greatly increased expenditure as compared with our present standard, although there might be some increase. I have never stated that in my belief the expenditure of this country could be

reduced, but I have said that it might have to be increased, and that therefore we must strengthen the basis of our existing indirect taxation; but I do not think; and I say this with the consciousness of my responsibility as Chancellor of the Exchequer; it is possible for us to continue at the rate of increase which we have seen for the past six years without the gravest danger to that financial system which has long been established in this country, and to which, through its light and easy taxa-

tion on the industries of this country, I believe we owe much of our prosperity. Sir, it would be foolish and a false economy to cut down what is required to provide for the safety of the country. But it is not necessary to my mind that the taxpayers of the United Kingdom alone should always bear, as now they almost exclusively bear, the whole charge for the naval defence of the Empire. Further, Sir, it is well that in some things the State should undertake work at the cost of the taxpayers for the benefit of the country at large. But it is not well, and it would be foolish to the last degree if this House ever imposed upon the State largely increased burdens for anything like all the work which we have seen for generations past well done by private enterprise and by individual action, with this great advantage, as it seems to me, that among the proudest attributes of our national character are independence and self-reliance. I do not think you can find the true way to economy in such a speech or such a motion as that of the right hon. Gentleman. I do not question his motive. I know he desires economy for economy's sake. I know that he has spoken to-night, as he has often acted, without being biased by mere party feeling. But this I must venture to say as my own opinion, that it is in such directions as I have ventured to indicate rather than in the mere denunciation of our existing expenditure that the path of true economy lies.

MR. HALDANE (Haddingtonshire): The concluding words of the speech of the right hon. the Chancellor of the Exchequer contrast with the early utterances in that speech. In this place, as elsewhere, the art of debate consists not a little in diverting the attention of the audience from the point at issue by throwing if possible as many appeals as you can to the discord amongst your opponents. And the right hon. Gentleman has proved himself a past-master in that admirable art of debate. The right hon. Gentleman began his speech by suggesting a number of things, which proved him to be a diligent student of the London correspondents of the various newspapers in the provinces. He suggested that this Amendment, if voted for, would prejudge opinion on the war. He raised the question of the Navy, and suggested that the Opposition would divide itself into various camps over the Amendment, and then the right hon. Gentleman went on to meet the very formidable indictment contained in the speech of the right hon. the Member for East Wolverhampton, and to give what was his real and only answer to that speech.

What was the gist of the speech of my right hon. friend? It was that above everything the Budget scheme as disclosed in this Finance Bill did not sufficiently take into account the gravity of the financial situation of the country. My right hon. friend made his point by showing in a striking fashion that if ten millions extra revenue were raised, five millions must go to

covering the normal deficit on the normal expenditure. The right hon. Gentleman answered that, and also the charge that the great burden which the war was throwing on the national finances was not being met vigorously enough, by a suggestion, which I think was the only real suggestion the right hon. Gentleman made in answer to the argument of my right hon. friend. It was that we were laying the foundation, he did not say that he had constituted it, but he suggested that a foundation might be laid; I do not think he put it at more than a hypothesis; of a Sinking Fund of twelve and a half millions a year, which would go to relieve the burden and the cost of the war. The way in which the right hon. Gentleman got at that was by taking a comparison of the revenues of the last three years, and showing, what I have no doubt is quite correct, that forty-five millions has in these three years been paid out of revenue towards the cost of the war, which he estimated at 153 millions. That may be true, but we are face to face with a situation in which on the normal basis of our taxation our expenditure is rapidly overtaking the yield of that taxation. We have got to look forward, and certainly I know no limit, at the rate we are going, to an increase in expenditure, and to talk of twelve and a half millions as anything in the nature of a Sinking Fund is basing his case on the most shadowy foundation. The right hon. Gentleman did not suggest that the twelve and a half millions was to be regarded in itself as a Sinking Fund. He only said it might possibly be so treated. I wish to follow out the line which my right hon. friend so appropriately put to the House in his speech. I do not think this is the occasion to discuss particular taxes. We shall have a discussion on them in Committee. We have discussed them to some extent already, and we shall hear a great deal more about them. I do not wish now to enter into controversial questions as to coal or sugar or the amount of the income tax, but I wish to try and impress on the House what seems to me to be the great gravity of the financial position in which this country stands, looked at from the broadest point of view. My criticism upon this Budget Bill is that it does not contain any resolute effort to grapple with that position. By an increased income tax and by a duty on sugar and coal we have this year added some ten millions to our revenue, and by borrowing we have added a very large sum to our debt. My criticism is that the scheme of finance as shown by the Bill is not sufficiently vigorous in view of the position in which we stand to-day. The right hon. Gentleman in the course of his Budget speech said that the position which we were in was that trade began to show signs of falling off, and that he would not be justified in putting heavier burdens on the taxpayers. Does the right hon. Gentleman imagine that he has got to the end of that falling off in trade? Does he imagine that the sources of revenue of this country are going to be again as good as they were three years ago, or as good as they were even a year ago? If there is anything that is more than ordinarily evident it is that within a few months the country will be less able to bear the burdens it has at present than is the case now, and if that process is one which by degrees gets worse and worse, surely it is the duty of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, as long as he has a large revenue, to make as much provision out of it as possible to meet a charge which is becoming heavier and heavier in proportion to our



resources.

The right hon. Gentleman says, and it is perfectly true, that the income tax at the time of the Crimean war was 2d. in the £;1 heavier than it is now. But surely in a time such as that in which we live we cannot take into account income tax only. At the time of the Crimean War the nation made a most resolute effort to discharge the cost of that war in the smallest possible time. The borrowing was comparatively small;under forty millions;and yet the Chancellor of the Exchequer of that day did not hesitate to raise the income tax to 1s. 4d. in the £; notwithstanding that there were other taxes pressing on commodities which do not exist now, and which made heavier charges on the country than anything contemplated under this scheme. In the forty-three years since the Crimean War 198 millions of debt has been paid off, but the borrowing for the war has absorbed the savings of nearly a score of years past, and we are in a position in which, if we do not make a resolute effort to retrieve the situation, we shall have to leave those who come after us in a very much worse position than our forefathers left us. That seems to me to be a consideration which ought not to be left out of account in considering what we are doing in a time such as this, because this war is not like one of those wars with a first class Power, to which the Chancellor of the Exchequer made reference. It is a war of great importance, but it is not a war of which we can say that we have effected by it the saving of the country from such disasters as threatened it during the Napoleonic wars at the end of the last century and the beginning of this. Surely we owe it to those who will come after us to make some provision that the burden of the cost of the war shall not come upon them with the weight that is threatened if the redemption of our position is to proceed at the very slow rate contemplated by the proposals of the Government.

But, apart from that, there are several reasons why it seems to me we ought to deal with this matter upon the basis of making the most vigorous effort in our power. In the first place we have got not only an increase in the normal expenditure, not only an increase in the dead weight of the Debt, but we have got remarkable indications that we are going to be presently face to face with a time in which we cannot count on the elasticity of those sources of revenue to which we have been accustomed to look up to now. I observe with a great deal of concern the suggestions which have come from influential journals, such as The Times newspaper, that we should adopt some other system of taxation than that to which we have been accustomed, for the raising of our revenue. I am glad to think that there is no response to these suggestions, so far, in any of the utterances of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The Chancellor of the Exchequer has spoken like a strong free-trader, and he is certainly not inclined to turn a listening ear to Sheffield, and I trust he will not turn a listening ear to Birmingham either, in whatever forms those suggestions may come. Any attempt to raise revenue on a large scale on the basis of indirect taxation, any attempt to take to those new principles of taxation, must have this effect, and can have no other;that they will deprive us of the knowledge of the extent to which, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer himself said, we are putting a burden upon the raw material of industry, a

burden on the very sources from which we derive our revenue, and which will prevent us from knowing how we stand as regards the basis of normal prosperity in this country. The indications are that we will do well to stand in the very strictest and strongest way by the existing foundations of our national system. What advantages have we in this country? We have a coal supply by no means inexhaustible. For a long time that was thought of as marking us out from the other nations of the world, but they are rapidly developing their coal supplies, and there is no reason to think that we can look forward for an indefinite period to pre-eminence in trade by reason of our coal supply. What has given us a certain position of stability and contributed to a very large extent to our vast and successful commercial activity? It is that this country is the place where the raw materials of industry are brought in free; that we have free trade; that we can get materials to an extent that no other nation can; and thereby have a

great advantage in holding our own against people who have advantages of a kind which we at this moment do not possess. Then again there is another advantage we have. Such has been our reputation for financial prudence, such has been our reputation for straightforwardness in the payment of debts, and in making income and expenditure balance, that we have always been able to borrow more cheaply than other nations. That has been a great advantage, and that reputation which enables us to borrow money more cheaply than other nations is one which we shall do well to try and keep with us. Consols are not now at 111 as they were three or four years ago, and the rate of interest is not that to which we have been accustomed, and if we wish to keep the sources of revenue on which our position depends, and to get back to that position which has done us so much good in days gone by, we must keep that reputation. Then there is another danger that alarms me considerably. I am not a pessimist. I am not one of those people who say that our trade is running away from us. I know the stuff our people are made of too well to believe that we shall fail to adapt ourselves to the position when the pinch comes, but I do say that the commerce which is the source of revenue on which the Chancellor of the Exchequer builds is going to be exposed to a strain of competition such as it has never had up to the present time. For the past two years the United States exports of manufactured goods have increased by 40 per cent. to markets, which were our peculiar markets, such as Russia and Japan, and when we look at the cause and the circumstances we see there is not likely to be any change in that respect.

We have got a most formidable rival. This is not the place to discuss these matters, but it must be recognised that American manufacturers are showing intelligence in technical training and scientific education, and are adapting themselves to new means of production which are not availed of in this country. Not only in time-saving appliances, but in the way they are worked, is America proving herself a formidable rival to us. Let us look at the way in which the situation presents itself to her own writers. I will quote from a recent writer in the North American Review, Mr. C. R. Flint, who writes on the new position which has developed between America and this country within the last few years. He writes;

"Europe needs us much more than we need her. The table of exports and imports shows this very plainly. Last year Europe bought of us 1,111 million dollars worth of goods. During the same period we bought of Europe only 439 millions. This gives us as against Europe alone a balance of trade amounting to 672,000,000 dollars. They bought from us more than two and a half as much as we bought from them. For every dollar invested by us in European productions they invested over 2½ dollars in American productions. Ten years ago, in 1890, we exported to Europe only 682,000,000 dollars, while we imported 474,000,000 dollars. In these few years, therefore, our exports have almost doubled, while our imports have decreased by 35 millions."

If we wish to know how that pinches, let us turn to the figures of the steel trade, for example, and see the position of our steel producers in this country as compared with a few years ago in the markets of the world. It is not only America that is to be feared, but Germany is also attacking us in another fashion. Germany is taking away our chemical trade, once so prosperous on the Tyne. It is, as is shown in an interesting special article in *The Times* the other day, breaking into our indigo trade, which means so much to many of our manufacturers, and it is breaking into our dye and colour trade, and is competing with us almost to the extent of wiping those trades out, and it is also competing with us in electrical engineering. My right hon. friend said to-night that he was not prepared to economise in the matter of education. Neither am I. I think we will have to spend considerable sums on education if we are to keep our position, and one of the things which the Chancellor of the Exchequer should bear in mind is that in his Estimates for the future he will probably be required to expend five millions more on education if our commerce is to be put on as good a position as that of Germany. We used to be first in the production of steel and iron. We have now sunk to the third place. In the last six months we have ceased to produce in the way we used to produce. I have here an article from one of the technical journals, with which I will not trouble the House, but I will read two sentences which sum up the situation;

"The foregoing figures show very conclusively that the increased growth of production in Germany during the last decade was nearly four times as much as that in England, whilst that of America was nearly six times greater. In 1890 Britain exported 4,001,430 tons, but in 1899 only 3,717,180 tons, whereas the value of American exports increased from 25,542,000 dollars in 1890, to 105,690,000 dollars in 1899. England thus shows a decrease of nearly one-fourteenth, whilst America quadrupled her exports. The American exports of iron and steel to England in 1890 amounted to 222,776 tons."

Now, Sir, in that condition of things it is perfectly plain that any Chancellor of the Exchequer framing a financial scheme cannot count on having a sinking fund of twelve and a half millions to be applied to these purposes. We shall have to incur large expenditure in the matter of education, if we are to enable our people to hold their own against the resources supplied by a poorer Government in Germany, and by millionaires in America, to universities and colleges, to give the people that impetus which is at present not possible in this country. We shall have to remember that our chances for the future depend

on three things: We have got to preserve our free trade basis; we have got to preserve our reputation for solvency and our power to borrow cheaply; and we have got to train the minds of our people so that they may be able to hold their own against the competition which is coming forward at such an alarming rate. Again I say I am no pessimist. I believe that our people have it in them to hold their own. The trade of this country still continues to increase, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer has still got sources of revenue, but he cannot count on having the increase in the future which he has had in the past. But, at all events, I feel that a much more resolute effort should have been made in the Budget to meet the present state of things. Of course we can only do that just now by raising more revenue. The Chancellor of the Exchequer challenges us to say that the income tax ought to be higher. I say that it ought to be higher. It ought to be as high as it was at the time of the Crimean War, and we ought to have more evidence of a resolute disposition on his part, having behind him Liberal representatives from Wales, England, and Scotland, to repeal the Agricultural Bating Act. I am quite sure the present agricultural community value that Act so lightly that the tenant farmers and small occupiers would part with it to-morrow without concern, and they would feel that they were taking one step towards putting the finances of the country on something like a practical basis.

\*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: And repeal the Scotch Act also?

MR. HALDANE: The right hon. Gentleman refers to the equivalent grant. At the time that money came we were in a position in which we so often are. We got money at the wrong time. As a matter of fact, we are able to absorb for the purposes of education all the money we can get, but money has been given to Scotland under the utmost clumsy and awkward system which at present exists; namely, by equivalent grants, a large portion of which has been wasted by throwing it into the payment of rates. This system of equivalent grants is one of the most wasteful and indefensible that has ever disfigured the finance of this country. But it is not only in the matter of the Agricultural Rating Act that retrenchment should be carried out. A great deal can be done in getting rid of extravagant expenditure, and certainly we are justified in that policy by reason of the position with which we are face to face. I wish these things were taken more to heart. I think, however, the country is getting more interested in economy; I think I see the awakening of the spirit of economy in this House. I am sure it will be welcomed, and by no one as much as the right hon. Gentleman himself, but I hope that he, in his turn, will not accept the maxim, *vestigia nulla retrorsum*. That principle has never been applied in finance. It is in the power of the right hon. Gentleman to use the great weight of his authority to promote that spirit of which I have spoken and to show an example. I often wish his counsels prevailed more among his colleagues than they do. What we want above all things at the present time is a settled principle in these matters, and no one would be more ready to lay down such a principle than the right hon. Gentleman if he could act on his own counsel and authority. What we want above everything else is a policy which shall point to economy, to a realisation of the true condition of the country, and of how precarious is our commercial hold

on our sources of revenue. We want a firm principle with which to be able to look proudly towards the future, and to feel that we are doing for those who come after us what our forefathers did for us. At the beginning of this century the burden on the nation was heavier than the burden we have to face to-day, but our forefathers bore it without complaint, and the vast Debt which was raised at that time left them under a load of taxation which they paid cheerfully. Are we to be the only generation to feel that we must look back upon the past with a feeling that we can do nothing comparable to what past generations did? Surely it will be our duty to do for the generations coming after us what previous generations did for us.

\*SIR EDGAR VINCENT (Exeter) said he had listened to the speeches from the other side of the House with some disappointment. The hon. Member for Haddingtonshire had given the House a most interesting essay, but he confessed he found very little in it with reference to the Budget before the House. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton made a mild attack on certain features of the Budget, but although he stated his objections to certain expenditure, he made no suggestion to reduce it, and when he objected to the proposed taxation he did not propose to supply its place by other taxation. He read the Amendment on the Paper with some satisfaction, because it appeared to him to indicate that the Opposition had at last awakened to the fact that the enormous increase in expenditure during the last seven years demanded the urgent attention of Parliament. He had seen with surprise the expenditure of this country grow in the last seven years from £95,000,000 to nearly £130,000,000 without any direct challenge on the part of the Opposition against the financial policy of the Government. It had been explained to him as a novice that this abstention on the part of Gentlemen opposite was less due to a conviction that the expenditure deserved their approbation than to a belief that any criticism would be bad electioneering, and he asked himself how far their political fortunes would have to fall before they would pluck up courage to criticise a method of public finance so much at variance with all their traditions. Even now, when the forces which the right hon. Gentleman claimed to have some part in leading to the attack had taken the field, each section apparently declined to march except against that portion of the Government's financial position which they viewed with particular hostility. The Welsh Members had to be warmed by coal, the gentlemen from the Midlands had to be cajoled by the tax on sugar, and the old Cobdenites had to be granted a dole in the shape of a cursory allusion to the ever growing burden of swollen expenditure. With regard to the Bill immediately before the House, the maintenance of our good credit and the sound administration of our finances were subjects beyond the pale of mere party recrimination, and deserved more attention than they had recently received. What was the present financial position of this country? That was the essential point regarding which every Member must make up his mind. What would be the probable aspect of the normal Budget at the close of the war? The Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated with courageous frankness that the real difficulty, the menace to our financial equilibrium, was less war expenditure than current expenditure; but he had so

much the habit of stating truths which were a direct apparent condemnation of the policy which he represented that sufficient attention had not been given to this note of warning. In making an estimate of the future Budget, he would suppose that the war would come to an end in six months, and that the total war expenditure of the current year would not exceed the Chancellor's estimate. He would also assume that the extraordinary military Budget could be closed at the end of the present year without throwing charges on the ordinary military Budget. He thought hon. Members would admit that that was taking a somewhat optimistic view. In the third place, he would assume that the civil and military administration of South Africa could be paid for by South African resources, and that no subvention from British funds would be required for the proper protection of our loyalist fellow-subjects. Proceeding on that basis our expenditure in 1902-3 would approximately amount to £130,000,000 or £131,000,000, and the ordinary revenue, including the war taxes voted last year, but excluding the taxes now under discussion, would amount to about £132,000,000. The war taxes of the present year, which were estimated to give an additional £11,000,000, would be required if we desired to constitute any sinking fund to pay off the accumulated war liability. We had, therefore, arrived at this unsatisfactory financial position; that there was a permanent income tax of 1s., together with the increased duties on beer and spirits, and there was a strong probability of an income tax of 1s. 2d. for at least four or five years, together with this year's additional taxation on coal and sugar. It appeared to him that the fact that we had arrived at this state of finance was a condemnation of the system which had been followed, and it should be borne in mind that any increase of military or civil expenditure must necessitate a further increase of taxation over and above the present level. It might be possible for party loyalty to attempt to excuse this position, but it would be difficult to justify it, and hon. Members on this side of the House would do better for the nation and their party if they endeavoured to find means to remedy it. The time of the House could be more profitably applied to the restriction of expenditure than to theoretical discussions regarding the merits of this or that form of taxation. The alternative to both the coal tax and the sugar tax was the reduction of expenditure so that both taxes would be unnecessary.

The argument used somewhat generally in the press, and especially in *The Times*, that criticism directed against expenditure was beside the point, because the war must be brought to an end, did not affect his contention. He protested against the increase in the permanent peace expenditure in the country, and he was alarmed at the frenzied haste with which the demands of this and that department were satisfied without reference to the general financial position of the country. History contained no instance of any result being achieved in military organisation except by means of scrupulous and rigid economy. The Duke of Wellington stood out as an administrator among his contemporaries. Mr. Gladstone said that he was a more rigid economist than Sir Robert Peel. The hon. Member for Oldham might have claimed to speak for economy on behalf of a more illustrious relative than even his distinguished father. He

might have told the House that the history of the battle of Blenheim was written on the back of a carefully revised washing bill. He hoped the Secretary for War would be guided by those precedents of economy. The Secretary for War asked them to abandon generalities and come to close quarters with the military expenditure of the country. But it was impossible to do so in a Second Reading debate, and in Committee of Supply those who thought expenditure excessive could not probe it to the bottom. For nearly 200 years past the Chancellor of the Exchequer had been the most powerful and influential member of the Cabinet. In the present Chancellor of the Exchequer the advocates of economy had a representative with excellent intentions, but it was written large and clear on the Budgets of the last two or three years that he had been overborne, and finding little support in the Cabinet and the House he had consented to Estimates and Votes which he would have gladly seen reduced. He himself believed the House could do a great deal in the direction of economy, and that if evidence was shewn that there was behind the Chancellor of the Exchequer a vigorous and solid body of opinion in favour of economy, the right hon. Gentleman's views would prevail more in the future than in the past. Then, he believed Treasury control could be considerably improved. Its absence of sympathy with the various departments of the Government was so offensive (if he might use the word with deference) that they had succeeded in setting everyone, even the Scotch, against the cause of economy. The Chancellor of the Exchequer should look closely into this, and see if he could not make Treasury control over the various spending departments more effective. The unpopularity of the Treasury was largely due to the fact that its criticisms were based on insufficient knowledge and that it made more fuss over a trivial error than a serious mistake of substance and large amount. Discussions in Committee of Supply, though useful in ventilating grievances, did little to improve the administration of finance. The Estimates of the spending departments should be subjected at intervals of three or four years to the examination of a Select Committee of the House, who could call for witnesses and documents and go thoroughly into the matter by way of question and answer. Such a reform would not tend to diminish the control the House Commons exercised over the Estimates. It would replace nothing now done, but would be supplementary to it. The difference between the present system and that he suggested was that the Committee of the whole House would then discuss the Estimates, of a particular spending department with full knowledge of details and the advantage of having the Report of the Select Committee before them. In that way it would be possible to increase largely the influences which assisted the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his fight for economy, and if that were done he did not see that any real diminution of the authority of the House would result. Finally, he appealed to hon. Members to remember that the greatness and authority of this country had not been built up solely by military or naval force. Our commerce, which had been such a powerful factor in our progress, had developed really because it had not been restricted by regulations of which our statesmen were the first to see the danger, and because it had not been weighed down by the oppressive taxes which their financial requirements obliged foreign countries to impose. The last twenty years had seen a great expansion of our

national and imperial possessions; they had witnessed the awakening of Greater Britain, but this expansion of our national feeling, with which he was in cordial sympathy, carried with it inherent dangers which could be guarded against only by severe self-discipline and ceaseless vigilance. He appealed to the right hon. Gentlemen who had the control of the fortunes of this country at the dawn of the new century not to forget in their pride and joy at the consolidation and expansion of the world-wide Empire those principles of wisdom and prudence which had been the foundation of our island strength.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): The hon. Gentleman who has just spoken has delivered an interesting speech, but he has dealt more with the affairs of futurity than with the actualities of the moment. He has sketched out what the Budget would be or ought to be in 1902; but for my part, the Budget of 1901 is sufficient and more than sufficient for the present. The hon. Gentleman's proposals in the matter of economy were, if he will excuse me saying so, of the most cheeseparing description. With regard to the Army, he suggested only that we should make certain minor changes which would have the effect of saving a few pounds, and he instanced, as the sort of economy to which he asked the House to agree when we are spending £60,000,000 on the Army and the Navy, the example of the great Duke of Marlborough, who wrote his account of the Battle of Blenheim on a washing bill. No doubt the Government have a good many washing bills, and a quantity of dirty linen to be washed, but even if they used all their washing bills, and nothing but washing bills, on which to inscribe their accounts, the economy effected would be absolutely nothing. The hon. Gentleman told us he looked for economy in the normal peace expenditure of the country. I do not know what he means, nor has he told us what that economy is to be. I do not want economy in the normal peace expenditure. The country is not so anxious that the Budget should be reduced as that the money collected for taxation should be spent in a proper and useful manner. I want the normal peace expenditure to go up considerably, particularly in regard to education, and so on. The hon. Gentleman concluded by telling us how his great schemes of finance were to be carried out. The House, he says, must do a great deal. I have heard that statement I should think quite 500 times, but I never yet knew it to have any effect in the House of Commons. The next suggestion of the hon. Member was that the Treasury are ignorant people, and that they must be more intelligent. That also is a somewhat vague generality. He added that he thought it desirable that the Treasury should enter into verbal discussion with the spending departments. We had from the Secretary of State for War the other day an account of certain verbal communications between Lord Randolph Churchill and himself, when Under Secretary, and I cannot say that the friend of economy in the person of Lord Randolph Churchill succeeded in effecting any economy through those verbal communications. The next point of the hon. Member was that all discussions in Committee of Supply should be done away with, and that a "Cutting-down Committee," composed of Members of the House, should be appointed every three or four years, with power to call for persons and documents. In connection with the French Chamber there is a Committee which can call for



persons and documents, and there it has been proved that the system leads rather to more than to less expenditure. The hon. Gentleman has been a distinguished light in Egypt, and with all respect I would say that his plan of finance is more fitted for that part of the world than for this free and self-governing country.

But my object in rising was to state my own position, and, I believe, that of other hon. Members on this side of the House, with regard to this Amendment. I object to the Bill. Objections are sometimes taken which can be remedied in Committee, but in this case my objections are so fundamental that they cannot be so remedied. We cannot in Committee of Ways and Means substitute one tax for another.

SIR HENRY FOWLER: Oh, yes.

MR. LABOUCHERE: I am glad to hear my right hon. friend say so, because I have occasionally tried it, but have never been allowed to do so. In any case, you cannot increase taxation, and, as part of the complaint against the Bill is that it does not sufficiently tax the present generation, but throws the expenditure on the war upon futurity by a series of post obits, we could not amend it in that respect in Committee. It is only right and proper, therefore, that we should attack the Bill on Second Reading, and, if possible, secure its rejection. There are two ways of proceeding in such a case. The first is to put down an Amendment, something like that of my right hon. friend, stating reasons why the Bill should be thrown out. The second is to meet the Bill with a simple "Nay," or its equivalent; a motion that it be read this day six months; without any reasons except those adduced in debate. My right hon. friend has chosen the first of those two methods. I do not complain of the reasons he has given; I think others might have been alleged, but as far as they go, I entirely agree with those put forward in the Amendment. But the right hon. Gentleman has not been satisfied with that. He has favoured us with a preamble. That preamble is; "that this House, while ready to make adequate provision for the naval and military requirements of the Empire."

I am entirely unable to agree to that preamble, and shall be unable to follow my right hon. friend into the lobby. Why has he put in this preamble? It is absolutely unnecessary. The Amendment would have read very well without it. Generally speaking, Bills read very well without preambles, and the modern habit is to do without them as far as possible. The right hon. Gentleman says we are ready to vote adequate provision for the naval and military requirements of the Empire. Does he mean to say that we are not ready to vote for anything else? We are ready to vote adequate provision for everything, including armaments. We are ready to vote more money for education, for the giving of old-age pensions, and for a great many other things, just as well as for the Army and the Navy. We do not consider that the happiness and the well-being of the inhabitants of the Empire are dependent entirely or mainly upon having a great army and a great navy. We think they are dependent upon good education, upon looking after the lot of the poor and aged people, upon doing our best by peaceful means to gain a prominent position; a superior position, if possible; in the markets of the world. Therefore I ask, why armaments? Why should the right hon.

Gentleman drag in armaments? Does he conceive that this is an implication that while we would grant money for everything else we would not make adequate provision for the Army and the Navy? According to the old proverb, he who excuses himself accuses himself, and I am bound to tell my right hon. friend that I regard this as gratuitous incense heaped up on the altar of the god of war. I am not going to burn that incense. I do not consider that this is precisely the time for expressing any such opinion. This is a Finance Bill, and the strictures of my right hon. friend are upon the mode in which the money is to be raised. What in the name of goodness has that to do with armaments? The right hon. Gentleman has suggested that some of us are not disposed to follow him because we do not believe that he is actuated by fair motives. Who ever said so? I have never said so in my life. There is a great difference between that and considering, when we have words of this sort interpolated into an Amendment, what are the opinions of the gentleman who proposes the Amendment. For that course of action I have the authority of my leader, the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition. In July last Sir Wilfrid Lawson proposed a reduction of the salary of the Colonial Secretary; something for which I should have thought anybody would vote blindly. The Leader of the Opposition said he should vote neither for nor against it, and one of the reasons he gave was that he was influenced by the general views of Sir Wilfrid Lawson. In the same way, having to estimate these words in the Amendment, I am influenced by the general opinions of the right hon. Gentleman in regard to a matter which does affect this expenditure. I am a great admirer of my right hon. friend. I admire his eloquence, of which we have had a specimen this evening. I admire him as a Radical. Hon. Members who are new to the House do not know what a Radical he is. I have heard Members complain of his Radicalism. I have sat on these benches with my right hon. friend, but I was a mild and temperate Radical in comparison with him. I followed him because I respected him so much, but I really trembled at the

lengths to which he would drag me. If he is not so Radical at present it is not that he is less Radical in his mind, but that he is cribbed, cabined, and confined by the position that he holds on that bench, and possibly by some of the colleagues around him. I admire him also as a Nonconformist. He has always boldly stuck to his guns. He has been opposed to all State endowments of religion, and he has fought gallantly not only for the liberty but for the equality of religions in this country. I agree with him in all that. I might say that I share his Nonconformist conscience. But what is the present position of my right hon. friend with regard to the expenditure of which he complains? He is one of the high priests of the Birmingham Imperialism. He approved and still approves of the war. He has stated in the country that we ought not to negotiate or to do anything of that sort.

SIR HENRY FOWLER: I have not said that.

MR. LABOUCHERE: I think his words were that there ought not to be a patched-up peace, but that we ought to fight the matter out to a finish. I assume that if he approves of that policy in the present he would approve of it also in the future. Such a policy involves enormous armaments, and if you have armaments you

must pay for them. Therefore, it seems to me that with the policy of my right hon. friend any real economies would be practically impossible. We entirely disagree as to the meaning of the word "adequate"; he applies one sense to it, I apply another. My hon. friend the Member for East Northamptonshire has an Amendment on the Paper protesting against the war. That is his preamble. If he had asked me, I should have said that I agree with every word of it, but I think it is inopportune to bring the matter forward as an Amendment on this occasion. Would my right hon. friend vote for that Amendment, or would he refuse to vote for it, on account of the preamble?

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): It is more than a preamble.

MR. LABOUCHERE: Well, it is an enlarged preamble. If my right hon. friend would refuse to vote for that Amendment on account of the sentiments expressed therein, why should he complain; I do not suppose he does; if I refuse to vote for his Amendment on account of the preamble? It is perfectly true that there are differences on this side of the House. I am glad there are, because it shows that we on this side of the House think, and that we are not sheep blindly following any bell-wether or running anywhere as driven by the dogs behind us. Last week we had an object lesson of the patriotism of hon. Gentlemen opposite in connection with the army reorganisation scheme. Nearly everybody opposed the scheme. Hon. Gentlemen, one after another, jumped up and complained of it, but when it came to voting they went like sheep into the lobby and recorded their votes in favour of a scheme which they considered as bad as it possibly could be. We on this side of this House do not do that sort of thing. We understand patriotism very differently. If we differ from our leaders we give effect to our difference in the lobby.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid): We do not differ.

MR. LABOUCHERE: My hon. friend says we do not differ, but I have known even him to differ. But it shows that we are a vital, thinking, independent party, and we vote according to our convictions, whereas we have this instance of hon. Gentlemen opposite;

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Not me.

MR. LABOUCHERE: The hon. Gentleman says "Not me"; he means "Not I."

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: The hon. Member said: "We had these hon. Gentlemen"; I said "Not me," which was a proper expression.

MR. LABOUCHERE: I give the hon. Member every possible credit for not having voted against his convictions, but I would have given him more credit if he had voted in accordance with his convictions. But I think that, while we have these differences, we ought to

take advantage of every opportunity upon which we can act unitedly. We do not differ in regard to the particular Bill before the House, and we are ready to vote against it when the question is put from the Chair. We do not fear even the consequences which would ensue upon the Bill being thrown out, namely, that Ministers would go out of office. My right hon. friend seemed rather to deprecate that idea, and to suggest that this Amendment was not really opposition, but a piece of gentle advice which the Government might well take in the matter of finance. He seemed to think that a Minister should bring in his

Budget, and, if the Opposition disagreed with it, say, "Yes, apparently you are right; I will take back my Budget, and bring in another until it pleases you." That is rather an odd argument to come from a right hon. Gentleman who was a Member of a Government which went out on the cordite Vote; it is precisely the reverse of the course they followed.

SIR HENRY FOWLER: We did not go out on that Vote.

MR. LABOUCHERE: But while we do not differ with regard to the Bill, we do differ with regard to this Amendment. Take, for instance, our fellow-workers in Ireland. They are not going to vote for this Amendment. I believe several Radicals intend to adopt a similar attitude. Those Irish Members and Radicals may be right or they may be wrong, but it does not alter the fact. The result will be the same so far as the division on the Bill is concerned. The only distinction is that by the right hon. Gentleman bringing forward this Amendment and asking us to vote for it we are divided, whereas a clean vote against the Bill, without any Amendment of this sort, would have united us. That, therefore, would have been the better course. As I have said, I shall not vote for the Amendment, because I object to the preamble. But even if I approved of the preamble I should not vote for the Amendment, because I am anxious that unity shall prevail on this side of the House, and, if I knew that a certain number of gentlemen were not going to vote for the Amendment, I should say that the better division was the larger division, or the one which united us most, and therefore should vote simply "Nay" against the Bill. I am glad that that opportunity will come at the end of the debate, and all Members, whether English or Irish, Imperialist or pro-Boer, will be able to go into the same lobby, actuated by the same feeling, that the sooner the Government is turned out of its present position the better it will be for the country.

\*MR. COHEN (Islington, E.): I am surprised that, for I think the first time, in a speech of the right hon. Gentleman opposite, we have not received that explanation which we always expect and usually receive of the motives which have actuated him in bringing forward his proposal. Some explanation is certainly needed, because I think most Members of the House must have some difficulty in understanding the Amendment as it stands. That difficulty will not be diminished by our knowledge of the opinions of the right hon. Gentleman. The Amendment begins by asking the House to record its opinion that the proposals of my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer do not exhibit that regard for economy which the condition of the country imperatively demands. I submit that, looked at from the business point of view, the right hon. Gentleman cannot expect economy from the financial proposals of this or of any Government. I quite understand from what my right hon. friend said that he looks upon all these financial proposals as coming here with the authority of the Cabinet. Perhaps that is so, but I submit to the right hon. Gentleman that it is not from the financial proposals of a Government that you can expect economy. So soon as the House of Commons votes and the nation requires money to be expended, it really is the duty of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Government to submit proposals which will provide the money voted by the House, and which is required by the country. It seems to me that a great deal of cant is sometimes

spoken here in the name of economy, and my hon. friend the Member for Exeter has spoken of it as a platitude to talk about the safety of the Empire.

It seems to me that it is cant to talk about economy. If you want economy, practically the only way to get it is to reduce your expenditure in those departments where the money is expended; I mean the expenditure upon education, upon the Army and the Navy. Will any hon. Member of this House say that they themselves advocate a reduction of expenditure in any of these directions? If they will say so here, as some hon. Members do, will they say it also to their constituents? The hon. Member for North Monmouthshire, in speaking upon the income-tax resolution, challenged us to go to our constituencies and there advocate the expenditure we have voted for here in this House. I accept that challenge, and I say that before my constituents I have always held out that the expenditure of the country must grow; I do not mean the war expenditure but the normal expenditure. This expenditure is growing and must grow, because of the requirements of education, and because of the necessity for the increased normal expenditure in regard to our defensive forces. It is not only this country which has recognised that necessity for a growing expenditure. I have before me the figures which were given to the Statistical Society by Lord Avebury, in which it is shown that during the last twenty-five years the expenditure of France in this respect has grown from £83,000,000 to £140,000,000; the United States from £64,000,000 to £110,000,000; Russia from £74,000,000 to £149,000,000; and Italy from £44,000,000 to £70,000,000. I will not trouble the House with the figures of all the European Powers, but I do say that it is nothing but cant to talk of economy when you are not yourselves willing to reduce the expenditure which requires this taxation to be imposed.

There is only one other point to which I should like to refer. I look with a little anxiety as to the way the floating debt of this country is going abroad. I make no complaint of the increase in the income-tax, which we all recognise as necessary, and the income-tax payers have always been a target against which successive Chancellors of the Exchequer perpetually fire. I quite recognise that in times of war the income-tax is a tax to which recourse ought immediately to be had. What we complain of, if we complain at all, is not that the income-tax is raised now, but that it is never lowered in times of peace and plenty. I will not dwell upon that, because I wish to call attention to the growing unfunded debt of the country. There is a very interesting Return which has just been presented to Parliament, on the motion of the Member for Exeter, and it shows that the unfunded debt of the country has grown to the unprecedented total of £75,000,000 sterling. Of this amount, £30,000,000 is for the war loan, which is not redeemable until the year 1910. Of the remainder, there are £14,000,000 redeemable in 1905, and £10,000,000 in 1903. I hope both these amounts will be paid off out of the mines and the indemnity to be obtained from the Transvaal. That leaves £21,000,000 sterling in Treasury Bills in the hands of the public, and principally in the hands of the foreign public. That is an element of danger to the money market of England and the world, and it is not advantageous to the Exchequer. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire, in his Budget speech of 1894, dwelt upon the importance of

keeping the unfunded debt of this country in the hands of the English public. I think the strength of English finance consists in the debt being held by the British public, so that you never need fear a forced realisation by foreigners at a time which would be very inconvenient to your own money market, and which probably might bring disaster to the commercial and industrial classes of the country. I have only to say in conclusion that I think the country has recognised that this Budget is not only, as the Member for West Monmouthshire said, an honest and straightforward one, but it is also a just and equitable Budget. It has distributed the burden of taxation justly upon all classes, and I believe that the vote which will be given upon this Bill will reflect thoroughly and completely the verdict and judgment of the nation on my right hon. friend's financial proposals.

