

<https://api.parliament.uk/historic-hansard/sittings/1901/mar/15>

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

Friday, 15th March, 1901.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

STANDING ORDERS AMENDMENT. (BY ORDER.)

Standing Order 134c read.

\*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS (Mr. J. W. LOWTHER, Cumberland, Penrith):

Perhaps I may be allowed

to shortly explain the object of the Amendment I have to propose in this Standing Order. It has been represented to me that in regard to the laying of trams along main roads, it is possible that the interests of the county council and of the urban district authority may clash, and that it is desirable that the county council, which at present has no locus standi, should be given the right to appear against tramway schemes proposed to be laid along main roads for which the county is responsible.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): Will this apply to Ireland also?

\*MR. J. W. LOWTHER: Yes.

Standing Order amended, in line 3. by inserting, after the word "affected," the letter (A).

In line 5, by inserting, after the word "county," the words "or (B) by the provisions of any Bill proposing to authorise the construction or reconstruction of any tramway along any main road, or along any other road to the maintenance and repair of which the county council contributes, within the administrative county."

Standing Order 170A read.

\*MR. J. W. LOWTHER: This raises a somewhat different point. It applies to cases in which a corporation is going to construct or work tramways outside its own area. The Standing Order lays down certain conditions, one of which is that the Committee should insert in the Bill a clause enabling the local authority, to purchase the tramways at the end of twenty-one years. It has been found, especially in the case of electric trams, that twenty-one years is not a sufficient period. Engineers put the life of an electric tram at forty-two years, and we propose to amend the Standing Order accordingly of course forty-two years will be an outside limit.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): Will this also apply to Ireland?

\*MR. J. W. LOWTHER: Yes, Sir.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil) asked if there was any special reason why the period should be extended from twenty-one to forty-two years? It seemed to be a tremendous difference.

\*MR. J. W. LOWTHER: I am afraid I have not made myself quite clear. The reason is this. In the year 1870, when the Tramways Act was passed, twenty-one years was taken as the life of a tram way. At that time only horse tramways existed, but at the present time many corporations are laying down electric trams, and the expense connected with the installation of these is so large that it has been found not to be worth while to lay them down unless for an extended period. If they have to sell them at the end of twenty-one years they are losers by the transaction.

DR. MAONAMARA (Camberwell, N.): In what sense do you mean the word "corporation"? Is it to be taken in its technical sense, or will it include a private company trading as the tramway company?

\*MR. J. W. LOWTHER: It is intended to cover the cases of municipal corporations.

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.): Then you are making a difference between corporations and private companies.

MR. CAINE (Cornwall, Camborne): Are we to understand that this extension of time would not be granted to a private company?

\*MR. J. W. LOWTHER: A private company would get whatever terms the Committee chose to give it. This Amendment relates only to the Standing Order which deals with municipal corporations constructing tramways outside their own areas.

Standing Order amended, in line 17, by leaving out, after the word "substitute," the words "shorter periods for the periods," and inserting the words "a period not exceeding forty-two years for the period of twenty-one years.";(The Chairman of Ways and Means.)

GREAT EASTERN RAILWAY BILL.

(BY ORDER.)

MR. TULLY said he wished to move the Instruction standing on the Paper in his name in regard to this Bill. The words he wished to have omitted dealt with the proposal of the company to acquire certain common lands in the urban district of Tottenham. Some year ago the Tottenham Urban District Council secured the passing of an Act of Parliament which gave them the right to certain common lands to be used as a recreation ground, but the Great Eastern Railway Company now proposed to take away those rights. This was a very serious matter. This company, like other companies, seemed to wish to deal with the public in a very arbitrary manner. Its Bill was pock-marked with proposals to interfere with public rights over footpaths and common lands. This was the first clause which suggested such an interference, and, unless the hon. Member for Lewisham, who was in charge of the Bill, could give a guarantee that a similar quantity of land in the same neighbourhood would be handed over to the Tottenham Urban District Council to be used as a recreation ground, he should feel bound to press his opposition to a division. The company were acting in an arbitrary and high-handed manner, and, if the proposals contained in the Bill were sanctioned, he submitted that there would be a most unfair interference with public rights.

MR. DOOGAN (Tyrone, E.) seconded.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it be an Instruction to the Committee, when dealing with Clause 10, page 8, line 3, to leave out from 'In,' to

'thereabouts', in line 15 (inclusive).;(Mr. Tally.)

MR. PENN (Lewisham) said the history of the case might be put in a nutshell. The company required, for the widening of its lines, just over an acre of land, which, as the hon. Member had stated, was common land. The company were at present in negotiation with the Tottenham Urban District Council in regard to the terms on which they should have this land, and they were on the eve of a satisfactory settlement. The Tottenham Urban District Council had very properly lodged a petition against the Bill in order that it might have a locus standi when the Bill went before a Committee, where the whole matter could be threshed out. The suggestion that the company should give an equal amount of land was scarcely applicable to this case. Prima facie, of course, it was undesirable that the area of recreation grounds in populous localities should be diminished, but this case stood on a very different footing. The ground proposed to be taken was rough common ground, which, in the ordinary sense, could not be termed a recreation ground; and what he understood would be done was to devote the money which the company proposed to pay for this acre of land to improving and laying out the remainder of the common land. This would be a great benefit to the locality, and he trusted the House would realise, from what he had said, that so far from the company desiring to act in a highhanded manner, they were anxious to do their best in the public interest.

MR. CAINE said it was all very well to suggest that the matter could be threshed out upstairs, but he wished to point out that that would involve the Tottenham Urban District Council in considerable expense. This was a matter which could well be settled on the floor of the House. There was no part of London to which working people were flocking in larger numbers. There was also no part of the Metropolis so short of open spaces. Tottenham was almost entirely inhabited by working classes; by unskilled rather than by skilled labourers; and he would remind the House that between 4.45 a.m. and 5.15 a.m. each week-day something like 4,000 of these men travelled from

Tottenham into London for their work. It would easily be understood therefore that there was a strong feeling, on this side of the House at any rate, against the action of railway companies in taking away land already allocated for public purposes, and he hoped that the mover of the Instruction would divide upon it unless he got an ample assurance that other land would be given in exchange for it, and that, if possible, the area of this piece of common land should not be reduced.

\*MR. J. W. LOWTHER said the point of difference was this, that it was agreed that if the railway company took this land other land would be substituted for it. That was agreed to by both the railway company and the Tottenham District Council.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.) said he understood the hon. Gentleman to say that the railway company was to pay money for the land taken to the district council, which money was to be used in improving land at present in their possession.

\*MR. J. W. LOWTHER said that the Report of the Board of Agriculture, to which any Committee to which this Bill would be remitted would attribute the greatest

importance, very distinctly stated that in their opinion the ordinary rule which required a railway company to substitute other land would not be so beneficial for the district as would be the payment of a sum of money to the district council to be applied by them in the purchase of additional land for recreation purposes or for the improvement or enlargement of existing recreation grounds in the district. As the Tottenham District Council was an elected body, surely they might be trusted to decide as to how best to meet the requirements of their own district. He should have thought they were a much better body for that purpose than the railway company, and it would be advisable to leave to them the decision as to what additional land, if any, they were to purchase, or what improvements were to be made on existing recreation grounds.]