\*MR. ASHTON (Bedfordshire, Luton): In the remarks I have to make I shall confine my attention to the question of the ordinary revenue and expenditure of the country more than to the war expenditure. As to the war expenditure, I will merely say that it is to me, and, I believe, to a very large number of those who sit on this side of the House, a source of very great disappointment that we are not laying upon our own shoulders a larger share of the cost of the war rather than placing it on the shoulders of posterity. I think it must be well known to all the Members of the House that, looking to history, this is not the way war expenditure has been dealt with in previous generations. Allusion has been made to-night to what we did at the time of the Crimean War. I think I am right in saying that the taxpayers then paid something like half of the whole expenditure. If we go further back; if we go back to the really great wars of the beginning of the century; we find a still more satisfactory state of things. We see the patriotism of the people of that time urging them to far greater sacrifices than did the patriotism of the people at the time of the Crimean War. From 1806 to 1815, when not only was the stress of war far greater than it is to-day, but when the prosperity of the people was less than it is to-day, and when the commerce of the country, unlike that of to-day, was interfered with in all directions, the people of the country took upon their shoulders to pay the whole cost with the exception of the interest on the debt. It would seem that the sacrifices the people are willing to make have become less and less. In the beginning of the century the whole of the war expenditure was borne by the people, at the middle of the century half was borne, and now, taking the figures of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, he has shown that we are only putting something like one-third of the expenditure on the shoulders of the people at the present time. I confess that I cannot follow the figures of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, but I do say this, and the figures cannot be manipulated, that last year we raised extra war expenditure of about £12,000,000, and this year that £12,000,000 will go almost entirely towards the ordinary expenditure of the country apart from the war. We are raising this year £11,000,000 more for extra expenditure, and we are raising the rest of the war expenditure entirely in the form of debt. We propose to take power to raise the sum of £60,000,000 by the creation of debt, and we propose

to raise only £11,000,000 by the further taxation of the country. In other words, I make out that we are only paying this year one-seventh of the whole of the cost of the war by means of extra taxation of the country. I think that is a very lamentable state of affairs; I do not think that I put it too low when I call it cowardly finance. I think it is cowardly to posterity. I do not think that anyone will contend that posterity will gain pecuniarily by the war which has taken place. We have not done our duty as a nation during this century by paying off the debt with which the country was burdened at the beginning of the century. We have had a century of unexampled prosperity; prosperity which is not very likely to recur again, now that we have the competition of foreign countries in every quarter of the globe. I think myself that with a hundred years of great prosperity we might have done something more than pay off £200,000,000. Now we are proposing to hand on to posterity the remainder of the debt unpaid and our obligations besides. I am afraid that it is the very prosperity of the country which has tended to demoralise the people. Adversity, no doubt, is a hard taskmaster, but, at any rate, it teaches the virtues of self-sacrifice, and it is those virtues which are largely absent from the moral fibre not only of the Government, but of the people of this country at the present time.

Now, Sir, I propose to turn to the ordinary Budget. I cannot help feeling disappointed that, with such great opportunities as the Chancellor of the Exchequer has had in dealing with these hundreds of millions in consequence of this lamentable war, he has not made greater use of those opportunities in the general adjustment of the taxation of this country. As has been stated by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wolverhampton this evening, the Government does not seem to have done anything to check the extravagance of the past six or seven years. They seem to have drifted in finance as they have unfortunately drifted in other ways. They have made no attempt to stem the tide of extravagance in the expenditure of the country. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton gave some interesting figures of the extent of that extravagance. I think he put it very low, for, as far as I can make out from the figures one can get at, the increase in the ordinary expenditure from 1895 up to the present time has been no less than 30 per cent. I am glad to think that the Chancellor of the Exchequer feels keenly that that is a serious state of things. It is a serious state of things which, if continued on these lines, will bring even this great and prosperous country to the verge of bankruptcy. I regret especially that the Chancellor of the Exchequer has not dealt with the question of local taxation and grants in aid from the Imperial exchequer. The Chancellor of the Exchequer has told us, and I entirely agree with him, that looking to the vast increase in the ordinary expenditure of the country, it is essential, or, at any rate, it is advisable that the framework of the taxation should be enlarged. But before extending the framework of taxation I think the first thing we ought to do is to get back to the national exchequer the vast sums of money going away in relief of local taxation. In order to enlarge the framework the Chancellor of the Exchequer has only put on the sugar duty and the coal tax, for we can hardly

call the increase of the income tax an enlargement of the framework. I for one do not complain of the sugar tax. I feel very strongly that at the time of a war like this which has undoubtedly been a popular war, although I wish it had not been so, popular, it is only right that all classes in the country should be called upon to pay something towards the extra taxation that is necessary for the war. I would suggest to the Chancellor of the Exchequer that, when times of peace return again, instead of abolishing the sugar tax he should leave it at a low rate, so that we should have always the means of increasing it in case of distress. He should also leave the tea duty at a low point, so that in case of distress it could be increased;

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

\*MR. ASHTON: I wish to say a word about the coal tax. There is a great deal to be said in favour of the coal tax if by that means you can prevent the export of coal from the country. There is also something to be said, on the other hand, for the contention that the tax should be put on all kinds of coal, whether it is consumed at home or sent abroad, but there is nothing to be said, in my opinion, for the miserable compromise adopted by the Government in putting 1s. duty on exported coal. In the first place, it will not have the effect of preventing the export of coal, and, looking at it from the other point of view, it is unfair to put a tax on one half of the industry and leave the other half untouched. The Chancellor of the Exchequer has increased the income tax by 2d. I think, and many of my hon. friends around me will agree, that it would only have been fair that the wealthier people should have been asked to pay a larger share of the taxation which is necessary. Fourpence would have been a very much fairer increase. We are told that this tax is to be part of the permanent framework of the taxation of the country. Well, if it is to be maintained as part of the permanent framework of taxation, all will admit that the time has come when something should be done to free brain capital from paying at the same rate as money capital. We have done something by letting off the small incomes, but have practically done nothing for alleviating the position of those whose incomes come from brain work. I am aware that it is a difficult subject, but I do not think that it is beyond the wit of men to tackle it.

I desire to say a few words in regard to the question of payments to the Local Taxation Account and grants-in-aid, on which subject I feel very strongly indeed. One of the first things which in my opinion we ought to do, considering the growing expenditure of the country, is to get rid of those vast payments that have annually been made towards the local taxation of the country. I am not going for one moment to pretend that if this is done there ought not to be an equivalent for them given to the ratepayers. It is, of course, known to everybody that this system of doles to local authorities is a very vicious system. In the first place it is a constant dead weight round the neck of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. However intent he may be on increasing the yield of his taxes, he has always to consider that a proportion of it is going to be taken out of his pocket and given to those who do not deserve it because they have not earned it. Then, these contributions undoubtedly lead to a great deal



of local extravagance, and a grave wrong is thus done both to the ratepayers and the taxpayers of the country. These gifts from the Imperial exchequer to the local exchequers of county and district councils are looked upon as windfalls. I will give one illustration which came under my own observation. A local authority came to me and asked me to assist them in carrying out a local improvement by a gift of land. I replied that I was willing to give the land, but it seemed to me to be a costly improvement, and not worth the expense to the ratepayers. The answer was, "Oh, we are not going to pay for the whole of it, the county is to give us so much towards the cost." So long as these local authorities get the windfalls from the Exchequer they do not consider economy in any way. They do not seem to admit that either as taxpayers or as ratepayers the amount of this extravagant expenditure is really being drawn out of their own pockets. There is another serious point in connection with these contributions to the local authorities. Though the ratepayers and the taxpayers are, in the main, the same, there is no doubt that in transferring part of the obligations of the ratepayers to the taxpayers you are removing obligations from the property owners to the working classes of the country. I do not know whether the House is aware of the extent to which grants-in-aid have grown during the last fifty or sixty years. At the present moment they have reached a total sum of over fourteen millions; but in 1842 they amounted to only £;600,000. If any tax could be found which could be handed over to the local authorities in lieu of grants in aid it must fulfil certain conditions. In the first place it must be collected from the ratepayers. The ratepayers must feel the responsibility for it. In the next place it must be collected without extra cost to the occupiers of tenancies; and lastly, it ought to be distributed fairly over the local area. The house duty seems in many ways to be a tax which might very well be handed over by the Imperial Exchequer to the local authorities. At present the house duty is a graduated tax on all houses over £;15 rent, and the total yield is only £;1,700,000. That would go a very short distance towards the relief of local taxation. But I suggest that instead of being graduated, a tax of 8d. in the £;1 should be imposed on all houses over £;15 a year valuation; and that it should be extended to Ireland, which at present escapes the house duty. I believe that by that means £;4,000,000 might be obtained from the house tax a year, instead of £;1,700,000. Next I would turn my attention to licences. Of course, a number of licences are handed over to the local authorities at present; but what I wish especially to allude to is the licences for fully licenced public-houses. The Chancellor of the Exchequer has told us that we have got to the end of the beer duty. I think that is very likely the case, but a large field still remains open in dealing with this question of public-house licences. At present the duties are levied on licensed houses at different rates. Houses that are valued at from £;15 to £;20 annually pay a duty which is equivalent to 40 or 50 per cent. of their annual value; but when you get to houses of £;600 or £;700 annual value, the duty levied only amounts to between 10 and 15 per cent. Now, that is a very unfair method of taxation. The taxation of this country has progressed with the idea that the wealthier people are, the more taxation they are able to bear;

but, on the contrary, in dealing with licensed houses we proceed on the theory that the poorer the house the larger the share of the duty it ought to bear. It would not be extravagant to say that the larger and wealthier houses should contribute according to their rateable value, and that the duty should be raised to the same level as that on the poorer houses, namely, 40 or 50 per cent. I go further, and maintain that it would be justifiable to raise the duty to over 40 or 50 per cent. The result of a house being licensed is that the value of the property is increased four or five times. That is a low figure. Again, the public-houses are rated at a lower rate than other houses compared with the annual value to the owner. I do not think it would be an extravagant thing to say that the nation or the ratepayers should get a larger proportion than it does at present of the increased value due to the monopoly granted to these houses. If we were to do that, we should see that this duty was, at any rate, paid to a larger extent than at present by the owners, and not by the occupiers. I go further, and say that the occupiers should be allowed to deduct at any rate a large part of the duty from the rent they paid the landlord. I am not going beyond the mark in saying that if you raised the duty on the more costly houses, instead of getting £1,700,000 a year from licences, you would obtain something approaching £5,000,000 without doing any harm to anybody, and only doing justice to the ratepayers.

For my part, I think that the time has arrived when the Agricultural Rating Act should be allowed to come to an end. The Chancellor of the Exchequer has told us to-day, in a very interesting speech, that it is nonsense to say that the money from the Agricultural Rating Act goes into the pockets of the landowners, but obviously that it goes into the pockets of the farmers, to relieve the farmers who are supposed to be suffering from agricultural depression. Very well, if we were to act practically on this question, we have to recognise the fact laid down by the Chancellor of the Exchequer that we cannot get that money back out of the pockets of the farmers, now that it has been given to them. What I would suggest is to let this Act expire, and give the Chancellor of the Exchequer the £1,500,000 a year; and resort for an equivalent to an expedient for which Liberals have voted in the past; namely, that we should divide the rates between the owners and the occupiers. If that were done the farmers, would get the same advantage as now, and we should relieve a great many who deserve relief quite as much as those who were relieved five years ago; namely, the agricultural labourers and village shopkeepers. I do not think that anyone would say that Lord Goschen is a revolutionist, but it will be in the recollection of the House that in the

year 1872, Mr. Goschen, as he then was, was Chancellor of the Exchequer, or at any rate in office, and he brought forward a proposition in this House that the rates in the country should be divided between the owners and occupiers. I do not think, therefore, that we need call that a very revolutionary doctrine. I would further point out to the House that in 1886 Mr. Thorold Rogers brought forward a resolution in favour of the division of the rates between owners and occupiers, and that it was carried in the House of Commons. I have endeavoured to supply the Chancellor of the Exchequer with a local Budget that ought to

assist him in forming a new basis of the system of taxation. I have made a present to him of £10,500,000 by the changes to which I most respectfully call his attention. It is perfectly true that a little of that would come off the house duty and licences; say to the extent of £3,500,000, but I am making him a present, at any rate, of £7,000,000. I wish the right hon. Gentleman were here, for I am perfectly sure that I would see his mouth watering on the prospect. I apologise to the House for having detained hon Members so long, but I have long felt strongly the importance of getting rid of the Imperial contributions to local taxation and so relieving in that way the Imperial Exchequer. We have lost the control of our own revenue, and I am sure the suggestions I have made would do something to restore that control to the House.

\*MR. RENSCHAW (Renfrewshire, W.): The speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton, to whom the House always pays the attention he deserves, from the admirable manner in which he touches the various subjects on which he addresses it, was a most interesting one. And I am quite sure that those who heard it felt the weight of the arguments which he invited the House to consider and give their votes upon. In the course of that speech the right hon. Gentleman divided the recent periods of finance into three-epochs. The epoch from 1890 to 1893 he spoke of as comparatively blessed, that from 1893 to 1896 as somewhat

less blessed, and then he referred to the condition of affairs in 1900 as being very much worse than in either of the two other epochs. But a great difference has taken place in connection with the finances of the country since 1893&#x2013;6, and I think the House will agree that that was owing to the passing of the Death Duties Act. That was an enormous change in the method by which revenue was collected in this country. It was a revenue which was easily got and it has been just as easily spent, and the lesson we ought to learn from that, in regard to economy, is that, if the population of this country do not feel the burden of taxation, it is in vain for the right hon. Gentleman or any other hon. Member, however great his weight and authority in the House and the country, to suggest economy in the national finances.

MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) You promised to spend it on old age pensions.

\*MR. RENSCHAW: The death duties Act was not passed by this present Government, but by the Government of which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Monmouth was Chancellor of the Exchequer. The hon. Gentleman will agree with me that if money is lightly come by it is very easily spent. The outstanding feature of the Budget of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer; and that which recommends it to the general approval of the people of this country; is that it seeks to widen the basis of taxation, to make the people feel that they must pay the cost of every engagement into which they enter.

I think, Sir, that the attack of the right hon. Gentleman opposite to-night was made with blank cartridge. I do not know who has drawn the shot out of the gun he was firing, but I am perfectly certain it was blank cartridge. He has preached economy to us. Although the Chancellor of the Exchequer has told us that he was the only economist left in the House, I believe there are still a large number of us in the House who are deeply interested in the subject, and

who are most anxious to see retrenchment in regard to the general expenditure of the country. But when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton came to deal with the question as to where the retrenchment was to take place, he was somewhat vague. It cannot take place in regard to the Navy. That he admits. He then dealt with the question of education, but in regard to that I believe the party opposite are all in favour of a large expenditure on national education, although they question the wisdom of some of the present expenditure. So do many of us on this side of the House. I doubt the wisdom of educating children under five years of age. I see from the Report of the Department that children under three years of age are being educated. I think that the cost of the education of children under five years of age is what the nation might very well be spared. Then I think the education of people twice over; of grown men and women; is a national expense we might spare ourselves; and if the right hon. Gentleman will urge that view upon the House he would find support on this side of the House. Then comes the question of the Army. I quite agree with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton that the country is in favour of making our Army strong enough for the necessities of military defence, and I believe with him that we look to the present Government to carry out substantial reforms in regard to War Office administration. At the last General Election I believe the people were far more deeply stirred in regard to that question than as to reform of the Army itself. The right hon. Gentleman says that the feeling of the country is growing that we do not get our money's worth, that there is a frittering away and wasting of the money of the nation in the support of our military system. I believe that not only on that but on this side of the House the Government will find that in securing military reforms and substantial and effective reforms in the War Office they will be backed up by the feeling of the country.

The right hon. Gentleman, dealing with the question of the new taxation created by the Budget, passed lightly over the subject of the income tax. The hon. Member who has just addressed the House dealt with that question to some extent, and he suggested that it

was an unfortunate feature that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had not made the income tax higher than 1s. 2d. He said it had only been increased 2d. in consequence of the war. But I should like to remind the hon. Member and the House that last year there was an augmentation of 4d., and that 1s. 2d. in the £; is a very large tax upon the comparatively small class from which it is collected. For a long time in this country the income tax was regarded as a war tax. It was put on originally in 1799, and reached 2s. in 1806, but in 1815 it ceased to be levied altogether for a long period. In 1842 it was again re-imposed by Sir Robert Peel, and from that date to this a comparatively small class of the community have been called upon to pay a very substantial share of the Imperial charges of the country, and I venture to say that they have done it ungrudgingly. Mr. Gladstone held a tempting bait out to the income-tax payer in 1873, when he made an election speech in which he proposed the definite repeal of the income tax. The country did not respond, however, and the tax has since been levied from year to year. For my part I think it would be a most

unfortunate thing if the income tax came to be regarded as the only tax which was to be resorted to in the future whenever the national finances demanded additional taxation. The Chancellor of the Exchequer has, in my opinion, very wisely added to the various methods by which the revenue of this country can be raised. He has put a tax on sugar, and as far as I can understand neither the House nor the country take serious objection to it. [Several HON. MEMBERS: No, no.] Hon. Members say "No, no," therefore I understand that there is a comparatively small section in this House which takes exception to the imposition of the sugar duty. Do the great body of the community express that view? I do not think so for a moment. I believe that the British public appreciate the necessity for additional taxation, and are proud to pay their share of the expense of the war. The right hon. Gentleman at all events took no serious objection to the question of the sugar duty, but he did take exception to the new duty which the Chancellor of the Exchequer proposes to levy on export coal.

I would ask the House for a moment to consider the exceptional grounds on which he argues that this new taxation is an undesirable one. He says that we have no right to levy an export duty unless upon a monopoly. I am not prepared to accept that theory. The necessities of the country override all questions as to whether or not we are theoretically right in creating new charges in respect of the taxation of the country. With regard to the new duty on coal, the gentlemen who have been most loud in their denunciation of it have been the wealthy colliery proprietors who regard it as an undue imposition on their particular industry, but by their own action during the last eighteen months they have levied upon the general trade of the country a very serious charge. I noticed the other evening that figures with reference to the profits of the colliery proprietors were bandied about from one side to the other, but I am quite sure that they are represented very much by the figures which the Chancellor of the Exchequer stated. However, for the purposes of my argument, I am willing to accept even a smaller sum. As far as four-fifths of it was concerned it was a charge upon the households and the industrial commerce of the country. Out of what was the higher price paid if it was not paid for largely by the commercial classes? And what was it which has brought the iron and steel trade of this country into the position in which it is? The high price of coal has demoralised the iron and steel trade. I do not believe a bit in the bogey of American coal competition. American coal can be produced cheaper, I believe, at the pit's mouth than British coal, but I doubt if anybody reads through the reports made by the consuls in 1898 will believe that in European ports American coal is likely to be a serious competitor of British coal. In the Blue Book published by the Board of Trade, 1900, the price of coal in America at the pit's mouth in 1886 was 6s. 4d., and of British coal 4s. 10d. For the year 1898 the price in Great Britain was 6s. 4d., and in America 4s. 5d. That is a serious change, and some official explanation has been given of it. I notice in the Report on Mines and Quarries last year, Mr. Foster gives as a reason;

"The difference between the two great coal producing countries of the world in respect to the use of labour-saving appliances is very marked indeed; whilst the

United States owe 23 per cent. of their total output of coal to the use of coal-cutting machinery, only a little more than 1 per cent. was so obtained in this country, for we learn from my colleague, Mr. Gerrard, that the total amount of coal cut by machinery in 1899 was only 3 million tons." And I notice in the same Report it is stated officially that the difference in the use of coal mining by machinery and working in the ordinary way in the State of Illinois was 7d. a ton. When this question of coal production is discussed, it is not unnatural that the question should be asked why it is the production per miner in this country averages 291 tons, whilst in America it averages 490. Is not that due to the widespread use of coal producing machinery? I am satisfied that the general body of people in this country are favourable to this tax, which is put upon the general trade with the country. It is desirable, at all events, that something should be done to prevent the continual extension of the exportation of coal, and this 1s. per ton may do something in that direction. I hope for my part if it does not that the Chancellor of the Exchequer will go a little further I thank the House for having listened to me so patiently. I approve of the Budget as a whole. I think it is a wise and prudent one to meet the large and growing expenditure of the country, and I believe the people were never better able to bear the burden than they are at the present time.

\*MR. MCCRAE (Edinburgh, E.): The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer made, I think, rather an unfair charge against the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wolverhampton, when he said that the right hon. Gentleman had attempted to mislead the House and the country, by the figures he presented to the House. I will, so far as I can, meet the Chancellor of the Exchequer on his own ground, and deal with the figures in the way in which he has dealt with them, and analyse the financial position of the nation at the present time. All who listened to his Budget speech must have been impressed by the lucidity and ability with which the right hon. Gentleman presented his case to the House, but the gravity of the financial position is such that no argument, however specious, can palliate, no statement, however brilliant, can deny. But the gravity of the financial position is much more serious than even the case presented to-day by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton. Sixty years ago, on the 18th of May, 1841, Sir Robert Peel gave utterance to these words;

"I view with unaffected sympathy the position of the right hon. the Chancellor of the Exchequer. It has been remarked that a good man struggling with adversity is a sight worthy of the gods; and certainly the right hon. Gentleman, both with respect to the goodness of the man and the extent of the adversity, presents at the present moment that spectacle. Can there be a more lamentable picture than that of a Chancellor of the Exchequer seated on an empty chest by the pool of a bottomless deficiency fishing for a budget?"

That is what the Chancellor of the Exchequer is now doing. History repeats itself. That is the position to-day, with this difference, that our difficulties are a hundredfold greater, and our financial embarrassments much more alarming. The right hon. Gentleman admits the gravity of the situation, and I think to-day

he presented a travesty of the case when he said the main feature of this year's Budget was a war expenditure. No doubt the war expenditure is large, but from a financial point of view the growth of the normal expenditure is much more alarming; and here I differ from some hon. Gentlemen who are lavish with their praise of the right hon. Gentleman's courage and candour. His courage I deny, and candour ceases to be a virtue when it becomes inevitable, when the skeleton at the feast can no longer be hidden from the eyes of the guests. I think the right hon. Gentleman should have taken a much bolder course. We must remember that we were on the downward grade, financially, before the war began; we deplore the heavy responsibilities which the war has occasioned, and that it has obscured the vision and deadened the conscience of the nation to the full import of this alarming increase in ordinary expenditure. That increase has been borne philosophically by the taxpayer because he believed it was a temporary burden; but if expenditure increases in the same ratio as during the last five years the revenue will only be able to keep pace with it by very large additions being made to taxation, apart altogether from war debt and interest.

A large increase of expenditure under a Conservative and Unionist Government is nothing new. During the administration of Lord Beaconsfield, from 1874 to 1880, the expenditure increased by £10,000,000, or £2,000,000 per annum. During the next administration, which was Mr. Gladstone's, it increased by £1,000,000 per annum. During Lord Salisbury's administration, from 1886 to 1891, the expenditure seemed to be normal, but that was only by the sinking fund being reduced in 1887 by £2,000,000, and in 1889 by a further million per annum. The next administration was Lord Rosebery's, and under that the expenditure increased by £1,000,000 per annum. Indeed one could tell the political complexion of the Government in power by a study of the national accounts. A Conservative Government is somewhat of a luxury, and the present Government is no exception to what is apparently an economic law. The increase is not altogether due to the war. During the first four years of the present Government the expenditure increased by £19,000,000, and what is the position now? In 1895-96, the last financial year during which a Liberal Government was only in power a portion of the time, the expenditure, exclusive of the local taxation account, was £97,500,000; now it is £127,000,000, showing an increase of £29,000,000. If we add to that the three millions and a quarter increase in local taxation expenditure and the two millions suspended from the contributions to the sinking fund to the National Debt, the increase amounts to £35,358,000, or an increase of nearly £6,000,000 per annum. Was that expenditure necessary? Since when has it been necessary? In 1897 the right hon. Gentleman, speaking at Sheffield with regard to Army expenditure, said;

"I wonder whether the Commander-in-Chief himself and his great military coadjutors would really tell the country that they obtained at the present moment an adequate return for the 18 millions a year spent on the Army."

That £18,000,000 is now increased to £30,000,000, exclusive of war charges. Is he now convinced that for the larger sum he gets an adequate return? At Bristol, in the May of 1900, the right hon. Gentleman said;

"He dared say when the war was over that they would have a demand for a great increase in our Regular Army. He disbelieved in the necessity of any such increase."

I think, therefore, we may say the Chancellor of the Exchequer is one of those who is opposed to the spirit of militarism, and not in favour of an aggressive policy. With regard to the expenditure on the Navy, I do not think any charge can be made against the Liberal party that when they were in power they neglected the Navy. What is the policy of the Government? What is the objective? A different standard is now being adopted; it is no longer considered sufficient that the Navy should equal the navies of two European Powers; now it has to equal four, and I have no doubt some will say it will not be sufficient until our Navy equals the navies of the whole world. The noble Lord the Member for Greenwich said we ought to be prepared to meet the whole world in arms. If we could finance the country as economically as the noble Lord finances some of the voluntary schools we hear of, it might be done. Russia and France spent on their navies last year £;21,000,000, Britain is prepared to spend £;33,000,000. It is fallacious to suppose that the mere spending of money is a guarantee of efficiency. The same spirit of extravagance is apparent through the whole expenditure. The Army Estimates have increased from £;18,000,000 to £;30,000,000; the salaries of the law officers of the Crown have increased during the same period from £;19,000 to £;30,000 a year. In the collection of income and land tax the right hon. Gentleman is losing at the present time £;50,000 a year by insufficient collection. If these taxes were collected in England in the same way as they are in Scotland the Chancellor of the Exchequer would gain another £;50,000 a year. The collection at 31st January in Scotland amounts to 67 per cent., and in England it is only 32 per cent. In Scotland at 28th February 93 per cent. has been collected against 53 percent., leaving outstanding in England at that date fourteen millions sterling. I was much struck by a speech of an hon. Member with regard to the subventions to local authorities; there is nothing so fruitful of extravagance as these grants-in-aid of local taxation. In the Report of the Royal Commission which has just sat to consider the question of local taxation Sir Edward Hamilton says;

"Under the old system the millions appropriated to local purposes were annually controlled and supervised by the House of Commons. The amount; and a still larger amount; which went to meet local requirements under the new system was once for all surrendered."

The House has no control over the expenditure, and it is iniquitous in this way that it is unjust to the working class taxpayer, who pays £;1 to the Imperial Exchequer, and whose local rates are relieved to the extent of 5s. What we want is a divorce between local taxation and Imperial taxation, and it could be effected by providing some other source of revenue to be levied directly by the local authorities and relieving the Imperial Exchequer of payments to local taxation. I ask the right hon. Gentleman, does he take a courageous course with regard to economy in public expenditure? There is always an alternative for the head of a great Department of State whose views have no effect with his



colleagues, but the right hon. Gentleman has not taken advantage of that alternative; he passed the Agricultural Rates Act and the Tithes Act instead. The large expenditure of the country makes it imperative that there should be greater economy. It will take the Chancellor of the Exchequer all his time to provide for his own debts without backing the bills of the Colonial Secretary. The ordinary expenditure, apart from the war, had increased enormously, and before the war the Chancellor of the Exchequer was not paying his way. The right hon. Gentleman admitted it when he resorted to these doubtful expedients in 1899, because he then said;

"If I do not reduce the amount applicable for the debt by two millions, I shall require to impose taxation, to increase direct as well as indirect taxation."

He started with a surplus of £4,000,000, and he had the advantage of the increase of the death duties, which amount to £7,000,000 per annum, and the position to-day was this enormous deficit. There never was a time of greater need for economy, and we on this side welcome the expressions of the hon. Member for Exeter and others on that side who spoke in favour of economy.

The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer complained that the right hon. Member for East Wolverhampton had said little about war expenditure. I have always held that this war might have been avoided, and I therefore can speak freely. The Chancellor of the Exchequer says that compared with the issues involved the war expenditure was a trifle. That is not the spirit in which the right hon. Gentleman ought to approach this question of expenditure. The total expenditure for the war is £147,650,000; of that £142,800,000 is attributed to debt, and £4,850,000 to interest. What provision is being made for the liquidation of that amount by those responsible for the war? The Chancellor of the Exchequer said this evening that £45,271,000 had been paid off from all sources. That is not a third part of the debt, but I object to the right hon.

Gentleman taking credit for either the suspension of the Sinking Fund or the realised surplus as moneys coming out of taxation. Of this £45,000,000 which was paid off over £9,000,000 came from the contribution from the suspension of the Sinking Fund and over £9,000,000 from realised surpluses, but the £18,500,000 should have gone to decrease capital expenditure. I agree with the hon. Member for Mayo when he said it was only accumulating debt in another form. The National Debt is larger by £18,500,000, and the right hon. Gentleman ought not to take credit for a transaction of that kind. Out of taxation we have only provided £26,974,000, of which £4,850,000 is for interest which must be paid, so that the Government has only provided out of taxation £21,899,000, or a seventh part of the debt, to meet the expenditure of the war in South Africa. It is a species of financial legerdemain unworthy of the nation. The ordinary expenditure, comparing the Estimates with Estimates of last year, shows an increase of £11,300,000. The additional taxation imposed in the present year amounts to £11,000,000 so that nothing additional has been provided for war expenditure, and allowing the Treasury Estimates of increased revenue to be correct, that shows a deficit apart from extra taxation of £9,269,000, and the balance between that and the £11,300,000 shows a provision

of only two-thirds of the interest for the year payable on account of the war, but we apply nothing in liquidation of the war debt. Is that good finance? Is that wholesale borrowing consistent with the pledges given to this House by the right hon. Gentleman himself? What did he say in December, 1900, three months after the country was told the war was over;

"I have said throughout I would not make the borrowing for the war a permanent burden on the country."

That is what he is doing now. If he was anxious to keep his pledges he ought to have ear-marked the loan and provided for it on the annuity principle, but he borrowed £60,000,000 on Consols, which will not be distinguishable from the National Debt. When the war was at an end was the former contribution to the Sinking Fund to be increased in respect of these additional sixty millions? I do not hesitate to say that the Government are shifting the responsibility and avoiding their just liabilities. It is the old story of leaving the debt to their successors to pay.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer said some time ago that if the ordinary expenditure increased as it was doing, we should require to find new and productive sources of revenue. We have had duties proposed on coal and sugar; the one cannot be said to be productive, and the other is by no means new. When the right hon. Gentleman is endeavouring to find new sources of taxation, why does he not increase the licence duties? Even in Edinburgh as much as £10,000 and £12,000 have been paid for the transfer of a licence. That is an unearned increment that certainly ought to be taxed. He has lost a great opportunity. If he had faced the situation he might have taken advantage of the crisis to deal with taxation of land values, an increase of licence duties, and other financial reforms deemed too heroic for calmer times. The right hon. Gentleman has many sound financial opinions, but the fatal influence of his environment prevents him carrying them to logical conclusions. He declared himself a free trader, yet imposed an export coal duty. He denounced the inequity of making war expenditure a permanent burden on the country, yet borrowed £60,000,000, and hung up £50,000,000 more for a more convenient season; he warned the country against the dire results of increased expenditure, yet supported the Agricultural Rates Act and the Tithes Act. Whatever gibes may be thrown at the squabbles and altercations in the Liberal party, they have never wavered in their allegiance to the principles of sound finance; but once more it will be their misfortune to succeed to a mortgaged estate. One result at least will follow, that the Unionist party will not for many years again be returned to power.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I do not think that the oldest Member of this House will be able to recollect so extraordinary and humiliating a spectacle as has been presented by this debate to-night. This is supposed to be a great parliamentary occasion, one of those occasions when great issues are at stake, when there is a conflict of parties, and when the House is deeply moved. We are to-night discussing an extraordinary Budget; a Budget without parallel in the history of this country, a Budget dealing not with millions, but hundreds of millions of public money, a Budget which raises the ordinary expenditure of this country to

a higher point than it has ever stood at before, a Budget which raises the Army and naval expenditure to the huge total of £;60,000,000, a Budget which imposes new and oppressive taxation on the people, and lays a burden on one of the staple articles of food of the poorer classes, a Budget based upon a war of which no man can see the end, which up to the present has cost this country £;150,000,000 of public money; and in this unparalleled crisis in the nation's history, when notice of a vote of want of confidence in the Government has been officially given by the Opposition, there would seem to be all the elements of a great discussion. But the debate opened this afternoon with absolute apathy and listlessness. I have seen more interest expressed on a Wednesday afternoon when the House was discussing the pro-

posals of some private Members. I ask myself what does it mean? Is it that the policy of the Government, the policy underlying this Budget, commands the almost unanimous support of all sections of the House. Nothing of the kind. There never was, I believe, a Government in office which has excited a more bitter and deep-seated opposition among the different sections of the House, and there never was a Government whose policy was more bitterly resented and abhorred by many sections of this House. Then what is the reason for the unparalleled scene which was witnessed when the debate was inaugurated this afternoon? The explanation, to my mind, is very simple. It is, in the first place, that the right hon.

Gentleman who has been put forward by the official Opposition to move this Amendment is a man who is morally as responsible for the policy underlying and necessitating this Budget as any man on the Ministerial benches. The explanation is that the right hon. Gentleman has been committed on behalf of the official Opposition to move an Amendment which, from beginning to end, is a mere dishonest platitude; an Amendment which neither approves nor condemns a signal vital issue in this controversy, and which is most carefully and skilfully drawn so as not to commit the mover of the Amendment or any of its supporters to any principle or policy whatever.

I desire, in the very few moments I propose to occupy, to get away if I can from all this make-belief, and to deal with what seem to me to be the real issues at stake. So far as the Irish Members on this side are concerned, we object to this Budget root and branch. On the first occasion when the subject of this Budget came before the House I briefly intimated the reasons which animated Irish Members in opposing it. They oppose it, first, on the ground that they believe, on the authority of the Royal Commission, that Ireland is called upon to pay more than her fair share of all this expenditure. That is a subject which it would be quite in order for me to discuss, I apprehend, on this occasion, but I recognise that it is not a convenient opportunity for the discussion, and the Government have announced that they will give us after

Whitsuntide a special day for the consideration of this grave question. I pass from it, then, merely mentioning it as the first ground of objection that the Irish Members have to this Budget. The second ground is the character of the taxation. I heard the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton, in which, making a great grievance of the coal duty, he spoke lightly of the imposition of the duty on sugar. As the representatives of a poor

nation, which pays in indirect taxation far more than the proportion paid in Great Britain, we protest against the imposition of the sugar duty; a duty which, small though it may appear in its incidence upon any particular individual family, is yet one which will be felt almost entirely by the poorer classes, and which will bring suffering and hardship into every poor little cabin through the West and South of Ireland. We object also to this Budget because of the cause which underlies it. The cause which underlies this Budget is, of course, the military expenditure necessitated by the war. I will pass lightly over this point; because I always endeavour to avoid repeating myself, and I have already spoken upon this point; but this much I must be allowed to say once more. The Irish Nationalist Members on the question of this war sympathise heartily and wholly with the Boers. These men, fighting in their mountain fastnesses against overwhelming odds, seem to us in the light of a people fighting for the greatest cause to which brave men ever consecrated their swords and their lives; they are fighting for their liberties and their homes. I remember at an early stage of this Transvaal controversy, shortly, I think, after the war commenced, that the Secretary for the Colonies made some allusion to the God of battles. Well, Sir, in this controversy England has had almost everything upon her side. She has had the numbers, and she has had the money; who will say she has had the God of battles? I believe that on the side of England this has been the most disgraceful war in her history. It has been a war promoted by greed, and carried on with untold cruelty. A more shameful record than the Return published the other day of the number of Boer homesteads burned down by your troops is not to be found, I believe, in the history of any civilised country in the world. It has been for you an inglorious war, with your 250,000 men in the field pitted against, as we are told, some 10,000 or 12,000 Boers in scattered parties at present in the field. And, above all; I say above all, because it is what, after all, will probably awaken the conscience of the country more than anything else; it has been a ruinously costly war. Passing over these grounds thus shortly, I say that the Irish Nationalist Members in this House protest against this Budget on these three grounds: because it calls upon Ireland to pay more than her fair share of the taxation; because of the character of the taxation, which presses most hardly upon the poorer classes; and because the whole reason of this Budget is this disgraceful and inglorious war, to which, if we had our way, we would not permit our country to contribute one farthing. The House is really, I admit, most fair and tolerant in listening to views which probably to the majority of Members are not very palatable, but I have felt it my duty, without unduly delaying the House by repetition, to emphasise once more these grounds upon which we object to the Budget. Hon. Members will probably think that our position has been so clear up to the present that this repetition was scarcely necessary. However, I have endeavoured to make this statement short.

It may be said, and fairly said, perhaps, that it was unnecessary for me to speak at all. The real reason I have risen is, not that I believe either the House or the country has any doubt or misunderstanding as to our attitude on this war, but in order that we may make our position perfectly clear and

intelligible with reference to this precious. Amendment. I desire to ask respectfully what does this Amendment mean? I confess that before the debate commenced I was considerably puzzled as to the meaning of this Amendment, and, having listened patiently to the speech of the proposer, I am more puzzled now than before. The preamble declares; "That this House, while ready to make adequate provision for the naval and military requirements of the Empire," and so forth. Now, I want to ask what does that phrase mean? The right hon.

Gentleman who moved

the Amendment spoke, forsooth, of what he was pleased to call the peace expenditure. That is the phrase he gave to what is going to be the normal expenditure of this country; expenditure consisting in part of £60,000,000 a year for the Army and the Navy. That is the expenditure termed by the right hon.

Gentleman a peace expenditure. May I use the phrase without offence; What a hypocritical argument! Of all the men in this House the right hon.

Gentleman has the least right to stand up here as the champion of economy. He does not complain, indeed, of the increased expenditure on the Navy. He does, in a faint, half-hearted way, complain of the increased expenditure on the Army. I

ask this House to recollect that that increase in the military expenditure has not been accomplished by one stroke. It has been gradual during the last few years, year after year. When did the right hon. Gentleman rise in his place in the past to protest even by word or vote against this increase of expenditure?

No, the right hon. Gentleman made no such effort on the side of economy; but when this enormous military expenditure was being piled up it was left to the Irish Members on these benches, alone and unaided, to make arguments in favour of economy in the public Departments. The right hon. Gentleman posed to-night as the champion of economy; a pretty champion, forsooth! The apostle of Liberal Imperialism masquerading as an economist! The increases in the military expenditure of this country, with which the right hon. Gentleman found fault, are the direct and necessary result of the policy of Imperialism, which he has preached up and down all through England. The right hon. Gentleman, I am bound to say, although he endeavoured to pose as the champion of economy, did not carry his economical views very far. He does not disagree with the increased expenditure on the Navy. He was not very definite or clear as to how he would reduce the increased expenditure on the Army made necessary by the policy which he has enthusiastically adopted. But he did say something on the amount spent on education. I ask again, what does this Amendment mean? I expected to receive from the

right hon. Gentleman some light and leading upon this matter, which would enable men who take an independent view of these things to make up their mind whether to vote for the Amendment or not. Does this Amendment mean approval of the war policy? It says; "While ready to make adequate provision for the naval and military requirements of the Empire." For my part, I would have thought that that committed us to approval of the war, no matter from whose lips the statement came, but when the statement comes from the lips of a man who has openly and enthusiastically supported the policy of the war, I have no alternative but to come to the conclusion that this Amendment does mean an

approval of that policy. The right hon. Gentleman is the representative par excellence on this side of the House of that policy. Indeed, it would not be going too far to say that he was elected to this Parliament as a supporter of the Government on the really vital issue at the Election. When a right hon. Gentleman with this past history asks me to vote in favour of a declaration that this House is ready to make adequate provision for the naval and military requirements of the Empire, I take that to be an invitation to vote in favour of the policy of this war. In my opinion, any man who votes for the Amendment will be voting in favour of the policy of the war. ["No."] Does anyone question this? ["Yes."] I am glad to hear that. One or two Gentlemen above the gangway say that voting for this Amendment does not pledge them to the war. Very well. Does this Amendment mean a condemnation of the war?

AN HON. MEMBER: It has nothing to do with the war.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Very well. There is one great vital issue at stake in this Budget, and an Amendment is proposed on behalf of the Opposition which does not commit anyone either to approval of the war or to condemnation of it; What, then, I ask, does it mean? Why, Sir, it means nothing at all. It is a facing-both-ways Amendment; it is a silly and, it seems to me, rather a contemptible evasion of the real issues at stake. If I might be allowed respectfully to say one word further, I would say that until the Opposition in this House make up their minds to stand by some policy, no matter how mistaken, or to stand by some principle, no matter how hum-drum, they cannot expect to command that respect in the country which must be the forerunner of popular support. Therefore, for the reasons which I have given I denounce this Amendment as a sham and a make-believe, put forward here by a man who; if he stands for anything; stands for all those principles of the present Government which are most abhorrent, as I believe, to the true democratic instinct of the people of Great Britain as well as of Ireland. Of course, I do not know what the rank and file of the Opposition will do upon this Amendment, but so far as the Irish Members are concerned the House may take it for granted that they will not be a party to this sham. This debate must of necessity, from the manner in which it was introduced, and from the character of the Amendment, be a dismal mockery and a hollow farce. The Irish Nationalist Members of this House have had to endure with patience many accusations of wasting the time of Parliament. After all, there is this to be said for us, that when we have been accused of wasting the time of Parliament we have been debating, perhaps, at too great length, with a reiteration which would be avoided by men of greater oratorical skill, subjects which, humble as they may seem to the large intelligence of Imperialist Members of this House, are subjects intimately affecting the lives and the happiness of the poorest of our population at home. That is to be said in extenuation for us if we do in this foreign Parliament occupy too much of your time. What is to be said of the occupation of three valuable nights of Parliament time in the discussion of a ridiculous Amendment like this, which is based upon no principle, and which, upon the admission of hon. Members above the gangway, does not commit anybody to anything? Let this debate come to an end. I regard this day and Thursday being

spent in the discussion of this Amendment as a pure waste of time. If there is to be a discussion on this Budget, let it be taken upon a plain and honest issue, and do not occupy three valuable days of Parliament time in the discussion of a mere platitude such as has been proposed by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton. So far as we are concerned on these benches, when the Second Reading of this Bill comes to be put from the Chair, we will, by our votes in the division lobby, show our disapproval of all the great issues underlying the Budget, but on this inconclusive and dishonest Amendment we shall refuse to vote, because we regard it as a foolish and contemptible attempt to sit upon two stools, an attempt to evade every real, honest issue in this controversy, and we shall refuse, once and for all, to make ourselves parties to a sham.

MR. GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): It is an agreeable surprise for me to be able for once to agree with the hon. Member for Waterford. I have so many times disagreed from him in the course of the debates in this House that an agreement with him upon the occasion of my first addressing this House is as pleasant as I hope it will be profitable to myself. The hon. Member for Waterford has dissented entirely from the Amendment which has been moved by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton. I find no difficulty in agreeing with the hon. Member for Waterford, for I found the same confusion in my mind when I came to study that Amendment. That confusion was increased by the speech which the right hon. Gentleman delivered, and by other speeches which were made on the opposite side of the House, and also, if I may say so, by one or two delivered on this side of the House. I find it exceedingly difficult to be able to dissociate what may be called extraordinary expenditure and expenditure on the Army and Navy from normal expenditure. It would seem sometimes to the new Members in this House, as was suggested by an hon. Member opposite, that we are approaching great public matters in the spirit of a parish council. But the policy which should animate us should not be that of a parish council. I have gained the impression from the speeches which have been delivered that the expenditure which has so largely and so disastrously increased has been a thing which has not had a legitimate origin, and has not proceeded along perfectly legitimate lines. I myself am of the opinion that the expenditure is proceeding along perfectly legitimate lines. The speech made by the hon. Member for Haddingtonshire and other hon. Members gave one the feeling that the spirit of pessimism was abroad in the land, and especially possessed the Liberal party. It is a curious thing, after all, that in the expenditure which has taken place, and in the speeches which have been delivered, so little reference has been made to all those expenditures which affect the Empire at large.

The Amendment which has been moved, and the speech which has been made upon it by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton, seem to occupy this ground only, that the normal expenditure is dissociated entirely from what may be called the general expenditure. Is it not within the knowledge of every Member of this House that every step that is taken for the opening up of new markets means an increase of the normal expenditure? Is it not the case that as

our trade increases our expenditure must also increase in all the departments of the State in this country? We have been told that during the last twenty years our trade has declined. That is not true, for our trade taken in the bulk has not declined. The Member for Haddingtonshire informed us, in a very pessimistic speech, that the United States and Germany were dispossessing us of our trade. That may be true in part, but it is not true altogether. It is a fact which every Member of this House must be aware of that the United States during the last fifteen or twenty years has largely increased its manufactures and has decreased its purchases from this country. It is likewise a fact that Germany has competed with us successfully in the markets of the world. We have, however, to face this remarkable fact, that no matter what our predisposition concerning the trade of the world may be the total trade of the world thirty years ago was represented by an enormous sum to which England contributed 51 per cent. We have to face the fact that during the years that have passed since then England has, on the whole, maintained her position.

She has lost, perhaps, in individual markets, but she has gained upon the whole. The proportion of her gains and her position in the world's trade to-day is exactly the same as it was thirty years ago. Thirty years ago Germany first awoke to her possibilities as a manufacturing country, and at that time the United States was borrowing; heavily from us. I dissent from the proposition of an hon. Gentleman opposite that the ability to borrow at a low rate of interest is a sign of the prosperity of any country. The United States was borrowing from this country largely during thirty and forty years, and this went on so extensively that our securities in the United States represented an extraordinary amount. Those securities we do not now possess, for they have vanished from our purview, and, as to the money which they represented, we do not know where it is. But the United States borrowed with a purpose. She borrowed to invest the money in profitable manufactures rather than to manufacture herself and expend her own capital at the time. But since then the United States has taken back those securities which we owned, and Germany has also taken a high position as a great competitor with us. What is the position now? I dissent entirely from the view that, at the present time, England is in the position of a declining country. Our carrying trade to-day in the world is exactly what it was in proportion to the world's carrying trade thirty years ago. If that is the case it seems to me that it is somewhat premature for pessimists in this House or out of it to preach only the decline and fall of the British Empire. The normal expenditure to which I have referred may be found to have increased in certain directions which are closely associated with the Empire.

I find it difficult to understand why, when hon. Members upon the opposite side of the House are criticising the Budget, our expenditure in certain departments of the public service intimately associated with our commercial development is entirely omitted from consideration. For instance, in 1881 the expenditure on the Post Office was £3,500,000. In 1901 it was £9,329,000. The expenditure on telegraphs in 1881 was £1,250,000; in 1901 it was over £4,000,000. On the Civil Service in 1881



the expenditure was £;17,000,000, and in 1901 it was £;23,000,000. May I ask if these services and these departments of the State are not closely identified with the development of commerce? Is it not the case that, as you extend your markets, you increase your normal expenditure? The United States began to take fewer of our exports and shut us out from the advantages of her market. Germany began to possess herself of certain ports and advantages, and she found her way into South America and the United States, and cut us out there by supplying our former customers in Asia Minor and Egypt with goods which we could not supply them with, because of the backwardness of our inventions, and the want of enterprise on the part of our manufacturers. It was then, by virtue of the extension of our colonies and our markets, that our ships and our carrying trade turned to the newer ports and the newer markets, where certain proportions of our Army are now occupied in preserving order. I take it to be an axiom almost that you cannot conduct any business organisation without a perfect command of the system, and without a careful consideration of all those elements which are necessary for the development of that business or commercial organisation. The time has come in this country when we have found it necessary to consider a larger scheme of army organisation. We have steadily increased our expenditure, but at the same time we have gained continuously, and by a proportionate and equable ratio, advantages of trade and of commerce which we should not have otherwise done if we had not kept pace with the necessities of the situation. My position in this matter is that we shall presently have to consider very carefully what our attitude will be towards those organisations, those nationalities, those colonies, which represent to us one-fourth of our trade at the present time. One-fourth of our trade represents an exceedingly large sum. We sometimes hear from hon. Members opposite criticisms upon the expenditure on our Navy for the defence of the colonies.

To-night the Chancellor of the Exchequer referred rather vaguely to the fact that there might come a time when

we should have to consider very carefully the question of this country not paying all the expenses attached to the defence of the trade of this country.

But this country does not pay all the expense of our trade. This country must realise, and does realise, that it has cost us during the last hundred years £;30,000,000 for the actual defence of those portions of our Empire which are known as our colonies. But what is this £;30,000,000 set against? It is set against £;5,283,000,000, that represents the trade of the colonies of this Empire with this country during the last thirty years, and we in this country have paid about £;30,000,000 in defence of those colonies. As the trade of this country declines through the competition which threatens it, to what source of revenue shall we turn? I hope I shall not be considered one of those Jingo Imperialists who stand solely upon the basis of sentiment. We have had our dangerous hours with our colonies, and we never had a more dangerous hour than in the year 1857, when the Liberal party in this country was disposed to let these colonies go. Another time more dangerous still occurred at a later moment in the history of Australia, when the Liberal party was prepared to allow Australia to find its way into an independence, which at this moment would have

been a disastrous thing for this Empire. I do not wish to put undue weight upon that sentimental bond which sent to us during the present war an extraordinary number of colonists to support this country in waging the war in South Africa. It is, however, a notable fact that, in proportion to her population, Canada sent the same ratio of troops as that of England. Australia sent to South Africa twenty men in every thousand in her population, which proportion is, I think, four times as large as the number which England sent herself of her civilian population. I do not wish to lay stress upon that fact, because I believe that the future of this Empire does not depend alone upon a sentimental bond. The colonies realise more clearly than any hon. Members of this House are aware that the ultimate natural union is a union which has for its basis mutual consideration, and mutual benefit, backed by a natural affinity. That natural affinity exists, and draws

the colonies towards England, but when you consider that at present Canada is attempting once more to negotiate a reciprocity treaty with the United States, and when you realise that that reciprocity treaty will withdraw from us, if it is accomplished, that trade which, during the last three years, has increased to an extraordinary extent; to the extent of £4,000,000 in three years, or 20 per cent. of what it was, and really an increase of 33½ per cent.; I take it to be an exceedingly serious matter. It has been the trade of the colonies which has in the course of the loss of certain markets to this country preserved for us our position in the whole volume of the trade of the world, and if we are to preserve that status which it has been the pride of commercial England to occupy, we shall have to consider very carefully, I think, these great commercial questions which are bound up with this very Budget and this very Finance Bill which the Chancellor of the Exchequer has laid before us.

I repeat my belief and opinion that the increase of the normal expenditure; which amounts within the last twenty years altogether, in the four Departments of the Government which I have named, to nearly £15,000,000; covers, I take it, that very deficit which an hon. Member opposite was so keen to lay before us. This means that if the deficit would have been £9,000,000 we might have saved it naturally out of the expenditure on these Departments by disregarding the natural laws of commerce. We might have saved the £15,000,000 in this way but would that have met the case? I do not think it would. I take it that in a private enterprise if you increase the volume of your business or the commercial output you must increase the expenditure upon it. That, I believe, is the law which governs not only private institutions but all Departments of the State as well, and also all great commercial organisations. I have been unable to agree with the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman, and I have been unable, for good reasons, to identify myself with the extravagant propositions of the Member for Oldham. I find myself unable to obey the firman of the new Sultan of a parsimonious democracy, but I do fine myself able to put on record my faith, if not my unflinching faith, in the judgment of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, I suppose that every hon. Member of this House eventually becomes educated to the fact that every great scheme in human affairs and every invention has its fallible points. I suppose I shall become

accustomed to find that even Chancellors of the Exchequer and Cabinet Ministers may be fallible. It is within even my capacity to do this, but I do feel as strongly as the hon. Member for Waterford that most of the objections which have been raised to this Finance Bill are exceedingly belated. I feel that most of the objections which have been raised have not been really raised in the most perfect good faith; I mean perfect good faith if it is to be founded on a clear and hopeful idea of the actual state of the commercial affairs of this country, and a clear and hopeful idea of what the commerce of this country means, not only to England itself but to the Empire. I feel as strongly upon this question as any hon. Member can feel who, as it were, has no ties in this House, but who comes here with an independent feeling, and is yet linked to the Conservative party. I believe to-day that the true Liberals and Radicals are to be found in the Conservative party. I do not find that the principles which animated the great Liberal party, which at one time was so necessary to the development of this country, any longer animate them in any concentration of purpose or clear idea of policy. Therefore, I maintain that if there is a movement which may be considered to be in sympathy with the advancement of this country and the advancement of the Empire, it is to be found in the party to which I belong, rather than in the party opposite, which presents a front which has been decimated by criticism, which has not the advantage of being united in any sense, or of being centred upon any one great vital principle except that devious, vague and uncertain challenge, "You are expensive, you are extravagant," disregarding the fact that the expense and the extravagance of which they accuse this party they themselves have had a share in. During the last thirty years, where they have not had a share in that growth, it seems to me, from my slight reading and observation, to have been because they have not desired to share fully in the proper, natural and inevitable development of the Empire. I, therefore, cannot agree with the Amendment, but am glad to support the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his Finance Bill. I hope that all Members of the House; yes, the Liberal as well as the Unionist party; will share as intensely as I and all true Imperialists do; not the Jingo Imperialists, but the Imperialists who have behind them the best conceptions of the commercial needs of this Empire; the rightful ambition of every true citizen of this land, namely, that our colonies, which will ultimately be our fiscal salvation, may not merely have our consideration; because we cannot approach them now as subordinate provinces of this Empire; but will be treated in all matters of a closer commercial union as if they were, as they are, nations by themselves, who could to-day, if they wished to do so, end the association as easily as they might have ended it forty years ago at the will of the Liberal party, and this country would find it most difficult to prevent them. But the colonies are united in the feeling of patriotism and devotion towards this country, and when difficulty arises they will take their stand upon the principle of mutual consideration, benefit, fairplay, and fair concession, either as to expenditure upon the Navy or as to the support of measures which go for the defence of this Empire.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): Although I am unable to agree with a great deal which

has fallen from the hon. Member who has just spoken, it gives me, and I am sure every Member of the House, pleasure to welcome to our debates a Member who has shown that he is able to win high distinction in other fields. But I must at once enter a protest against the suggestion that the Liberal party was the party which ever expressed a desire to part with the colonies. I must remind the hon. Member that the famous phrase about "these wretched colonies" was spoken not by a Liberal Minister, but by Lord Beaconsfield. I do not intend to deal in detail with the various points of the Budget, which require again the marshalling of the figures which the hon. Member for East Edinburgh has so admirably dealt with. There are many Members of the House who have a more minute knowledge of these financial details than I could possibly pretend to. I desire to endeavour to lay before the House a few general aspects of the financial position in which we are placed, and which seem to me to be the main issue raised by the Amendment. I understand this Amendment as asking us to review the finance of the last few years, and to say whether it leaves the country in a position from which we can regard the future with anything but disquiet.

In the first place, let me say a few words with regard to the methods by which the Chancellor of the Exchequer proposes to raise the funds necessary to meet the expenditure of the present year. I assent entirely to the view that the masses of the people must pay their share of the war expenditure. We have placed the destinies of the country, the issues of peace and war, in the hands of the majority of the voters of the country, and they ought to bear their share; not more than their share, but certainly their share; of the expenditure which is the result of a policy which they have sanctioned by their votes. I think that this is all the more necessary in a country like ours, where the safeguard against war which exists in continental countries is absent. I hope it always will be absent; I hope we shall never have conscription in this country. But hon.

Members will recollect that in a country where there is conscription there is a security which does not equally exist in this country against the Government embarking upon war. It is, therefore, all the more necessary that the results of war should be brought home to every individual voter by the taxes he has to pay.

In the Middle Ages they resorted to the rough-and-ready method of a poll tax. The poll tax was sometimes followed by an insurrection, and the insurrection had the effect of making the rulers of the country realise where they were leading the country to. In our more refined days we are obliged to resort to indirect taxation, and we must choose a form of indirect taxation which, if possible, will enable the body of the people to realise that expenses are incurred of which they must bear their own share. I quite agree that we must bring home to the people the responsibility which they have as citizens. We must make them realise that we are at war, and we must

make them estimate what we are going to get by the war. One of the great objections to the policy which the Government have followed of raising a very large part of the expenditure of the war by loan is that it fails to bring home to the country the real gravity of the position in which we stand and a sense of the amount of the expenditure in which we are involved. Altogether apart from other arguments which have been dwelt upon by my hon. friend the Member for East

Edinburgh, I feel strongly that it is desirable that the country should be made to realise from the moment war begins how serious is the responsibility it has incurred, and that can best be done by paying a very large proportion of the expenditure out of current revenue.

I will say a word upon two of the taxes which the right hon. Gentleman proposes to impose. The first is the sugar tax. It is not for me, nor is this the time, to compare the merits of the tax upon sugar with several other taxes which have been suggested. Personally, I prefer a tax upon beer, or the tax advocated by the hon. Member for Bedfordshire upon licences, or an increase of the tax upon tobacco. Either one of these would have many reasons to recommend it in preference to the sugar tax, because, although the Chancellor of the Exchequer passes it very lightly by, I think he must feel that it is a little hard upon the classes of the community which are least able to make their voices heard and their influence felt; I mean the very poor and the women; that this tax should fall with special weight upon them. But there are two other objections to the tax. It is a tax upon food and a tax upon raw material. For the last thirty years we have done our best to reduce all taxes upon food, but we are now abandoning that principle. Therefore, although I admit that it has become necessary to impose some tax of this kind, I think it is a pity that this particular tax has been selected. Now I will say a few words about the coal tax and its general effect, but I must make one observation in reply to the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He spoke as if he felt easy as to our command of the Mediterranean market. I do not share his confidence. I believe the Mediterranean market is one of those threatened, and I believe it is especially threatened by the competition of the United States. Already there are powerful syndicates in the United States which, we understand, are preparing to ship coal to the Mediterranean, and taking this opportunity of competing there with us. Although we have an advantage in proximity of the markets, they have an advantage in cheap carriage from the mines from the Atlantic slope, and an advantage from easy mining, because many of their mines are not deep and the coal costs far less in raising. They are anxious at this moment to develop this export trade, and they are willing to take considerable trouble and run considerable risks in order to compete with us in European markets and other foreign ports. Therefore I think the Chancellor of the Exchequer is far too sanguine on the subject. There is another remark on the coal trade to which reference must be made; it was mentioned by the hon. Member for Hartlepool, and also by the hon. Member for Gloucester; and that is the effect the coal tax is likely to have on British shipping. The Chancellor of the Exchequer knows that coal is by far the largest article in point of quantity carried in British bottoms. He knows that it pays by far the largest part of our freights, and that the coal freights are larger than those of all other commodities taken together. It is clear that it must be a very important article in the general profit of shipping, and that it affects the shipping trade in a very particular way. An immense number of vessels are built for the coal trade and employed entirely in that trade. If the export coal trade receives a check by this duty which the Chancellor of the Exchequer is imposing, those ships will

have to be worked without profit or laid up, in which case a considerable amount of labour will be thrown out of employment and a great deal of capital will remain unused. If, on the other hand, they continue to be worked, there will be a serious shock and disturbance given to the freights of other commodities, because vessels which go out with coal bring home other articles from abroad; very frequently they are able to bring home cargoes at a lower freight in consequence of the freight obtained in taking out coal. That reacts on the manufactures of this

country. Therefore you will disturb the whole trade of the country by disturbing the shipping trade, and you will particularly disturb the possibility of making calculations in the shipping trade as to the expectation of getting a continuation of freight or a return freight. If a ship-owner knows that he will not get a coal freight it will be quite clear that his whole calculations will be disturbed. You add this to the other difficulties which operate to disturb the shipping trade, which is an unusually complicated one. When we remember how large a part of the whole capital of the country is embarked in the shipping trade, how it affects everybody else, and how sensitive the trade is, we must conclude that it was unfortunate for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to try this tax, apart from the effects upon the coal trade, on account of the effect it will have in disturbing other industries. It has always been a maxim of financial policy that we ought to disturb the natural operations of trade as little as possible, and that is a strong argument against the measure taken on this occasion.

I pass from that to say a few words on general finance. The expenses of the war are put down at £;153,000,000, but we all know that that figure is likely to be exceeded. The war may last a great deal longer than the War Office or the Chancellor of the Exchequer expect, and we do not know; I do not think they would claim at this moment that they do know; what the expenditure will be afterwards.

I say, then, that very probably we shall not be rid of the expenses of the war for a smaller sum than £;200,000,000. I do not think that is an extravagant calculation judging from the way our hopes have already been deceived during the course of the last eighteen months. Something has been said as to the relation which this Amendment bears to the war. I do not propose to discuss the war here.

I have often expressed my opinion about it in the House, and I am perfectly willing to do so again. There is not a word in the Amendment which expresses approval of the war, either directly or by implication. If there was a word expressing, even by implication, approval of the war. I should not vote for it, because I have often said I look upon the war

as having been absolutely unnecessary and entirely deplorable. And having said that, and shown what I think of the construction and meaning of this Amendment, I have no more to say upon that subject. Another point to which we are brought in the present position is this. We have the suspension of the Sinking Fund, that is to say, we are not exactly adding to our debt, but we are stopping the process by which it was being reduced. That is a serious fact. During twenty-five years of economy we paid off more than during the whole of the reign of her late Majesty.

So much for the special expenditure which the war has caused. Now let me say a word about the ordinary expenditure. In 1895 it was £94,500,000, and now, according to the Chancellor of the Exchequer's own figures, it is £123,000,000; that is an increase of thirty per cent. in six years. I do not believe that any equal increase to that in the normal expenditure; I speak entirely irrespective of party; has been produced during any other period in our history. It is, at any rate, certainly something to which we have absolutely no parallel during the late reign or during the memory of any man living. This expenditure has been mainly incurred on the Army and Navy. We have productive and non-productive expenditure. This is non-productive expenditure, or the greater part of it. There has been £12,000,000 increase in the Army, and £12,500,000 in the Navy. The total expenditure on the Army and Navy together is now £60,000,000. When we come to the expenditure on the Post Office, upon the telegraph service, and upon education, we have one of two things, either we have greater facilities, as, for instance, by improved postal service, or else we have, as in the case of education, an expenditure which is, or ought to be, eminently reproductive in increasing the productive power of the people by their improved intelligence and skill. Therefore these are expenditures we need not grudge. I agree that we ought to scrutinise the education expenditure. I agree that we do not get full our value for it, but, at any rate, it is reproductive; but the expenditure upon the Army and Navy cannot be claimed to have any similar benefit to the country. The most we can say is that it is an insurance, and I entirely admit that a country like this, living largely off its commerce, should safeguard its vast mercantile marine. I approve of spending a large sum on insurance, but that does not prevent us from inquiring whether we are paying too high a premium. As regards the Navy, we are all perfectly well agreed that we must have a navy adequate to the defence of the country. That is an old and tried proposition. No one in the House will disagree with that, but it does not follow that we ought to give naval experts everything they ask for, and I am astonished at some of the demands made for the Navy. I think the House ought to remember that one result of our constant increase in naval expenditure has been to increase the naval expenditure of other Powers, and, therefore, we are simply pitting ourselves against other Powers in this matter.

\*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: No.

MR. BRYCE: Everyone admits that that has been the result. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer will read the debates going on in the French Chamber he will see that the increase of our Navy is constantly cited there as a reason why their Navy should be increased. That is one reason why we should scrutinise more than we have done this naval expenditure, but when I come to the Army I have no confidence at all. We have not had reasons given us by the War Office to show that the increase in our Army expenditure is called for. I am inclined to think that the expenditure on the Army is very largely the result of lax administration, and that we might attain quite as good results at probably several millions less than we spend annually on the Army now. We must remember that both naval and military expenditure is very largely a question of policy. It is foreign and colonial policy that determines our expenditure. If our

foreign and colonial policy is aggressive, provocative, unwise, and shortsighted, we are perfectly certain to have to pay a much larger sum for military and naval armaments than we would have otherwise to devote to these purposes. When I am asked how to retrench military and naval expenditure, I say we ought to

have a better foreign and colonial policy than the present and previous Conservative Governments have given us. When the present Government came into power in 1895 the Prime Minister acknowledged that we were on the best relations with every foreign Power, and he went out of his way to pay a tribute to our good relations with foreign Powers as left by the outgoing Government. A year ago, when he addressed a speech to the Primrose League, he said we were obliged to admit that we had incurred the hatred and exposed ourselves to the rivalry and danger of the Continental Powers. There is in that statement quite enough to bear out the comment on the policy which I have ventured to make.

There is one other observation I should like to make about expenditure and efficiency. Large expenditure is not necessarily associated with greater efficiency. I think economy means a great deal more in administration than merely saving up the money which economy represents. The easiest way, some people think, to appear to be doing something is to vote money, and when they have voted money they lay the pleasing unction to their souls that they have done all that is necessary. You may go so far as to say that lavish expenditure means lax administration. The surest way to get value for our money is the fear of criticism, and to be obliged to show that you are getting the most out of every shilling you spend, and I believe the extravagant practices of late years have very much reduced the efficiency of the public service. The hon. Member for Gloucester in his interesting speech to-night quoted the Duke of Wellington as being a remarkable instance of a great military man who set the highest value on economy, and always insisted that it ought to be strictly applied to military matters. I will give another high authority; Frederick the Great. I suppose we all remember that there has been no Government in Europe which has devoted for the last 200 years such constant care and attention to its military establishment as the Government of Prussia, and the watchword and the principle of the Government of Prussia since the days of Frederick the Great has been "Economy." I believe the extraordinary

efficiency which the Prussian army has reached has been very largely due to strict and close attention to detail and the determination to get value for every thaler spent, which was steadily enforced by all the German generals and officers. I believe we could succeed in very largely reducing every branch of our expenditure, but, above all, our military expenditure, if we applied scrutiny like that which Prussia applies to our expenditure. I am sure that those who have followed the debates on the Estimates must have felt that the examination we give to them is far too slight, and very far from being sufficiently close and searching. I believe there never was a Government which even in the smaller matters, such as the case of the law officers, gave greater evidence of inattention to detail, by which true economy must be secured, than the present Government. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, not only in his speech



this year, but in the Budget speech last year, called our attention in a forcible way to the dangerous position in which we stand. He made speeches such as ought to be heard from the guardian of the public purse. He said we ought to beware while it was yet time. I confess that after these exhortations I was a little surprised that he did not suggest to-night that there was any saving we could make or any way to redeem our growing expenditure, except by obtaining contributions towards the cost of our Navy from the colonies. I should have liked some other suggestion, at any rate, as regards a contribution from the colonies. I am sure such a contribution would be welcomed, and we should all be very glad to have it. I do not think there is the slightest difference of opinion in the House as to the desirability of getting a contribution from the colonies. We should be very glad to get it as an evidence of their interest in the mother country, but the Chancellor of the Exchequer must know that it is not an easy matter. He must know that there are other questions which must arise in relation to the application of the money, should such a contribution be made, and with the strongest possible wish that such a contribution should come, it is not a thing we can count upon this year or next.

I am sure the Chancellor of the Exchequer, after the appeals he made last year and this year to us, must desire more control over the purse. He must wish that we should respond to the appeals he has made, and it is with the desire of responding to those appeals that I ask the House to consider the position to which we have come. There would be no danger in the position if our resources were increasing in the same proportion as our expenditure. The reason why there is danger is because our resources do not increase in the same proportion. True, we are increasing in population, and I suppose we are increasing in wealth, but we are increasing both in population and in wealth on a very much lower scale than that at which our expenditure has increased. Our population has risen from 37,000,000 to 40,000,000, and our wealth has risen certainly at no very rapid rate, but our expenditure has risen 30 per cent. in six years. Our exports are not increasing. It is extremely difficult when one looks at the Returns to determine exactly how you are to measure the growth of exports; but this may be said, that if they are increasing it is at a slight rate, and by far the greatest increase is that in coal. Coal is an article of a special kind, and we cannot regard an increase chiefly supported by coal as an increase of the same healthful and hopeful kind as the increase which took place in our manufacturing productions thirty years ago. So far we agree with the Chancellor of the Exchequer. It has been pointed out by my hon. friend the Member for Haddington that we have been having during the last six years a period of exceptionally good trade, that has given increased revenue, but we cannot expect it to be continued. We know that these periods of prosperity are followed by periods of depression. They generally follow at a period of seven, eight, nine or ten years, and therefore we can fairly conclude that we are approaching the end of the period of prosperous trade which we have been lately enjoying, and that the productivity of the revenue during the next ten years will probably be very far below what it is at present. There is also another serious consideration, and that is the foreign competition, from which we have

most to fear as regards our exports. America and Germany are increasing their exports far more rapidly than we are doing. There is another source from which danger appears to come, and that is the cheap labour of the East. There are some large classes of British products in which we have immense Eastern markets. Factories are being erected in India and Japan, where there is cheap labour.

There is another aspect from which we should regard the future. The calls upon the revenue are likely to increase, or, at any rate, not diminish. If we could hope that we had come to an end of the further demands on the revenue, we might look at the cost up to the present time with comparative complacency; but over and above that natural increase of expenditure which always goes on in this country, owing to the greater demands made on the Government, and owing to the rise in the price of educated labour, there are a large number of other demands looming in the future which we shall be called upon to meet. I shall only give the House one or two of these to suggest how serious it may be. We are going to do something for technical and secondary education. That means a larger expenditure. You never embark upon things of that kind without finding that you have to pay more for them, and although it may be good expenditure, the money has to be raised some way. You have got the question of old-age pensions. It has been thrown into the background for the moment by the preoccupation of our minds by the war; but when that preoccupation is at an end you may be certain that the question will be revived. You cannot throw down a question of that kind before the people of this country and expect them to forget it. I feel quite sure that Ministers will be obliged to take up and face the question before many years are past. Where are you to find the money to do it? The money which has been spent on the war would have gone a long way to provide the funds required for that purpose. When that question was started there were many economists who expected that the Secretary for the Colonies would deal with it. They will regret that he did not continue to devote his energies to that question instead of turning them to the Colonial Office. There is another question with respect to which there is likely to be a demand for money; the question of Irish land purchase. I do not express any opinion on the merits of that question, for which I have never voted, but it is a demand perfectly sure to be renewed and pressed with constant insistence. The present attitude of the Government towards it does not give us any security that they will not, one day or other, themselves comply with it. Though it may not demand a large sum, the possibility of it will depend on your credit, and the more you borrow the more you will impair that credit upon which we shall have to rely if we undertake the operation. Far larger and more important are the calls likely to be made on this country from those external sources of expenditure which are always growing with the expansion of the Empire in various parts of the world. I would ask the House to look round at what has happened in the last ten years. Whether you look at South Africa, and the expense which is being incurred there, or at China, and the expense that will have to be incurred there some day if Wei-hai-wei is to be of any use to us, you will find in every direction expansion of the Empire. All this means larger and larger calls for expenditure upon this country. Now I

think we may say there has been no country in the modern world which has undertaken such enormous tasks as we are always ready to undertake. We take pardonable pride in the growth and greatness of the Empire, but I doubt whether we realise the responsibility which the growth and greatness of Empire bring with them. The mere fact that it is a wonderful and extraordinary phenomenon indicates that it is a phenomenon which cannot maintain itself in its present position without the exercise of the highest qualities of prudence, wisdom, and foresight. The more extraordinary it is the higher are the qualities that are required to keep it in existence. We occupy a small island, and we live by industry and commerce. In the last thirty years we have seen the growth of rivals less and less friendly to us, and making our position more and more doubtful than it was thirty or forty years ago. He is the worst enemy of the country who would tell us to go on trusting blindly in our luck or in our stars. The country has enjoyed in recent years a period of unexampled prosperity. We have been lulled into confidence and ease, and we have come to believe that for us everything is possible. We have thought that "to-morrow shall be as this day and much more abundant." We have had during the past few years a further inducement to indulge in laxity of expenditure. The Government has enjoyed a large majority. The First Lord of the Treasury has himself frequently expressed his regret that he had so large a majority.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I never complained of my own side; it was the other side I complained of.

MR. BRYCE: The right hon. Gentleman said it was less easy for him because he had so large a majority.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Oh, no; because I had so bad an Opposition.

MR. BRYCE: I think even the right hon. Gentleman will admit that when the Opposition is in so great a minority it is not an Opposition which can offer much effective resistance to the proposals of the Government. I think he will admit in his calmer moments that a Government which commands a very large majority is apt to enjoy a somewhat dangerous immunity from opposition. Under such circumstances the Government is enabled to carry measures with far less opposition and far less criticism than it would receive in normal times. We sometimes throw the blame of all this on democracy, and it is said that, with the large extension of the franchise, everybody leaves everything to the Government. I hope that is not so, but if it be so it only makes the responsibility of the Government all the greater. It is all the more necessary that the Government should undertake to form and guide public opinion. I regret that the Government has not chosen to give to the country, except through the Chancellor of the Exchequer, that guidance and warning which these rapidly and dangerously increasing expenditures demand. I believe this Government has applied a less scrupulous test to the expenditure of the departments than any other Government. In consequence of the policy which we are now so hopelessly pursuing, the wealthy classes, who have acclaimed this expenditure, and some of whom, I am afraid, have expected to make their own profit out of these large and increasing expenditures, will be among the sufferers from the reaction which is

certain to follow. I earnestly hope and trust that we shall not cease to make our views heard against the extravagance which has been increasing in our administration. Among other measures, we shall probably have larger and larger taxes upon great fortunes. It is necessary to protest on every occasion against the extravagance into which during the last ten or fifteen years we have been more and more betrayed, and to endeavour to recall the country to the sounder principles which guided it thirty or forty years ago. The true sources of the strength of this country are to be found, not in extension of territory, but in perfecting our resources, in reducing the burdens upon the taxpayers, in promoting the health and vigour of the people, and, above all, in developing their intelligence and productive capacity.

Debate adjourned till To-morrow at Two of the clock.

SUPPLY [17TH MAY].

Resolutions reported.

CIVIL SERVICE AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS, 1901&#x2013;2.

CLASS II.

1. "That a sum, not exceeding £7,300, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Department of His Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council."
2. "That a sum, not exceeding £21,650, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Charity Commission for England and Wales."
3. "That a sum, not exceeding £5,019, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Registry of Friendly Societies."
4. "That a sum, not exceeding £9,962, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of the Commissioners in Lunacy in England."
5. "That a sum, not exceeding £91, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Mint, including the Expenses of Coinage."
6. "That a sum, not exceeding £7,107, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, for the Salaries and Expenses of the National Debt Office."
7. "That a sum, not exceeding £12,938, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Public Record Office."
8. "That a sum, not exceeding £4, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during

the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Establishment under the Public Works Loan Commissioners."

9. "That a sum, not exceeding £36,430, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Department of the Registrar General of Births, etc., in England."

10. "That a sum, not exceeding £33,450, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of the Commissioners of His Majesty's Works and Public Buildings."

First four Resolutions agreed to.

Fifth Resolution;

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) said that perhaps the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Treasury would now be able to give him the answer he promised on Friday with reference to a certain salary which did not appear to tally with the terms on which the recipient was appointed.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.) said that the officer concerned was appointed at the salary mentioned, and was to remain at that salary until a vacancy occurred in a higher office.

Resolution agreed to.

Remaining Resolutions agreed to.

STEAMSHIP SUBSIDIES SELECT COMMITTEE.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That it be an Instruction to the Committee appointed to inquire into the system of Subsidies to Steamship Companies under Foreign Governments, and the effect thereby produced on British trade; that they do also report on similar bounties relating to sailing ships.";(Mr. Lawrence.)

Objection taken.

MR. LAWRENCE (Liverpool, Abercromby) said he hoped the hon. Member would not press his objection, as the Motion was only to extend the reference to the Committee to sailing ships.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.) said he would object as long as hon. Members opposite objected to the Roman Catholic Disabilities Bill.

Resolution deferred.

Adjourned twenty-five minutes after Twelve of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 21st May, 1901.

The House met at two of the clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 62 COMPLIED WITH).

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

Barry Railway Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

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

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

Cowes Ferry Bill [Lords].

Manchester Corporation Bill [Lords].

Otley Gas Bill [Lords].

South Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

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

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

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill.

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

BRITISH GAS LIGHT COMPANY BILL.

DUBLIN (EQUALISATION OF RATES) BILL.

GLASGOW AND SOUTH WESTERN RAILWAY BILL.

IRISH PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

LANCASHIRE AND YORKSHIRE RAILWAY (DEARNE VALLEY JUNCTION RAILWAYS) BILL.

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

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (MONEY) BILL.

METROPOLITAN WATER COMPANIES (AMENDMENT OF ACTS) BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

PEMBROKE URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL (COUNTY OF DUBLIN) BILL.

SWANAGE GAS AND WATER BILL

TOTTENHAM AND HAMPSTEAD JUNCTION RAILWAY BILL,

Read the third time, and passed.

SOUTH METROPOLITAN GAS BILL.

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 4) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 5) BILL.

Read a second time, and committed.

NAVAL WORKS PROVISIONAL ORDER.

Bill to confirm a Provisional Order of the Admiralty under the Naval Works Act 1895; ordered to be brought in by Mr. Pretyma and Mr. Arnold-Forster.