SIR JOHN BRUNNER (Cheshire, Northwich) said that the land at Tottenham was of very small value, and a very small amount of money would be given for it; but when the district council came to buy other land they would have to pay a very large sum. It seemed to him that the purchase of the necessary land ought to be imposed on the railway company and not on the council.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said there was another point. The House viewed with great suspicion any attempt to take away open spaces by any company, more especially a railway company. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Lewisham spoke of the necessity of taking this land to widen the lines, but Clause 10 showed that the land was required not for that purpose, but for purposes of minor moment. The railway company might take land, therefore, at some other spot, and not necessarily at this particular spot. Unless the hon. Gentleman gave the House some assurance that the same space of land would be given in place of that taken, he would vote for the Instruction.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil) said there was in London an association known as the "Commons and Footpaths Preservation Society" to which many hon. Members belonged and subscribed, and which performed a very useful and necessary work in preserving playgrounds and recreation grounds in and around London. The executive of that association had considered this Bill, and had passed a resolution that a clause should be inserted providing that the railway company should secure for the Totten-

AYES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.

Crean, Eugene

Gilhooly, James

Allan, William (Gateshead)

Crombie, John William

Gurdon, Sir William Brampton

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

Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)

Hammond, John

Ashton, Thomas Gair

Delany, William

Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)

Austin, Sir John

Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles  
Harwood, George  
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)  
Donelan, Captain A.  
Hayden, John Patrick  
Bell, Richard  
Doogan, P. C.  
Hayne, Rt-Hon. Charles Seale-  
Blake, Edward  
Dully, William J.  
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.  
Boland, John  
Edwards, Frank  
Holland, William Henry  
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.  
Farquharson, Dr. Robert  
Hope, John Deans(Fife, West)  
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson  
Fenwick, Charles  
Horniman, Frederick John  
Burt, Thomas  
Ffrench, Peter  
Jacoby, James Alfred  
Buxton, Sydney Charles  
Field, William  
Jameson, Major J. Eustace  
Caldwell, James  
Flannery, Sir Fortescue  
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Flavin, Michael Joseph  
Jordan, Jeremiah  
Carvill, Patrick G. Hamilton  
Flynn, James Christopher  
Joyce, Michael  
Clancy, John Joseph  
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co)  
Kearley, Hudson E.  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Furness, Sir Christopher  
Kennedy, Patrick James

ham District Council a similar area of land in lieu of that proposed to be taken away. He trusted the hon. Member for Lewisham would give an assurance that not only compensation would be paid to the Tottenham District Council for the land taken, but that an area of land equal to that taken would be given for playgrounds for the children.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) said that every airhole stopped up in London was a detriment to the surrounding districts. He had a considerable interest in a district in the neighbourhood of Tottenham, and he hoped the railway company would not be allowed to take this land without substituting a similar area of land for it.

SIR. BLUNDELL MAPLE (Camberwell, Dulwich) thought the question was not thoroughly understood. The population in this district was increasing enormously, and the railway company were, for the safety of the travelling public, compelled to get land for increasing the size of the lines. The railway company were perfectly prepared to pay to the district council what was right and proper for the land, and the details could be discussed in Committee upstairs. If the time of the House was to be consumed in discussing petty details of private Bills there would be none left for the consideration of national and Imperial affairs.

Question put.

The House divided:;Ayes, 110; Noes, 133. (Division List No. 66.)

Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth

Norton, Capt. Cecil William

Roche, John

Lambert, George

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

Shipman, Dr. John G.

Langley, Batty

O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid)

Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)

Layland-Barratt, Francis

O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)

Soares, Ernest J.

Leamy, Edmund

O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)

Spencer, Rt Hn C. R(Northants)

Leng, Sir John

O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)

Strachey, Edward

Levy, Maurice

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

Sullivan, Donal

Lewis, John Herbert

O'Dowd, John

Tennant, Harold John

Lough, Thomas

O'Kelly, J. (Roscommon, N.)

Thompson, E. C. (Monaghan, N.

Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.

O'Malley, William

Wallace, Robert

M'Hugh, Patrick A.  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)  
M'Kenna, Reginald  
O'Shee, James John  
Warner, Thos. Courtenay T.  
Markham, Arthur Basil  
Partington, Oswald  
Wason, E. (Clackmannan)  
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William  
Paulton, James Mellor  
White, Luke (York, E. R.)  
Mooney, John J.  
Pirie, Duncan V.  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)  
Priestley, Arthur  
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)  
Murnughan, George  
Reddy, M.  
Newnes, Sir George  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Mr. Tully and Mr. Caine.  
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)  
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)  
NOES.  
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. E.  
Hain, Edward  
Pilkington, Richard  
Aird, Sir John  
Halsey, Thomas Frederick  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Allsopp, Hon. George  
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd.  
Purvis, Robert  
Anstruther, H. T.  
Haslett, Sir James Horner  
Bandies, John S.  
Arcbdale, Edward Mervyn  
Heath, James (Staffords., N. W.  
Rasch, Major Frederic Came  
Bailey, James (Walworth)  
Hogg, Lindsay  
Reid, James (Greenock)

Bain, Colonel James Robert  
Hope, JF (Sheffield, Brightside  
Renshaw, Charles Bine  
Balfour Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds  
Horner, Frederick William  
Rentoul, James Alexander  
Balfour, Maj K. R (Christch'ch)  
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry  
Renwick, George  
Bartley, George C. T.  
Howard, Capt J (Kent, Faversh.  
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Staly bridge  
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin  
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil  
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. T.  
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol  
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick  
Ropner, Colonel Robert  
Bignold, Arthur  
Johnston, William (Belfast)  
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter-  
Boulnois, Edmund  
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)  
Round, James  
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu  
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W (Salop)  
Royds, Clement Molyneux  
Carlile, William Walter  
Kimber, Henry  
Russell, T. W.  
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lanes.)  
Kitson, Sir James  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)  
Laurie, Lieut.-General  
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Lawson, John Grant  
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.  
Lee, Capt. AH,(Hants. Fareh'm  
Sharpe, William Edward T.  
Chamberlain, J. Austen(Worc.  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)  
Charrington, Spencer



Leighton, Stanley  
Skewes-Cox, Thomas  
Churchill, Winston Spencer  
Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham  
Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks.)  
Cochrane, Hon. Thos H. A. E.  
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter(Bristol, S  
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)  
Coghill, Douglas Barry  
Lonsdale, John Brownlee  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Cohen, Benjamin Louis  
Lowther, Rt. Hn. W. (Cum. Pen  
Stevenson, Francis S.  
Col lings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)  
Stroyan, John  
Colomb, Sir John C. Ready  
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth  
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison  
Thomas, J. A. Glam., Cower  
Cripps, Charles Alfred  
Macdona, John Gumming  
Thorburn, Sir Walter  
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton  
Maconochie, A. W.  
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray  
Dickson, Charles Scott  
M'lver, Sir Lewis (Edirb'gh, W  
Valentia, Viscount  
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.  
Malcolm, Ian  
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H  
Doxford, Sir William Theodore  
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H E(Wigt'n.  
Warr, Augustus Frederick  
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin  
Mildmay, Francis Bingham  
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney  
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton  
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)  
Welby, Lt.-Col ACE (Taunton)  
Fardell, Sir T. George  
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)

Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd  
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edwd.  
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.  
Willox, Sir John Archibald  
Finch, George H.

Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)  
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)  
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C.B. Stuart-  
Fletcher, Sir Henry

Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)  
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong  
Flower, Ernest

Nicol, Donald Ninian

Garfit, William

O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens

TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Mr. Penn and Mr. Banbury.

Gibbs, Hon. V. (St. Albans)

Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay

Gordon, Maj Evans-(Tr.H'ml'ts

Parker, Gilbert

Grant, Come

Peel. Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley

The following Instructions also appeared on the Paper::

(MR. FLAVIN.); That it be an instruction to the Committee, in Clause 23, line 4. to leave out "twenty or more," and insert "any."