NAVAL WORKS PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

"To confirm a Provisional Order of the Admiralty under the Naval Works Act, 1895," presented, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 197.]

## ARDROSSAN GAS AND WATER ORDER CONFIRMATION.

Bill to confirm a Provisional Order under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Ardrossan Gas and Water; ordered to be brought in by the Lord Advocate and Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland.

## ARDROSSAN GAS AND WATER ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL.

"To confirm a Provisional Order under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Ardrossan Gas and Water," presented; to be read a second time upon Monday, 10th June, and to be printed. [Bill 198.]

## METROPOLITAN RAILWAY BILL.

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

## STANDING ORDERS.

Resolutions reported from the Committee::

1. "That, in the case of the Biggleswade Water Board, Petition for Bill, 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 Belfast and Northern Counties Railway, Petition for Bill, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with::That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill."
3. "That, in the case of the Cromer Water Bill, Petition for additional Provision, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with::That the parties be permitted to introduce their additional Provision, if the Committee on the Bill think fit."

Resolutions agreed to.

## BELFAST AND NORTHERN COUNTIES RAILWAY.

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

Bill ordered to be brought in by Colonel James M'Calmont and Mr. O'Neill.

## BIGGLESWADE WATER BOARD.

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

Bill ordered to be brought in by Lord Alwyne Compton and Mr. Guy Pym.

## PETITIONS.

### CLUBS (LICENSING AND SUPERVISION)-

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

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

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

### HOUSING OF WORKING CLASSES (REPAYMENT OF LOANS) BILL.

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

### LOCAL AUTHORITIES OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION BILL.

Petition from Liverpool, in favour to lie upon the Table.

### ROMAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY IN IRELAND.

Petitions against establishment, from Kingussie and Dunfermline; to lie upon the Table.

### SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Fulham; Walthamstow; Leyton; Budleigh Salterton; Southwark, and Wells; to lie upon the Table.

### SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

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

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

Petitions in favour, from Exmouth; Pimlico; Easthampstead; Folkestone; Wells; Nanstallon; Hoxton; Salisbury; Birmingham (two); Westbourne Park; Walworth; Sidmouth; Fletcher's Bridge; Bodmin; Bolton; Pickering; Doncaster; Bangor; Kettering; Cheshire, and Portsmouth; to lie upon the Table.

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

Petitions in favour, from Caithness; Barr; Hutton and Corrie; Annandale, and Dryfesdale; to lie upon the Table.

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

Petitions against, from Reigate; Morton-on-the-Hill, and Great Driffield; to lie upon the Table.

#### RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Return [presented 20th May] to be printed. [No. 183.]

#### CIVIL LIST PENSIONS.

Return [presented 20th May] to be printed. [No. 184.]

#### PRIVATE LEGISLATION PROCEDURE (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1899.

Copy presented, of Report by the Chairman of Committees of the House of Lords and the Chairman of Ways and Means in the House of Commons, under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, that they are of opinion that the Loch Leven Water Power Order ought to be dealt with by Private Bill, and that the Edinburgh Corporation, Greenock Corporation, and Invergarry and Fort Augustus Railway Orders may proceed as Provisional Orders [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 185.]

#### AFRICA (No. 3, 1901).

Copy presented, of correspondence relating to the murder of Mr. Jenner and the Ogaden Punitive Expedition [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

#### TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 2,603 and 2,604 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

#### ARMY (MILITIA TRAINING ESTABLISHMENTS).

Copy presented, of the Militia Training Return, 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

#### PRISONS (RULES FOR CONVICT PRISONS).

Copy presented, of Draft of Rules for Convict Prisons proposed to be made under the Prison Act, 1898, with regard to the Dietary of Convicts [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 186.]

#### PRISONS (RULES FOR LOCAL PRISONS)^

Copy presented, of Draft of Rules for Local Prisons proposed to be made under the Prison Act, 1898, with regard to the Dietary of Prisoners [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 187.]

#### TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION ACT, 1889.

Copy presented, of Minute sanctioning the subjects to be taught under Clause 8 of the Act for the county of Cardigan (First Minute) [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

#### COLONIAL REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS).



Copy presented, of Report No. 16 Selections from Colonial Medical Reports for 1898 and 1899) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

#### SOUTH AFRICA (TRANSPORTS).

Return ordered, "showing the name, tonnage, and speed of each vessel employed to convey troops to South Africa since the 1st day of April, 1900, and up to and ending 31st day of March, 1901, the date and port of her departure from these shores and arrival at Cape Town, Durban, or elsewhere, respectively, including arrival at and departure from

Name of vessel.

Tonnage.

Speed.

Date of departure and port.

Date of arrival and departure from intermediate ports.

Date arrival intermediate ports.

Time occupied on voyage.

Number of troops carried.

Number of horses or mules carried.

Number of horses or mules lost on voyage.

Whether provided with new pattern or old pattern fittings.

Whether provided with slings for each horse or mule.

Port.

Departure.

Port.

Arrival.

Departure.

Cape Town.

Durban.

(in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 184, of Session 1900).";(Sir John Colomb.)

#### QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICA;POSITION OF CHARTERED COMPANY AND DE BEERS COMPANY.

SIR CHRISTOPHER FTJRNES (Hartlepool): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can state when His Majesty's Government propose to demand payment of the indemnity due from the Chartered Company to the late Transvaal Republic; whether the Government have paid £;83,000 to the De Beers Company during the siege of Kimberley; whether the De Beers Company have since made a further claim for £;54,000, or any other sum; and, if so, whether the particulars of these claims will be laid upon the Table of the House.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): In reply to the first

intermediate ports of call; the number of troops and horses or mules carried on each occasion, the number of horses or mules lost on voyage, vessels provided with new pattern fittings, vessels provided with old pattern fittings, vessels provided with slings for each horse or mule, vessels not so provided; and the time occupied by each vessel in making the voyage, in the following form;; part of the question I must refer the hon. Baronet to the answer which I gave to

the hon. Member for the Carmarthen Boroughs on the 1st of April, &#x2020; The second question should have been addressed to the Secretary of State for War, who informs me that a telegram has been received from the general officer commanding lines of communication stating that no payment has been made to the De Beers Company, but that claims from that company amounting to about £;54,000 are under consideration. The particulars of these claims not having been received, it is impossible to say whether it will be desirable to lay them on the Table of the House.

BOER PRISONERS IN ST. HELENA; SHOOTING OF A PRISONER BY A SENTRY.

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.): I beg to ask if I should be in order in putting to the Secretary for War the question which stands in the name of the hon. Member for Stafford, and which has not been asked. I wish to ask the question &#x2020; See Debates [Fourth Series], Vol. xcii., page 329.

because it rather reflects on certain persons. The question is "Whether any inquiry has been instituted into the charge recently made against a sentry at St. Helena of having shot a Boer prisoner dead whilst singing a hymn during the service of the Christian Endeavour Society, and whether any report has been received by him; if so, will he state the effect of it."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): My attention has been drawn to this statement. The reports from the officer commanding the troops at St. Helena show that there is no truth whatever in the statements made, which appeared in the Review of Reviews. The Boer prisoner alluded to as being shot at St. Helena was endeavouring to climb over the wire fence enclosing the prisoners' camp in the early morning before daylight. This assertion, like others persistently disseminated by this journal, is untrue and mischievous.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): Is it in accordance with the rules of the House for one Member to put a question which stands in the name of another?

\*MR. SPEAKER: I was rising to explain that the hon. Member for North Islington would not be in order in asking the question, but the Minister is in order in answering the question on the Paper, although it is not asked, if he thinks it is in the interests of the public, and I understood that that was the object of the Minister in rising.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Of course, if it were in order, I could ask any number of questions.

ALLOWANCES TO INVALIDED SOLDIERS.

MR. LEVY (Leicestershire, Loughborough): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will state in how many instances the pensions and allowances of soldiers invalided from South Africa have been reconsidered since 18th March, with the view of increasing such pensions and allowances, and in how many cases the grants have been increased to sums varying from 1s. 6d. to 2s. 6d. per day, the amounts invalided soldiers are entitled to according to the statement of the Paymaster-General; and whether, in cases where increases have been decided upon, such increases will be paid from the dates when the soldiers were first placed on the pension list.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): The cases of 281 pensioners have been reconsidered since the 18th

March, and increased awards have been made. In addition, twenty-three pensioners will be awarded increase of pension by the next board of the Chelsea Commissioners, and 138 cases are in progress of examination. The increase has, as a rule, been given from the first of the current quarter. Pensions are not made generally retrospective.

#### COMPASSIONATE ALLOWANCES.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether the Secretary of State for War received a petition last December asking for an ex gratia allowance to be made to a poor woman of Blackpool, Cork, whose son, John Addis, was killed by the bursting of a gun at Cork Harbour Fort in the summer of 1900; and whether, in view of the fact that this soldier was the main support of his mother, and was killed in the execution of military duty, the authorities will take her case into favourable consideration.

LORD STANLEY: The petition has been received. The regulations do not admit of any grant to the mother from public funds.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): Cannot something be done for the woman out of the Patriotic Fund?

LORD STANLEY: Representations can be made, but we have no power except to do that. I will refer the matter to the Patriotic Fund Commissioners.

#### ARMY ORGANISATION-GOVERNMENT SCHEME;LEGISLATION.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state whether any portion of the proposed Army reform scheme requires legislation.

MR. BRODRICK: A short Bill may be required in connection with the Yeomanry.

#### RECRUITING-PHYSICAL STANDARDS.

MR. YERBURGH (Chester): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state the minimum standard of height v. chest measurement at the present time, and how many specials there are among the 16,000 men recruited in the first four months of this year.

LORD STANLEY: The various minimum standards are laid down in the Recruiting Regulations, pages 51 to 54; those for the Infantry are 5 ft. 3 in. and 33 in. respectively. From the 1st January to the 27th April, 17,311 recruits were taken, of which 5,790 were specials.

#### COLOURS FOR VOLUNTEER CORPS.

MR. HELME (Lancashire, Lancaster): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the fact that, for the first time in the history of our country, Volunteers have rendered active service at the front, His Majesty's Government are willing, in recognition of such services, to so far modify paragraph 870 of the Volunteer Regulations as to enable Volunteer corps who have supplied contingents for the war in South Africa to receive and carry standards or colours presented to them by local authorities or persons on their return home.

MR. BRODRICK: The Volunteer corps who supplied contingents were nearly all rifle corps, and rifle corps of the Line do not carry colours. No local authorities have ever been permitted to present troops with colours which are to be carried on parade, and I do not think it would be advisable to establish such a

precedent.

MR. HELME: Does not the right hon. Gentleman think it would be an advantage, and develop the interest taken in the Volunteer movement, if;

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

LONDON IRISH VOLUNTEERS AND THE KING'S DECLARATION.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to the case of Roberts v. O'Sullivan, recently tried at Bow Street before Sir Frederick Lushington, in which the defendant, a private in the London Irish Volunteers, who resigned his membership of the corps because of the King's Declaration that the Roman Catholic religion is idolatrous, was fined £;1 15s., the maximum, for non-efficiency, and £;1, the maximum, for surrendering his rifle in an improper condition, and costs; and seeing that the claim originally made was only for 10s., and that though the usual fine for surrendering a rifle unfit for immediate service is only 1s. or 2s. 6d., the maximum fine was imposed in this case, will he inquire into the case with the view of having the fines imposed reduced; and can he state how many Volunteers have resigned previously, or what fines, if any, each of them has had to pay.

\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): The defendant was summoned for 35s. being the amount of the capitation grant which he had failed to earn by rendering himself efficient, and for 20s. for damage to his rifle through neglect to clean it after use. The magistrate found that both sums were due, and I have no power to review his decision.

MR. NANNETTI: With a view of the great hardship of this particular case, and the feeling that the heavy penalty was imposed simply because the Volunteer resigned in consequence of the obnoxious oath, will the right hon. Gentleman make further inquiry?

\*MR. RITCHIE: I can make no further inquiry into the matter, with regard to which I have no jurisdiction whatever.

VICTUALLING OF THE NAVY; DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the Departmental Committee appointed last year to inquire into the victualling of the Navy has presented its Report; if so, whether he can state their recommendations, and what reforms are likely to be introduced.

\*THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): The Committee has presented its Report. The evidence and recommendations will require careful consideration, and I am not yet able to make any statement as to what action may be taken by the Admiralty as a result of the Committee's investigations.

WEST INDIA DOCK NAVAL STORES; PACKERS' WAGES.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that some men are now employed at the West India Dock Naval Stores packing at a weekly wage of 21s., others doing similar work at 20s.; and whether, seeing that this arrangement gives rise to dissatisfaction, he will take steps to raise the wages of the latter.

\*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The wages of twenty of the more experienced men engaged in packing electrical instruments and other articles calling for special care in

handling were recently raised from 20s. to 21s. The fact that the wages of some of the more competent men have been increased does not in itself seem sufficient reason for raising the wages of the remainder. I can assure the hon. Member that the question of the position of the remaining men shall not be lost sight of.

#### CHINA-REPORTED FIRING BY GERMAN TROOPS ON A BRITISH BOAT.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he is aware that a few days ago, at Tientsin, a tugboat, the "Ewo," flying the British flag, was fired upon by German troops, and that two of the crew were wounded, and the others imprisoned and flogged by the German authorities; and whether His Majesty's Government have taken any, and, if so, what action in this matter.

\*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRANBORNE, Rochester): The British Consul General at Tientsin has reported that on the 4th instant a tug and lighter flying the British flag collided with a German pontoon bridge, and that German soldiers fired on the tug, wounding two Chinese, and subsequently boarded the lighter and took the crew on shore to the barracks. The matter was represented by the British general commanding at Tientsin to the German general, and the latter replied expressing regret for what had happened and promising to take measures to prevent similar violence in future.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Is there any foundation for the statement that some of the crew of this boat were flogged in a German prison?

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: I shall have an opportunity of saying a word or two on this later on.

#### CHINA AND THE POWERS;PRESENT POSITION.

MR. JOSEPH WALTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can give the House any information as to our position and that of the other Powers in China, and as to the progress of the negotiations with the Government of that country and with the Russian Government.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Will the noble Lord at the same time state whether there is any foundation for the statement referred to in my question that some of the crew of a tugboat flying the British flag were flogged in a German prison, and, if so, whether any compensation will be asked for from the German Government.

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: I am afraid that the answer to the question of the hon. Member for Barnsley is of so wide a character that I must ask the indulgence of the House in giving such a

reply as may, I hope, be considered adequate. The question really relates to the whole situation in China. There is not much that I have to communicate, but I am aware that the House is anxious for information. The question which has most interested the Government recently in the negotiations with China is the matter of the indemnities; and upon that, as the House is aware, a long time back I had the honour of informing it that, in our view, it was very important to bear in mind, in fixing the amount of the indemnities and the method of paying them, that we should not injure in any way the commercial interests of this country. Our endeavour, therefore, was as far as possible to moderate the demands for indemnities, and that they should not in any way infringe upon the commercial

interests of Great Britain, and with that view we have been opposed to raising the Chinese tariff as has been suggested to the figure of 10 per cent. in order to provide the necessary security. On the contrary, we have, on behalf of His Majesty's Government, declined to accede to any such suggestion, and have signified that we should only be ready, on behalf of Great Britain, to consent to the raising of the tariff to that figure upon the commercial improvement of the Chinese fiscal system, such as the abolition of the likin and other matters which I do not propose to trouble the House with. But I would ask the House to recollect that in moderating the demands for the indemnities there are more ways than one of achieving that object, and that the method in which the payment is made has a great deal to do with the burdens of its incidence on the Chinese. That brings me to a question of some little interest, namely, the proposal which has been made that the indemnities should be defrayed by means of a loan, which should be guaranteed by what I may call the concert of the Powers. Undoubtedly the obligation under which the Chinese Government rests to pay an indemnity is a joint obligation, and if it were necessary to use force, which I hope may never be the case, the force which would have to be employed would be the joint force of the Powers. But the objections to a joint guarantee are so obvious that His Majesty's Government will have nothing to do with it. It is quite clear, considering that our interest and credit stand higher than those of any other Power, and that the sum of money which we claim to receive as an indemnity is a very small portion of the whole, that we should have been nothing short of insane if we had agreed to a joint guarantee for the loan. I do not know that there is anything else which will interest the House, except perhaps a word about the punishments. With regard to the punishment of the high-placed delinquents who were responsible for the murder of various Europeans in the attack upon the legations, six have been killed, three have been banished, and two have been deprived of their posthumous honours.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Isle of Thanet): Killed by whom?

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: Three have been executed and three have been permitted to commit suicide. As regards the provincial criminals, a demand has been made for the punishment of a certain number of individuals; and, considering the awful character of the murders which have been committed, I do not think that the demand can be considered excessive. Various degrees of punishment have been demanded for 107 individuals. That has been a joint demand, with the exception of the Government of Russia, who have not joined in it. On the whole, we may say that matters in China are entering upon a more pacific phase, and we hope that before long there may be an opportunity of withdrawing a large portion of our force. That, of course, must depend upon how far the Chinese Government go in fulfilling the minimum demands of the Powers which have been made; but already over 3,000 troops are under orders to evacuate China, and we hope that before many months have elapsed they will be increased by a still larger body.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER (Cheshire Northwich): That is, our troops?

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: Yes. I do not know that there is anything else except the question of the hon. Member for East Clare. I have already informed him that it is a fact that this gunboat was

fired on by the German guard, and that the German general has expressed his regret and has informed the British general that no such violence should again occur. The hon. Member asked me whether something beyond the shooting took place, and I believe I am accurate in saying that there was other violence as well.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Flogging?

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: I do not remember that. There was other violence as well, but of course that comes in the general question. [Nationalist laughter.] I do not understand the reason for that laughter.

MR. FLYNN: You have no sense of humour.

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: The German general has signified that similar violence will not occur again, and I should have thought hon. Members would be satisfied with that assurance.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): Was the British Government satisfied with that assurance?

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I wish to know whether it is a fact that a certain number of Chinese sailors, sailing under the British flag, were flogged in a German prison, and, if so, whether the German authorities will be asked for any compensation.

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: I have no information regarding the hon. Member's statement in the supplementary question. As to whether any compensation is to be claimed, that is, of course, a matter for the aggrieved parties to decide. We are inquiring into that very point at this moment. There is another matter with respect to Tientsin which the House will probably like to hear about. There was a question on the Paper addressed to me in the name of the hon. Member for East Bristol, and, in reply to that, I have to say that the Russian Government, on 20th March, proposed that all questions of title and proprietary rights which had arisen out of the Tientsin incident should be reserved for examination by the two

Governments, and that, meanwhile, the troops on both sides should be withdrawn from the disputed point. To this proposal His Majesty's Government assented, and the troops were withdrawn accordingly. On the 18th instant, however, certain notice boards and boundary stones implying possession were reported to us as having been erected by the Russian authorities upon the ground claimed by the Chinese Railway administration. We have no reason to believe that this has been done with the knowledge of the Russian Government; and the House is aware that it not infrequently happens that things are done in China by Russian authorities which, we have every reason to believe, are against the wishes of the Russian Government. The matter has at once been brought under the notice of the Russian Government, and we are waiting their reply. Hitherto the examination of these questions has been deferred until the pressure of more important negotiations upon the time of our representatives should become relaxed; but the settlement will require investigation on the spot into any evidence, documentary or otherwise, which may be forthcoming. Into this we hope soon to enter. I have said all I have to say on the Chinese question, and I hope it will be sufficient for the House at the present moment.

CROYDON BRAWLING CASE.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been directed to the case of a man named Catterall, who was charged at Croydon on Saturday with brawling, and whether, as the defendant admitted the charge, and the majority of the magistrates dismissed the case, he will follow the Irish precedent, and direct the Public Prosecutor to send a Bill to the grand jury against Catterall.

\*MR. RITCHIE: I have seen a report of the case, but it appears not to be one in which I can interfere with the jurisdiction of the magistrates.

MANNING OF THE MERCANTILE MARINE.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the Board of Trade have laid down any regulations defining what constitutes the proper manning of ships, and whether there is any means at present of preventing ships going to sea without having amongst the crew a due proportion of proved A.B.'s.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): In order to secure the efficient manning of emigrant ships, steam and sailing, the Board of Trade have laid down specific regulations and scales for the guidance of their officers. With regard to other vessels instructions have also been issued to secure such manning as will provide for an effective watch and for the detention of any under-manned ship. There is no provision either in the Merchant Shipping Act or in the regulations issued under it which requires the detention of a ship unless any particular proportion of the crew are proved A.B.'s.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he will be kind enough to answer that portion of my question in which I inquire whether the Board of Trade have laid down any regulations defining what constitutes proper manning?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I have answered that question.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: No, Sir; with great respect you have not. I again ask whether the Board of Trade consider that the shipping of men who are not proved A.B.'s constitutes under-manning?

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order order; The hon. Member has complained that the question on the Paper has not been answered, but he is now putting a question which is not on the Paper. If he wants further information he had better put the question down in the ordinary way.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I have no doubt that if the right hon. Gentleman says he did answer my question I did not catch his reply. Perhaps he will be kind enough to repeat that portion of his answer in which he deals with my question asking whether any regulation of the Board of Trade defines what constitutes proper manning.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The hon. Member is now asking what the regulations are. I understood his question on the Paper to be as to whether any regulations are laid down, and I have no objection to repeating the answer I gave to it. (The right hon. Gentleman then again read his answer.)

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: With great respect, may I ask the right hon. Gentleman if he cannot give me a more definite or distinct answer to that portion of my question in which I inquire whether any of the regulations which the Board of



Trade have laid down define what proper manning is? I am aware that there are regulations to secure proper manning, but I want to know is there any specific regulation which he can refer me to which defines what proper manning means?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: If the hon. Member desires to know exactly what the regulations are he had better put down a further question, but whether I shall be able to answer it within the limits of a reply I cannot say.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Perhaps if I direct a letter to the right hon. Gentleman on this subject he could answer it more fully?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Of course.

BUTTER ADULTERATION.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether his attention has been called to the fact that new milk heavily charged with boracic acid or water is forced by means of a spiral machine into butter, which increases its weight and bulk; and what steps he will take, by legislation or otherwise, to prevent such adulterations of butter in the interests of the public.

\*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): The facts as stated in the question

are, I believe, correct. At Longton, on the day following the Bath decision, a conviction was obtained against the same firm; and I understand that it is to be appealed against. Other prosecutions are being held over until the decision on appeal has been given. The settlement of a butter standard, to which I referred in answer to another question of the hon. Member, will itself, I hope, go far to prevent such questions arising.

MR. FLYNN: Is it not the fact that boracic acid, in addition to being an adulterant, is most dangerous to health?

\*MR. HANBURY: I should not like to answer that without notice.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that in France the authorities refuse to allow the use of it?

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

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he can state when he proposes to appoint a Committee to inquire into the question of the quantity of water to be legally allowable in butter; what will be the nature of the Committee; what will be the character of the evidence submitted to it, and where will the inquiry be held.

\*MR. HANBURY: The Committee will be appointed as soon as we have collected sufficient expert evidence and analytical facts to lay before it. The Committee will be of the same character as that to which the question of a milk standard was submitted. We are in communication with the Irish Department as to the constitution of it.

STEPNEY AND POPLAR MAIN ROADS.

MR. HARRY SAMUEL (Tower Hamlets, Limehouse): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the London County Council has repudiated its liability to provide for the maintenance of the main roads in the boroughs of Stepney and Poplar; and, if so, what steps the Board proposes to take in the matter.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): I have not received any representations on this subject, and am therefore not in a position to say whether the case is one in which I am empowered to take action. If any representations are made the matter will receive my consideration.

#### SUNDAY CLOSING OF PUBLIC-HOUSES IN SCOTLAND.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether he has noted the statement of His Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for Scotland in his annual report, that the extension of the Public-Houses, Hours of Closing (Scotland) Act of 1887 to all places would conduce to greater peace and order, and enable the police to give more undivided and earlier attention to night patrolling and watching; and whether he is prepared to take any step to give effect to that extension.

\*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): Yes, Sir, the recommendation quoted by the hon. Member stands tenth among twelve suggestions which the Inspector of Constabulary puts forward in his annual report. It will be considered on its merits along with the other eleven, but no undertaking to propose legislation can be given at present.

#### CONTINUATION CLASSES IN SCOTLAND.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether he can give any information as to the relation of the authorities managing continuation classes to county technical instruction committees whose grant is in part applicable to the same purposes and which have in fact been so applying it, but who do not know whether it is expected or allowed to subsidise or to assume any responsibility with regard to continuation classes in future.

\*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The Scotch Education Department will be glad to give any information in their power in regard to any question raised by the technical committees of county councils with reference to continuation classes. They are not aware that there is any change in their relation to these classes consequent on the new Code; but any attempt to discuss the powers of these committees in this matter in an answer to a question would certainly give rise to misapprehension.

#### MISDIRECTED TELEGRAMS.

MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether, in the case of a telegram having been misdirected, there is any rule which prohibits the postmaster at the office at which the telegram has been received from informing the person for whom it is intended of the fact of its having been received; whether his attention has been called to the inconvenience which was recently caused at Grosmont by the alleged existence of such a rule; and whether, if such a rule exists, he can see his way to recommending that greater latitude should be allowed to postmasters to permit of their divulging in such cases the fact that a telegram has been received, though not its contents.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): The circumstances under which telegrams are misdirected vary so greatly that the Postmaster General would prefer not to answer upon a hypothetical case. It is of course of great importance in the interests of the

public that information respecting telegrams should not be divulged. Postmasters are, however, called upon to exercise a reasonable discretion. The Postmaster General has made inquiry in the case of Grosmont, a village in Herefordshire. The telegrams were simply addressed to the name of the village, and it was not at first known for whom they were intended. It eventually appeared that there had been a misapprehension on the part of the senders, the telegrams being intended for a doctor at Grosmont.

#### KENMARE CONSTABULARY AND HARVEST WORK.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state on how many occasions during the last harvest members of the constabulary force at Kenmare, county Kerry, were employed in saving the hay on the private grounds of the local district inspector; whether the performance of such work for the district inspector is part of the duties of the constabulary and is sanctioned by the Irish Government; and will he cause a full inquiry to be instituted.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): On two occasions last year a couple of constables stationed at Kenmare voluntarily assisted the district inspector in the manner referred to. There is nothing in the regulations prohibiting members of the force from employing their spare time in this manner.

#### CAVAN OLD GAOL.

MR. M'GOVERN (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the building which was formerly used as a gaol for county Cavan was built by the Grand Jury of Cavan out of the rates of the county, and that it cost over £20,000 to erect this gaol and the buildings connected with it; that after it had ceased to be used as a gaol the County Council of the county of Cavan informed the General Prisons Board, Ireland, that it was prepared to take over this building or such portion of it as was not required for a Bridewell and utilise it for the benefit of the ratepayers at whose cost it was erected, and that the General Prisons Board since this application was made to them have handed over this building to the military authorities; and will he state by what authority the General Prisons Board handed over the property of the ratepayers of county Cavan to the War Department without compensation, and will the Government pay the cost of the construction of this building or hand it back to the county council.

MR. WYNDHAM: The building formerly used as a prison at Cavan was built by the Grand Jury out of county rates, but at what cost I am unable to say. Section 31 of the Prisons Act of 1878 authorises the Prisons Board, within twelve months after the closing

of a prison, to allow it to be used for any public purpose, with the consent of the Treasury. Subject to this provision the prison was handed over to the military authorities in August last with all liability for rent and cost of maintenance. There is no power to award compensation, as suggested.

#### FISHERY LOANS IN IRELAND.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say when the amended rules for the administration of Loans under the Sea and Coast Fisheries Fund (Ireland) Act,

1884, will be printed.

MR. WYNDHAM: The rules, I am informed, have been printed.

MR. POWER: They are not available at the office.

MR. WYNDHAM: I will see that they are made accessible.

#### KILMALLOCK PETTY SESSIONS HOUSE.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on 15th January, 1900, the clerk of petty sessions and custodian of the court house in Kilmallock, county Limerick, on behalf of the justices of the petty sessions house in Kilmallock, wrote to the clerk of the Kilmallock District Council saying that he could not allow the petty sessions house to be again used by the district council without the written permission of the justices usually presiding there; and that, in reply to the secretary of the Limerick County Council, on behalf of the said council, who, in a communication of 9th April, 1900, addressed the justices of the Kilmallock petty sessions district with a view to obtaining the use of the court house for quarterly meetings of the Kilmallock District Council, the magistrates in question, at their meeting on 4th May following, refused the use of the court house for holding their meetings to the district council; is he aware that the district council intend to hold no future meetings in the board room, which is insecure and does not afford accommodation; and will he make an order compelling the magistrates to give the use of the court house to the district council.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): With the permission of my right hon. friend, I will reply to this question. The facts are substantially as stated in the first paragraph. The district council have no right whatever to the use of the petty sessions court house, nor have the Government any right or power to make the order suggested.

#### LAND PURCHASE IN COUNTY LIMERICK.

MR. LUNDON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will say how much of the thirty millions of money to be expended on the purchase of lands in Ireland under the Land Purchase Act of 1891 was allocated to the county of Limerick, how much of that sum has been expended and how much remains over; and will he lay upon the Table of the House a statement of the various sums set apart for the different counties and how they now stand, and what dispositions have up to this been made of those moneys.

MR. WYNDHAM: At the request of my hon. friend, I will reply to this question. The capital value of the share of county Limerick in the cash and contingent portions of the guarantee fund under the Act of 1891 represents a sum of £1,361,136. The total issues in the county to the 1st instant have been £510,000. A Return such as indicated in the question will be laid upon the Table.

#### IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHER'S SALARY.

MR. KENDAL O'BRIEN (Tipperary, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the teacher of the national school in District No. 46, whose roll number is 8,316, has not yet received salary for the quarter ended 31st March last, the reason of this detention of

salary being that there are no out-offices attached to this school, and that, in communications to the National Board, the manager of this school has expressed his willingness to build these out-offices if he could obtain a suitable site, but that the inspector of the district, on 13th September last, examined the surroundings of the school without being able to point out a suitable and available site for these out-offices; and will he say if there is a rule of the National Board prohibiting the teacher whose salary is withheld from building these out-offices himself.

MY. WYNDHAM: The Commissioners inform me that they cannot reconsider their decision in the case of this school until they receive an assurance that definite steps have been taken by the manager to provide out-offices. The inspector does not allude to the alleged difficulty of procuring a site in the report of his visit on the 13th September. The Commissioners cannot assent to any action that would give the teacher a proprietary interest in the school premises.

#### AGRARIAN OUTRAGES IN IRELAND.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the Return of the number of agrarian outrages in Ireland for the quarter ending 31st March last, showing that out of a total of 65, 37 are described as threatening notices; and if he can say whether the police make inquiry as to whether these alleged threatening letters should be described as genuine threats or the reverse.

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes, Sir; no case is finally recorded in these Returns until after the fullest possible investigation.

MR. FLYNN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that in many of these cases the threatening letters are sent by the individuals themselves for obvious reasons?

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

#### STEAM TRAWLING OFF COUNTY LOUTH.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether he is aware that last year the Irish Privy Council disallowed as illegal a bye-law made by the Irish Fishery Board prohibiting steam trawling between points in county Dublin and county Louth on the ground that portions of the sea outside the territorial jurisdiction of Her late Majesty were embraced; and, seeing that last week the King's Bench upheld a conviction in county Waterford under an analogous bye-law embracing an extra territorial area, and held that the same was legally made, whether the Irish Fishery Board will now be advised to re-enact the disallowed bye-law for the protection of the county Louth fishermen.

MR. ATKINSON: The Lord Chancellor, in announcing the advice the Committee of the Privy Council would give His Excellency in reference to the bye-law mentioned, did not state the grounds on which that advice was based. It is open to the Department of Agriculture, however, to submit a fresh bye-law if, upon consideration of the facts and the law, they consider such a course advisable, having regard to the recent decision.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the expediency of dealing with the point in his present Bill on steam trawling?

MR. ATKINSON: The decision in King's Bench seems to cover it.

#### BOYLE TOWN COMMISSIONERS; FAIRS AND MARKETS REGULATIONS.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether he can explain why the Local Government Board have informed the Boyle Town Commissioners that they cannot make fair and market regulations for the prevention of obstruction of the streets and of the holding of pig fairs on other than the appointed days, the Boyle Town Commissioners being constituted under the Towns Improvement (Ireland) Act, 1854.

MR. ATKINSON: The only explanation is that that was the conclusion to which the Local Government Board came on the law and the facts, in the case of the bye-laws submitted by them.

#### REVALUATIONS IN IRELAND.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether Article 37 (N) of Privy Council Order, 30th January, 1899, was drawn to apply to general revaluations of property under Sections 65 of the Local Government Act, 1898, and 34 of the Valuation Act, 1852, or only to annual revisions; and is he aware that the wider construction would enable a rate to be struck before the appeals are heard, which in cases of the general revaluation of a city must be numerous, whereas in the case of isolated revisions made annually appeals are always few.

MR. ATKINSON: The order was intended to apply, and the Valuation Office insists does apply, to a general revaluation. In the latter case it would, no doubt, have a wider scope than in the former, but the provisions for recoupment prevent any difficulty or hardship from arising and greatly facilitates the making of that valuation.

#### BALTIMORE MAILS.

MR. GILHOOLY (Cork County, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that the mail for Baltimore, which is carried from Cork to Skibbereen by the train leaving at 11.50 (arriving at Skibbereen at 1.30), is not delivered at Baltimore until next morning, though the train by which the letters are brought proceeds immediately to Baltimore, a distance of nine miles from Skibbereen; and whether, in view of the fact that the bulk of these letters are from England and of importance to fish buyers, he will cause inquiry to be made, with a view to having an immediate delivery of the letters referred to.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Inquiry is being made on the subject referred to by the hon. Member, and the result will be communicated to him as soon as possible.

#### REGISTRY OF DEEDS OFFICE, DUBLIN ; TELEGRAMS TO SEARCHERS.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether, seeing that until recently it has been the practice of the Post Office to deliver telegrams to searchers in the Search Room of the Registry of Deeds Office, Dublin, he can explain why telegraph messengers have now been instructed not to deliver messages to searchers there; and is it intended to also instruct such messengers not to deliver messages to barristers or solicitors personally at the Four Courts, Dublin.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General is unable to trace any such

instructions as those referred to. The hon. Member must, he thinks, have been misinformed.

#### GIBRALTAR DEFENCE WORKS.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether His Majesty's Government will give a day after the Whitsuntide holidays for discussion of the questions relating to the works and defences of Gibraltar; and whether, in the meantime, they propose to suspend the construction of any of the works sanctioned on the western side of Gibraltar.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I have to say that I imagine an occasion may arise when this question may be discussed on the Naval Works Loan Bill. I cannot answer the second paragraph of the question or add anything to what I said yesterday in reply to an hon. Member opposite. I then stated that the House shall have the earliest information as to any change of plan.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): Can the right hon. Gentleman say when the Naval Works Loans Bill will be introduced?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No; I cannot say.

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER: I beg to ask the right hon. Gentleman what will be the business on Thursday?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Supposing we do not finish the debate on the Second Reading of the Finance Bill to-day, we shall finish it on Thursday. But the first Order of the day on Thursday will be the motion for the adjournment for the Whitsuntide holidays. On Friday I propose to put down first the Order for the Joint Committee on Queen Anne's Bounty. It has been on the Paper for a long time, and it is extremely inconvenient that it should hang fire any longer. The Civil List will be the second Order, and the Demise of the Crown Bill the third Order. There are also two Votes on the Army Estimates which, for financial reasons, it is very important that we should take.

DR. FARQUHARSON: Which Votes are to be taken?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Vote 10 and the Ordnance Vote.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): Does the right hon. Gentleman propose to have a morning sitting on Friday?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: What will be the business after the Whitsuntide holidays?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Perhaps the hon. Gentleman will repeat that question on Thursday.

#### NEW BILLS.

##### EDUCATION (CONTINUATION SCHOOLS).

Bill to enable School Boards to establish and maintain Schools of Science and Art, Science and Art Classes, and Evening Continuation Schools out of the School Fund: ordered to be brought in by Sir John Brunner, Mr. John Burns, Mr. Channing, Mr. Ernest Gray, Mr. Alfred Hutton, and Dr. Macnamara.

##### EDUCATION (CONTINUATION SCHOOLS) BILL.

"To enable School Boards to establish and maintain Schools of Science and Art, Science and Art Classes, and Evening Continuation Schools out of the School

Fund;" presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday, 10th June, and to be printed. [Bill 199.]

#### EDUCATION OF THE BLIND (SCOTLAND).

Bill to amend the law in regard to the Education of the Blind in Scotland; ordered to be brought in by Sir John Stirling-Maxwell, Mr. Baird, Mr. Shaw-Stewart, Lord Balcarres, and Mr. Tennant.

#### EDUCATION OF THE BLIND (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"To amend the Law in regard to the Education of the Blind in Scotland," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 11th June, and to be printed. [Bill 200].

#### FINANCE BILL.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [20th May], "That the Bill be now read a second time";

And which Amendment was;

"To leave out from the word 'That' to the end of the question, in order to add the words, 'this House, while ready to make adequate provision for the naval and military requirements of the Empire, is of opinion that the Financial proposals of His Majesty's Government are objectionable both with regard to taxation and debt, are calculated injuriously to affect industry and commerce, and do not exhibit that regard for economy which the alarming increase that has recently taken place in the normal expenditure of the country imperatively demands,' instead thereof.";(Sir Henry Fowler.)

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

Debate resumed.

\*SIR THOMAS WRIGHTSON (St. Pancras, E.): Before discussing the question of the coal duty, I have only a word or two to say with reference to the tax upon sugar. I notice that the Chancellor of the Exchequer has been careful to pay attention to the different qualities of sugar, and has brought to his aid a scientific instrument known as the polariscope, by means of which he is able to insure that the incidence of the duty upon this particular commodity shall be just. We do not ask in the case of the coal tax to have scientific apparatus; applied in order to detect the different qualities of coal, but we do ask that in the imposition of the duty the instruments of justice and common sense shall be applied.

Coming to the coal duty, the different qualities of coal ought to be and are, of course, thoroughly well-known, not only to coal-owners but to coal consumers, and I am sorry it is proposed to place a level 1s. per ton upon every class of coal, no matter from what district it comes. There appears to me in this to be a lack of consideration for the interests of colliery owners and the trade. The Chancellor of the Exchequer usually selects some prosperous trade upon which to levy taxation. He is quite entitled to do that, and I for one think the coal trade has been prosperous and ought to be taxed; but, at the same time, I hold that the incidence of the taxation, whatever form it may take, should be one which is guided by a proper appreciation of the principles of justice. Now the remarks I am about to make will chiefly refer to one district, which is harder



hit than any other. I mean the district of Northumberland. The popularity of the coal tax is undoubted; it is, I believe, growing in popularity, but that fact will not prevent me from expressing my opinion. The reason for the popularity is obvious. The householders of this country have been very much punished by the high prices they have had to pay for coal lately, and that is quite a sufficient reason for their present attitude. I was driving through my constituency the other day, and saw an advertisement announcing that for 5d. it was possible to buy 28 lbs. of coal. That works out at 33s. per ton. It is a monstrous price to pay for coal, especially when it is remembered that coal at the pit's mouth will not fetch one-third of that sum. Hence one cannot be surprised that the tax is popular, and appeals to those who have had to pay such high prices. But, after all, the feeling is somewhat unjust, because it is not the coalowner who has reaped all the benefit of the heavy charges. The money has gone largely to the middlemen. I have over and over again put down the price of coal at the pit mouth, and added to it every conceivable charge for freight, etc, and yet I could not bring the total up to anything like 33s. per ton, or even 29s. There must, therefore, be a considerable amount added at some intermediate stage. If I might be allowed to suggest it, it is the coal ring in London which has benefited by these high prices, and yet the gentlemen who form this ring are not touched by the tax. However, the people with whom this tax is so popular are not aware of that fact. They simply blame the coal-owners generally, and when they hear that the Chancellor of the Exchequer is going to put a tax upon exported coal they are not aware of the fact that the coal which is exported is not the same class of coal as that which comes into London and which is used for household purposes. The coal produced in Northumberland is not household coal. It is not gas or cokeing coal. It is merely ordinary steam-producing coal which has not the smokeless property of Welsh coal. In consequence of not possessing that property it has an extremely restricted market, and when I tell the House that 80 per cent. of the coal which Northumberland produces is exported; and I know that in some collieries 93 per cent. is exported; I would urge that hon. Members should recognise that it is a most serious thing to put a tax of 1s. per ton upon it. The situation becomes still more grave when it is known that the only markets we now have left for that coal are the northern ports of Europe, where German coal comes into competition. It is the fact that there is only a margin of 2d. or 3d. per ton between the Northumberland and the Westphalian coal, which enables the English coalowners to get the contracts, and if you are going to put 1s. extra per ton upon their coal you will practically destroy that market for them. It will be found to be impossible to make the foreigner pay the 1s., and I do not see how Northumberland can pay it. Formerly Northumberland used to supply coal to the Navy, but they lost that market when the Welsh coal fields were developed, and smokeless coal was obtained from them. Northumberland has no chance against the smokeless coal, and so one by one our markets have disappeared. In the Far East we have no chance at all. In India the coalfields of Madras and Hyderabad have cut us out entirely, and we have no export there; while if we go to the West Indies we find that we have been deprived of our original markets by

America and Australia. Thus, there is nothing left to us but the northern ports of Europe, and there we are subjected to a keen and close competition with Germany. The German trade is not one that can be spoken of with disrespect. At present it represents 138,000,000 tons per annum, while our own trade throughout the United Kingdom amounts to 225,000,000 tons. The German coal-owners, therefore, are no mean antagonists in our trade. The increase of the German coal output is going on at a very great speed, and I am informed that it is at least five and a half million tons annually. The Chancellor of the Exchequer in his speech the other day rather dismissed this question of German competition and the difficulties attending it by suggesting that the coalowners should go to the North Eastern Railway Company and ask them to reduce their rates. I see some of the North Eastern directors in the House at the present moment, and I should like to know their view of the suggestion. They have a monopoly in their district, and it is very unlikely indeed, therefore, that they would help us in this matter. The Chancellor of the Exchequer also suggested that we ought to put our coals on board vessels and send them to the south. But he forgot that our coal is not a household coal, and therefore that particular remedy would not be efficacious. We do, of course, send some of our coal south, but it must be remembered that there are no large manufacturing centres near the southern ports, and therefore there is practically no market there for our coals.

I now come to the effect which the tax will have in favour of the German coalowners. It is a well-known fact, not only in Northumberland but elsewhere, that the full working of the collieries produces the lowest cost; for instance, we get the minimum cost when we are working eleven days in the fortnight. If we work ten days the cost goes up at least 6d. per ton; if we only work nine days it goes up a shilling; while for eight days the increase, as compared with full time, is 1s. 6d. In the case

of Germany exactly the reverse occurs, for directly the collieries there are worked at full time; which they are not just now; the cost will go down 1s. 6d. per ton. It has always been my view that the profit made by the reduction of cost is ten times more valuable than that obtained by fluctuations in the market, and we are giving that to the Germans. They are throwing up their hats with joy at this proposal, because, they recognise that the export duty will curtail the quantity that we send out, and therefore increase our cost of production; in fact, what is a loss in our case will be a profit to them, and this is quite independent of any advance in price they get from being able to charge the 1s. duty to their home consumers. It has been suggested that owners might send their coal to other markets by railway. But allow me to tell the House that in Northumberland half of the colliery owners are absolutely independent of the railway company. Many of them have their own railways, and enormous sums of money have been expended in constructing lines and shipping stages. Is all this outlay of capital to be thrust on one side on account of a capricious change of the nature proposed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer? I hope the House will see that it is a most unreasonable proposal, and that it would have been, at all events, less unsound to have put a tax upon some imported goods that we ourselves manufacture. I am not a Protectionist, but I

say that this duty breaks through one of the great canons of Free Trade, and, if you once do that, there is nothing to prevent the creation of tariffs which will, no doubt, bring revenue to the country, although they may at the same time increase the cost to those who buy the articles in this country.

I wish to allude to a Return of statistics relating to coal mining, moved for by the President of the Board of Trade, and published last Saturday. I think it shows most conclusively that the contention that the coal trade is as a rule a poor trade, and only good in times of inflation, is fully borne out. I do not intend to trouble the House with many figures, but those figures are given in such a form that it is easy for the House to follow them. I

will ask them to look at the table on page 4, which gives the average quantity of coal raised per annum between 1890 and 1899 as 191 million tons. The average price per ton at the pit mouth during the same period was 6s. 10<sup>0</sup>/<sub>7</sub>3d., and that amount is divided under the heads of, first, wages to miners, and, second, expenses other than wages including coal owners' profits. The computed amount under the latter head is 19<sup>0</sup>/<sub>10</sub> million pounds sterling, which means that after the wages are paid there is just 2s. per ton left for paying the other expenses and for profits, if there are any. A great many things have to be paid out of this. We have school board rates and taxes, mineral rents, materials, and way leave charges, damage to land, and other things which have to be compressed into that 2s. In Northumberland and Durham materials alone cost 8d. to 10d. per ton: rents, 5d. to 7d. per ton; colliery consumption of coal, 3<sup>0</sup>/<sub>10</sub>1d. per ton; rates and taxes, 1<sup>0</sup>/<sub>10</sub>1d. per ton. These are all included in the 2s. per ton. I ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer where are the large profits left?

There are no doubt some coal owners who have made a profit all through those ten years, but many have lost. It only shows that this question must be investigated before legislation of this kind is put forward. I only give those figures from the Home Office statistics to show that the estimates upon which this tax is based are absolutely fallacious. Another way in which we can get at the profits on coal is from a statement prepared by Mr. J. Bell Simpson (an eminent Northumbrian engineer) for the fourteen years ending March, 1899. In that Return, taken from the Inland Revenue Returns, he gives the total average gross profit at over £;9,000,000; of that the royalties were £;4,600,000. So far as royalties are concerned, there is no Return except 1899, when a Commission was appointed which reported and gave the royalty rents for that year 5<sup>0</sup>/<sub>7</sub>7d. per ton, and if we deduct the amount of the royalties at this rate from the coalowners' profits we find that the royalty owners receive more than the coal owners. The amount which is made by the coal owners runs out at 5<sup>0</sup>/<sub>7</sub>6d. per ton. These different

statements show that the amount of the earnings in coal mining over a term of years are very small, and when such a tax as this is to be imposed all these matters ought to be thoroughly considered. The coal owners are glad to admit that they have had a good year, and if the Chancellor of the Exchequer will devise an equitable plan of making a charge upon what they have earned they will not grumble, but they do grumble at the selection of particular districts for punishment. I was asked the other day to present to the Chancellor of the

Exchequer a resolution which had been passed by the Mining Institute of Great Britain, asking that a small charge should be put upon all coal raised at the pit to cover the full amount he expected to raise from the export duty, and the reply I received from the right hon. Gentleman I do not consider was entirely discouraging. He pointed out that the proposal could not be entertained until it was proved to be unanimous from all localities. It is, no doubt, difficult to get absolute unanimity, and I hope the right hon. Gentleman will not expect it, for when coal owners not affected by this tax are asked to bear a portion of this burden many of them will probably be selfish. Any small view of the case such as that should have no consideration whatever in this House. Now that the Chancellor of the Exchequer has made up his mind, I hope that this duty will not stop where it is, but that next year it will extend to the whole coal trade. I urge the respectful request that there should be a proper inquiry into this question before legislation takes place, so that there might be some kind of equality and justice in the way the tax is levied. The Chancellor of the Exchequer has seemed to be rather obdurate on this matter, but at the same time we know that he can take as broad a view as anyone of these things; and we believe that when the Bill gets into Committee this question will have his consideration. I trust he will then find some way out of the difficulty, and that he will bring forward proposals by which there shall be laid upon the coal trade a tax which will not press with so much inequality and injustice upon particular districts of the country.

SIR ROBERT REID (Dumfries Burghs): I wish to state the grounds upon which I intend to support the Amendment, especially as there has been a good deal of criticism which has arisen, I think, from misunderstanding. If the Amendment meant an approval of the policy which led to this war, I certainly should not vote for it. If the Amendment was an attempt to prevent the legitimate discussion of the issues raised by the war, I should think it a most unworthy device, and should vote against it. I do not intend to enter upon the question, but my view with regard to the policy which led to the war is the same as it always has been. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said the issue was whether Boer or Briton was to be supreme in South Africa. I believe it is a complete delusion to suppose that any such issue was at stake until the war itself raised it. Whether I am right or wrong in thinking that that policy is the greatest blunder this country has made during the last century and a quarter, since the loss of the American colonies, I am quite satisfied that there was no intention on the part of my right hon. friend the Member for East Wolverhampton to exclude any legitimate discussion which might arise in respect of that subject. To begin with, no one would be so foolish as to imagine that, whatever differences may exist on this side of the House; which appear to excite so much mirth among hon. Gentlemen opposite; they are to be composed by cunningly constructed sentences. I hope those differences will not be of long duration, but this I will undertake to say; that when they are brought to an end it will be by toleration, mutual respect, and above all, plain and explicit expression of opinion among the Gentlemen sitting together on this side of the House. I understand the real object of the Amendment to be to condemn the enormous

growth of our normal expenditure, quite apart from that which is due to the actual outlay on the war. That is a most legitimate and useful theme of discussion, and we ought not to allow the plain fact of this enormous growth to be concealed by reason of the existence of a state of war. The rise in expenditure, we have been told, has been 30 per cent. or more during the past six years; and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, be it noted, holds out no hope of a reduction. Throughout his speech he said nothing about any prospect of a reduction. He is too candid a financier; he knows perfectly well that the probability is not a reduction but an increase. He has warned us against it repeatedly; he now sees it coming upon him. I do not doubt that some saving might be effected by close examination of details, such as, unfortunately, this House is not well able at present to make. I have often thought that if a strong Committee, similar to that which used to be appointed every twenty years in regard to Indian finance, were appointed to consider the finance of this country, possibly something might be done in the way of the reduction of expenditure, or the promotion of economy. Whether that be so or not, I am sure that small parings here and there will not affect the great volume of taxation in this country, and it would be a great pity if we deluded ourselves with the idea that any mere methods of investigation or inquiry could achieve the object we have in view. The great bulk is what we have to deal with, and the great bulk of the increase is in regard to the Army and the Navy. I am well aware that it pleases some hon. Gentlemen; I think they do it more out of heedlessness or party spirit than out of any belief that it is true; to be constantly suggesting that we; especially the miserable individuals who hold my opinions about the war; are "Little Englanders," that we wish to restrict the power and the greatness of our country, and that we are prepared to give up in every direction British interests and the British Empire. I shall not condescend to answer any suggestions of that kind. I believe that all parties in the House really desire to maintain the greatness of this country, and that they all recognise that it is impossible to do that without also maintaining the dependencies, the colonies, and what is generally called the Empire attaching to this country. What we differ about are the means and methods. I believe the methods which have been adopted for some time are calculated to diminish the British Empire, to weaken it, and to expose it to great danger when the time of trial comes. That is all we differ about, and my purpose now in referring to this military increase is merely in a few words to point out what I believe to be the true reason that we have arrived at the financial situation in which we now find ourselves. The military increase has not been gradual or by slow steps. Within the last six years the military expenditure has gone up from £18,500,000 to £30,000,000. Not only so, but for the year or two following 1896 there was no appreciable increase at all; while in the year ending 31st March, 1900, if I remember rightly, the expenditure stood at £20,500,000, and now it is almost £30,000,000. The increased expenditure, therefore, has been almost entirely within the last three or four years, and mainly within the last two years. That is quite remarkable. What are the reasons for the great increase during the last six years? The

Chancellor of the Exchequer told us that there were four or five Great Powers now, whereas there was only one before, from whom we need apprehend any danger. Is that new within the last six years? There has been no Great Power which has come into existence within that period. The United States has taken a more prominent position of late, but apart from that no Great Power has taken up such a formidable position as would require this enormous military expenditure, any more than it was required six years ago; or even ten, fifteen, or twenty years ago. The Chancellor of the Exchequer in dealing with the reasons for this increased expenditure pointed to the extended frontier that we have to defend. He referred to India. Well, India is no new thing. The North-West frontier of India is no new thing; we have had to provide for that for many years. India is a country with an enormous population of her own, and I am satisfied, although we must not neglect reasonable precautions, that one of the best safeguards we can have for India is to govern the people justly and well, as I believe we are trying to do, thereby securing their contentment and allegiance. Then the Chancellor of the Exchequer referred to Canada. That also is a very old story. None of the recent increase of military expenditure can be attributed to Canada, and the right hon. Gentleman will not suggest such a thing. If; which God forbid; there should ever be a conflict between Canada and the United States, the 10,000 or 20,000 or more Regular troops which we have in that country would not make the smallest difference in the issue. That issue would depend upon very different considerations. But I trust we may practically exclude such a calamity from the range of possibility. The only other frontier to which the right hon. Gentleman adverted was that of Uganda. Uganda is inaccessible. I feel that I am treading on delicate ground in saying anything about Uganda, but I may say I have never been in the least friendly to the original occupation of that territory. But whether that be a correct view or not, it is very difficult to think that any great portion of the increased military expenditure now proposed is required on account of Uganda. It is not the old condition of things to which the Chancellor of the Exchequer referred. It is not the old conditions which caused this great increase in the expenditure, but it is the new state of things created within the last five or six years, and especially within the last two years. It is the new spirit that is abroad throughout this country, which was sedulously fostered and cultivated by a quarrelsome and aggressive disposition. It was this spirit which nearly led us into a war with France, and which has unhappily ended in the most serious war we have been embarked upon for the last hundred years. That I believe to be the case. I do not say that hon. Gentlemen opposite desire to quarrel, but they use language of a provocative character. They decline arbitration, for example, as they did with the United States over Venezuela, although I am bound to say that Lord Salisbury nobly redeemed his original mistake. The Government and Gentlemen opposite carry on a policy of a provocative character. [Ministerial cries of "No, no."] There is nothing unparliamentary or offensive in that expression, and I think hon. Gentlemen opposite will see that it is perfectly legitimate.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): It is a provocative expression.

SIR ROBERT REID: Then let me express my meaning by simply saying that there has been a difference in the manner in which we have conducted our foreign relations within the last four or five years, and it has not been a change in the direction of a conciliatory or propitiatory demeanour. Another reason for this great expenditure is this: When this war is ended, as I trust it soon may be, it is almost certain that a situation will have been created full of new danger and full of a new military danger. That is almost certain to be the case. It is also necessary for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to provide for that danger. I deplore as much as any man this expenditure, and regret more the causes which have led to this expenditure; and, unless there is a less aggressive attitude adopted towards other nations, I am afraid that this is not the last war you will enter upon, nor will this be the last increase in our military armaments for which we shall have to provide. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer was to analyse this question he would have to say that the spirit which has been created abroad in foreign countries is far less favourable to this country than it was, and they are more disposed to find fault and be embroiled with us. The right hon. Gentleman also contemplates a great increase of military expenditure arising after the settlement of the war. I regret this expenditure exceedingly. I cannot see why great additional armaments have become necessary by reason of this war. It is not the old conditions with which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had to deal which are responsible for this increase of taxation and expenditure, but it is the new conditions, for which, I believe, the Government themselves are responsible; and this state of things will be still more aggravated unless the Government alter their methods and their tone.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): I sat here listening to this debate during the greater part of last evening, and up to the present moment this evening every speech I heard from the other side has confirmed me in the opinion that was so adequately expressed by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Waterford, that this Amendment and the debate upon it is a farce and a sham. We have really had no criticism in this debate upon the Budget. The Chancellor of the Exchequer is introducing increased taxes and originating two new ones, and the right hon. Gentleman who initiated this discussion had nothing to say against the war, nothing to say against the expenditure for it, nothing whatever to say against the principle of borrowing for it, nothing to say against the income tax or the sugar duty, and very little against the coal duty. Practically every speech made last night, instead of dealing with the new taxation proposed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, went back to the old subject of grants in aid of local taxation, which, after all, is not the question we are discussing. This is a subject which the right hon. Gentlemen themselves had an opportunity of dealing with from 1892 to 1895, but they never touched it, and I venture to say that if they were in office to-morrow they would not touch it, because they would lose the support of all the agricultural Members who sit behind them if they did. I confess that I thought, however, that the hon. Member for Waterford was a little hard in other respects upon the right hon. Gentleman who introduced the Amendment. The right hon. Gentleman, whether he differs from his party or not, is always honest,

frank, and straightforward, and that was the essential character of his speech last night, and of that portion of the Amendment for which I take it he is responsible. But that cannot be said of the preamble to the Amendment. I cannot conceive why any such platitude as that which forms the first part of this Amendment was introduced at all. It is not necessary for the right hon.

Gentleman to proclaim to the House and to the country that he is prepared in a certain way to defend the Empire. The preamble must have been introduced on behalf of another section of the party in search of a character, of a section of the party who no doubt would like to catch the patriotic breeze now blowing, and yet do not wish to be committed by anything it says. For such the word "adequate" has been introduced into this Amendment, and this "fly in the amber" betrays its origin. I venture to say it has been

introduced by no less a Member than the Leader of the Opposition. It is just one of some half a dozen words, which mean nothing at all, that form part of the stock-in-trade of the embarrassed politician, and is valuable because it has no fixed meaning. The lady in the circus ambles round on her monotonous course until she finally lands in the arms of the clown, and the right hon. Gentleman, after riding opposite policies abreast, has fallen into the hands of the Daily News; but the Daily News is far from being in a comic mood, it is in a very serious mood indeed. That paper, recently re-edited and renovated to express the opinions of the united Liberal party, declared that this was not an honest Amendment, but that the honest party Amendment was represented by the notice given by the hon. Member for South Molton;

"That this House is of opinion that if the foreign policy of the country is conducted with skill and judgment our present large and increasing armaments are quite unnecessary and the taxation which they involve perfectly unjustifiable"

I do not wish to intervene in these party squabbles, which apparently do not represent the feeling of the party opposite, although that is the feeling of the Daily News. Surely the country, upon an occasion like the present, has some right to have an expression of opinion from the other side upon a resolution of this kind. Upon a vote of want of confidence in the Government, surely the ordinary man and honest artisan has some right to have a full, straightforward, and candid expression of opinion on the question at issue from the Opposition. That is our defence, for we consider the condition of our Army and Navy are more important than any other subject.

But this is not all. The hon. Gentleman who spoke last dealt very largely with the question of the war, but that is not the question at issue to-day. The question of the policy of the war has been placed before the country, and the country has given a decided verdict upon the subject. What we have to discuss to-day is the question of the growth of our normal expenditure. That growth, no doubt, is very considerable, but would it decrease if the party opposite came into power? Is this a party question at all, or is it due to the sheer necessities of the nation? I hope that whatever we do in this discussion we shall stick to facts. Let us stick to the facts, and not go wandering into dreamland, where I think we have been wandering too long. What is the actual position of this country at the present moment?



Great nations have not yet turned their swords into ploughshares. We are no longer the only workshop, the only warehouse, and the only transport managers in the world. The world shows no great desire to be our customers, and our best customers are our colonies. Unlike twenty years ago, we live to-day amid great nations armed to the teeth, and most of our trouble is in connection with trade markets; those very things upon which our national life depends. Trade is like Christianity itself. It may mean "not peace but the sword." When we are told that we are to trust to diplomacy, then I say that we may reasonably ask ourselves the question, Are we to depend for our safety in the future on the benevolence of foreign nations, just as Cobden depended on the goodwill of those nations for the universal establishment of free trade? We compete in peace, and, it may be, in war, with nations with a very large and wide population. Surely it is our duty for that purpose to make the best use of every unit in our population, and this we aim to do by means of national education and perfecting the defences of the country. A very large proportion of this expenditure has been spent on education. Does anyone grudge that expenditure? Is it not likely that it is an expenditure which has not reached its limit, and which must increase if we are to do justice to our policy? Could there be any objects for the nation of more pressing importance than education and self-defence? When we go to the country speaking of this enormous expenditure it would be well to add, for the benefit of the people to whom we speak, something with respect to the purposes to which it is devoted. What does self-defence mean now? The hon. Member for the Dumfries Burghs seemed to say that all our troubles were due to the provocative spirit of our diplomacy. Well, let us get away from theories of that kind, and look at what are the sober facts at the present moment. Even our territorial frontiers have increased. No doubt, as he said, they are the same as they were in India and Canada, but are they the same all over Africa? Are they the same in South Africa, in East Africa, and in Egypt? Even in West Africa twenty years ago very little consideration was given to our colonists there. Our interests in West Africa have very largely indeed developed, and so have our interests in other countries where we have colonies, and where we have land frontiers which we are bound to protect. But there is another consideration. It is not merely that we have larger frontiers, but there were times when we did not take the trouble to protect those frontiers as we should have done. The country has woken up to the necessity of self-defence. It realises that it cannot any longer go on in the happy-go-lucky system to which it trusted twenty years ago. It is a fact, therefore, that we have not only got larger frontiers to protect, but the country has determined, as it never did twenty or thirty years ago, that these frontiers shall be adequately protected. Should we grudge this money spent on self-defence; we who are still the most lightly taxed nation in the world? Though our expenditure has grown great as it is, it has grown to nothing like the same extent as that of foreign nations. Between 1826 and 1869 our taxation has increased only 20 per cent.; that of France has increased 78 per cent.; and that of Prussia 70 per cent. Even on the top of this enormous increase of expenditure France has increased its expenditure from £84,000,000 to £141,000,000 between

1870 and 1897. Germany has doubled its expenditure; and Austria has nearly doubled its expenditure. The expenditure of Russia has advanced from £;74,000,000 to £;150,000,000; and Italy has increased from £;44,000,000 to £;70,000,000. Our National Debt is only £;15 18s. 7d. per head, while that of Italy is £;16 17s., and that of France is no less than £;28 2s.

The right hon. Gentleman introduced in his Amendment a phrase about which I hoped he would have something to say in his speech, and that was the phrase with regard to economy. I am one of those who have always advocated economy in this House, and I think that the worst things ever done, perhaps, for the real cause of economy were those violent retrenchments of expenditure which took place under Mr. Gladstone's Governments. I believe they have been utterly discredited. What I believe to be more true economy is looking that for every £;1 and every £;100 spent you have proper regard for efficiency. What the people of this country want at the present moment is a strong Army and Navy, and what they do insist upon is the getting of full value for their money. That is really the subject we have to face. We are told that even in our English methods of procedure in trade we are not so businesslike as we might be. We are reading constantly in the papers, in the reports of consuls, that English manufacturers fall behind their foreign competitors in their business methods. I am afraid that what is true of the private business of the nation may also, to a great extent, be true of the public service. Although I wish that the discussions on the Estimates in this House were more calculated to reduce our expenditure than they are, I am afraid, as a matter of fact, the interest this House takes in the Estimates when they are discussed it is not of such a nature as to bring about any great reduction. On the contrary, the discussions which take place, as a rule, are in the direction of increasing expenditure, and I am afraid even that guardian the Treasury, which is said to keep so close a watch on our expenditure, does not provide the adequate control it ought to do over that expenditure. The Treasury, under the present system, undoubtedly has the power to prevent any great increase of expenditure, but it has not the knowledge to go into all the details of every Department, and it has not the power if a Department is exceeding its own expenditure to cut that expenditure down. Therefore I believe if this expenditure goes on increasing as it has done we shall undoubtedly have to get a more effective control than at present over the details of that expenditure. But, after all, it is not only the expenditure of money; it is the way in which we use our men. I am bound to say that, however excellent as I believe the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War is, what pleased me more than all his scheme of reform were the words in which he spoke of administration, and stated that in the Army in future merit should have its place, and that backstairs influence should disappear. One misplaced man in high position may lead to an enormous waste of money, and I believe that my right hon. friend in inaugurating that reform in the Army is doing a great service. I take the question of contracts. Contracts for the public services should be dealt with on more businesslike principles. As an instance of what may be done I may mention the fact that when sitting in this House one day with the Paper in my hand on which the questions were printed, I

found that the paper supplied to the Stationery Office was formerly made in the United States, and was decidedly inferior to what is now obtained. The change was brought about by an arrangement by which, instead of having the contracts fulfilled by wholesale stationers, they were thrown open to manufacturers only, and thus we got English paper and at the same time saved £60,000 a year by that transaction alone. I believe that principle could be applied to a great many of our Departments.

What, Sir, are the two great merits of the Finance Bill? In the first place that it recognises that taxation and representation should go together. The separation between the two has been too great and has lasted too long. Our system of taxation is a relic of the time when the working classes had not got votes, and it is a dangerous state of things when there are classes in this country who have an enormous voting power but who do not bear a corresponding burden in relation to the taxation of the country. While the Government are anxious to widen the basis of taxation, the party opposite, so far as I understand their principles, are anxious to make the basis even narrower than it is. Indirect taxation is levied upon very few articles at present, and when the Chancellor of the Exchequer proposed to increase the number of these articles by levying a tax upon sugar, the first opponent he met with was the Leader of the Opposition, who said, "That is contrary to our doctrine of a free breakfast table." But why

a free breakfast table? Why not a free dinner table, and a free supper table? [Hear, hear.] Yes; but we know why a free breakfast table is to be preferred to a free dinner table or a free supper table. It is because the only person who would benefit by the free breakfast table is the teetotaller. I have never been able to see why teetotallers should be especially exempted from taxation. I believe the working classes are not quite in harmony with those who make these attacks on indirect taxation; I believe they regard it rather as an insult. The working classes are perfectly willing to take their share in the taxation of the country. They are as proud of the Empire as the richest man is, and they have as large a share in the control of it as the richest man has. [Opposition cries of "Oh."] Oh; yes, they have. The man in the humblest cottage has as large a share in the control of the Empire as the man living in the most highly rated mansion. Besides that, I venture to say that there are no men like the working man, or the manufacturer, if you like, and his employees, who have so much interest in taxation and are so interested in keeping the markets open to their trades; these markets being to them the very bread of life. We are told that hon. Gentlemen opposite wish to steady the policy of the Government, and are anxious that we should not engage in war except under the direst necessity. What would steady the policy of this country more, and make it more definite and unchanging, than the application of the principle which Mill applied to direct taxation in the old days, when direct taxation was borne by those who had the main influence in the country? He said, "You ought to levy direct taxation, because it makes taxation odious, and therefore prevents any great increase in the taxation of the country." If we want to prevent the taxation of this country from growing, and to steady the policy of this country, we ought to impose

taxation upon those who have a real voice in the Government; of the country, and that can be done by means of indirect taxation.

The main attack on the Finance Bill has been the attack which has been directed to the coal duty. My hon. friend behind me, the hon. Member for East St.

Pancras, made a most interesting and to me a most informing speech, but in regard to this question of the coal duty we might very well be on our guard and see from whom the cry really comes. In the first place, we have had a great wail from the colliers, but the colliers are in a very peculiar position in regard to this industry, because they were within a very narrow margin of upsetting the whole trade and industry of this country by a strike, and I believe myself that a great deal of the opposition which came from the colliers was a political opposition.

MR. JOHN WILSON (Durham Mid): Not in the least.

MR. HANBURY: The hon. Gentleman says "Not in the least," but I venture to say that there are two reasons that fully justify me in taking that position. For instance, this tax will not affect the Midland colliers directly or indirectly, and yet they voted against it as vigorously as anybody.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): It will indirectly.

MR. HANBURY: Indirectly, but not so much, at any rate, as to cause such immense emotion in the breasts of the Midland colliers. We have to recognise the fact that colliers as a rule belong to one political party. To a great extent Lancashire is an exception, but Lancashire is a wise county in many other respects. Other colliers, unfortunately, have lagged behind. They have not followed their colleagues under the banner of Unionism, but still lag behind under the banner of Little Englanders, of which hon. Gentlemen seem so very proud. That is very easily explained. Other industries have felt keenly the fight of competition. They have had to battle with foreign competition to an extent which the colliers never had. The colliers have had their home markets to depend upon, or their foreign markets, where their prices practically protected them against any competition whatever; and they are the only class of workmen in this country who have not felt the necessity for foreign markets, and have not supported vigorously the policy of a Government who said these markets are to be maintained.

MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.): Has the right hon. Gentleman forgotten the builders, and printers, and other domestic trades?

MR. HANBURY: I come to the speech of my hon. friend, who laid great stress on the fact that Northumberland coal was cheap coal; but, after all, the cheapness of the coal is not the index to the profit made upon it. The profit depends not so much upon the price as upon the cost of getting the coal. I venture to say that the difference between the cost of getting Northumberland coal and the selling price of that coal is almost as considerable as it is in Wales. We know that in Wales the price of coal is largely governed by the cost of getting the coal, which is enormous, owing to the depth and the quality of the seams which are-worked. The hon. Gentleman also stated that nearly the whole of the Northumberland coal was exported abroad. That assumption is based on inaccurate figures. [Cries of "No."] He said 93 per cent.

MR. JOHN WILSON: In one colliery 93 per cent.

MR. HANBURY: The figures are made up by taking into consideration nearly the whole of the coal that is shipped from the Tyne as if it were Northumberland coal. That is not the fact; a very large proportion of that coal came from Durham, and therefore ought not to enter into the calculation at all. There is another point. I read yesterday in The Times a very interesting letter from a gentleman who wrote from Bremen, and signed himself "Englander." It is so important and so interesting, and the facts he gives are so strong that I venture to put them to the House. He says;

"A day or two ago I had a conversation with a merchant here who imports about 800 tons of English coal every week. He informed me that he has no fear whatever of losing any trade by increasing his prices 1s., or even 2s., per ton, although during the panic caused by the first announcement of the impost some orders were given to the Westphalia collieries which would in the ordinary course have fallen to the importers of English coal. I then made some inquiries as to the comparative prices of English and German coal, and was much surprised to learn that, on an average for the whole year, English coal is considerably cheaper in the ports of Hamburg and Bremen than any other. The chief cause of this is the gross indifference to their own interests displayed by British exporters. They invariably base their prices for export on the prices current in England, which are almost always lower than here. My informant re-Sated several instances showing the folly of this system which have occurred in his own business; at one period recently the Westphalia Syndicate of Coalowners were demanding 200 marks where the British asked only 170 marks. He also told me with some amusement that the British coal-shippers relied solely on the German buyers for their information of the state of the markets in Germany, whereas the buyers here keep themselves cognisant of all movements of prices in England by subscribing to half a dozen English newspapers. The nature of the information supplied to the British seller by his German buyer may be readily guessed; the news of any slight fall is wired at once, and a discreet silence is maintained as to the rises."

There is only one other point which I should like to touch upon in the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman, and that is the question of the loan. Of course less loan means more taxation, and if the right hon. Gentleman wants more taxation it is incumbent upon him to say what kind of taxation it should be. He has not hesitated to give his opinion in regard to the loan. He says that the loan ought not to have been as large as it is. Surely, if he can give his opinion as to the loan he ought to give us the benefit of his advice on what the taxation should be. Why should this generation bear the whole burden and brunt of this war in the next two or three years? We are at this moment paying the debt incurred for the wars of those who went before us. We are not only bearing our own sins, but specially the sins of those who went before us; we had to bear the cost of Majuba, and of the ignominious retreat then imposed upon us. That was proved by one of the letters, written by a Boer in England, which have appeared in The Times. [Nationalist cries of "P.S."]

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): He was not a Boer at all.

MR. HANBUEY: He was a Boer who, at any rate, knew what he was writing about, and he had the strongest anti-English sentiment.

MR. DILLON: It was not a Boer. It was one of the forgers in The Times office.

MR. HANBURY: I do not know how the hon. Member knows that. If the hon. Member can tell me the writer's name I would be obliged.

MR. DILLON: Nobody knows his name. I judge from the past history of The Times office.

MR. HANBTJRY: The letters betray the hand of a man who knew the whole history of the Boers, who expressed their opinion, and was entitled to be heard. What is his opinion on the subject of how this war was brought about? He says;

"All nations thought you English were dead; but, unfortunately for us, you were only dead drunk, drugged by the fatal folly of your disarmament craze and love of luxury, and the war has, as yet, only very partially aroused you. I cannot blind myself to the fact, however, that new life has been breathed into the dead bones in the valleys in Great Britain, and that your people are gaining strength and spirit every day, while our men are degenerating into murderous bandits and ruining our land, regardless of the fate of our women and children, who are now depending upon the generosity of the British for their food and clothing, and their very lives."

That is the kind of thing for which we are paying now. It was the peace after Majuba Hill and our loss of prestige that has brought about this war.

MR. E. J. C. MORTON (Devonport): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware of the fact that the present Colonial Secretary in this House defended with the greatest enthusiasm the making of peace after Majuba?

MR. HANBURY: If the right hon. Gentleman did defend it, then he has paid dearly for it, and we are paying for it at the present moment. But, again, there is another difference between this war and the Crimean War. This war will bring us a permanent investment in South Africa. We shall have, at any rate, something tangible to produce as a result of this war, and there can be no doubt whatever that, although we may not get from the Transvaal so large a recovery as we once anticipated, we may confidently look forward to the fact that a large portion of this loan will ultimately be repaid by the Transvaal itself. But after all, what will we gain by this war? We will gain much more than the mere repayment of any part of the cost of the

war; we will gain much more than the permanent investment of having added two colonies in South Africa to our Empire. We will gain the increase in the public spirit of this country which has been called forth by this war, and which will last for many and many a generation to come. The spirit of this country has been aroused, and not only that, but the spirit of our colonies also. The price paid for this war has produced a feeling of sympathy between the various branches of the English-speaking race that no other war or cause could have produced, and even if a portion of this loan does fall on future generations great results have been gained, and the loan itself would be a small price to pay for so great a blessing.

\*SIR JOSEPH PEASE (Durham, Barnard Castle): I was one of those who listened yesterday with considerable interest to the speech delivered by the hon. Member

for Exeter. He took a very different view of the position of things to that taken by the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down. The hon. Member, as a new Member, looking over our expenditure, was astounded at its magnitude, and he devoted the greater part of his speech to what he deemed might be the means of reducing our expenditure in future. The right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down has made, to my mind, one of the most hopeless speeches I have heard from the other side during this debate. The right hon. Gentleman gloried in this expenditure, and looked in a very superficial way at its origin and at its effect. I have always thought that the origin of this war, the manner in which it has been conducted, and the effect it will have in the future are questions which ought to come into a debate of their own, and which are hardly apposite or proper to be raised in the debate on the motion of my right hon. friend the Member for East Wolverhampton. What I desire to do is to take that portion of my right hon. friend's motion which refers to the manner in which the Government propose to deal with one specific trade. The hon. Member for East St. Pancras has already made a very practical and excellent speech on this subject, but what I want to do is not to take up the question of the coal-owners, but to show how unfair the incidence of this tax is, and how little the Chancellor of the Exchequer will get from the coal tax as compared with the damage he will do to the general trade of the country and to the various industries which are directly and indirectly connected with the coal trade.

This is not a new subject. In 1848 I was partly in command of collieries, and in 1873 I had the honour of sitting on a Committee on this subject after a large boom in the coal trade; a larger boom than that recently experienced. Out of the seventeen members of that Committee only three are now left; my right hon. friend the Member for the Ripon Division of Yorkshire, the Earl of Ravensworth, and myself. We sat, I believe, for three months, and went very carefully into many of the questions raised during the last few weeks and came, I believe unanimously, to the conclusion that it would be injurious to the best interests of this country as a trading country to tax the export of coal. It is rather curious to see the evidence that was given before the Committee. My late friend who for so many years sat in this House; Sir George Elliott, a man of great natural ability, and a large coal-owner of what might perhaps be called the speculative type, in Durham and Wales, declared that the average profit he had made had not exceeded 8d. per ton. I was a witness, and I took very much the same view as the hon. Member for East St. Pancras does now. I said I did not think from my experience of the coal trade that it had ever made more than 5 per cent. over an average of years, and I was speaking at a time when a greater boom than the late boom had just passed. I also stated, and it is my opinion still, that as a rule, coal-owners did not get in the long run as much profit as they paid the landlords in the shape of rent. This evidence agreed with the figures given to the Chancellor of the Exchequer by the chairman of the Northumberland Coal Trade Association, Mr. Eamb, who said that after carefully going through the figures of the coal trade in Northumberland he found the average profit was from 7d. to 9d. per ton. Another commission which sat a few years previously to

1873 stated rather-curiously that the discovery off coal in China, Japan, India, Australia, and America would gradually have the effect of limiting the distance to which the export of English coal could attain. There can be no manner of doubt that at this moment the large quantity of coal produced in Germany and Belgium does materially place a limit to the extent to which our coal can leave our shores. In "Tooke on Prices" it is stated that a deficit of one-tenth raises the common market three-tenths and that a deficit of two-tenths raises the common market eight-tenths. The markets to which we send our coal are comparatively few. Out of the 44,000,000 tons of coal exported in 1900 Cardiff and Wales sent 18,000,000, the Newcastle district 13,000,000, the Hull and Yorkshire district 4,000,000, and Scotland about 6,000,000. Therefore, this tax, which is not a war tax, but a tax which is to last, falls upon the industry of those comparatively few districts which happen to have steam and export coal of various descriptions in them. The Baltic, including Russia, took 18,000,000 tons of our coal, and France and European ports 21,000,000 tons. One point has not been mentioned in this House, and that is the large amount of bunker coal which is worked in order to get 44,000,000 tons exported. The bunker coal amounts to about 12,000,000 tons per annum, and therefore 56,000,000 tons, or a fourth of the whole quantity of coal raised in the United Kingdom, is concerned in this question. The disturbance in such a quantity must cause a very great disturbance in the trade of the country.