(Mr. KEIR HARDIE.); That it be an

Instruction to the Committee to insert the following Clause::

"It shall not be lawful for the Company by any rule, bye-law, or order, to in any way restrain, or punish, or dismiss any person in their service from acting or for having acted as an elected member of any public body, or for acting in the interest of any registered trade union, co-operative society, benefit society, or of any lawful organisation in which such person has an interest, during the hours in which such person is not bound by the terms of his contract of engagement with the Company to devote himself to the Company's service."

(Mr. JOYCE.); That it be an Instruction to the Committee to insert the following Clause::

"All works and undertakings carried out by the Company under the provisions of this Act shall be subject to the terms and conditions set forth in the Fair Wages Resolution of the House of Commons in all respects as if such works and undertakings were a Government contract, and any failure to observe this condition shall subject the Company to a penalty of twenty-live pounds for each day over which the offence lasts, such penalty to be recoverable by the workmen affected or by any registered trades union whom said workmen may authorise to act in their name."

(Mr. J. P. FARRELL.); That it be an Instruction to the Committee to insert the following Clause;

"Where the Company propose to erect dwellings outside London under the provisions of this Act they shall issue free of cost a pass to enable tenants of such dwellings to travel to and from the station nearest the new dwellings to that nearest their former residence."

\*MR. SPEAKER: The next Inst motion standing on the Paper, in the name of the hon. Member for North Kerry, is not in order. It proposes to give a mandatory direction to the Select Committee to set aside the form of clause which is prescribed by the Standing Order with regard to houses of the working classes. That is altogether an abuse of the use of Instructions. The next three Instructions, standing in the names of the hon. Members for Merthyr Tydvil, Limerick, and North Longford, are out of order because they seek to take the occasion of a private Bill and the time of private business to discuss general questions which apply equally to all railways.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.) asked by what means were railway companies to be compelled to give proper housing accommodation.

\*MR. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

MR. KEIR HARDIE inquired under what circumstances and conditions would it be in order to introduce the question raised by his Instruction.

\*MR. SPEAKER: It would be in order in a resolution on a Tuesday. It would be in order on a public Bill dealing with the question, but it is not in order upon a private Bill affecting a particular private company.

MR. KEIR HARDIE said that the Instruction was intended to deal with a particular order issued by the Great Eastern Railway Company, and which, so far as he knew, had never been issued by any other company.

\*MR. SPEAKER: That is altogether foreign to the purpose of the present Rill.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 62 COMPLIED WITH).

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

Midland Railway Bill.

Torrington and Okehampton Railway Bill.

Tottenham and Hampstead Junction Railway Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

PRIVATE RILLS (STANDING ORDER 63 COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills. That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof. Standing Order No. 63 has been complied with, namely;;  
Long Eaton Gas Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

PROVISIONAL. ORDER HILLS (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).

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

Paisley Gas Provisional Order Bill.

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

PRIVATE LEGISLATION PROCEDURE (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1899.

The CHAIRMAN of WAYS and MEANS presented Report by the Chairman of Committees of the House of Lords and the Chairman of Ways and Means in the House of Commons;"That the General Orders not complied with in respect of the following Provisional Orders;;

Ayr County Buildings,

Paisley District Tramways,

ought, to be dispensed with and the Orders allowed to proceed."

Report to lie upon the Table.

PETITIONS.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (HIGHER GRADE AND EVENING CONTINUATION SCHOOLS).

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

INHABITED HOUSE DUTY AND INCOME TAX.

Petitions for alteration of Law, from City of London; and Manchester; to lie upon the Table.

PARLIAMENTARY FRANCHISE.

Petition from Cheltenham, for extension to women; to lie upon the Table.

POOR LAW OFFICERS SUPERANNUATION ACT. 1896.

Petition from Ince-in-Makerfield, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN RILL.

Petitions in favour, from Sheffield (twenty): Norton; Widmore (two);

Tuxford; Prestonpans; Clitheroe; London (eight); Newhaven; Disley; San-lely;

Cupar; Kidderminster (two); Brecon; Leith; Lower Wortley; Yorkshire;

Petersfield; Bethania; Llwynypia; Holmesdale; Nottingham; Glasgow; Cardiff;

Chorlton-cum-Hardy (four); Chertsey; York; Stockton-on-Tees (four);

Sittingbourne; Stretford; Whiteinch; Aberdeen (four); Bromley; St. Austell;

Manchester; Camberwell; Bute; Bath (two); Norwood; Rotherham; Chichester;

Wigton; Manningtree; Liverpool (five); Brechin; Chryston; Perth; Perkins Beach;

Gotldhurst; Leeds; Congleton; Cinderford; Thornaby-on-Tees (two); Greenock;

Birmingham (four); Stone Broom; Edinburgh (two); Cupar Angus; Shettleston;

Carlisle (six); Rotherham; Masbrough; Greasbrough; Driffield; Kensington;

Swansea; and Zetland; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Denny and Dunipale; North Berwick; Dryfesdale;

Kirmahoe; Gladsmuir; Lockerbie Ferryden; Cupar (two); Inverness; Ross-shire;

Duns; Whithorn; Dunoon; Wemyss; Govan; Gartley; Huntly; Edinburgh; Blairgowrie

and Rattray; Kirriemuir; Monifieth; Aberdeen; and Dollar; to lie upon the Table.

SOVEREIGN'S OATH ON ACCESSION BILL

Petitions against, from Dunfermline; and Alloa; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PARLIAMENTARY CONSTITUENCIES (ELECTORS, ETC.) (UNITED KINGDOM).

Return presented, relative thereto (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No.

116. of Session 1900) [Address 15th February: Sir Charles Dilke]; to lie upon

the Table, and to be printed. [No. 85.]

## MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS (INCORPORATION OF WALLSEND).

Copy presented, of Charter of Incorporation of the borough of Wallsend, dated 12th March. 1001 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

## CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS (SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1900&#x2013;1901).

Copy presented, of a revised Estimate of the further sum required to be voted for the service of the year ending 31st March, 1901 [by Command]; referred to the Committee of Supply, and to be printed. [No. 84.]

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

Inquiry into Charities (County of Lancaster).;Further Return relative thereto [ordered 8th August, 1898: Mr. Grant Lawson]; to be printed. [No. 86.]

## EAST INDIA (PETITIONS OF OFFICERS OF PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT).

Address for "Return showing the number of Petitions which have been received during the past fifteen years, either by the Government of India or by the Secretary of State for India, from the officers of the Public Works Department who entered the Royal Indian Engineering College, Coopers Hill, during the first five years of its existence, the said Petitions containing, it is believed, representations to the effect that the terms under which they had been engaged had not been adhered to, and that their careers and prospects were thereby ruined or very seriously affected; also of the number and nature and date of the replies to these officers." ;(Mr. Kimber.)

## SOUTH AFRICA (NAVAL BRIGADE).

Address for "Copies of Despatches in regard to the Naval Brigade in South Africa which were published in the London Gazette of the 12th instant.";(Sir James Fergusson.)

## CIVIL LIST.

Leave given to the Select Committee to make a Special Report.

Special Report brought up and read as followeth;;

"The attention of your Committee has been called to the publication in The Times newspaper of 14th March of a statement purporting to represent proposals contained in the papers marked

Confidential referred to your Committee, and to a Report of their proceedings on 13th March.

"They are unable to ascertain in what manner this can have been divulged.

"They recommend that Mr. Speaker, to whom the authority of the House in such matters is delegated, do take such steps, either by the exclusion of the representative of The Times from the inner lobbies of the House, or otherwise, as may seem to him best calculated to prevent such publication in future."

Special Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 87.]

\*MR. SPEAKER: The House will not expect me to say more at present than that I shall at the earliest moment take into consideration the recommendations of the Committee, with a view to doing what I think best for attaining the object they have in view.

## ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

## QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR;RELIEF TO SUFFERERS AFTER THE WAR.

\*MR. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can inform the House whether there will be an organisation in South Africa with its machinery in such order that, upon peace being declared, it will be in a position to promptly give help to needy loyalists who have suffered owing to the war, and to needy Boers; and, if so, whether such help will be a charge to the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies; and whether he can state the basis upon which such help will be given.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): The organisation of a suitable machinery is under consideration, but I am not in a position to make any further statement at present beyond saying that it is intended that the assistance should be a charge upon the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies.

PAARDEBERG;GENERAL COLVILE'S REPORT.

MR. ALLEN (Gloucestershire, Stroud): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is willing to publish the report sent by General Colvile to the Commander-in-Chief on the battle of Paardeberg, as he did the corresponding report of General Kelly-Kenny.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): No report was received by Lord Roberts from General Colvile, who held only a divisional command at Paardeberg. By the King's Regulations reports describing the action taken by their respective commands are furnished to the senior officer present by officers commanding divisions or brigades, and by such other officers as he may specially call upon: these reports do not accompany the despatch, the senior officer being alone responsible for rendering to the Secretary of State for War an account of the operations. Under these circumstances this report cannot be laid.

MR. ALLEN: Do I understand that no such report was sent to the Commander-in-Chief?

MR. BRODRICK: NO, Sir; certainly no report was sent to the Commander-in-Chief. A report was sent to General Kelly-Kenny. It was not forwarded to the Commander-in-Chief.

GENERAL COLVILE'S RECALL.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether Lord Roberts's despatch of the 19th July, 1900, was before Lord Lansdowne when he reinstated General Colvile in the command at Gibraltar; also if he can state why Lord Roberts's despatch was not issued before instead of after the debate on General Colvile's case; and whether he will lay upon the Table of the House the finding of the Court of Inquiry into the Lindley disaster, which was the reason given for the recall of General Colvile.

\*MR. BRODRICK: Lord Roberts's despatch was received at the War Office before Lord Wolseley recommended the reinstatement of General Colvile at Gibraltar. It is not customary to lay Reports upon individual officers on the Table of the House unless they are quoted or specially moved for, and in this case I should not have thought it fair to General Colvile to depart from the rule in order to justify my action. I quoted from the Paper on Monday last and laid it at once. There is no objection to laying the finding of the Court of

Inquiry which investigated the circumstances of the surrender at Lindley.

MR. LAMBERT: When will it be laid on the Table?

\*MR. BRODRICK: In a day or two.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham): On what ground, if this finding is laid on the Table, are the findings of other Courts not to be laid on the Table?

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; That is a matter of argument.

LADYSMLTH CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. YERBURGH (Chester): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will lay upon the Table of the House all the communications, whether by correspondence, messenger, or heliogram, that passed between Sir Redvers Buller and Sir George White relative to the siege of Ladysmith.

\*MR. BRODRICK: No, Sir; it is not the custom to publish such communications.

YEOMANRY TRAINING CONDITIONS.

\*MR. CARLILE (Buckinghamshire, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state what the conditions of training for Yeomanry regiments will be this year, whether specially under canvas or not, and of what duration it is likely to be, so that commanding officers may make their arrangements accordingly.

\*MR. BRODRICK: As I stated yesterday, an Army Order on this subject will shortly be issued.

IMPERIAL YEOMANRY; FIFE AND FORFAR CONTINGENTS.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that the original Fife and Forfar Volunteer contingent of the Imperial Yeomanry, who went out 125 strong, have been reduced by death, disease, and physical weakness to under twenty men now in active service in South Africa; and whether there is a prospect of this remnant, who enlisted fifteen months ago, being enabled to return to their professions and occupations at an early date.

\*MR. BRODRICK: Some companies of the Yeomanry have, I know, been very much reduced, but we are not aware of the exact strength of the company referred to. It is not possible to state when the operations in South Africa will permit of the return home of these men, but Lord Kitchener is now endeavouring to spare the men whose losses are the hardest.

GERMAN-MADE FIELD GUNS.

\*MR. RENWICK (Newcastle-on-Tyne): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state the nature of the defects in the German-made field guns; also how long will the repairs of the defects occupy; and if it is usual to find similar defects in guns made by British manufacturers.

\*MR. BRODRICK: I have already described to the House the nature of the defects found in the carriages of the field guns recently obtained from Germany. The repairs are being carried out with all due expedition. German firms are not unique in having trouble with the axles of gun carriages.

\*MR. RENWICK: Is it not the fact that before these defects are remedied the total time occupied will have exceeded that which would have been taken had the orders been given to British firms?

[No answer was returned.]

#### PAY OF CIVILIAN DOCTORS AND VETERINARY SURGEONS AT HOME STATIONS.

MR. HANDLES (Cumberland, Cocker-mouth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, having regard to the fact that the civilian veterinary surgeons at home stations during the war emergency

are drawing pay at the rate of £;250 per annum and allowances, which brings their pay to over £;30 per month, and receive a gratuity of two months pay after twelve months employment, and an extra month's salary for each additional six months service, can he state what increase of salary and gratuity the Government propose paying those civilian medical practitioners who have been engaged at Home stations for the last twelve months and upwards at a salary of only £;270 per annum; and, can he explain why the gratuity of £;100 for the first year of service with troops at home and £;50 for the succeeding years award to civilian medical practitioners holding commissions as medical officers to Volunteer corps and Militia regiments has been refused to the civilian medical practitioners who offered their services during the war, seeing that the rate of pay to the civil surgeons proceeding to South Africa has been increased from one guinea to one and a-half guineas per diem with same allowances and gratuity.

\*THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): In regard to the first paragraph the civilian surgeons and veterinary surgeons employed at home stations are paid at army rates and there is no intention of making any alteration in their pay. In regard to the second paragraph, medical officers belonging to the Militia and Volunteers are treated as officers under Army rules, while private medical practitioners are treated according to the terms on which they engage.

#### ALLOWANCES TO CIVIL SURGEONS WITH THE FIELD FORCE.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that civil surgeons attached to the Field Force in South Africa do not receive Colonial allowance; and, in view of the fact that the cost of living at the seat of war entails heavy expense, will he consider the expediency of increasing the allowances of these officers.

\*LORD STANLEY: I have nothing to add to the full reply given by my right hon. friend the Chief Secretary to a question on this subject put by my friend the Member for the Clapham Division on the 7th August, 1900.

#### MILITIA NON-COMMISSIONED OFFICERS AND THE AVAR.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state whether non-commissioned officers of Militia on active service in South Africa retain their Militia rank and the pay attaching to that rank; and, if not, will he state why these non-commissioned officers are degraded after volunteering to go on active service.

\*LORD STANLEY: Non-commissioned officers of Militia regiments which volunteer to proceed to South Africa or elsewhere retain their Militia rank. The Militia Reservist who is called up under the Reserve Forces Act joins the Army in the rank of private unless he held the rank of non-commissioned officer on discharge from the Regular forces.

#### LONDON SCOTTISH VOLUNTEERS.



MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state whether the detachment of London Scottish Volunteers who sailed from Liverpool for the seat of war in South Africa on the 12th instant were enrolled on the understanding that they would relieve the London Scottish Volunteer detachment which has been on service in South Africa for upwards of a year; and, will this detachment return home so soon as the men now going out reach their destination.

\*LORD STANLEY: The detachment mentioned sailed on the 12th instant. The company of Gordon Highlanders now in South Africa is intended to return when the new company arrives, but as I told the hon. Member before, it is not possible to say exactly when Lord Kitchener will be able, to spare them.

MR WEIR: Will the noble Lord answer the latter part of the question?

\*LORD STANLEY: I am not in a position to do so.