Now, my hon. friend the Member for East St. Pancras called attention to the different ratios in which the different parts of England will be affected by the manner in which this tax is to be put on. Northumberland and Durham raise 46,000,000 tons of coal. Thirty-one per cent. of that is exported, but Northumberland when taken alone exports eighty per cent. of its output. That shows how unfairly this tax will fall on different districts. The district I am personally interested in is not what is generally known as a coal-exporting district; it is a coking district. Therefore this permanent rise would be paid by north of England to the extent of £;678,000, and by Wales and Cardiff £;922,000. So that two comparatively small sections of the country will have to bear the burden of this proposed tax. We have not heard yet what are to be the allowances during the current year on the coal under contract. The best figures I can find show that the right hon. Gentleman will lose a quarter of this revenue for the current year, and that all this disturbance will be caused to the trade for £;1,500,000, paid to the Exchequer. The Chancellor of the Exchequer cannot expect that so large an amount of coal will be exported with this duty of 1s. per ton as when there was no duty. The right hon. Gentleman will lose, as I have said, probably a quarter of a million, or £;500,000 below his calculation of revenue; but if he is going to lose one-fourth of the export coal trade of this country, what is he going to lose by the disturbance to other trades? I think he will lose £;500,000 in value of exported coal. He will lose for the workmen £;2,500,000 in wages, He will lose for the landlord about £;250,000, to whom he looked for income tax; he will lose to the farmers, from whom we buy our horse corn, £;47,000; but, worse than all, he will send 33,000 men out of employment, unless other work is found for



them, and they will go back upon the labour market, reducing wages, and that will reduce the men's power to purchase farm produce which they are now able to do. It has been said that the foreigners are going to pay this tax, but you cannot get it out of them. The Times newspaper has over and over again declared that it is going to be paid by the rich coal owner. But I say that the coal owner will not pay it. You may get it out of the Durham men, or the Yorkshire men, but not out of the Scotchmen. It is not a usual charge against the coalowner that he sells abroad at 1s. per ton less than the market price of the day. This tax will also affect the shipping interest, because coal forms a great proportion of the out cargoes, and the ships bring back raw material for English manufacture. There is the "long trade" from Hull and the "short trade" to Dutch and Belgian ports.

And here we come into direct competition for French and German coal. If the export of coal is stopped the shipper cannot afford to take anything he can get for other goods, the earnings of each voyage must be taken as a whole. His voyages will cease to be profitable when coal no longer forms part of his cargo, and if the Chancellor of the Exchequer reduces to any extent the seagoing trade, he will be doing an irreparable damage to the whole of the country. All these industries are going to be damaged; I will not say ruined; but certainly the process of the right hon. Gentleman is essentially to damage all these industries. And all this is to be done for the sake of a revenue of about £1,500,000. Lord Londonderry is interested in a company at Seaham which is spending £600,000, in new docks. The North Eastern Railway is spending £250,000 on a new east coast line. They are also spending many thousands of pounds in shipping facilities at Newcastle, Middlesborough, and Hartlepool, and there are now three large companies sinking shafts along the East Coast, and these have enormous fields of coal going underneath the German Ocean. It is said, "Oh, that is railway property;" But what is railway property, and who are railway investors? Railway investors are principally not the rich, but the middle class men; they are the little investors. I have periodically taken out of the North Eastern shareholders' register the average holdings. Of course, there are large investors, such as bankers, financiers, and so forth, but the average of our ordinary holding, including these, is under £900 per head. That shows that you cannot trifle with this industry without probably depriving these people of some of their hard-earned savings. With regard to the question of exhaustion, first of all I would say that you cannot have your cake and eat it. If you want the tax you must work the coal. Either you must carry on the coal trade or you must hold specifically and practically the doctrine of exhaustion. Are you going to provide for that? That surely means the buying up by the State of the unexhausted royalties in order to hold them as a savings bank for the future. You cannot do that when you are borrowing money or when one only of your wars is costing you £200,000,000. You might do it otherwise, but it is a doctrine which the Committee of which I have spoken put on one side. The old principle is that 1s. a ton to-day would be worth 2s. per ton fourteen years hence. You will have to work your coal when you can get it. There is one point more that I should like to mention, and that is the relative position of our

exports and imports. If we knock on the head this most important exporting trade, which takes out our goods, or do anything to damage it, we do something to increase the discrepancy which exists between our imports and exports; a discrepancy which is at present larger than ever before.

I do not wish to detain the House, and would therefore sum up my remarks. Your mining interest will be damaged by decreasing the output and adding to the cost of production. The question of the cost of production was very well treated by the hon. Member for East St. Pancras. It is a fact that, if you take from any of these pits 10 per cent. or anything like that amount of their productive working, and so stop this particular market, you damage the other portion of the produce, to the infinite disadvantage both of the owner and of the men he employs. You damage the working classes, and when you do that you deprive the farmer of his best market, because the working classes are his best customers. You damage your manufacturers by adding to their expenses in obtaining raw material and in the cost of reaching foreign markets. I can only repeat that the damage you cause must in my opinion far exceed any present gain by the tax you propose. I thank the House for having listened to me so patiently.

\*MR. CHAPLIN (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): If I may be permitted to intervene for a few moments in this debate, I hope there will be nothing in what I have to say to cause my inclusion in the list of long-winded sinners who were the object of so much complaint a few nights ago. I understood the hon.

Baronet opposite to say that coalowners during recent years had not received as much out of their properties as the landowners of this country.

\*SIR JOSEPH PEASE: I beg the right hon. Gentleman's pardon. As much as their landlords have received.

\*MR. CHAPLIN: Oh, the royalty owners?

\*SIR JOSEPH PEASE: Yes, the royalty owners.

\*MR. CHAPLIN: I beg the hon. Baronet's pardon, because if that had been so I should have commiserated with him in the extreme. He appeared to attach great importance to extremely cheap wheat. Wheat for many years had been extremely cheap, with the result that the growth of wheat in this country had diminished by a great deal more than one half. I do not know whether, in the interests of the manufacturers, the working classes, and nearly all other classes of the population, the hon. Baronet thinks that coal should be equally cheap, and whether he would view with the same satisfaction a great reduction in the production of coal in this country as he seemed to view the enormous reduction in the growth of wheat.

Sir, I have no intention whatever of travelling over the general grounds of the proposals contained in the Budget, but, following the example of the hon. Gentleman who resumed this debate, I desire to limit my observations to the export duty on coal. I was extremely glad to hear from my right hon. friend the Minister for Agriculture that he had listened to a very instructive and informing speech from my hon. friend, but if I am to be perfectly frank, I confess I was unable to perceive that he had profited very much by that instruction. However that may be, I desire to devote my attention entirely to that branch of the question to which I have referred, and as far as I can to

reinforce the views which have been urged by the hon. Member. We have been told from the first that this proposal to place an export duty on coal was based on the belief that the tax

would be paid by the foreign consumer. I am not quite sure that the Government are now quite as confident in that belief as they were at one time; their later statements are to the effect that the tax, or a part of it, will be paid by the foreigner, which is a very different thing. I do not know that I should be prepared to go quite as far as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton went yesterday, when, as I understood him, he said that no export duty ought to be placed on any article other than an article which was in the nature of a monopoly. But I am quite prepared to make this admission, that where it can be shown that in any particular class of coal that we export from Great Britain we have a monopoly, and that the foreigner cannot do without it. There, no doubt, you can, and you will, give effect to the belief and intention of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the foreigner will be made to pay the duty. But your ability to impose that burden upon the foreigner will be limited strictly to that particular description of coal. What proportion of the total amount exported from this country does that kind of coal represent? The total amount exported is 42,000,000, and of that, in 1900, 18,500,000 tons were supplied by South Wales. There is, therefore, a large amount beyond the Welsh coal to be reckoned with. With regard to the best coal, I admit there is very little doubt that the Chancellor of the Exchequer is right, and that the foreigner will have to pay. But as to the rest of the coal which is exported, unless we are absolutely misled by the statements of hon. Gentlemen interested in that industry, I cannot help thinking it may be a very different story. Where does this other coal come from? In 1900, from Durham and Northumberland alone 14,000,000 tons were exported, or one-third of the total amount. The right hon. Gentleman the Minister for Agriculture said he knew a great deal about the way in which these figures were prepared, and that a large quantity of the coal attributed to Northumberland in reality went from Durham. But the figures with which I have been favoured are very explicit. They give the total export from Durham as 5,600,000 tons, and the total export from Northumberland as 8,300,000 tons. I think my right hon. friend should have produced greater proof of the knowledge he professes before he could expect those who have given some attention to this subject and been supplied with figures of a positive character to credit the mixing of the amounts in the manner he has described.

If I might be permitted for a few moments to examine the position of Northumberland, I think I shall be able to show the House very clearly that it is not nonsense altogether on the part of the coal industry in that district to object to this tax, and that there is some real and genuine cause for apprehension on their part as to what the effect of this tax may be with regard to the export of coal in their district. The case they submit to Parliament is this. In 1900 in Northumberland they produced 11,500,000 tons of coal, and of that they exported 8,500,000 tons; in other words, 80 per cent. of the whole production in that county. But there is this to be observed about

Northumberland, that not only is there little or no demand at all for local consumption, but the situation of the coalfield is such that it is impossible for them to dispose of the great bulk of their coal unless they dispose of it by export, and for this reason the adjacent markets are already occupied. The market to the north is supplied by Scotland; that to the west is supplied by Cumberland; and that to the south is supplied from Durham and Yorkshire. Consequently, the whole mining industry in Northumberland has been developed and the capital sunk with a view of extending the great export trade. And if by any unfortunate accident that trade should fail them, so far as I have been able to learn I should not envy the prospect of the industry or the enormous population which is dependent upon it in that part of the world. The right hon. Gentleman met these objections by saying, in the first place, that the amount of coal required abroad was so enormous that it never could be met without what we sent them at present. In a moment or two I will compare the relative amounts supplied by Northumberland and Durham and foreign countries for export, and I think my right hon. friend himself will see that this reply upon that point was hardly sufficient. Then he said that the reason why there is no demand at present in the adjacent counties is this, it is because the freights into Yorkshire are more, than the freights to the ports abroad where they have been in the habit of sending their coal. That, no doubt, is perfectly true, and it is one of the reasons which adds to their apprehensions. Go to the railways, says the right hon. Gentleman, make better terms with them; and what will they get if they do? It is not like railways abroad. In Germany they are always ready to give preferential rates either to coal or agricultural produce; or, indeed, to any produce which enters into competition with us; but nobody knows better than the Chancellor of the Exchequer that whether it is for coal or agricultural produce, or whatever it is, railway rates are always the subject of constant complaints in this country.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: They do give preferential rates.

\*MR. CHAPLIN: I am not sure about that, and that is not the reason which prevents Northumberland supplying the home markets at present. The home markets are occupied already, but if it were possible to make a change in the source of supply the only result would be to hamper industries in other parts of the country and to throw people out of employ, if not in Northumberland in other districts. Then it is said why do you not export Northumberland coal to some of the southern parts of this country, where coal is exceedingly dear at present, and where it is greatly needed. The answer to that is that what is wanted in these southern parts is house coal; and the great bulk of Northumberland coal is sea-coal, and not suited for the purpose. Under all these circumstances, we cannot be surprised that it has become with them a question of vital importance in that part of England whether their trade in coal will be able to hold its own under the new conditions in future. What are the facts for our guidance and information upon this point? Northumberland has to compete with Germany, Belgium, and with France, who export coal like ourselves. It is a fact that these

three countries alone in 1898 exported no less than 23,000,000 tons of coal in

direct competition with British coal.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: No, no.

\*MR. CHAPLIN: The Chancellor of the Exchequer will not deny, I think, that Germany alone exported 14,000,000 tons of coal; as much as Durham and Northumberland combined. Moreover, it is stated on the highest authority that the German coal is nearly equal in quality to the north-country coal, and it is positively asserted that 2d. or 3d., or at the outside 4d., per ton would turn the scale in favour of the Germans. This fact is confirmed, to a certain extent, by the fact that large contracts have already been recently lost to the north of England, and given to Germany instead of to England. These statements may be exaggerated, for what I know, but the information is given to me as absolutely reliable; and, if they be anything approaching the truth, how is it possible in the future that we can continue to compete successfully with an additional weight of a shilling per ton?

I have listened with great attention to the replies which have been given upon this subject, and I am bound to say that it seems to me, so far, that the right hon. Gentleman has failed to meet these various objections. There is another point on which I certainly did expect to hear something from the right hon. Gentleman, and it is this. That while the coal exported from this country is all of different classes and qualities, they are all taxed at precisely the same rate. This has been repeatedly urged, and the justice and force of this argument cannot, I think, be denied. I joined myself in this appeal when I had the privilege of saying a few words on this subject a few nights ago, but as the right hon. Gentleman has apparently either forgotten or ignored the question altogether in his speech last night, perhaps I may be permitted to repeat in a very few words the statements which have been made upon this point. The prices of the best Welsh coal are said to be from 16s. to 20s. a ton, those of the north-country coal from 10s. to 12s., and there is another class of coal not worth more than 8s. per ton. The result is that the tax on the worst class of coal is rather more than two and a half times as much as on the best; and with regard to this there is a general agreement that even with the extra shilling a ton the best coal could always hold its own. Even the exporters are willing to admit that. As for the others, they are placed in this extraordinary position. The worst coal or which they declare that the market is imperilled abroad, if it is not already destroyed, has to pay two and a half times as much as the best coal, which can command a market whenever and wherever it pleases. Surely that is a manifest anomaly and injustice, which could not have been contemplated when this proposal was made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. I am not attributing in any way blame to the right hon. Gentleman. I can quite understand, and it must be perfectly obvious, that it was impossible for him to get the information required on all these points before his proposals had been declared without the secrets of his Budget escaping. The existing contracts of which we have heard so much in the course of this debate was a case in point, and I suspect that this question of the different classes of coal all being taxed at the same rate is another. But that is no reason why an injustice should be allowed to continue

after the facts are made known.

There is another point upon which I should also like to say a word, and it is on the possible effect of the proposals on the wages of the miners in Northumberland. There and in Durham wages are assessed and adjusted according to the price of coal at the pit's mouth, and if by any misfortune the Chancellor of the Exchequer should turn out to be wrong, and the price of coal at the pit's mouth in Northumberland should be less than it has been, then the miners' wages would fall in proportion. I confess this adds to the misgiving with which I regard this part of my friend's proposals in their present form. Suppose experience should prove that a mistake had been made, that the duty imposed on this inferior coal could not be and has not been paid by the foreigner, that the industry of the North of England has, in consequence, been seriously damaged, if not destroyed, that a number of pits have been closed, and a great number of workmen have been thrown

out of employment; what would be the position of a Government who had made such a mistake when that mistake was discovered? Rightly and properly they would be condemned, and when Parliament met under ordinary circumstances it would be strange if they were not turned out and another Government put into their place. The tax would of course be repealed, and we on this side of the House have had very good warning from hon. Gentlemen opposite as to where the substitute will be found. They have told us very distinctly they would begin by doubling the rates on agricultural land, and in some way or other would endeavour to put the whole burden on that kind of property. I am perfectly frank and open upon this subject. It adds to my desire that no mistake should be made on this occasion, and I should say to my brother agriculturists that we ought to be warned in time. That is one of the reasons, but not the only reason, why I urge these views on the House of Commons this afternoon. So far as I am able to judge, the tax seems to me to be an unfair and unjust tax so far as it relates to the inferior coal which is exported from this country. There is no doubt that it has already created a great disturbance in that industry, and in all probability it will create more, and although on general grounds, and with this exception, I approve and support the proposals of the Budget of my right hon. friend, I most earnestly hope that he will take into consideration the representations that have been made with regard to the effect of this tax on the inferior kinds of coal exported from Great Britain, and that, when we come into Committee he will either propose or agree to amendments in the direction that is desired.

\*MR. ALFRED THOMAS (Glamorganshire, E.): I desire to support the Amendment of my right hon. friend the Member for East Wolverhampton. In common with all who view the ever-growing and present abnormal growth in the expenditure of the Government, I expected that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would propose additional taxation. But I was not prepared to find that the Chancellor would be so hard driven as to be compelled to make proposals so reactionary and mischievous in character as he has done. Hitherto we had regarded him as an orthodox free trader, and, so he tells us, he still regards himself. But in his present Budget he advocates the imposition of a tax of a character that has been abandoned for over half a century, and few, if any, ever expected to see it re-

enacted in this country. Indeed, so far has the right hon. Gentleman backslidden that he has made a proposal, namely, that of the tax on coal, that would be repudiated by even the most advanced protectionist. The example of the United States is often dangled before us as one worthy to be followed, and as being that of advanced protectionists. Yet even in the United States they would not impose such a tax as that proposed by the Chancellor. The first article in the Constitution expressly prohibits the levying of duty on exports. Yet in order to obtain a comparatively small amount, small when contrasted with the enormous sum now necessary in order to meet present expenditure, the Chancellor of the Exchequer has taxed one of the first necessities of life, and an article upon which our supremacy as a mercantile power is altogether dependent; for I have no hesitation in asserting that our importance as a Power is just in ratio to that of the position of our mercantile marine. We have heard much of the desirability of keeping up a strong Navy. I quite agree with that proposition, as long as we have a strong mercantile marine, but no longer. Among the many salutary lessons taught us by what I should have liked to describe as the late war, is that of the extreme difficulty of successfully invading a country. That ought to have one good effect; it ought to convince those cowardly people who, in combination with some City financiers, get up these periodical scares, and who prevail with whatever Government may be in office in rushing into reckless and useless expenditure. We may hope that much may be learnt from the costly war in which we have been so long engaged, and which, if rumour be correct, will last to the day of judgment if some people are to be the arbitrators of the terms of settlement. We believe that the chief duty of the Navy is to protect our trade and commerce, but with a few more such Budgets as the present one, we will have no trade and commerce to protect. Sir, for what has the Chancellor of the Exchequer taxed the food of the people and disorganised and dislocated our foreign trade? In order to raise a sum that would be covered by threepence in the pound of income tax. Now, why does the Chancellor of the Exchequer make so little use of this convenient tax? In this the right hon. Gentleman had an instrument ready to his hand, for this tax has been rightly called a war tax or an emergency tax. It has very many qualifications superior to any other. To begin with the limitations put upon such an impost; no one can be so taxed as to reduce him to the position of being unable to provide the necessaries, at least, if not some of the luxuries, of life. How different is the case of the poor widow striving to bring up a young family without having recourse to parish relief, when she finds that she has to pay duty on so necessary an article of diet as sugar. Again, if the income tax be 6d. in the £; or, as I maintain it ought to be, under present circumstances, 1s. 6d., it would not require an additional employee to collect the extra taxation. But I would like to know how many more employees will be required by the complicated system just introduced by the Chancellor of the Exchequer? A little army of non-producers must be saddled upon the over-burdened taxpayers of this country, and as far as the coal tax is concerned, in order to bring in a sum that would be covered by 1d. in the £; of income tax. The Chancellor of the Exchequer when proposing the tax upon coal spoke of the large profits made by

colliery proprietors during the last eighteen months or two years. He very carefully abstained from referring to the lean years. The Chancellor of the Exchequer succeeded in obtaining a large number of statistics to prove the money gained; he did not take any trouble, as far as we know, to ascertain the money lost in other years; and it was very flattering to those of us who represent the constituencies in which the best Welsh steam coal is obtained (which by the way is only four constituencies) to know that the coal is of such a superior quality. But superior as it is, it is not essential, though undoubtedly the best steam coal in the world. The area of the South Wales coal-field is about one thousand square miles, but the area in which the coal that has given the name of South Wales so much prominence is only one hundred and twenty square miles, just one-eighth of the total area. And even the best coal in ordinary times is not so much sought after as appears to be the view of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. In fixing the selling price he seems to be under the impression that it is only a question of the amount demanded and the purchaser would have no other choice than to comply. But the President of the Board of Trade the other evening rightly expressed the proper view when he said it was largely a question of freights; and, that being so, the addition of 1s. per ton in the shape of a tax will mean that much less freight will be available to compete in foreign markets. In fact the tax is just 1s. in favour of the foreign shipowner and the handicapping of our own. The tax will just reduce our markets as represented by the distance that the freight of 1s. per ton would carry a cargo of coal. Now we complain that a section of a trade should be penalised by this tax. We may say that mine-owners and their workmen and the shipowners are chief sufferers by this tax. Some of us know the risks the mine-owners have to endure in order to win the coal. We also know that the miner risks his life in order to raise it from the dark caverns in which it is found. But what do the royalty owners risk in the matter? Not a farthing. Has not the Chancellor of the Exchequer heard of the proposals to nationalise royalties? Well, this measure will be an inducement for those who hold such views to persevere in their agitation. I maintain that such a proposal is not more unreasonable than the one to put a tax of 1s. per ton upon exported coal. Hitherto it has been said that Wales has not suffered so much from agricultural depression as some other portions of the United Kingdom. That is to be attributed to the fact that in Glamorgan and Monmouth there have been so many flourishing industries in which many thousands have been employed, and which furnished so good a market for food supplies. Many of the workers keep up their connection with their old homes, and large sums of money find their way to the rural districts. Anything that will hurt the great industries of South Wales will react upon the whole of the Principality. Indeed, some seven hundred thousand people in Glamorgan and Monmouth depend entirely upon coal exporting industries. So strongly do the miners of South Wales feel the imposition that I myself have received eighty resolutions, representing one hundred and twenty thousand miners, in which they bitterly complain of the injustice of being singled out to bear this additional burden. They realise that they have to bear a double burden. First, a tax on their wages and on the



increased cost of sea-borne food. Whatever may be our opinion about the present war, we must have felt proud of the manner in which our men rallied to the colours when called upon at the commencement of hostilities. I certainly felt very proud of my native county, which in every way sent out some four thousand men to the front, and most of them were miners, whose fellow workmen subscribed to keep the wives and families of those who are fighting for their country. And how does the Government recognise the gallantry of those brave men? By taxing their one great industry. It is for us who have some regard to the principles under which our country rose to what we are now afraid is its greatest height; we must at least offer our strongest opposition to a measure that seeks to wreck and destroy the splendid services of Peel and Cobden, Bright and Gladstone, and reject the most reactionary and mischievous Budget of modern times. I trust that the Government will do something to bring about a reconciliation and pacification of the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony. It is the City financiers who get up these political and war scares. They do not realise how difficult it is to conquer a free people. One of the grandest things connected with the late war was to see the sons of the Empire rallying round the grand old flag. I trust the same policy will be pursued as in Canada during the rebellion there, when Lord Durham went out and brought peace in a very short time, and as was followed in Australia after the Lawlor insurrection, when self-government was given to Victoria. I would never be a party to a settlement which did not secure the supremacy of Great Britain in South Africa. There is no mistake about that, but granting that, there should be nothing short of self-government to the new colonies.

COLONEL MILWARD (Warwickshire, Stratford-upon-Avon): In the last two speeches we have seen the difficulties of debating a specific subject on a general Amendment. Here and there we have a speech interjected on one specific subject, such as the coal tax, in the midst of a general debate. I have an Amendment on the Paper to discuss another specific subject, viz., the question of the sugar tax as it will affect our colonies; but I have thought it better not to persevere with it. This is a subject in which I myself have taken a very great interest for the last five years; one where a great deal of injustice has been done to our colonial possessions; and which involves a large amount of capital invested, not only in the West Indies but in Australia and Natal. It seems to me that it would be scarcely respectful to these colonies to discuss this question unless we could do so in a serious way. The colonies will naturally be looking to the English papers to see what has taken place, and they would be disappointed if they saw that, instead of giving an evening to it, we had simply interjected a speech here and there on this important subject, on a general motion regarding the finance of the country. Therefore I come at once to the Amendment which has been raised by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton. I should like, however, to say that perhaps the most striking speech delivered yesterday or to-day was that of the hon. Member for Waterford. It was painful and interesting. Painful because it was a studied attack on the right hon. Member for East Wolverhampton, who has many admirers on both sides of the House; and interesting, because the hon. Member said that the whole of the

sympathies of the Irish Members were given to the Boers in the present war. I take that to be a proof that the question of Home Rule is absolutely dead as a question of practical politics. The hon. Member would not have made that statement otherwise; but from it we are taught what to expect should Home Rule ever be granted to Ireland.

The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition spoke very much more strongly at Bradford the other day than the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton yesterday, and described the financial outlook as appalling. I cannot see that it is in the least appalling. I see that the country is enormously rich, that it is spending its money very freely, and is apparently well able to pay for all its wants. True, there is great need for economy, but I can see nothing in the financial outlook which can be properly described as appalling. I wish to say, in passing, that it is curious in dealing with figures to observe what different aspects can be placed upon those figures. For instance, they told quite a different story to the right hon. the Member for East Wolverhampton and the hon. Member for East Edinburgh. Taking the last year of Lord Rosebery's administration, and comparing it with this year, I find that the national income in 1895-6 amounted to £90,192,000, while the income this year is estimated at £143,255,000; or an increase of £47,000,000, although no one can say, inside or outside the House, that the burden of taxation is by any means particularly heavy. Certainly it is not appalling. Out of that increase of £47,000,000, the increase of national taxation accounts for £22,067,000, and the normal increase of the income of the country has been no less than £24,996,000; that is to say, putting the new taxes out of account altogether, the actual increase of income has amounted to £25,000,000. Of course the expenditure has largely increased. We have heard that the expenditure on the Navy and Army has increased by no less than £24,000,000, but in connection with that increase there was an interesting statement by the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition at Bradford. He stated that during the years 1890-5 the navies of France, Germany, Russia, and the United States had increased at the rate of 6 per cent., whereas in the years 1895-1901 they had increased at the rate of 50 per cent. The right hon. Gentleman, of course, could not say that that was due to their own necessities, but this was certain, that it would be impossible for this country to sit down to a position of that kind. If foreign nations increase their navies it is necessary that we should increase not only our Navy, but our Army too. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton says that the Navy is our first line of defence, our second line of defence, and our third line of defence. That is perfectly true, but after that comes the Army. We have seen many strange things in connection with the present war. We saw, to our utter surprise, Natal invaded by an enemy; we saw Kimberley and Mafeking shut up for weeks by great bodies of Boers. But if this surprise took place when we were fighting a small country in South Africa, what might not the surprise be in connection with large Continental countries, which were increasing their armies and their navies at the rate mentioned? I should like to point out that the measure of reform for our Army passed last week is a measure of decentralisation, and will not

necessarily increase the cost of the Army. There is no doubt that a great deal of the expense of the Army has arisen from the overgrown nature of the establishment. I thoroughly believe that when we have not one army, but six, when we have generals at the head of these six army corps capable of supervising closely the expenditure, we will find a very large economy in the administration of the Army. I should like to mention one concrete case, which illustrates the necessity for reform. After the attack on Spion Kop, the chief of the staff telegraphed down to Natal asking for volunteer officers from the volunteer regiments in Natal to go to the front. Twenty seven of these young fellows, from twenty five to thirty years of age, many of them engaged in business, volunteered. They all knew the country, and many of them knew the Boer and the Kaffir languages, but, to their utter surprise, eighteen out of the twenty seven were ordered by the War Office to join batteries either in England or India; I think that shows how the War Office is conducted. The total excess over ordinary expenditure at the present time is three millions. The right hon. Gentleman put it at five millions.

SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): The Returns circulated this morning show that the actual sum is £9,300,000.

COLONEL MILWARD: It is very curious when we are dealing in figures that we can often find different figures which express very much the same idea. Last year we added by new taxation £11,067,000, and this year £11,000,000, making together £22,067,000. I fully and frankly admit that our normal expenditure is increasing, and that as regards defence it has been forced on us. But if we are forced to this additional expenditure we will not shrink from it, and we are as well able to bear it as other nations. My right hon. friend the Member for Preston referred to the great increase in expenditure in France, Italy, Germany, and Russia, but if we look at the continually increasing wealth of this country there is no doubt whatever that we will not be the first to give in if it is a matter even of increasing our armaments. No one doubts the vast increase in the prosperity and well-being of the working classes. We see it on all sides, especially on Saturdays and Sundays. We see that pleasures which formerly were outside the purview of their lives now enter very largely into them. Another class which have also advanced in wealth and prosperity are the income-tax payers. In the last year of the late Administration the income tax at 8d. in the £ produced £15,600,000, and last year at 1s. in the £ it produced £26,920,000. It is very easy to find from these figures what was the income of income-tax payers in these two years. In 1894-5 the incomes on which the tax was levied amounted to £468,000,000, whereas last year they amounted to £538,000,000. Such a story in finance was never told in any country before, as that the incomes of one class of the community should in six years have increased from £468,000,000 to £538,000,000. And it must be remembered that in that class there are no doubt many men; landowners, agriculturists, and perhaps clergymen; whose incomes have not increased at all. Look at it from another point of view. Deducting the amount of the tax, there remained to that class £452,000,000 in the first mentioned year, and £511,000,000 last year. I am not here

to defend the income tax. I believe that in many cases it is a very hard tax, and presses unduly on certain classes such as landowners, agriculturists, widows, clergymen, and people on settled incomes. I made a suggestion once or twice to the Chancellor of the Exchequer which I venture to renew now. It is, whether it would not be possible to collect a part of the income tax half-yearly in advance. I believe that there are a great many people who would rather pay a part of their income tax in advance in August or September than have to pay it all at the beginning of the year. A man with an income of £700 has at the shilling rate to pay £35 at the beginning of the year, when he has to pay rent, rates, and doctors' and other bills, which come in at that time. I believe if some inducement were offered many people would pay part of the tax in advance, and the Treasury would have five or six millions in the autumn and a great deal of satisfaction would be afforded to the persons concerned. In conclusion I would say that if this Amendment is pressed to a division, it can only be regarded as a want of confidence vote in the Government. No Government could possibly stand after being defeated on an important Amendment to the Finance Bill. I entirely agree with the right hon. Gentleman opposite; I have the greatest respect for him; that it would be very desirable if we could discuss questions connected with the finances of the country without introducing party questions; but it is exceedingly difficult to do so. It is unfortunate that on a question of duties of this kind one must vote on party lines. Members must vote aye or nay, as it is a vote of want of confidence in the Government, and will be so regarded by the House and the country.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I think it will probably be for the convenience of hon. Members if we take the division to-day, leaving the general question to be discussed further on the day on which this Bill will again be put down for discussion. I have seen a crowd of Members on either side rise on every occasion, and I can only address this word of consolation to them; I have no doubt that, either on that

further occasion or on the details of the Bill, they will have ample opportunity of enlightening the House with their opinions. The Chancellor of the Exchequer told us that this was in reality a war Budget. He said: "What is the main feature of this Budget? It is the war expenditure." In a sense that is perfectly true. No doubt the huge sums which have been dealt with last year and this year directly arise from the war. The war, past, present, and future; the War in its inception, its conduct, and its probable end, comes within the limits of this discussion; and you, Sir, have shown that that is so by the great latitude you have allowed in the course of the debate. But I doubt whether it would be either usual or convenient to use this occasion for the purpose of discussing the policy or the conduct of the war. The House has had repeated occasions of discussing the subject, and will have others, no doubt. We must have opportunities within a very few weeks of discussing our present position in relation to the war in South Africa. I cannot help thinking we should not be doing justice to the growing feeling of weariness on the part of the country if we did not. The country is desirous, no doubt, of securing benefit to ourselves and to our Empire from all the sacrifices that have been made in the war; but,

at the same time, I am sure I am expressing what is within the knowledge of most Members who hear me when I say that there is an almost universal desire for peace; for a peace, not only on reasonable, but, I would rather say, on generous and honourable terms; but, at the same time, for a peace which would be final and satisfactory. That is what the country desires, and we are in a great state of uncertainty and darkness as to the steps that are being taken at this moment in order to secure that desirable result. That is a matter which is necessarily forcing itself upon the attention of the House. It must be dealt with before much further time has elapsed, but I venture to doubt whether this is the proper occasion for it to-day. To-day we are concerned, not with the war itself or with the expenditure upon the war, but with the financial arrangements that are proposed by the Government for meeting that expenditure. It is to these that this Amendment addresses itself, and it seeks also to direct; and this, perhaps, is its main object, as I understand the motive of my right hon. friend; the attention of the House and the country to the startling facts disclosed as to the huge growth of our normal expenditure.

There are two purposes, Sir, to which there seems apparently to be an idea, in some quarters at all events, of applying this great war expenditure. There is a tendency to use it for the purpose of blinding our eyes to the rate at which the normal charges have been allowed to increase. Of any such intention I completely acquit the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He has, not only in his Budget speech, but since then, been most honest and outspoken in his language on this subject. More than once we have been surprised and gladdened by a healthy outburst of a strong economical fervour from the right hon. Gentleman. We have on more than one occasion praised his frankness and his courage in doing so but I am bound to say that on further reflection we have qualified a little our estimate, not, indeed, of his frankness, but of his courage. The right hon. Gentleman appears sometimes to forget that he is not a mere watchman set upon a tower to warn us of some impending danger. He is above all other men the particular public official who is charged with the duty of protecting us from that danger. He has given us on several occasions eloquent rebukes and exhortations, addressed, it seems to us, rather to his colleagues than to the House; but they should, I venture to say, have been administered to his colleagues in their respective Departments. He has hinted that we should not think hardly of him if we knew all the things that have been asked of him, and what it was that he had replied. I can well believe it. I can well believe that the demands made upon him as Chancellor of the Exchequer have been extravagant beyond our knowledge, if not beyond our conception, and I feel sure that he met those demands in firm and emphatic language. But that does not alter the fact of his responsibility, and the fact that it is the duty of the Treasury to check extravagance. The Treasury does not discharge that duty by mere complaints. What are the facts? I am not going to plunge into figures, because for one reason, although there is really no conflict on the general effect of the figures, I notice that every set of figures that is quoted differs in some way or another from those that we have had before. But I have one or two figures, at all events, that I think are beyond suspicion. The increase in the

ordinary expenditure of the country since the present Government came into power has been 33 millions sterling. The right hon. Gentleman meets this sometimes by asking us what we would have reduced, by asking us to put our finger on the particular item which should be diminished. In that he makes a demand on us that I think he is not entitled to make. It is not our business to suggest particular reductions, and we have not the information which is at his disposal which would enable us to do so. Take an individual case. Take the expenditure on the Army and the Navy. It has increased by £22,600,000. I said I would avoid figures, but here are some which I think set the growth of expenditure in rather a strong light. In 1881 the ordinary cost of the Army and Navy was per head of the population 14s., in 1891, ten years later, it was 17s., and this year, after another decade has passed, it is 30s. per head of the population. The right hon. Gentleman and some of his friends say to us, "Do you want to starve the Army?" and we reply, "No." "Then," it is said, "why do you grumble at this expenditure? We are asked," Do you think, on the other hand, we do not need a Navy?" We say, "Yes, we quite agree that we must have a strong Navy." "Then why do you cavil at the Naval Estimates?" is the rejoinder. There are two qualifications with which we accept any Estimates for the most excellent purposes. In the first place, do these Estimates give us an army and navy strong in proportion to the money spent? Here is where the strong Chancellor of the Exchequer in a strong Government would come in. I have never seen in Committee of Supply much useful work done in the way of reduction of expenditure, although, of course, there is abundant use and public benefit in the free discussion of the matters involved.

I confess I thought that the hon. Member for Exeter in the course of an admirable speech last night made a suggestion which well deserves consideration, and that is whether on the Army and Navy Estimates there should not be a periodical committee of inquiry; not a Standing Committee, to which I should be entirely opposed. A Standing Committee to which these Estimates should be referred automatically would destroy the responsibility of the Minister, and, what is worse, would destroy his own sense of responsibility. But a periodical examination every five, six, or seven years would, I think, be a great source of enlightenment to the House, and would bring larger number of Members into some acquaintance with the facts with which you have to deal in this matter. The only organised opinion in this House on the question of military and naval expenditure is an opinion organised to increase and not to scrutinise or to check expenditure. But our object is to secure well expended money. We are by no means satisfied that this is now done. When fresh items of expenditure are incurred; and the relentless march of military inventiveness no doubt makes that necessary from time to time, for the art of war, unfortunately, is not an art which stands still; I cannot help thinking it might often occur that some older expenditure might be dropped, and some relief obtained in that way. My confidence in the present Administration is shaken when I remember what can occur in these matters. I remember a case, which, perhaps, some Members of the House may also bear in mind, where a Minister was censured by the House of Commons on account of a deficiency in small arms ammunition. This thoughtless

Minister had provided only ninety-two million rounds; at any rate, he had provided an amount which, considering the enormous pace at which the article could be produced, and considering also that at that moment the powder that was used was practically not out of the state of being experimented with, his military advisers told him was a sufficient provision. The House of Commons thought differently, and that happy result to which I have referred followed. A Minister came in who immediately introduced a special Vote for a large sum of money to make good this frightful deficiency. Five or six years have passed, and no doubt the Votes have been carefully scrutinised by these Gentlemen who are so sensitive to the possible deficiencies of the country in every respect. Yet, when they managed to lead us into a big war we are informed, to our great surprise; and our surprise is still greater when we ask why we were informed of the matter; that in the first days of the war they only had in reserve 3,300 rounds of small arms ammunition. It was not for want of money. This was not due to starving the Army, because the Estimates had been increased from eighteen millions to well on to thirty millions. Therefore, I can only take it as a terrible example of maladministration and a proof to the world in such a concrete form as they have seldom had before that the mere spending of money and heaping up of Estimates does not, after all, prevent occasional lapses from perfect efficiency.

But that by the way. I have dealt with one of the qualifications with which we regard estimates for military purposes. The other is this. Expenditure depends on your necessities. But you yourselves are the principal agents in many cases in creating these necessities. If you pursue a restless, pushing, bouncing policy, your needs may be indefinitely multiplied. The right hon. Gentleman attributes this great expenditure to the growth of the Empire, to the necessity of guarding the frontiers of India and Canada, and to the increased armaments of four or five Great Powers. There is nothing new in India or Canada. The only thing that I know about India is that the Government of which I was a member determined upon a certain arrangement for the defence of the Indian frontier, where it was most liable to attack; that the present Government, the moment they came into power, reversed that arrangement, and after looking at the matter and having experience of it for two or three years they reverted to the arrangement which they had abandoned. There is no new necessity in that direction. As to Canada, I can only say it is a most ill-omened reference. I never knew before that there was any necessity for openly and avowedly taking Canada into consideration in regard to our military requirements. It is difficult, therefore, to see how the dangers have increased. Then there is the action of other Powers. The action and reaction between themselves of the estimates of expenditure of different nations are extremely difficult to follow, and it is hard to say which are foremost and which are only following on the others. The Minister of Agriculture quoted figures showing how the military expenditure of Continental Powers had increased, and he actually quoted the increase of the French and German expenditure since 1870, as if that had anything to do with the position of this country. There are two main factors only which I can discern which have produced any change in the last five or six

years. The first is the colonial energy of Germany, which brings a severe and steady competition against us in the markets of the world. But that is not a competition that you will meet by any armaments that military expenditure can provide. It is a competition that must be met by the increased intelligence and the better training of those who conduct your trade. So far as I am aware there is no direct geographical friction between us and Germany in any part of the world. Therefore, that new development can have nothing to do with increased expenditure. The only other novelty consists in the braggart words and aggressive designs with which the present Government opened their career as an Administration, and in the claim they put forward to be the lineal inheritors of universal Empire. It is since that time that we have had nothing but troubles and critical situations all over the world. This is the true genesis of all this expenditure, and it is in these respects that you can introduce moderation into your military and naval expenditure. I am not going on to speak of education, of the Post Office, and other branches of expenditure, when we are met in the same way; "Are you in favour of education?" "Yes." "Then why do you grudge the sums we ask for?" Our doubt is whether the money is properly bestowed; and with regard to all those Civil Service branches of expenditure we find the same thing exemplified when we by accident come upon a concrete instance. The other day the ingenuity and pertinacity of

some of my hon. friends behind me provided an excellent instance of what I mean. We may be asked, "Are you in favour of having law officers of the Crown and good ones?" Yes, we are. We think they are a useful institution to the Government and to the country; but, on the other hand, we do not think the two law officers of the Crown should be paid £30,000 a year, when £19,000 was enough five or six years ago. That is the sort of thing which, on being disclosed, tends to make us doubt whether there is that careful administration that there ought to be. The truth is, the Government is demoralised by this huge expenditure. The feeling is, when you are throwing millions about, why should you care about thousands? It is here, from the strong vantage ground of the Treasury, that the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer might have so much effect if he chose. He speaks strongly in the House. He said last night;

"I do not think; and I say this with the consciousness of my responsibility as Chancellor of the Exchequer; it possible for us to continue at the rate of increase which we have seen for the past six years without the gravest danger to the financial system which has been long established in this country, and to which, with its light and easy taxation of the industries of the country, I believe we owe much of our prosperity."

Here is a picture of helplessness. The right hon. Gentleman does not know what it will end in, because expenditure such as I am deploring cannot be stopped. There are a great many items and channels in the present expenditure, great as it is, which necessarily may lead to increases in future years. You cannot suddenly stop. It is a slow process. It needs a great deal of courage and hard-heartedness. The right hon. Gentleman made an almost piteous appeal to the colonies. He said we must look for help in this Imperial expenditure to the colonies. That is too large a question to discuss now, and too large to be



introduced in a casual way into a debate of this sort by a responsible Minister. But on what condition of a full share in the control of Imperial matters would any contribution to Imperial charges be made by the colonies?

Well, Sir, I have said that the war is being used in some quarters for two purposes. The second purpose is that in our financial system there may be new taxes introduced, slipped in which are permanent and capable of development, but which are introduced under cover of the patriotic feeling of the moment, and on the plea of making those who supported the war contribute to its cost. Of course I refer specially to the coal duty and the sugar duty. I will say nothing at present on the coal question, which has been so much discussed; but as the right hon. Gentleman has referred to what I have said about the sugar duty, I will say this, that if you are to open some new source of revenue like this, sugar is about the worst you can choose, inasmuch as it is the largest but one of the articles of food consumed by the people, not only when you take the sugar itself, but all the other articles into which it enters. It is emphatically the food of women, and especially of children, and when you say, "Let the working man pay his share," it will not be the working man who pays, as he would do if you taxed his tobacco or his beer, and possibly other things which he consumes personally, but this will come out of the money he allows for the maintenance of his family. It will therefore press upon the children and the home. I will not go further into the general question, but that was the reason which made me use the words to which the right hon. Gentleman referred. Now this Amendment is directed against the financial proposals of the Government. I blame them for their careless administration, the proof of which is the steady growth of the Estimates. I blame them, for their imposing by their policy burdens which their own Chancellor of the Exchequer says cannot be increased without disaster.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I said at the same rate.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: We must expect the same rate of increase if the political circumstances continue the same. I believe the Government have chosen, with preferable alternatives-open to them, new sources of revenue which will prejudicially disturb trade and seriously diminish the comforts of the people.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): The right hon. Gentleman, in the

course of his speech, has attacked us for the nature of our taxation. He has attacked us for the extravagance which has, in his view, made that taxation necessary. Of the character of the taxation I mean to say nothing. The right hon. Gentleman's chief criticism was that in putting on the sugar tax we had taxed the wife and child of the working man himself. I do not draw that distinction between the working man and his family, nor do I believe that the working classes of this country deserve the taunt of the right hon. Gentleman. I do not think the working man is prepared to regard with indifference taxation which does not happen to touch articles which he consumes, but touches only articles which are necessary to his wife and children. The chief part of the right hon. Gentleman's speech was devoted, not, however, to criticism of the taxation we have proposed, but to the cause which made that taxation necessary;

and he has told us what everybody knows, and what we have never concealed, that the Estimates have grown very largely in the course of the last few years; the Civil Service Estimates, the Educational Estimates, and the Military Estimates. The right hon. Gentleman hints that we might economise in the salaries of the law officers and that we might greatly economise in our education. [Opposition cries of "No."] So I understand.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I said we were not certain that the money is all well spent. We would vote more money for education if we had that security.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: When we are talking about the amount of our taxation the question is whether we can economise or not. If we are not spending too much money on education, then no economy can be made under that head. But the main charge of the right hon. Gentleman is the growth on the military side of our expenditure. Nobody denies that. Have we got an Army or a Navy too great for our present necessities? That is the simple question we have before us, and I say, in view of the present needs of the Empire, neither our Army nor our Navy is too great. "But," says the right hon. Gentleman, "they are greater than they were in our time, and in our time the necessities were the same."

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: No. I said the natural necessities were the same; but I said also that new necessities had arisen in consequence of your policy.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The "bouncing" policy to which he referred, I suppose. I do not know what that bouncing policy is. I know that when the right hon. Gentleman left office he and his friends left behind them unsolved five or six great questions between us and the great military Empires of the world, each one of which, if mismanaged, might have produced a great war. Was Fashoda, among other things, due to a bouncing policy on the part of the Government? Was it we who said that any interference of the French Power in the Valley of the Nile would be treated by us as an unfriendly act? Was that our bounce or your bounce? We do not blame you for that statement; we agree with it. But if you make these statements you must have defensive forces, naval and military, to enable you to back up a policy like that. When the right hon. Gentleman left office he had neither the naval nor the military forces which in our opinion are necessary for the defence of the Empire. And no man has shown; no man has attempted to show; that the expenditure on the Army, greatly as it has increased, has not given us increased military strength in proportion to the increased military expenditure. On the contrary, I think it can be demonstrated with mathematical certainty that, whether our Army be too big or too small, or the right size or the wrong size, at all events the money we now spend upon it gives us proportionately a much more effective, a much more mobile, and a much more useful force than the Army expenditure, smaller though it was, in the time of the right hon. Gentleman. I am not going to discuss the question of ammunition again, but the right hon. Gentleman actually had the extraordinary courage to get up in this House and remind us of the fact that he only left ninety-two millions of cartridges in stock, and that that amount, more than doubled by that which we hastened to provide, proved insufficient when war came. That is the evidence he gives of the preparation for war which he and his friends made. It would be quite beyond my power at the present time

and in the few minutes still left to me to take any survey of the responsibilities of this Empire; but I do say, in the light of recent events, in the light of the strain which the recent war has placed not only upon the men but upon the stores of this country, that it would be perfect insanity for us to allow our Army to sink back into the condition in which it was when the right hon. Gentleman left office in 1895. I do not know whether a united Liberal party are going rapidly to turn us out of office and to accept the responsibility of government. When they do, and when they have not merely to make speeches but to carry out actions, I think they will find that what we have done, costly as it has been, great as is

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.  
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon  
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte  
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'  
Flannery, Sir Fortescue  
Aird, Sir John  
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry  
Fletcher, Sir Henry  
Allhusen, Augustus Hy. Eden  
Chapman, Edward  
Flower, Ernest  
Allsopp, Hon. George  
Charrington, Spencer  
Foster, Sir Michael (Lond Univ.  
Anson, Sir William Reynell  
Churchill, Winston Spencer  
Garfit, William  
Arkwright, John Stanhope  
Clare, Octavius Leigh  
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H (City of Lond.  
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.  
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.  
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick  
Arrol, Sir William  
Coddington, Sir William  
Gordon, Hn J E. (Elgin & Nairn  
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John  
Cohen, Benjamin Louis  
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)  
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy  
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir J. Eldon  
Bailey, James (Walworth)  
Colomb, Sir John Charles R.

Goschen, Hon. George Joachim  
Bain, Col. James Robert  
Compton, Lord Alwyne  
Goulding, Edward Alfred  
Baird, John George Alexander  
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas  
Graham, Henry Robert  
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)  
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds)  
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge  
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds  
Balfour, Maj. K. R. (Christen.)  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury  
Banbury, Frederick George  
Cripps, Charles Alfred  
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)  
Barry, Sir F. T. (Windsor)  
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)  
Gretton, John  
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin  
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)  
Greville, Hon. Ronald  
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol  
Crossley, Sir Savile  
Groves, James Grimble  
Beach, Rt. Hn. W. W. B. (Hants  
Cubitt, Hon. Henry  
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill  
Bill, Charles  
Cust, Henry John C.  
Guthrie, Walter Murray  
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.  
Dalkeith, Earl of  
Hain, Edward  
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.  
Dalrymple, Sir Charles  
Halsey, Thomas Frederick  
Bigwood, James  
Denny, Colonel  
Hambro, Charles Eric  
Blundell, Colonel Henry  
Dewar, T. R. (T'rH'mlets S. Geo.  
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Middx

Bond, Edward  
Dickinson, Robert Edmond  
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry  
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-  
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.  
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Rbt. Wm.  
Boulnois, Edmund  
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield  
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd  
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)  
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon  
Harris, Frederick Leverton  
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John  
Dorington, Sir John Edward  
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.  
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Hay, Hon. Claude George  
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.  
Doxford, Sir William Theodore  
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)  
Bull, William James  
Duke, Henry Edward  
Heath, James (Staffords, N. W-  
Bullard, Sir Harry  
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart  
Heaton, John Henniker  
Butcher, John George  
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas  
Henderson, Alexander  
Campbell, Rt Hn J. A. (Glasgow  
Faber, George Denison  
Higginbottom, S. W.  
Carlile, William Walter  
Fardell, Sir T. George  
Hoare, Edw Brodie (Hampstead  
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.  
Fellowes, Hn. Ailwyn Edward  
Hoare, Sir Samuel (Norwich)  
Cautley, Henry Strother  
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r  
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.  
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)  
Finch, George H.  
Hogg, Lindsay  
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)

Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Hope, J. F (Sheffield, Brightside  
Cayzer, Sir Charles William  
Fisher, William Haves  
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Fison, Frederick William  
Howard, John (Kent, Faversham  
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)  
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose-  
Hozier, Hon. James Henry C.

the strain; and we admit it to be great; which we have placed upon the resources of the country, we have not done a single thing which they will not have to maintain, we have not raised our forces by a single man which they can afford to disband, we have not added a single ship which they can afford to put on one side. Under these circumstances, Sir, it appears to me to be mere folly to pretend at this time of day that we can run this great Empire, in the face of our recent experience, on Estimates framed on the scale which the right hon. Gentleman and his friends thought adequate six years ago.

Question put.

The House divided:; Ayes, 300; Noes, 123, (Division List No. 199.)

Hudson, George (Bickersteth)  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Seton-Karr, Henry  
Hughes, Colonel Edwin  
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.  
Sharpe, William Edward T.  
Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)  
Moon, Edward Robert Paey C.  
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)  
Jebb, Sir Richard (Claverhouse  
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)  
Simeon, Sir Barrington  
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick  
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow  
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)  
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton  
Morgan, Hn. Fred. (Monmouth  
Skewes-Cox, Thomas  
Johnston, William (Belfast)  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)  
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.  
Kennaway, Rt Hon. Sir J. H.

Morrison, James Archibald  
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand  
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh  
Morton, Arthur H. A (Deptford  
Spear, John Ward  
Kenyon, Jas. (Lancs, Bury)  
Mount, William Arthur  
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich  
Keswick, William  
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.  
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk'  
Kimber, Henry  
Muntz, Philip A.  
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset  
King, Sir Henry Seymour  
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Lambton, Hon. Frederick W.  
Myers, William Henry  
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Newdigate, Francis Alex.  
Stock, James Henry  
Lawrence, Joseph (Monmouth  
Nicholson, William Graham  
Stone, Sir Benjamin  
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Stroyan, John  
Lawson, John Grant  
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens  
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley  
Lecky, Rt. Hn. Wm. Edw. H.  
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)  
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier  
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham  
Parker, Gilbert  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)  
Parkes, Ebenezer  
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Uni.  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Peel, Hn Wm. Robert Wellesley  
Thornton, Percy M.  
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.  
Pemberton, John S. G.

Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray  
Llewellyn, Evan Henry  
Percy, Earl  
Tritton, Charles Ernest  
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.  
Pierpoint, Robert  
Tufnell, Lt.-Col. Edward  
Loder, Gerald W. Erskine  
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard  
Tuke, Sir John Batty  
Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham)  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Valentia, Viscount  
Long, Rt. Hon Walter (Bristol, S  
Plummer, Walter R.  
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)  
Lonsdale, John Brownlee  
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Lowe, Francis William  
Pretymann, Ernest George  
Wanklyn, James Leslie  
Lowther, C. (Cum., Eskdale)  
Purvis, Robert  
Warde, Col. C. E.  
Lowther, Rt. Hn. Jas. (Kent)  
Pym, C. Guy  
Wason, John Catheart (Orkney)  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert  
Welby, Lt.-Col. AC E (Taunton)  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)  
Randles, John S.  
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts)  
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)  
Rankin, Sir James  
Wharton, Rt. Hn. John Lloyd  
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W G Ellison  
Remnant, Jas. Farquharson  
Whiteley, H (Ashtonund. Lyne)  
Macdonald, John Cumming  
Renshaw, Charles Bine  
Whitmore, Chas. Algernon  
MacIver, David (Liverpool)  
Richards, Henry Charles  
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell- (B'rm



Maconochie, A. W.  
Ridley, Hn. M. W (Stalybridge)  
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord  
M'Arthur, Chas. (Liverpool)  
Ridley, Samuel F (Bethnal Gr'n)  
Wilson, A. S. (York, E. R.)  
M'Calmont, Col. H. L. B (Camb.  
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)  
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney  
Wilson, J. W (Worcestersh, N.)  
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire  
Robinson, Brooke  
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.  
Malcolm, Ian  
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.  
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath  
Manners, Lord Cecil  
Ropner, Colonel Robert  
Wolff, Gustay Wilhelm  
Maple, Sir John Blundell  
Round, James  
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-  
Martin, Richard Biddulph  
Royds, Clement Molyneux  
Wrightson, Sir Thomas  
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H E (Wigton  
Rutherford, John  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)  
Melville, Beresford Valentine  
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alex.  
Younger, William  
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.  
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)  
Mildmay, Francis Bingham  
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
Milward, Colonel Victor  
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)  
NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)  
Craig, Robert Hunter  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
Allan, William (Gateshead)  
Crombie, John William  
Grant, Come  
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud  
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan  
Grey, Sir Edward (Berwick)  
Ashton, Thomas Gair  
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.  
Griffith, Ellis J.  
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert H.  
Duncan, J. Hastings  
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton  
Atherley-Jones, L.  
Dunn, Sir William  
Haldane, Richard Burdon  
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire  
Edwards, Frank  
Harmsworth, R. Leicester  
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.  
Elibank, Master of  
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Chas. Seale-  
Bolton, Thomas Dolling  
Ellis, John Edward  
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.  
Brown, Geo. M. (Edinburgh)  
Emmott, Alfred  
Helme, Norval Watson  
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson  
Evans, Sir F. H. (Maidstone)  
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.  
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James  
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan  
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)  
Burt, Thomas  
Farquharson, Dr. Robert  
Holland, William Henry  
Buxton, Sydney Charles  
Fenwick, Charles  
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.  
Caine, William Sproston  
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)  
Joicey, Sir James  
Caldwell, James

Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)  
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)  
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.  
Fowler, Rt. Hn. Sir Henry  
Kay-Shuttleworth, Rt Hn Sir U  
Causton, Richard Knight  
Fuller, J. M. F.  
Kearley, Hudson E.  
Cawley, Frederick  
Furness, Sir Christopher  
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth  
Kitson, Sir James  
Palmer, George Wm. (Reading)  
Strachey, Edward  
Lambert, George  
Partington, Oswald  
Taylor, Theodore Cooke  
Layland-Barratt, Francis  
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.  
Tennant, Harold John  
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)  
Pease, Sir Joseph W. (Durham)  
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)  
Leigh, Sir Joseph  
Perks, Robert William  
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.  
Leng, Sir John  
Price, Robert John  
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings)  
Levy, Maurice  
Priestley, Arthur  
Trevelyan, Charles Philips  
Lough, Thomas  
Rea, Russell  
Wallace, Robert  
M'Crae, George  
Reckitt, Harold James  
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.  
M'Kenna, Reginald  
Reed, Sir Edw. Jas. (Cardiff)  
Warner, Thos. Courtenay T.  
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin  
Reid, Sir R Threshie (Dumfries)  
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)  
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe  
Rigg, Richard

Weir, James Galloway  
Markham, Arthur Basil  
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)  
White, George (Norfolk)  
Mather, William  
Robson, William Snowdon  
White, Luke (York, E. R.)  
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William  
Roe, Sir Thomas  
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)  
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen  
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)  
Whiteley, J. H. (Halifax)  
Morley Charles (Breconshire)  
Shaw, Chas. Edw. (Stafford)  
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer  
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)  
Shipman, Dr. John G.  
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth  
Moss, Samuel  
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh  
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersfd  
Norman, Henry  
Smith, Samuel (Flint)  
Yoxall, James Henry  
Norton, Capt. Cecil William  
Soames, Arthur Wellesley  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. M'Arthur.  
Nussey, Thomas Willans  
Spencer, Rt Hn. CR. (Northants  
Palmer, Sir Chas. M. (Durham)  
Stevenson, Francis S.

Main Question again proposed; Debate arising.  
It being after Seven of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned.  
Debate to be resumed upon Thursday.

EVENING SITTING.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to;  
Ardrossan Harbour Order Confirmation Bill.

Ayr Harbour Order Confirmation Bill.

Highland Railway Order Confirmation Bill, without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act for Legalising Marriages heretofore solemnised in certain churches and places." Marriages Legalisation Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Alkali, &c. Works Regulation

Act, 1881." Alkali, &c. Works Regulation Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Law relating to Prisons in Scotland, and for other purposes connected therewith." Prisons (Scotland) Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Education under the Elementary Education Acts, 1870 to 1900, to enable the School Board for Acton

to put in force the Lands Clauses Acts. Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (Acton) Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to authorise the Lynton and Barnstaple Railway Company to raise further moneys." Lynton and Barnstaple Railway Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to authorise the construction of tramways and a tramroad in the urban districts of Walker, Wallsend, Willington Quay, and Gosforth, the borough of Tyne-mouth, and the parishes of Willington and Longbenton, in the county of Northumberland; and for other purposes." Tyneside Tramways and Tramroads Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to confer further powers upon the mayor, aldermen, and burgesses of the borough of Wigan in regard to the construction of tramways and street improvements, and in regard to their electric lighting undertaking; and for other purposes." Wigan Corporation Tramways, &c. Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled "An Act for the acquisition of the undertaking of the Portmadoc, Croesor, and Beddgelert Tram Railway Company; to construct railways and works in the parishes of Treflys, Ynyscynhaiarn, and Beddgelert, in the county of Carnarvon, and the parish of Llanfrothen, in the county of Merioneth; to produce, store, and supply electricity for public and private purposes; and for other purposes." Portmadoc, Beddgelert, and South Snowdon Railway Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act for conferring further powers upon the Urban District Council of Handsworth with respect to Tramways and Electric Lighting; and for other purposes." Handsworth Urban District Council Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to authorise the Corporation of Leeds to make street works and to lay down tramways; and to make better provision in regard to the loans of the Corporation and the health, local government, and improvement of the city; and for other purposes." Leeds Corporation (General Powers) Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act for authorising the City of Birmingham Tramways Company, Limited, to construct additional tramways; and for other purposes." Birmingham (City) Tramways Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to authorise the South Essex Waterworks Company to construct further works; to extend their limits of supply; and for other purposes." South Essex Water Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to authorise the Urban District Council of Broadstairs and St. Peter's, in the county of Kent, to purchase the undertaking of the Broadstairs Waterworks Company; and to construct additional waterworks for the supply of their district and the parish of St. Peter Extra; and to make further and better provision for the improvement, health, local government, and

finance of the district; and for other purposes." Broadstairs and St. Peter's Water and Improvement Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to confer further powers upon the South Lancashire Tramways Company for the construction of tramways and street improvements; and for other purposes." South Lancashire Tramways Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill intituled, "An Act to authorise the Corporation of Chesterfield to execute certain street improvements and works; to make further provision for the improvement, local government, and health of the Borough of Chesterfield; and for other purposes." Chesterfield Improvement Bill [Lords].

And also a Bill intituled, "An Act" or rendering valid certain Letters Patent granted to James Godman Rodgers for an invention for improvements in rubber tyres for vehicles." Rodgers' Patent Bill [Lords].

EDUCATION BOARD PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION (ACTON) BILL [H.L.].

Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 201.]

LYNTON AND BARNSTAPLE RAILWAY BILL [H.L.].

TYNESIDE TRAMWAYS AND TRAM-ROADS BILL [H.L.].

WIGAN CORPORATION TRAMWAYS, ETC., BILL [H.L.].

PORTMADOC, BEDDGELERT, AND SOUTH SNOWDON RAILWAY BILL [H.L.].

HANDSWORTH URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL BILL [H.L.].

LEEDS CORPORATION (GENERAL POWERS) BILL [H.L.].

BIRMINGHAM (CITY) TRAMWAYS BILL [H.L.].

SOUTH ESSEX WATER BILL [H.L.].

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

SOUTH LANCASHIRE TRAMWAYS BILL [H.L.].

CHESTERFIELD IMPROVEMENT BILL [H.L.].

RODGERS' PATENT BILL [H.L.].

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

IRISH EDUCATION;TEACHING OF THE IRISH LANGUAGE.

MR. DOOGAN (Tyrone, E.): I rise to call attention to the question of teaching the Irish language in Irish schools and to move the resolution that stands in my name on the Paper. This is not a party but an educational question, and one which I claim can be supported in all quarters of the House. To explain the question it will be necessary for me to refer to the deplorable condition of the school life of the children in the Irish-speaking districts of Ireland. When they enter school they are set to what I consider an impossible task, and to one which inflicts upon them much pain, punishment, and mental torture. Those children who come from Irish-speaking homes, where they may have never heard a word of English in their lives, are set to struggle to acquire English, which to them is a foreign language, through a vocalism to which their tongues have been untrained, their ears are unfamiliar, and they are frequently taught by a teacher who knows not a single word of Irish. The problem seems a most extraordinary one to have to solve. It is strange that such treatment should be inflicted on any civilised community;to teach English to Irish-speaking pupils who know no English through English alone, and by a teacher who knows no Irish,

and therefore without the aid of any oral explanation whatever. Surely such a system is not education. Education means the drawing out of all the mental faculties and the training and developing of the intellectual powers. But this system must inevitably dwarf and stunt the intelligence and deprive the children of their natural rights' to be educated; a right to which every person born into the world is entitled. It is inevitable that such a system must and does produce illiteracy. This evil method has been going on now for a long period in the history of Ireland; ever since the Commissioners of National Education took over the educational destinies of our country about sixty-six years ago. At that time the native language was spoken extensively in the rural areas of Ireland. Since that time the home language of the pupils as an educative instrument has been entirely ignored, and the extensive vocabulary which the children have acquired at home and through intercourse with the people in the locality is absolutely shut out from them when they go to school as a means of acquiring new ideas. The children are quick, alert, and intelligent, and everybody knows that ideas can only be acquired through the instrumentality of language, so that the system of beginning the education of Irish children in a foreign language is most unenlightened and intolerable, and is perhaps the most barbarous that could be followed in any country in the world. The pupils acquire some words merely through the ear, and they may be taught to read by sight in a mechanical manner without understanding what they are reading. When these children escape from school; and escape they do at the earliest time they can, for the school to them is a veritable

prison; they having picked up a mere smattering of English, return to the old environment of hearing Irish spoken, and of speaking it themselves. They have acquired such a distaste for the sound of the English language that they have no desire for continuing their reading. In the districts in which they live they do not hear it, and as a natural consequence in the course of time their memory of that language dies out, and before they are fully grown up they have lost the capacity to read and write, and in the Census Returns they must necessarily be enrolled in the long local list of illiterates.

The resolution which I respectfully submit to the trained intelligence and reasoned judgment of the House is the only real remedy for this absurd and irrational system. It asks the Government to put an end to a system that has been absolutely worthless as a system of education. It has deprived hundreds of thousands of the population in these Irish-speaking districts of anything resembling education at all. This resolution is purely a demand for educational reform; a demand made by the voice of the united people of Ireland. The bishops, managers, teachers, elected local boards, literary societies, the Nationalist press and the Nationalist party, and the Gaelic League are unanimously and loudly demanding this educational reform. The Gaelic League has pledged itself to continue its active and vigorous agitation for the revival of the Irish language as part of the educational curriculum of the country, and as it has behind it a widespread and growing movement I venture to think that the Government will find it impossible to refuse its just demand. The question then is ripe for settlement, and I hope the House to-night, by affirming this

resolution, will render the continuation of this pernicious and anomalous system in the Irish-speaking districts an impossibility. The resolution before the House does not demand that this bilingual system should be applied to the schools of Ireland, which may fairly be described as being in English-speaking areas. It is only to be applied in Irish-speaking districts, where education, under the existing system, is a nullity, and where quick, intelligent children, born with the inherited capacity of a gifted race, go to school with a large stock of words and ideas in their own language, and which should be utilised to lead them from the known to the unknown. Sir Patrick Keenan the late resident commissioner, a man of experience and broad mind, a lover of education, and a lover of his country, when he was head inspector of the Board, in 1855, criticised the fatal system of instruction pursued by the Board of Education in the districts of the west of Ireland where Irish alone was spoken by the people. He pointed out that the system in vogue was absolutely worthless. In his report in 1855 he refers to a school which had been seven years in operation, and in which he did not find that one child knew a word of English, or, in point of fact, knew anything else. He said it was a waste of time and a cruel injury to the children, which deprived them of the capacity for future development. In that report of 1855, nearly half a century ago, he set out in detail the system which ought to be followed by the Commissioners of Education.

The system outlined by Sir Patrick Keenan, then, is what I am to-night submitting to the House. When a pupil enters a school his mental equipment should be utilised, and his intelligence developed, in the most thorough and efficient manner. He should be taught the alphabet of his own native language before being set to learn the grammar of a strange one. He should be taught to read his mother tongue intelligently, and then his education in English and other school subjects should be pursued through the medium of Irish. Sir Patrick Keenan pointed out that by that system no injury would be done to the acquisition of English; in fact, it would enable the children to learn English in a shorter time and in a more improved fashion, for their English would be strengthened and beautified by the vigour and imagery of the mother tongue. Sir Patrick Keenan repeated his recommendations in 1856, 1857, and 1858. In 1859 he was taken into office as chief of inspectors, when his duty to make annual reports ceased. In 1868 he gave evidence before the Royal Commission on Irish Education, in which he again expounded the same unchanged ideas on the subject. When the present Chancellor of the Exchequer was Colonial Secretary he gave Sir Patrick Keenan, in 1878, an important commission. He sent him out to investigate the language difficulty in Malta, and gave him a free hand: and Sir Patrick solved the problem by introducing into the Maltese schools the system of bilingualism; a system that throughout his long and glorious career he was unable to have established in the interests of the bright children of his own dear land.

The absence of this system has done much wrong to generations of Irish children, who have grown up with their intelligence dwarfed, and who had to fight the battle of life on that account as mere hewers of wood and drawers of water. The



conclusion irresistibly forced upon the impartial mind is that the policy of the Government during this long period was the extinction of the Irish language. I hope that hereafter a more advanced and enlightened policy will be carried out in the whole educational system of Ireland. Rules have recently been promulgated by the Board which go very far to reform the defects in the system of elementary education in Ireland, but when the question of teaching the Irish language had to be considered, although the Commissioners have taken a step in that direction, they have stopped short of bilingualism, which was adopted long ago with so much success in the Highlands of Scotland, and more recently with the happiest results in Wales. Countries such as Germany, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, and Switzerland recognise the great advantage, as an educational instrument, of two languages. Nobody can deny the disciplinary effect upon the mind of learning two languages; and the mere transference of thought from one language to the other is in itself a mental process of great educational value. The introduction of the mother tongue into school life would enormously enhance the education of the pupils. The use of the Irish language would tend to widen their ideas, to cultivate the imagination, to foster a love of literature, to improve the taste and enlarge the understanding. The Irish language is a classic of great beauty, imagery, and strength. It is as harmonious, copious, flexible, and as well suited to make "the sound an echo to the sense" as is the language of Ancient Greece. It is as capable of expressing every idea of the mind and every affection of the heart as is any language of ancient or modern times. I hope, therefore, that the Chief Secretary will not stand in the way of the revival of the native language of the children in the Irish-speaking districts; a revival which is so essential in the interests of education and in the interests of Ireland.

I appeal, therefore, to the right hon. Gentleman to accept this resolution for an educational reform which has been too long delayed; a reform which has been sanctioned in Scotland and Wales by the educational authorities, and which has been so favourably reported upon by the inspectors. I beg to move the resolution standing in my name.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): In rising to second the motion of my hon. friend I wish to say that I desire to deal with this subject as a literary question of great value to us from a philological point of view. I wish also to say that the Irish language is the only natural and most effective medium through which to educate the Irish child. This language is to Irishmen really a national treasure, and we should be unworthy of our position and failing in our duty if we did not attempt to keep it alive. I think I shall be able to prove to the House the value both from the intellectual and material standpoints of a bilingual education. I do not wish to go back into the history of the treatment which this language question has received from the English Government. Suffice it to say that ever since the English came over to us the language of our country was a special subject of detestation to them. In 1837 a law was passed by which it was made a criminal offence punishable by death to teach the language, and the men who continued to speak it had their land confiscated. But still the Irish kept their language and treasured it. Sixty years ago when a

system of education exultantly termed "national" was introduced into the country, four-fifths of the Irish spoke the Irish language. It was the language of home; the language in which the children thought, and the only language by means of which they could receive ideas from their teachers in their schools. Can it even be imagined by hon. Members of this House that the only language by which they could be taught did not find a place in the curriculum of the schools? It would be difficult for Englishmen to understand the results of such a system. Fancy an English child, who knows only English, transplanted to, we will say Russia, and taught by a teacher who only knows Russian. During the first six months what would happen to the child? The language by which he could receive ideas is not used in the country, and how is it possible that such a child could be effectively instructed? Such was the condition of the Irish child, and such has it remained. Such a system of education is unjust, and must tend to blunt and retard the progress of education among our people. Only a few nights ago the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary stated that one of the reasons why Irishmen were not appointed to lucrative positions in Ireland was that they were not sufficiently educated. Even the right hon. Gentleman must admit that Irishmen are capable of receiving education; the Irishman is proud to be able to say he is the descendant of a people who loved education and carried its light abroad before England was a nation; but I am afraid I must agree with the Chief Secretary in this respect. Irishmen are not so well educated as they should be. What is the cause; are they incapable of receiving it? Are they the descendants of a race so stupid and blunt that no education can improve them? Look at the Irishman abroad; in America, in the colonies; where, under the influence of that liberty which you deny him at home, he progresses and goes forward to the highest positions in commercial and social life. In those countries he is capable of filling the highest positions, but at home in his own country he is uneducated; there alone he is unable to fill important positions. We feel that that is due to the fault of the system of the Government, which has not the proper force to draw out the latent abilities of the Irish, and we come here to-night to appeal to this House for more enlightened treatment; to appeal to them to give our children at home the opportunity to develop the intelligence with which Nature has endowed them.

It may be said that the Irish language is dead, and that our grievance with regard to it is a sentimental one, but I trust the few quotations I shall read to the House will prove to England that the Irish language, which extends back over 1,400 years, is still a living language, and that it would be a loss not only to Ireland, but to the whole world, if such a virile and ancient language should be allowed to pass away. Professor Alfred Nutt, the president of the Folk Law Society, in a letter to Dr. Douglas Hyde, says;

"This literature can be traced back with certainty for over 1,000 years, inferentially for several centuries further. It has exhibited during the whole of this period characteristics of imagination, presentment, and form alike enduring, significant, and of extreme interest. It contains the life history of

the soul of a race, and it can best be comprehended and expounded by means of that race provided they receive the necessary training. The great continental scholars who have done so much for the furtherance of Celtic studies are the first to insist upon the value of living tradition; the first to urge the importance of the instinctive native knowledge and love of Ireland's ancient speech and literature. If Celtic studies are discouraged in Ireland springs of knowledge and right comprehension will be immediately lost."

Professor Stern says;

"My opinion in consequence is that it were to be exceedingly regretted if instruction in the Irish language should be excluded from the curriculum of schools in that country."

Professor Windisch, of the University of Leipsig, says;

"In Ireland, Irish is the ancient language of the country which is even still spoken by hundreds of thousands, a language in which the spiritual mode of interpretation and expression of the people's forefathers is preserved. It expresses the spiritual peculiarities of the character of the Irish population, and not to cultivate the Irish language means to close up without any necessity a well-spring of the spiritual characteristics of the people. For the Irishman the Irish language must possess a value as a school subject, because it contributes towards the maintenance among Irishmen of their spiritual characteristics."

Professor Dollin, of the University of Rennes, says;

"I confess to you that I am absolutely astonished that any one can contest the utility of it. It is certain that the intelligence of people who speak more than one language is singularly developed, and it is only natural that in Ireland one should study Irish in addition to English."

Professor Zimmer, of the University of Greifswald, says;

"With regard to the Irish language as a subject of instruction, I know of no other modern language which, regarded purely as a language possesses a higher educational value than modern Irish for a boy who knows English. For thorough education of the mind (i.e., the intellect) Irish stands on a level with French and German, in fact it is in many respects superior to them, because it is more characteristic and consequently gives more matter for thought."

Professor York Powell, of Oxford, says;

"It would be a thousand pities if a wise and reasonable effort to bring culture to the children through their mother-tongue should be stopped on the ground that it is a waste of time. The discipline and education were the same whether a child learns in Gaelic or English. We want it to learn both and we know by experience in the past that a bilingual child will learn English better and more readily if its own tongue is not tabooed in the early years of its life."

These are quotations from men of European fame, scholars of the highest reputation, knowing the ancient Celtic language and the modern languages of Europe, who have come over to Ireland and spent months at a time on the western seaboard to acquire there a speaking knowledge of the language. Surely their testimony is worthy of regard. I might quote also Professor Meyer, of Liverpool, a professor of an English university, who says;

"To refrain from teaching it to Irish youths who talk it as their mother-tongue I must regard as a gross educational blunder. The Irish language well taught I regard as a first rate means of mental training. Why deprive in their education for life and all it means the youth of Ireland of such intimate touch with the literature of their past as they can thus acquire?"

Professor Holger Pendersen, of Copenhagen, says;

"I wish to state that the teaching of Irish seems to me to be imperiously commanded by the simple circumstance that one-third of Ireland (in area) is still Irish speaking; for Irish children, even if they know some little-English, cannot acquire a satisfactory intellectual and moral development if they are not taught to read and write their mother-tongue. The neglecting of the mother-tongue of the pupils is always and everywhere a barbarity, and an injustice that should not be allowed in our century."

Mrs. Hall, speaking of the effect which this study has on Irishmen, says;

"I have never seen anything to compare with the enthusiasm and earnestness with which the study of the language has been taken up. It appears to exercise both an intellectual and moral influence over the students; many of them are young men engaged all day in various public offices, and young women employed in the General Post Office. Yet after a hard day's work they meet together to study the language with an energy and perseverance which I have never seen applied to any other intellectual pursuit, while on their holidays they find a new and healthful field of recreation in gathering the folk-lore and songs, and studying the antiquities of their own parts of the country. Surely every possible facility should be put in the way of such rational and wholesome recreations and pursuits."

I trust these quotations from scholars of world-wide fame prove that the Irish language, even from a literary point of view alone, is worthy of being saved. Now I wish to pass on and prove that the study of language is not alone useful to the people of the particular country, but necessary. Gallant little Wales has preserved its language. It is studied and taught in the schools as necessary for the children. Who can say that Wales has been injured because of the respect they have for their language and the traditions which their language brings home to them? The hon. Member quoted the opinions of Professor Keenan and other educational experts, and also extracts from the reports of the examiners as to the effect of bilingual studies in Wales, and proceeded]: In appealing to the House to-night on behalf of Irish children, we hope the honesty of the English Government will extend to us this reasonable concession, and remove the stigma from the people of Ireland that they are uneducated, and cannot take any position in their own land.