&#x2013; See The Parliamentary Debates [Fourth Series]. Vol. lxxxvii., p. 913.

#### CHAIRS FOR MILITARY HOSPITALS

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will consider the advisability of replacing the barrack forms without backs now used in the wards of military hospitals by chairs, so that each patient may have one chair.

\*LORD STANLEY: The question has been under consideration, but is not finally settled.

#### PURCHASES OF MUNITIONS OF WAR ABROAD.

MR. BATTY LANGLEY (Sheffield, Attercliffe): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office if he can state how much has been spent during the present financial year in purchasing foreign-made guns and munitions of war.

\*LORD STANLEY: These figures can only be given when the accounts are made up.

#### SWISS MILITARY SYSTEM.

MR. YERBURGH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can furnish the House with such information as the War Office possesses with regard to the military system of Switzer land as is not of a confidential character

LORD STANLEY: The handbook of the Swiss Army published by the Intelligence Division of the War Office will give my hon. friend all the information he requires. The book can be obtained through any bookseller, and the price is sixpence.

MR. YERBUEGH: In what year was the book published?

LORD STANLEY: I cannot say, but I will show my hon. friend a copy.

MR. YERBURGH: Will the War Office issue it in a cheaper form, so that the general public may be able to study it?

LORD STANLEY: No, Sir, I cannot undertake to do anything of the kind.

#### SOLDIERS PENSIONS;CASE OF HENRY BEATTY, LATE 102ND FOOT.

MR. CLANCY (Dublin Co, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been directed to the case of a man named Henry Beatty, of the late 102nd Foot, who, after having been in the Army and Reserve for twenty-one years and six days, was discharged from the Reserve on 7th January, 1886, with a good conduct certificate; whether he is aware that the greater part of Beatty's period of service was spent in the East Indies, where he contracted fever and ague, the effect of which has been permanently to injure his health

and render him incapable of any work requiring much physical exertion; and, will he state whether Beatty is entitled to a pension, and, if so, to what pension; and, if the man has not received it, will he explain on what ground it has been withheld.

LORD STANLEY: This man served thirteen years 193 days with the colours, which, under the terms of his engagement, did not entitle him to a pension. As he was discharged on the termination of his period of engagement, and not on account of any disability contracted while in the service, there is no regulation under which any grant can be made to him.

MARK IV. BULLETS.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office for what reason 4,500,000 Mark IV. bullets were recently broken up.

LORD STANLEY: As no more Mark IV. ammunition was to be made the bullets were useless, and were therefore broken up.

MR. WEIR: By what firms were the bullets made?

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

H.M.S. "ST. VINCENT" AND BRITANNIA"

MR. EUGENE WASON (Clackmannan and Kinross): I beg to ask the Civil Lord of the Admiralty whether he is aware that an outbreak of influenza followed by pneumonia occurred on board H.M.S. "St. Vincent," at Portsmouth, last year owing to the contamination of the site of her moorings, and that since the moorings have been dredged there has not been any similar outbreak on board the "St. Vincent"; can he state how long she was away from her moorings; and will he cause the "Britannia" to be removed to other moorings, and not to be again moored in the same position until the site has been thoroughly dredged and the accumulation of filth for years removed.

\*THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): There was an outbreak of influenza, accompanied by lung and other affections, on board the "St. Vincent" in 1899. The ship was specially inspected at the time by the Medical Director General; the whole question of her sanitary condition was inquired into and the ship was thoroughly overhauled. There was no evidence that the outbreak was due to contamination at the site of the moorings, but the moorings were in fact dredged because it was found that the ship touched the ground at low water. There has been no outbreak of any importance since the date named. The "St. Vincent" left her moorings on the 6th July, 1900, and returned to them on the 20th October. A committee, composed of the following gentlemen: Sir Henry Norbury (Medical Director General), Professor Caulfield, Inspector General Fisher, Fleet Surgeon May, has been engaged during the last two days in examining H. M. S. "Britannia" and making inquiry into all the circumstances likely to affect the health of the cadets. The committee has now terminated its inquiry, and its report is expected immediately. Until that report is received I should prefer to postpone answering the last part of the hon. Member's question; but I may say there is no reason to believe that there is any accumulation of filth under the "Britannia."

RETURN OF FLEETS.

\*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary

to the Admiralty if he can say

on what day he hopes that the Return of Fleets will be circulated to Members.

\*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The Return is very voluminous, and I fear it will not be possible to circulate it for another week or so.

IRELAND AND NAVAL CONSTRUCTION.

MR. M'GOYERN (Cavan, W.): I beg TO ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can state how many of the twenty vessels which are in the course of construction for the Royal Navy are being built in Ireland; how many of the thirty-three new vessels that are to be built in the coming financial year will be built in Ireland; how much of the £30,875,500 which it is proposed to spend on the Navy in the coming year will be paid by the people of Ireland; and how much of this sum will be spent in Ireland; and can he say what reasons, if any, exist why the Government should not establish a dockyard at Cork or Dublin in which some of these vessels could be built, in order that some of the money raised in Ireland should be spent there.

\*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: None of the twenty vessels which are in course of construction for the Royal Navy are being built in Ireland, nor will any of the thirty-three new vessels, referred to in the question as being in course of construction in the coming financial year, be built in that country. No tender for the construction of ships for the Royal Navy has been received from any Irish firm. A tender has been received from an Irish firm for the construction of machinery. This tender has been accepted, and the engines are now being manufactured. It is impossible at present to state how much of the funds voted for the Navy will be spent in Ireland during the forthcoming year. The Admiralty are not aware what proportion of the sum which may be voted for the Navy will be paid by the people of Ireland. The interests of the Navy do not at present require the establishment of a dockyard at Cork or Dublin; but I may remind the hon. Member that there is a Government dockyard at I Haulbowline, and that the establishment of this dockyard, and the expenditure in connection with it, have both been greatly increased during the past year.

MR. CREAN (Cork. S. E.) Is any Irish firm entitled to tender for Government work?

\*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Any firm which sends a requisition to be placed on the list of Government contractors has the application considered on its merits, and, if found suitable, is invited to tender.

GAYA BAY, BRITISH NORTH BORNEO.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the First Lord of the Admiralty is aware that Gaya Bay, British North Borneo, affords excellent accommodation as a harbour and naval base; and, in view of the fact that coal is readily available, will he consider the expediency of having the district surveyed with a view to the establishment of a naval station.

\*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The Admiralty are aware that Gaya Bay is a good anchorage, but it is not considered suitable as a naval base, and it is not proposed to utilise it for that purpose.

GREENWICH HOSPITAL AND TRAVERS' FOUNDATION.

SIR JOHN LENG: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the Board of

Admiralty receives, in addition to the capital and -income account of Greenwich Hospital and Travers' Foundation, annual reports on the administration of the hospital and foundation; and, if so, whether these can be published along with the statements of the Finances.

\*THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): The affairs of the Greenwich Hospital and Travers' Foundation are entirely under the management and control of the Admiralty, and an annual report on their administration is received. Such information as it is considered necessary to furnish is already published with the Estimates.

RHODESIA;NATIVE LABOUR.