It has been said by the enemies of the language that there is no widespread feeling for the resuscitation of the language. As a fact, the feeling is as widespread as it can be. The Catholic Hierarchy of Ireland has passed resolution after resolution stating in plain unmistakable terms that for the thorough education of the Irish child bilingualism is absolutely essential. Can anyone in this House say that these men are unable to form a correct judgment as to what is useful to the Irish child? Can anyone say they are influenced by sentiment

alone, and that they have not the welfare of the Irish child at heart? Can this House refuse a demand in which no political considerations are concerned? The different county councils of Ireland, representing the people, have practically all passed resolutions claiming that the Irish language is essential to the proper education of the people. For the last quarter of a century repeated resolutions have been passed that Irish should be taught in the schools. There is strong evidence in favour of the national demand abroad. The Gaelic League, which started a few years ago to cultivate a knowledge of our dear old mother tongue, has over 200 branches in Ireland, over a dozen in South America, over 50 in North America, and a great number in England and Scotland, and in these branches you have the young men of Ireland who are determined that the language of their forefathers and of their country shall live. As showing the demand for literature on this subject, I may mention that last year there were sold 43,000 copies of the first edition of O'Growney's "Study of Irish," 13,000 of the second edition, 3,500, of the third, 3,000 of the fourth, and 3,000 of the fifth edition, and about 20,000 copies of other books. That shows, even with the present system of education, the results of voluntary effort. The Irish language is a cultivated and literary language, a language which the people are determined shall survive. If I have not already wearied the House I should like to give another quotation. Englishmen are very practical, and they like to see Irishmen who are always regarded as merely sentimental, prove their case with positive facts. I will quote an extract from a reverend clergyman who knows what he is talking about. (The hon. Member then read in Irish the letter referred to.) I hope that this latest quotation will appeal to hon. Gentlemen opposite.

SIR HARRY BULLARD (Norwich): May I ask the hon. Member to translate the letter he has just read.

A NATIONALIST MEMBER: There is no necessity.

SIR HARRY BULLARD: For the benefit not only of members on this side of the House, but of his own party also.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I should be delighted to translate it, but in an assembly of educated gentlemen I should be sorry to enlighten one who is unable to understand the oldest language in this kingdom, if not the oldest in Europe. I do not wish to import any political bias into this discussion; I have given a quotation in my own language in favour of the claim I am advocating; I have not done it to offend; I thought it my duty to do it; and if my hon. friend does not understand it I can only pity him. Only a few days ago I got a letter from a member of the Flemish Academy. They also have a language question. Other countries have a language question, and will continue to have it. This gentleman says::

"I have just read your interesting paper concerning the revival of the Irish language. As you perhaps know, we Flemish Nationalists have been struggling for years and with good result to uphold our language; in fact, we have succeeded so far that at present French and Flemish enjoy equal rights in Belgium, and are both used in school and even in the army "

I am afraid that we in Ireland cannot say that with regard to the Irish

language. I trust that the English Government will recognise that it is of no advantage to them, and is a great injury to our country, to deny us the opportunity of educating our people in the only effective way that is open to them. I do not wish to dwell too long upon this matter. I trust I have proved that the Irish language is a literary medium worthy of preservation, and that its use in the teaching of the Irish child is essential. Under these circumstances, I hope that the English Government of to-day will try to remedy the evil of the past and give to the Irish child that facility for education which has hitherto been denied him. I do not wish to touch upon the sentimental aspect of the question. I am addressing Englishmen, who are a very practical people. I ask, What is your present system of education in England? A few days ago a Bill was introduced in this House, which, while it gave a central control, allowed each different district of the country to introduce the system best adapted to its own particular circumstances. Wales is allowed to introduce the Welsh language. Other districts are allowed to teach whatever subjects they think best suited to their requirements. When you in England received, a long time ago, local government, you said that we in Ireland were unfit to receive it; if you did not say it you acted it; but after a long time we have received it. Now we simply ask that you should give to us in Ireland that which you are giving the English people, the right to manage our education in the way we think best suited to the educational development of our people. Surely that is not a great demand. Perhaps I should insult my hon. friend who rose just now if I quote these words, and before I do let me remind him that they are from a clergyman of, I was going to say, the ascendancy party in Ireland. He says;

"Britain, with shame confess this land of mine  
First taught thee human knowledge and divine;  
My prelates and my students sent from hence  
Made your sons converts both to God and sense."

We in Ireland sent our prelates and our missionaries not alone to England, but all over Europe, in the fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries. Our schools, flourished; they were free not alone to our own people, but to students from, the Continent, and they sent forth scholars all over the world. But to-day we stand; we, the descendants of a people who were ever remarkable for their educational ability; we, the descendants of a people who loved knowledge and learning more than all people on earth; we stand to-day, cursed by a vicious system of misgovernment, declared by you to be illiterate, uneducated, and undeveloped. ["No, no."] Yes, we do. If it is to your advantage or to the advantage of England that Irishmen should remain undeveloped and uneducated, continue the bad and pernicious system which has obtained, in the past. But if you are prepared, to discard politics for once, to do justice for once, to allow Irishmen to develop on Irish lines, to allow Irish intellect to feed on the only food which will develop and improve it, then I say grant to us; to-night the prayer we now offer, and allow the children in Irish-speaking districts to receive their mental training; in the language which alone is capable of drawing out their best faculties. I beg to second the motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed;"That in the opinion of this House it is

essential in the interests of education that bilingualism, as a system, be introduced into the national schools in districts where Irish is extensively spoken, and that special facilities be afforded for training teachers to meet the demand for the teaching of Irish throughout Ireland.";(Mr. Doogan.)

MR. RENTOUL (Down, E.): No one can accuse the Irish Nationalist party of want of consistency in their programme;at least, as viewed from this side of the House.

They are eminently consistent in asking for things which would be for the disadvantage of Ireland. In asking for Home Rule we think they are asking for that which would be for the disadvantage of Ireland. We think also they are asking for that which would be for the disadvantage of Ireland when they ask for a sectarian University. [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: The old, old story.] We certainly think it would be for the disadvantage of Ireland that there should be a revival of the Irish language, for which they are asking tonight. That the Irish language should form a class subject in University colleges is a perfectly conceivable and proper thing. As an ancient and practically dead language;["No, no"];to the antiquarian and scholar it would be of considerable interest and value. Mention has been made of the literature of the Irish language. I understand that in it there are some very beautiful things, but, after all, it is a very small literature. [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: Have you read it?] As to the preposterous question whether I have read it; \*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; I hope hon. Members will not constantly interrupt.

MR. RENTOUL: Personally, I have not the slightest objection to hon. Members' interruptions, because they seem to me to indicate that hon. Gentlemen do not like a plain statement of the facts with regard to this highly sentimental and poetic subject. I am told that the literature is a very small one. The same remark applies to the literature of the Hebrews. That undoubtedly contains very beautiful gems, such as might not be found in any other language in the world, but it is certainly a very small literature, and if it was not the language of sacred Scripture it would not be studied seriously as competing with other languages as a means of education or of benefit to any people. Look at the manner in which the most prudent and intelligent people in the world act with regard to their language and literature;I refer to the Jews. They put in the first place, as far as they can, not necessarily English, French, German, or Russian, but the language of the country in which they happen to be, and of the people with whom they associate. When I came into the House the hon. Member the mover of this resolution was urging

that Sir Patrick Keenan had done something in the way here suggested in connection with Malta, and as far as I could judge the only advantage that he could put forward as springing out of that attempt was that Sir Patrick had been knighted. The first knight I ever knew was my tailor, and when he measured me for my clothes, and I had to address him as "Sir Robert," I learnt then to have, perhaps, less appreciation of the honour of knighthood than I might otherwise have had. That was the sole recommendation, as far as I could see, put forward in connection with the application of the bilingual system in Malta.

Then the hon. Member spoke of the value of learning this language, and said that

some of us would like to extinguish it. I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that I would like to extinguish Irish as a spoken language in the country. I happen to have spent a great portion of my life in County Donegal, which is very much a bilingual county, and in which Irish is spoken, I suppose, as much as in almost any other county in Ireland. I found that the people there regarded having learnt the Irish language as their mother tongue as a wonderful disadvantage, and they were very anxious to conceal the fact that they knew it. If this were merely a sentimental matter, put forward for the sake of a debate on a Tuesday evening, it probably would not be worth anybody's while to speak, but it would be deplorable if in these days, when we have so much difficulty in getting our children taught two or three languages, such as French and German, without overwork, this subject was added to their task. I am sorry to see that an immense proportion of the examination papers in connection with London and other Universities is absurdly taken up by old French and old German, which are of no practical value whatever, so that people have to learn these old dead-and-gone forms of French and German at the expense of the living language. With regard to the bilingual system, let us look at how the matter has worked out in other places. The two countries in Europe in which the bilingual system prevails to the largest extent are Belgium and Switzerland. Those are the two countries in which, so far as I can

find, university education stands lowest. Certainly the university education of Switzerland and Belgium cannot compete for a moment with that of Germany or France or Italy. Some time ago I had a conversation in Antwerp with a priest who was examining a class in Flemish, and certainly his testimony was very strongly against the bilingual system. I came across this bilingual system in Brussels. The servants there have to speak French to their masters and mistresses, but they speak very bad French. Coming to Switzerland, I feel a little more on firm ground. The languages there are French and German and a little Italian. It is acknowledged that Swiss French and Swiss German are not good. Very many Swiss people come over here to be educated, and we know that in many schools Swiss teachers are employed because they speak both French and German. It is admitted, I think, that the average Swiss is not a good or safe French scholar. They are not at all equal to the Frenchman in French or the German in German. If I were employing a teacher to teach French and German for a term of two years, I should prefer to employ a Frenchman for one year and a German for the other year, instead of employing a Swiss for two years to teach both languages. The hon. Member opposite, in his peroration, said he thought the Irish language was equally as fine and grand as the language of the ancient Greeks, and that it was as capable of expressing anything as any other language. That was thrilling and delightful, and his peroration shows that he is a master of the English language.

MR. DOOGAN: Are you referring to me?

MR. RENTOUL: Yes, I am. If the hon. Member opposite had professed that he was a master of the Irish language I should not have been in the position to contradict him. I was, however, obliged to notice the difference between him and the Leader of his party whilst that long extract in Irish was being read by the



hon. Member for West Kerry. I have never seen on the face of the Leader of the Irish party such a wooden look.

MR. DOOGAN: I do not think the hon. and learned Member opposite is drawing a parallel example of what I want. How would you teach English in a school to Irish-speaking pupils when the teacher does not know Irish?

MR. RENTOUL: I am sorry I cannot answer that question, because I do not follow it. With regard to teaching in the schools, that is a matter with which I will deal later on. I think the meaning seems to be that in order that a child should be taught English well it is necessary that the child must first be taught to speak Irish well.

MR. DOOGAN: To read Irish.

MR. RENTOUL: That is a contention which I dispute.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I did not state what the hon. and learned Member has attributed to me. I simply stated that in order to have English taught thoroughly it should be taught through the language which the child knows.

MR. RENTOUL: I am prepared to dispute that point. I have known many children who have been sent to a foreign country, and who have been taught the foreign language through the foreign language itself, and I find it is the best method that could be applied. I sent a boy to France, and had him taught the language entirely through the French, without the assistance of one solitary word of English. I see occasionally in the Irish newspapers at the present time portions of Irish printed from time to time, and that is evidently done to propagate the Irish language. That does not seem to me to do anything useful, and I am told it is often printed upside down. [An HON. MEMBER: No, no.] At any rate, I am told that that is so, and I am sure that the Leader of the Irish party will not contradict this statement from his own personal knowledge. The hon. Gentleman opposite spoke of the system in Wales, and he stated that the bilingual system there had produced intelligence which could not have been got by any other educational system. The only instance I ever heard of in connection with the use of the Welsh language in a court of justice was one which occurred some time ago at a Welsh assize, where counsel asked the permission of the presiding judge to address the jury in Welsh.

The judge in a weak moment permitted it, and counsel said;

"Gentlemen of the jury,;The Judge is generally an honourable, upright man, but in this particular case he is prejudiced against the prisoner, and therefore you will not listen to a word he says when he comes to address you."

The result of this case was not desirable. Why does Italy not reintroduce Latin, the ancient language of that country? Why is not ancient Greek revived in Greece and taught by the side of modern Greek? The whole argument in favour of the revival of Erse is base merely on sentiment, though I respect that sentiment.

What is wanted in Ireland is something practicable, and the few quotations which the hon. Member opposite gave certainly do not seem to carry him any further than this, that in a university Irish might be kept up as an interesting dead language, or a language practically dead. I have no objection to Irish being taught as a dead language. The great advantage of English is that it is spoken in so many parts of the world. Language, after all, is intended to convey our

thoughts in the clearest and most unmistakable manner; except when we are making political speeches. The Irish language will carry us nowhere. It is of no value anywhere outside a few mountainous districts in Ireland. English is admitted now to be the leading language of the world. English is what the Germans would call the Umgangssprache, the language for going round the world. If they have not been as fortunate as we have in being born into other belongings, and in what the hon. Member called "a religion made in Germany," we do not wish to take away everything that is good for them, and we would like to leave them the English language.

I want to ask the hon. Gentleman who seconded this motion, or one of his friends who may follow me, to answer a question. I wish to know how the teaching of the Irish language is to be done. If the Chief Secretary for Ireland answers seriously this matter, what he has to inform us is, How is this to be done? Does it not involve the getting of a vast number of teachers who are not to be got at present? The hon. Member opposite would be perfectly qualified for filling that position, but I understand that he is one of the rare specimens of that class in Ireland. There would have to be an entire change of the whole system of inspectors, and the cost of the Irish national system of teaching would be increased by one-third. It would be the very worst thing the Chief Secretary could do for Ireland to grant this request. I do not think for a moment that hon. Gentlemen opposite are serious in their desire to put the Irish language in competition with the French or German languages. There are several hon. Gentlemen opposite, I am told, who are having their children taught modern languages. I want to know who would think of putting Irish in the place of either French or German in the education of a child? The average child is not able to make headway with more than a couple of spoken languages at the same time. Hon. Gentlemen opposite know perfectly well that there is nothing harder than to get an Irish peasant to confess that Irish is his mother tongue. We want to know how this language will benefit the people of Ireland or their prosperity. We are told that it is not a party question; but we are not going to support this motion on merely sentimental grounds.

\*MR. WILLIAM JONES (Carnarvonshire, Arfon) said the hon. Member for East Down had spoken as if it was proposed to resuscitate a dead language, but that was not the proposal. On the other hand, this was a very moderate resolution. It was sought to develop the mind of the children through the medium of a language that they already knew. The hon. Member for East Down entirely misunderstood the question before the House. He had stated that Ireland had no literature worth speaking of. If the hon. Member had taken the least trouble to consult the writings of the great European scholars in France, Germany, and Italy, he would have found that their testimony was that at one time the Irish language had not merely a literature, but that it had the richest literature in Europe. He could quote many authorities on the value of the Celtic languages. It was, however, from the practical point of view that he was going to deal with the matter. Speaking as a humble student of the Celtic language, and particularly the language and literature of Wales, he would tell the House what had been done in Wales in recent years. He believed it was universally acknowledged that no

nation had done by self-sacrifice and endeavour more than the Welsh nation towards fostering education during the past generation. What was one of the main elements in the success of their system? Why, that Welsh had been recognised not merely as a means of culture, but a means of instruction. The success was so startling that the chief inspector, who was an English gentleman, said there was a striking growth in all-round excellence, in English especially. Other inspectors told us in their reports that the standard of elementary education was greatly raised by the introduction of Welsh. In our secondary education system it was likewise said by the best authorities that the influence of the study of Welsh was already beginning to tell on the literature of the country. Another leading educationist bore witness that we had gained in every direction by giving Welsh an important place in our whole system, from the elementary classes to the university course. In these days, when commercial education was wanted to enable us to compete with Germans and Americans, what did we find in Wales? Welsh children in the elementary schools and in the splendid intermediate schools, and those who entered the university, learned French and the Romance languages through Welsh much quicker, than through English. Surely that was a practical thing. These languages must be an effective means of culture if foreign languages which were of such use could be learned through them. The reason was this. The vowel system, the syntactical arrangement, and the genius of the Welsh language was much more akin to the French language than English. The same thing held good in regard to Irish. If Irish children could be taught in their schools by using the language already known to them as their mother tongue they would learn English all the better. After all, that was the main question. They were not seeking by the resolution to do away with English or to de-Anglicise Ireland. What they wanted was to get at the mind of the child for educational purposes wherever that child was to be found. In Wales the teacher could now draw forth and educate the mind of the child by means of the tongue known to it. The man who most of all in Europe had emphasised the importance of the mother tongue as a means of culture was Bismarck.

There was another point in connection with education in Wales to which he desired to call attention. He held in his hand an extract from the latest report on the secondary education schools in Wales. What did the examiner say about the teaching of Welsh in these schools?

"It is pleasing to state that the work actually submitted to the test of examination was, as a whole, of a very high character. This year was a conspicuous absence of poor papers. &#x2026; The Welsh composition and the work in grammar were, in every stage, better than in any previous year."

Of course, the study of Welsh was proving to be a really efficient help to the acquisition of English, and to serve the highest purpose educationally the language itself must be taught *pari passu* with English. That was exactly what hon. Gentlemen from Ireland asked with regard to Irish. Such a course of education to-day would be better for Ireland and better for this country. Bilingual education was the best for developing the literary power and qualities of the child. If they wanted to raise a cultured nation, they must give it the

best means of sharpening its intellectual equipment, and Irish was a remarkable instrument for that purpose. Professor Rhys, Principal of Jesus College, Oxford, perhaps the best all-round Celtic scholar living, writing to one of the Commissioners during the Viceregal inquiry into the question of the Irish language in intermediate education, said;

"I am very sorry to learn from Dr. Douglas-Hyde that some educationalists who know nothing about the Irish language and its literature are trying to persuade your Commission to exclude both from Irish education.&#x2026; Irish is a highly inflected idiom, with an eminently logical syntax, which is likely to be heard a good deal of in the future in connection with the question which the early ethnology of the British Isles has to dispose of. It has a large literature, in which the foundations of a good deal that was developed into the romances of the middle ages are beginning to be recognised.&#x2026; The difficulty, if there is any, would arise perhaps from the fewness of the texts which have hitherto been edited for school use; but I feel sure that once the subject is recognised by your Commission, able men would be found who will undertake to prepare handy books."

What was the use of foisting an adventitious growth in the shape of an alien language upon a child who was thinking and speaking in his mother tongue? The system of education in Ireland should train and educate the intelligence without missing to educate the sympathies. He hoped the Chief Secretary would give his most sympathetic attention to this question. Even from the practical point of view, from the point of view of the children to be trained, from the point of view of the teachers who taught, it was worthy of that attention, as such a course was calculated to produce the best and most capable citizens in after life, and to fit them to take their places in the world.

\*THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): Most of us know little or nothing of the Celtic languages, but I think I may say for everyone here that we are ready to listen to the hon. Member who has just sat down for as long as he likes whenever he is good enough to speak to us on these subjects. He has to-night, as ever, enchanted us with the spell of his eloquence, but it seems odd to me to remember that he began his speech with the observation that he meant to be entirely practical. Throughout the whole of his remarks he has, no doubt, been very practical; he has created a practical effect, yet I think he has invested the subject with something of Celtic glamour. It is my painful duty to approach the subject in the humdrum capacity of a British Minister.

At the very outset I must draw a sharp distinction between the two questions involved in the matter we are debating to-night. One of these questions is very explicitly set forth in the resolution, but nearly every speaker has glanced at the other question, which is very closely allied to it. The first question is this;"Ought instruction to be given through the medium of Irish to a child who either can only speak Irish, or who speaks a little English, but thinks in Irish?" That is the first question, and the resolution deals principally with that. Well, Sir, I do not claim to be an authority upon what is, after all, a purely educational question, and I prefer to base myself on the words of Sir Patrick Keenan, who wrote, so long ago as in 1855;

"It is hard to conceive any more difficult school exercise than to begin our first alphabet and syllabication, the first attempt at reading, in a language of which we know nothing, and all this without a means of reference to or comparison with a word of our mother tongue "

And there I pause for one moment to pick up what seemed to me to be a fallacy in the reasoning of my hon. friend the Member for East Down. He said that the best way to teach a child French or German was to send it to a French or German home. Yes, but surely that child would have learned to read his mother-tongue, and would have got over the difficulties of the alphabet and syllabication of its own language? Sir Patrick Keenan says;

"The real policy of the educationalist would, in my opinion, be to teach Irish grammatically and soundly to the Irish speaking people, and then to teach English through the medium of their national language. If that system be pursued people will soon be better educated than they are, and English will be more generally and purely spoken."

It is notorious that the Highlanders of Scotland brought up in Gaelic homes do speak very pure English, and they are taught at the outset through the medium, of Gaelic. The words of Sir Patrick Keenan were, I submit, common sense fifty-five years ago, and are common sense still. Indeed, I can speak from my own experience. I was not so very long; ago in a school in a remote district of Ireland, where I found particularly good instruction being given by a young lady to a number of children, and she said that three or four of those could speak no English. I said, "Do you speak Irish?" She said, "No." I asked her, "How do you begin?" Her answer was a winning smile, charming but inarticulate. However, I think it was a complete answer. I believe that is how she relieved the tedium of those children who, on recognising, certain cyphers, were taught to declare by rote that "A cat was on a mat" or that "A fox was in a box;a sorry business at the best, as most of us remember, but lightened in our case by the interest which children take in the familiar, or unusual, predicaments of animals. There has been a note in the Code of the National Board of Education since 1883 advising that Irish-speaking children

should be instructed in the way suggested by Sir Patrick Keenan, and my right hon. friend the President of the Board of Trade, five years ago, referring to the matter, said;

"There are districts in Ireland where the national language is the language of the people. Where that is the case it is probably true that the best way to teach the children is to teach them in the language that they naturally speak." I adopt that view with the single substitution of certainty for probability.

Really, Sir, the matter is not in dispute. I could quote a hostile witness;hostile in the sense that he and many able men are opposed to any unnecessary extension of the bilingual system. Dr. Atkinson said that;

"These children should be taught Irish: and they would learn it without great difficulty, because they speak it from their childhood. If they speak it, then it would be right to teach them in the mother tongue. It is wrong not to teach them in their mother tongue. If they know Irish, let them be taught in Irish. If the child thinks in Irish, let it be taught in the Irish language."

That evidence was given only three years ago by a very learned gentleman who is not in favour of the view so eloquently put forward by my hon friend, so that there is no difference of opinion upon this matter. It is not maintained that a system of education which might be a sad necessity in the case of deaf mutes is really proper for those who do not suffer from that infirmity.

In the revised programme of the Board of Education, drawn up last September and sanctioned by the Irish Government in March, I find;

"In schools where there are Irish-speaking pupils the teacher, if acquainted with the language, is advised to use the vernacular, and inspectors are at liberty to use] Irish in conducting school examinations."

English Members may ask why the Board of Education, holding that opinion, only gave advice. I must explain that there are profound differences in the system of education in Ireland and in this country. For example, neither the Chief Secretary nor any member of the Government has direct control over the Board of Education; and, further, the Board of Education has not direct control over the managers and teachers of the schools. Except by expressing opinion, or by offering advice and helping

to procure funds, I do not know that any very operative effect can be transmitted either by the Government or by the Board of Education to the managers of schools in Ireland. Hon. Members from England may think that system very absurd, but I must tell them that we are not the only people who have found it necessary to govern Ireland through a system of boards. Nominated boards have always been found useful. Why, even St. Patrick, when he addressed himself to the task of bringing the Brehon laws into line with Christianity, found that he could only effect his purpose by appointing a joint committee to revise them, consisting of three bishops, three Brehons, and three kings; three clerics, three lawyers, and three permanent officials; the very image of a Castle board. [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: They were all Irish.] And there is another difference. In this country we have compulsory education. In Ireland except in sixty-eight towns and townships out of 120, there is no compulsion; it is only optional, and in rural districts there is no machinery of any kind to put compulsion into effect. As a result, out of 900,000 children who ought to be in school in Ireland there are only at present 500,000. We have a right to ask whether more would not attend if the instruction were more congenial, and whether more of those who attended would not learn more English. I know that the size of this problem is not very large. The Census figures are often quoted. The return of those who spoke Irish in 1881 was 885,000. In 1891 it was 642,000. But the force of that argument must be qualified to a certain extent when we reflect upon the great number who emigrated from Ireland, to which the reduction must be probably attributed, and not to a cessation on the part of the people from speaking the language. It is very difficult to get at the truth of the Census returns, and we have been warned that a good deal of pressure would be put on the Irish people to make it appear that they talk nothing else but Irish. I am bound in honesty to say that in the past a great many people thought it a fine thing to say that they knew English and knew no Irish. I should not like to make that statement

without some evidence to support it. It is better to get at the truth in this matter and not to argue from a priori premises. I quote these words from the official report of an inspector of fisheries;

"The men we found, on the whole, well clad, but only one could speak good English, and one other man had a few words of English. The children seemed to know no English, although there was a school in the island. The man who was spokesman said if you put one of the bigger girls at the fifth book she could very likely go through it in first-rate style, but beyond the books they had no English."

I have very little doubt a child which could get through the fifth book in "first rate style" would proudly inscribe herself as an English scholar in the Census report.

I submit a further consideration. Compulsion is optional on the part of the local authorities in Ireland, but the local authorities are urging this matter upon all our attention, and as a matter of administrative expediency ought we to resist the demand made by the Irish local authorities in a matter which has been accorded to the Highlands of Scotland and Wales when it is impossible to hope that education will be made compulsory unless we co-operate with the local authorities? Therefore, as to the question of teaching the children who speak English but think in Irish, or who know only Irish, I say, in view of what is done in Scotland and Wales, from an administrative point of view, and also from an educational point of view, in which all the educational experts concur, the question is no longer an open one, and I regard this debate to that extent as being somewhat academical. That question is closed, and I should be slow to believe that anyone would reopen it; and I shall be slow to believe that the Board of Education will neglect any steps that may be necessary in order to secure the acceptance of the advice which it itself gave eighteen years ago, and has explicitly reaffirmed during the last few months with the sanction of the Irish Secretary and the Government.

I do not think that I need say any more upon this question of teaching Irish-speaking children through the medium of Irish, because I really do not believe that we are in dispute upon that matter at all. Where we are in dispute is when we come to more debateable points; the grounds traversed by many of the speakers in this debate; "Ought Irish to be taught in non-Irish-speaking districts?" Well, I will do my best to describe my own view on that matter, which is an educational and literary question rather than a political one. My opinion is identical with that of the National Board of Education. In their revised programme, sanctioned by the Treasury and the Irish Government, I find;

"In connection with the new scheme the Commissioners sanction, as they sanctioned under the old results system, Irish, French, Latin, mathematics, instrumental music as optional branches that may be taught in all national schools, and taught during the ordinary school hours, provided that the adequacy of the course of instruction in the usual day subjects is not impaired or hampered thereby. But, as the time for secular instruction is limited, it may not be found possible to do that during the ordinary school hours. In such case

the Commissioners will be prepared to recognise them as special branches, and pay supplemental fees for the work done outside ordinary school hours."

Now, that is the position taken up by the National Board of Education. That is my position also. I will not comment upon it myself, but I will invite the attention of those interested to a comment made upon that by one of the Commissioners of National Education, Archbishop Walsh, who is reputed, and I believe justly reputed, to be a great authority upon education. This is what he says;

"I for my part regard what has been done by the Commissioners in reference to the teaching of Irish as satisfactory enough, at all events for the present. I see that on this matter also people are writing to the newspapers, trying to make out that Irish may not be taught in schools as the programme says it may be taught now. Plainly, what people of that description want is not facilities for the teaching of Irish, but what they want is a grievance, and in this particular matter the occupation of the grievance-monger is rapidly coming to an end."

I agree with that. I believe that the revised rules of the Board do show a reasonable attempt to meet the wishes expressed upon this matter. But what is practical? We have heard debates on the Irish Estimates. We have had a great increase in the Irish Estimates recently in reference to Irish education. There was £14,000 last year, and £16,000 this year for the training of teachers in elementary science, cookery, etc. I should not interpret this resolution as a mandate to the Treasury to stand and deliver more money, and everyone knows that no resolution should be interpreted in that way. In my opinion, if managers and parents mean business, and if the necessary steps are taken to teach through the medium of Irish in the first case, viz., where Irish-speaking children are involved, then, without adding to the expense of education in Ireland, it will be quite possible to teach Irish as a kind of secondary subject in the manner indicated in that portion of the Commissioners' Rules to which I have referred. I am glad to believe that the occupation of the grievance-monger is rapidly coming to an end, and I hold that it would be a grave mistake to give back his occupation by taking any backward step or exhibiting any vacillation upon a question which excites so much interest in Ireland at the present moment. I approach the second question from a purely educational standpoint. My right hon. friend and predecessor said in a previous debate that if there were any national desire to see Irish introduced in this way as a secondary subject he would not withstand it. Neither am I prepared to withstand it. There is at present an enthusiasm in Ireland for the study of Irish, and in the interests of education I submit that it would be a mistake not to take advantage of that enthusiasm, because any subject is of value educationally if it is pursued with zeal. Again I cannot dogmatise as an expert in these matters, and I should like to quote the words of an inspector of intermediate education in Ireland. He says;

"It does not appear that the good results likely to follow from the proper study of Irish are very generally appreciated, notwithstanding all that is constantly being said about the need of bringing the sympathies of the young to bear on the subjects of their study. We all know well that as regards the general round of



subjects, the best efforts made in this direction can be only a partial success so long as boys are boys and girls are girls. Hence the great advantage of including in the curriculum one subject which makes a personal appeal even to the youngest Irish students, and supplies them with a motive to put forth their mental powers lovingly and zealously, as doing so towards one subject cannot fail to have a good influence on their mental attitude towards other subjects."

But consider what a small question this

is in size, though I believe it is a great one in respect of educational advantage. Only 1,443 children passed in the National schools in Irish last year. Does anyone believe that our own language will become unintelligible in that country? With all the efforts which have been made there has been very little progress. I could give an illustration of the progress which has been made from this same report. There is a phrase, the pronunciation of which I will not attempt to give, but the meaning of which is, "The chest was full of meal at the time of their marriage." These are some of the translations of that sentence given by the children: "The cup of their happiness was full at the time of their marriage"; "their conversation was filled with sweet honey while they were married"; "they filled their box with fine linen on their marriage"; "the country was full of oats when they were married"; "the cupboard was full of wine at the completion of their marriage"; "the coffin was filled with meal during their marriage"; and, lastly, "the company was filled with surprise at the duration of their marriage." For an Irish child, that is a novel, one might almost say a hill-top novel, view of the marriage tie.

If that be the progress which has been made, I think my honourable friends may reckon on attending Punches-town races or the horse show without any danger of making a mistake in a bargain owing to unfamiliarity with the language in Ireland. The only difficulty, I think, in dealing with this question is to keep politics out of it. I have not altogether succeeded in doing so myself, because a moment or two back I let fall the remark that it was difficult to refuse to Ireland that which we have accorded to Scotland and Wales. But need we dread any dire political consequences even from the spread of what is called "the Celtic Renaissance"? The hon. Member for Waterford will forgive me for reminding him that the leaders of that movement are quite impartial in the attentions they pay, whether to the Chief Secretary or to the leader of the Irish Nationalist party. In a very interesting publication of theirs I find this statement by one of the standard-bearers of the Celtic Renaissance;

"Politics is not nationality, and the nineteenth century has been for Ireland mainly a century of humbug."

He writes elsewhere that;

"Ireland during the last century has in many vital matters played the fool."

Some of the standard-bearers of the Celtic Renaissance may believe that English will shortly be unintelligible in Ireland, but nobody else does. The hon. Member for the Harbour Division of Dublin, speaking last year, said that the Irish were not so far advanced in lunacy as that. The bread and butter argument, does come in, and nobody means to throw away such a good industrial and commercial asset as the English language. What the Irish want is, as I have said, that the

children who cannot be taught through English should be taught through Irish, and that Irish should be taught in the schools as a special subject which is calculated to elicit those intellectual qualities which everybody must allow to Irish children. That is the practical question. Is the study of Irish, even of ancient Irish history, or even, if you will, of ancient Irish legend, a good or a bad subject for eliciting these qualities? I happen to think that it is a good subject, and I do not believe that the political consequences would be very harmful. Suppose they do go back a little further in history. I have sometimes ventured to think it a pity that all Irish history, even the rebel history of Mitchell, seems to begin with the Treaty of Limerick, about 1690. Yet centuries before that the Irish illuminated the "Book of Kells" and won the battle of Clontarf. If Irish children read some of the publications of the Celtic Renaissance I venture to say that they will find that the Ireland long before what hon. Members call "the pernicious influence of British rule" was not as totally different from the Ireland of to-day as they have been led to believe. I do not know whether I may refer to a poem. The hon. Member who preceded me did so, and I wish that I could repeat it with the same charm. It is a very interesting poetical account given of a visit paid to Ireland by a king of Northumbria, a little before the time of the Venerable Bede. It says;

"I found in Ulster, from hill to glen,  
Hardy warriors, resolute men."

Those are what we find there still.

"I found in Leinster nourishing pastures."

I hope to use that some day in a debate upon grass-lands.

"I found in Meath's fair principality

Virtue, vigour, and hospitality."

I have admired the vigour of Meath in the hunting field, and I have enjoyed its hospitality. And, lastly;

"I also found in Armagh the splendid Meekness, wisdom, and prudence blended."

Everybody will recognise in that a portrait painted in anticipation of my right hon. and gallant friend the Member for North Armagh. Now, Sir, are the consequences of studying the literature of the Celtic Renaissance so very desperate? If the result of such instruction should be that in fifty or a hundred years; though that is a sanguine forecast; Irish lads were to abandon the practice of singing upon certain anniversaries spirited ditties which enjoin the propriety of kicking the Crown or the Pope into this or that river, and to prefer instead to recite some of the publications of the Celtic Renaissance; for instance;

"Oh, where, Kincora, is Brian the great,  
Where is the Beauty that once was thine,  
Where are the Princes and nobles that sate  
To feast in thine halls and drink the red wine?  
Where, oh, Kincora?"

For the life of me I cannot see that such a change in the national taste for ballads would be politically deleterious. A belief in legendary grandeur does not; witness the Scots; impair the utilitarian aptitudes of a race. You would not

make a Scotsman into a better engineer by confiscating his heirlooms. The Irish language is an heirloom of the Irish. Its usefulness may not be immediately obvious; but that is true of most heirloom and household gods. And yet a tutelary reverence for household gods has often nerved heart and hand for purely utilitarian contests. There is no heresy to the Union in permitting to Ireland that which we promote in Scotland and in Wales; on the contrary, it is an article of the Unionist creed that within the ambit of the Empire there shall be room for the co-operation of races, maintaining each a memory of its own past as a point of departure for converging assaults on the problems of the future. Therefore I really see no objection to the motion at all.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I have not risen with any kind of desire to continue this discussion, but I have risen simply for the purpose of congratulating the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary upon his exceedingly witty and charming speech. It is one of the most delightful speeches I have ever listened

to in this House. What I desire chiefly to congratulate him upon is that underneath the lightness of touch and the wit of his speech there was evident to the House a sincere sympathy with the object we have in view. The right hon. Gentleman has accepted the resolution which has been proposed by us, and I cannot help feeling that the movement in favour of which we have spoken here to-night will gain immeasurably by the speech of the right hon. Gentleman. If there was any danger of the National Board of Education halting upon the road in which they have embarked in this matter, I feel sure that the courageous words of the right hon. Gentleman will encourage them in following out the course they have entered upon, and it will enable Irish to be taught in school hours in the ordinary districts of Ireland, thus introducing the system of bilingual teaching into those districts where Irish is the house language of the people. Although I admit that the right hon. Gentleman is justified in saying that this resolution cannot be held to be in the nature of a mandate to the Treasury to provide additional funds, at the same time he must recognise that it would be impossible to carry out the good intentions he has enunciated, and fulfil the policy he has approved, unless, in the words of the resolution, in the future "special facilities be afforded for training teachers to meet the demand for the teaching of Irish throughout Ireland." It would be wrong for me to say anything further than this, and I am heartily glad that the opportunity has been afforded me of congratulating the right hon. Gentleman not only upon his rhetorical triumph, but also upon the general sympathy with our object he has shown in his speech, which I am sure will be received in Ireland with feelings of great gratification.

Question put, and agreed to.

WELSH DISESTABLISHMENT.

\*MR. OSMOND WILLIAMS (Merionethshire): If the circumstances of a country were such that a Government could with propriety give religious instruction to a people, we have it on the authority of Lord Macaulay and Bishop Warburton that the religion that ought to be taught should, without doubt, be that of the majority, and on behalf of

the vast majority of Welsh people of the Principality I beg to move the resolution standing in my name. I maintain that no Church can justify its position as an Established Church unless it is the Church of the majority. As a Welshman, and as a representative of a Welsh constituency, I know perfectly well that the Established Church in Wales at the present time is not in any shape or form the national Church of the country. If we Welshmen had our way, this question of Disestablishment would be settled on a fair and equitable basis before many months were over. And it is, perhaps, because hitherto Welshmen have not insisted upon having their share in the attention of Government and Parliament, which they ought to have had, that this question has remained so long unsettled. I take it that no man with any fairness would desire that any church should be supported by an unwilling population, and I can conceive no position more detrimental to any church or to any religion than that it should be dependent for its existence upon conditions of that sort, and I beg formally to move my Amendment.

\*MR. WILLIAM JONES (Carnarvonshire, Arfon): On national and religious-grounds, I beg to second this motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, as the Church of England in Wales has failed to fulfil its professed object as a means of promoting the religious interests of the Welsh people, and ministers to only a small minority of the population, its continuance as an Established Church in the Principality is an anomaly and an injustice which ought no longer to exist."; (Mr. Osmond Williams.)

MR. BANBURY (Camberwell, Peckham): The hon. Gentleman who moved this motion stated that he was surprised that this question had received so little attention from Parliament during the last few years. I had the honour of sitting in the Parliament of 1892 when, I believe, we devoted something like three or four weeks to discussing this question, and now the hon. Gentleman opposite is apparently under the impression that three or four minutes will suffice; It being midnight, the debate stood adjourned.

Adjourned at two minutes after Twelve of the clock.