MR. THOMAS BAYLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has received information, through the British South Africa Company, or from other sources, as to collisions at Salisbury last December between the British South Africa Police and natives imported from Somaliland for service in Rhodesia, and as to disturbances at Beira in January with other natives imported for similar service; and, if so, whether he will inform the House as to the facts; whether he will inform the House as to any arrangements now in progress for obtaining native labour for Rhodesia from outside areas, which are within the knowledge of His Majesty's Government, and have received or may be awaiting its approval; and whether any reports have been received by the High Commissioner for South Africa from the Resident Commissioner in Rhodesia as to the condition and treatment of natives in the British South Africa Company's territory; and, if so, whether they will be communicated to the House.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: (1) I have seen an account of the collision at Salisbury on 31st December in the Rhodesia Herald, and I am expecting a reply from Sir A. Milner. As to the disturbance at Beira. I would refer the hon. Member to the answer I gave to the hon. Member for Northampton yesterday. (2) The Administration of Southern Rhodesia have applied to His Majesty's Government to obtain a removal of the prohibition against native labour being introduced from Portuguese East Africa, and His Majesty's Government are in communication with the Portuguese Government on the subject. The question of obtaining labour from the Northern Transvaal, which is not possible for the moment in the disturbed state of the country, is under consideration. (3) Such a report has been received by Sir A. Milner, who will no doubt send it on as soon as the pressure of work leaves him time to consider and comment upon it.

WEST COAST OF AFRICA;LABOUR LAWS.

MR. CAINE (Cornwall, Camborne): I bog to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will consent to a Return of the laws and regulations affecting labour in those parts of the West African dominions of His Majesty in which gold reefs are being worked.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The special laws affecting labour on the Gold Coast are the Master and Servant Ordinance, 1893, the Slave Dealing Abolition and the Emancipation Ordinance of 1874. A copy of the laws of the Gold Coast will be placed in the. Library. I cannot help thinking there must be some misconception of the answer I gave the other day, when I spoke of the ordinary law of the Gold

Coast as seeming to me sufficient to deal with this case. I was not referring to any special law.

MR. CAINE: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware there are a great number of miners up and down the country, specially in Cornwall, who being out of work in consequence of the war in South Africa, are looking to West Africa for a fresh sphere of employment, and are consequently anxious to know what are the conditions of labour obtaining there? Would not a fuller statement on these laws be of value to them?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I do not think it is possible to furnish any such statement as to the special laws on the Gold Coast.

CHINA;ANGLO-RUSSIAN DISPUTE AT TIENTSIN.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the attention of the Government has been called to what took place in China recently when the Russians objected to the construction of a railway siding by the British; whether General Barrow, Chief of the Staff, met the Russian objection by ordering the construction of the siding to be completed, if necessary, by force of arms, and had troops placed along the line while the work was continued whether the Russian General protested against this action; and whether General Barrow acted under instructions received from His Majesty's Government.

\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): I am informed that some land

over which the North of China Administration have proprietary rights has been claimed by the Russian military authorities as belonging to them in virtue of a concession alleged to have been made to them by the Chinese Government when the disturbances commenced. I am informed that, consequently, some difficulties have arisen with regard to the construction of the sidings referred to in the question. The matter is being dealt with by the authorities on the spot, but not under any special instructions from His Majesty's Government.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): Arising out of this matter, may I ask the noble Lord whether in cases of dispute between the allied Powers in China British officers are entitled to threaten to use force without consulting the Home Government?

\*LOED G. HAMILTON: In reply to that question, I may say that right throughout the Chinese operations British officers have shown conciliation in meeting every difficulty. I do not therefore consider it necessary to send any special instructions.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Will the noble Lord kindly answer the latter part of the question and say whether General Barrow did threaten to use force of arms, and whether in so doing he acted on his own authority or on the authority of the Home Government?

\*LORD G. HAMILTON: I do not know on what authority the hon. Member makes the statement.

An HON. MEMBER: Reuter.

\*LORD G. HAMILTON: I think if he looks at the telegram he will see that all General Barrow has done has been to ensure the protection of people working in

territory belonging to a British company.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: But;

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The question on the Paper has been fully answered.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I will call attention to this matter on an early day.

CHINA; COST OF WARLIKE OPERATIONS.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can state the estimated total cost up to the present date of the recent military and naval operations in China.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): I will do my best to answer this question, but I cannot be at all certain as to the accuracy of the answer. The estimated total cost of the military operations in China to the present date is three and a half millions in round figures. I am informed that at the present stage it is impossible to give an estimate of the total cost of the naval operations.

EAST INDIA; PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

MR. KIMBER (Wandsworth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will grant the Return entitled East India (Petitions of Officers of Public Works Department).

\*LORD G. HAMILTON: I have no objection to granting the Return, but a reference to India will be necessary to render it complete.

INDIAN MILITARY OUTPOSTS.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will state what military outposts were maintained at the close of 1898 beyond the frontiers of His Majesty's Indian possessions; whether he can give the aggregate strength of the garrisons by which these posts were held and the class of troops occupying them, and what was the estimated annual cost of the occupation of these positions; and whether he will state what is the present position as to the number, cost, and disposition of troops holding these military outposts.

\*LORD G. HAMILTON: There were in 1898 no military outposts maintained on the North-West Frontier outside the boundary of the Durand delimitation, and since the ratification of that Agreement the line so defined is held to be the external frontier of British India.

WINTER CROPS IN BOMBAY AND MADRAS.

MR. CAINE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he can give further information as to the condition of the winter crops in the Bombay Presidency and parts of Madras: and whether he will state what steps are being taken to deal with a renewal of the distress.

\*LORD G. HAMILTON: In Bombay the autumn harvest was poor, and the area sown below the average; the spring crop prospects are bad throughout a large portion of the Presidency. In Madras the harvest is below the average to the extent of about 20 per cent. In Burma, Bengal, and Upper India the prospects are such that these provinces will have surplus food with which to supply the wants of those localities where the crops are poor. It is only in the Bombay Presidency that the circumstances are such as to make special relief measures necessary. The

Government have provided funds for this purpose, and are taking steps, according to the provisions of the Famine Codes, for carrying on and extending any relief operations which may be necessary.

#### INDIAN MEMORIAL TO QUEEN VICTORIA.

MR. CAINE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will state what amount has been subscribed in India for a memorial to Her late Majesty Queen Victoria; and whether he can suggest to the Viceroy that this memorial should be such as to confer some permanent benefit upon the suffering masses in India.

\*LORD G. HAMILTON: I have received no information as to the amount subscribed in India to celebrate by memorials the memory of Her late Majesty. The matter is not an official one, and I could not interfere with the discretion of the subscribers as to the purpose to which their subscriptions should be put.

#### INDIAN FAMINE;PROVISION FOR ORPHANS.

MR. CAINE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that, owing to the mortality in the Bombay Presidency from famine and disease, numbers of orphans have been left entirely dependent upon charity; and whether he will state what has been done to provide for these children, and what public funds have been allotted to the support of public and private orphanages.

\*LORD G. HAMILTON: Unhappily, orphans are left after every serious Indian famine. After the 1897 famine about six lakhs of rupees were set apart for the maintenance of orphans. Volumes I. and II. of the Charitable Relief Fund Report describe at more length what was done. Briefly, it may be said that a yearly sum was provided from Government or charitable funds for the support of every really destitute orphan, whether the child was in the keeping of co-religionists or of mission orphanages. I have no doubt similar arrangements will be made by the Government this year. But I have not received and have not asked for a special report upon the subject.

#### SURAT DISTRICT LAND REVENUES.

MR. CAINE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that in the Surat District, out of a total of 95 per cent. of land revenue collected last year, 85 per cent. was received from the money-lenders and only 10 per cent. from the cultivators; can he state under what authority the land revenue was received from money-lenders who are not in possession of the land, and what interest is exacted by the money-lenders from the cultivators for these advances; and whether, looking to the existing indebtedness of the cultivators, he will direct this practice to be abandoned.

LORD G. HAMILTON: The matters to which this question refers are being investigated by the Famine Commission. Until I receive the Report of the Commission and the opinion of the Government of India, I do not propose to take any action.

#### CHINA AND EARTHENWARE TRADES;NEW RULES.

MR. COGHILL (Stoke-upon-Trent): I bug to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the proposed new rules for the china and earthenware trades were adopted on the advice of Professors Oliver and Thorpe; and whether either of these gentlemen has had any practical experience of these trades, or have

ever been personally engaged in the production of china or earthenware.

\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): The rules were based on Reports made by Doctors Oliver and Thorpe. Dr. Thorpe has been specially consulted on the chemical questions which have arisen in drafting the rules. These gentlemen are not pottery manufacturers; but they are experts in the scientific questions on which they were consulted.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

MR. TENNANT (Berwickshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can state when he proposes to introduce the Bill to amend the Factory and Workshop Acts of which he has given notice.

\*MR. RITCHIE: I am afraid not.

MR. TENNANT: Will it be before Easter?

\*MR. RITCHIE: Probably it will be, but I cannot say absolutely.

NEW CODE OF RAILWAY BYE-LAWS.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the New Code of Railway Bye-laws, which was submitted to the Board of Trade upwards of three years ago, and remitted to the railway companies with certain modifications and suggestions, has again been submitted to the Board for confirmation; and, if not, will he state the general tenor of the replies given by the railway companies to the Board's repeated requests for the adoption of a satisfactory code of railway bye-laws.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): As the House is aware, railway bye-laws are submitted to the Board of Trade by individual companies desiring to adopt them, and any confirmation by the Board is a confirmation of a particular system of bye-laws so submitted. It is obviously desirable, however, that the bye-laws of the railway companies should be, as far as it is possible to make them, uniform; and the Board of Trade have been using their best efforts to procure that there shall be submitted to them a system of bye-laws, which may be discussed and accepted as a model code. Up to the present the Board of Trade have not succeeded in these negotiations. I am assured that there is no indisposition on the part of the companies to bring the matter to a conclusion, and I venture to hope that they will succeed in agreeing among themselves as to a system of bye-laws submitted either by an individual company or by the Railway Association, and which may be discussed with the representatives of the companies and other persons interested, with a view to their adoption as a model code.

IMPORTS OF GERMAN-MADE BRUSHES.

MR. BATTY LANGLEY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state what is the value of German-made brushes imported into this country during the year 1900: and whether he can say what quantity has been stopped or confiscated on the ground of being made by convict labour.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Brushes are included with brooms in the official trade accounts, and no separate particulars as to brushes are available. The total value of the imports of brooms and brushes from Germany in 1900 was £45,968. German-made brooms and brushes may reach this country via other countries, such as Holland and Belgium, and these would consequently be returned as importations



from such countries. No imported German-made brushes appear to have been stopped or confiscated on the ground of being made by convict labour during the year 1900.

#### ENGINE EXPLOSIONS ON THE LANCASHIRE AND YORKSHIRE RAILWAY.

MR. BELL (Derby): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the engine 676, which exploded on the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway on the 11th instant, was reported on 28th January last as being defective, with tubes badly leaking, and that in consequence the driver had to give up the train of coal he was then working, for which he has been degraded to a fireman's place, at a reduction of 1s. per day in wages; and will he direct an inquiry to be held in this case.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: No, Sir. I am not aware of any such report. If the hon. Member refers to a report made to the company by one of its officers, it would not come under my notice. I will, however, see that the inspecting officer who holds the inquiry into the accident shall have his attention directed to the allegation contained in the hon. Member's question.

#### CONSTITUTION OF THE BOARD OF TRADE.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can state who are the members of the Board of Trade, excluding the Advisory or Consultative Committee, and irrespective of permanent officials; whether those Members of the Board attend meetings, and how many such meetings have been held since he became president; and whether he can state what functions those Members are called upon to exercise.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The "Board of Trade" means the Lords of the Committee for the time being of the Privy Council appointed for the consideration of matters relating to trade and foreign plantations. Under an Order in Council of 1786 these Lords include; The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, the First Lord of the Treasury, the First Lord of the Admiralty, His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Speaker of the House of Commons, and such Lords as hold the following offices, namely: the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster,

and the Paymaster General of His Majesty's Forces. It is not customary to summon a meeting of all these members.

MR. FIELD: Does the Board of Trade ever meet? If so, how many attend?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The Board of Trade does meet. The quorum consists of one; myself.\*

#### IRISH AND SCOTTISH LIGHTHOUSE BOARDS.

MR. FIELD: I bog to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the annual meeting of Associated Chambers of Commerce yesterday passed a resolution unanimously resolving that the constitution of Lighthouse Boards, particularly those of Ireland and Scotland, is unsatisfactory; and whether he will support a private Bill or introduce a measure to reconstitute the Irish and Scotch Lighthouse Boards.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: No copy of such a resolution has yet reached me. As I have more than once informed the hon. Member, His Majesty's Government do not, as at present advised, contemplate legislation dealing with the constitution of the

Irish and Scottish Lighthouse authorities.

VACCINATION;LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD CIRCULAR.

MR. LEVY (Leicestershire, Loughborough): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, having regard to the declaration of his predecessor in this House on the 20th of July, 1898, that the administration of a compulsory vaccination law would be neither necessary nor desirable, and the tacit promise of the same Minister on the same date that the Local Government Board would not do anything to interfere

\*Reference may be made to The Parliamentary History, Vol. xxi., page 233, for the discussions on Burke's abortive "Establishment Bill" of 1780. The clause for abolishing the old Board of Trade was vigorously opposed, and passed through Committee by a majority of only eight. On page 241 one of Burke's opponents traces the institution of councils or commissions of trade to very early times. with the relations between vaccination officers and the guardians who employ and pay them, he will withdraw the circular issued by the Local Government Board.

MR. CHAPLIN (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): As the question of the hon. Member contains two distinct statements referring to myself, perhaps before it is answered I may be allowed to make a personal explanation. The hon. Member is new to the House, and is probably not aware that I have repeatedly explained that the first statement alluded to refers solely to the concession made by the Government at that time. As to the second statement, I have repeatedly shown that both the statement and the inferences which are drawn from it are equally erroneous.

\*THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG. Bristol, S.): My right hon. friend has dealt with the allegations contained in the question, and it only remains for me to say that I must decline to withdraw the circular.

POST OFFICE;TWINE CONTRACT.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he can say when the contract for twine supplied to the Post Office was last renewed, and the name of the present contractor; whether he is a manufacturer of twine; whether the contract is for hemp twine, and whether that article is being supplied; and when he again proposes to submit the contract for tender.

\*THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): There are ten kinds of twine, string, and cord used by the Post Office, and supplies are obtained partly from the Prison Commissioners and partly from two contractors, Messrs. Ullathorne and Co. and Mr. I. N. Lyons, the contracts with whom were made in 1895 and are terminable by six months notice. Both are manufacturers of twine. The materials specified for the various kinds of twine, &c., are hemp, flax, and jute, and the supplies are carefully tested on delivery to see that they conform to specification. It is not considered desirable to invite fresh tenders at present.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: Are the contracts of any other Department subject to similar conditions as to termination?

\*MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Yes' Sir, many contracts are so determined.

VALE OF CLWYD POSTAL SERVICE.

MR. HERBERT EGBERTS: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware of the inconvenience long felt by the residents of Denbigh and Ruthin, and other places in the Vale of Clwyd, owing to the system by which the mail postal service is worked; whether he is aware that the town of Denbigh is served by a mail cart, which is driven all the way from Denbigh to Rhyl, calling en route at Trefnant, St. Asaph, and Rhuddlan, and travelling along a road which most of the distance runs alongside the line of the London and North Western Railway Company from Denbigh to Rhyl; whether he is further aware that letters from Ruthin are similarly driven in a mail cart from Ruthin over the mountain to Mold, and from Mold on to Flint, although there is a railway connection from Ruthin to Chester either via Rhyl or via Mold; whether he can state the reason why this system, in vogue previous to the opening of the railway connections between the London and North Western Railway main line and the Vale of Clwyd, is perpetuated; and whether, seeing that these railway facilities for the carrying of the mails from these towns are, and have long been, available, he will, in the public interest, take steps for securing a more expeditious transference of the mails in the district referred to.

\*MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The night mails for and from Ruthin and Denbigh are conveyed by mail cart in the manner described by the hon. Member. There are no trains at present running which could be used for that service, and when the railway company were last communicated with on the subject they were not willing to put on

trains at suitable hours except for a payment considerably greater than the service warranted. As, however, some years have elapsed since the matter was last inquired into, the Postmaster General has given instructions for renewed inquiry to be made, and he will communicate the result to the hon. Member as soon as possible.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS: Has the hon. Gentleman received information that since this question was put down there has, owing to an accident, been another delay of one and a half hours?

\*MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Yes, Sir. But it is not merely to mail carts that accidents happen.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS: But is not the hon. Gentleman aware that these accidents and delays frequently occur?

\*MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I am not aware of that.

ASSISTANTS OF CUSTOMS.

MR. JOHN GORDON (Londonderry, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that the promise made by his predecessor on 31st July last, that the outdoor officers promoted to the grade of Assistants of Customs, who did practically the same work in their former posts, would have that fact recognised by being placed at a higher point in the scale of salary assigned to Assistants of Customs, has not been fulfilled, and that these officers have been informed that no further recognition must be looked for; and if he will state why this promise has not been fulfilled, and whether he will take measures to see that it is carried out.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Yes, Sir, I am aware of the promise made by my right hon. friend that the men who, before they were appointed to the new class of Assistants of Customs, had as outdoor officers been doing work equal to that of the new class, should count the time during which they had done such work and take their position in future in the scale of the new class accordingly. Steps were at once taken

to carry out this promise. After careful consideration it was decided to allow them to count all time in excess of three years served as outdoor officers as if it were time spent on duties equal to that of the new class, and that to give effect to the promise made each of the officers affected should be placed at the point which he would have reached if he had become an assistant on the completion of three years service as outdoor officer. On applying this rule to the individual-cases it was found that owing to a special concession made to this class of officer in March, 1897, the benefit of the concession promised by my right hon. friend' was already enjoyed in practice by the whole of the staff concerned with some few very slight and temporary exceptions, not amounting in most cases to more than a few shillings. I have directed that in all these cases the difference, whatever it is, shall be paid to the officers concerned; and when this has been done the promise of my right hon. friend will, have been completely fulfilled.

DISMISSALS; CASE OF MR. CARELESS.

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that Mr. Careless, a post office sorter, has recently been dismissed, after sixteen years good conduct service, on a charge of stealing and cashing a postal order value 8s. 6d.; that Mr. Careless denies the charge and demands to be prosecuted so that he may prove his innocence; that the post office, though they have deducted the 8s. 6d. from his pay, refuse to prosecute him; and whether it is in accordance with the rules of the public service to dismiss an old official for stealing, deduct the loss from his wages, and yet refuse to prosecute him when he demands to be tried to prove his innocence.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: In reply to the hon. Member I have to state that Mr. Alfred Charles Careless, late a sorter attached to the Circulation Branch at the chief office was recently dismissed by the Postmaster General, as he was of opinion that Mr. Careless was not a fit person to be retained in the service. The Postmaster General is unable to admit the principle that he is bound to prosecute a post office servant for an alleged irregularity before dismissing him. The Postmaster General must in the interest of the public service exercise a discretion in such matters.

MR. HARTLEY: May I ask whether this sorter was dismissed not for irregularity and unsuitability, but for absolute stealing? Was not the money said to have been stolen deducted from his wages, and has he not asked to be prosecuted for stealing in order to be may have an opportunity of proving his innocence?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: There was a deduction made as stated in the question. The reply given to me by the Postmaster General is that which I have read. It says that Mr. Careless was dismissed because the Postmaster General did not

think him a fit person to be retained in the service. If Mr. Careless considers himself aggrieved he has his remedy against the Postmaster General, who cannot undertake to order a prosecution in every case in which he feels it necessary to dispense with anyone's service.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Will the Postmaster General defend the action if one is brought?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I must ask for notice of that.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): In view of precedents recently set by another Department, cannot this man, who is unfit for service at home, be sent to Gibraltar?

[No answer was returned.]

#### COMPULSORY RETIREMENT FROM THE CIVIL SERVICE.

SIR GEORGE NEWNES (Swansea Town): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can state the objections, if any, to assimilating the age fixed for the compulsory retirement of officials from the Post Office, and Inland Revenue, and Customs Departments respectively; and will he take steps for the assimilation in future of the practice of these Departments.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Orders in Council while making retirement compulsory at the age of sixty-five, leave it to the discretion of heads of departments to call upon their officers to retire at sixty if they see fit. The Treasury think it important to maintain the discretion and responsibility thus vested in the heads of Departments, and they are not prepared to interfere with the existing practice.

#### AVOCH HARBOUR.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the Secretary for Scotland is aware that one side of the harbour of Avoch, Ross-shire, has been entirely swept away, and that apart from this the harbour is in a bad state of repair; is he aware that during a storm a year ago several boats inside the harbour belonging to fishermen of the district were completely wrecked; and will he state who is responsible for the maintenance of the harbour, and what steps he proposes to take in order to secure the repair of the harbour.

\*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): I am informed by the Fishery Board that the answer to the first paragraph of the hon. Member's question is in the negative, and to the second in the affirmative, and in reply to the third I may point out that the Secretary for Scotland has no source of information not equally open to the hon. Member himself, and no means of securing the repair of the harbour as seems to be suggested by the hon. Member.

#### HOSPITAL ACCOMMODATION IN THE HIGHLANDS AND ISLANDS OF SCOTLAND.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether, in view of the difficulty experienced in securing suitable hospital accommodation in the poorer districts of the Highlands and Islands of Scotland, he will consider the expediency of introducing legislation such as will provide for the establishment and maintenance of hospitals in congested areas.

\*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The Secretary for Scotland would not be disinclined, should a favourable opportunity present itself, to amend the Congested Districts (Scotland) Act, 1897,

in one or two respects, and in this event he will consider whether the point mentioned in the hon. Member's question can be provided for.

#### CONGESTION IN THE ISLAND OF LEWIS.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the Secretary for Scotland has received a petition from the Landward Committee of the Stornoway Parish Council calling attention to the congested condition of the Island of Lewis and the consequent evils arising therefrom; and will he state whether the Congested Districts Board have made any efforts to secure land in Lewis, at places other than in the Point District, suitable for new holdings; and if so, will he give particulars.

\*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The answer to the first portion of the hon. Member's question is in the affirmative. The answer to the second portion is also in the affirmative, namely at Aignish, Cress and Croir.

MR. WEIR: What is the acreage of land sought to be secured?

\*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I cannot answer that without notice.

#### IRISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT RULES AND ORDERS.

MR. CLANCY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can explain why the further Return of rules and orders made or issued under or in consequence of the Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1898, which was promised on the 20th July last year by his predecessor, has not since been laid upon the Table of the House.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say when the rules and orders of the Local Government Board (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 360, of Session 1899), promised last year, will be issued.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The Return was laid on the Table and ordered to be printed in August last. The rules and orders are ready for press, but there has been unavoidable delay in the preparation of the index. This has now been completed, and the Return will be distributed at an early date.

#### IRISH DAIRY INDUSTRIES.

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Department of Agriculture is aware that all dairies must be registered, and that all preservatives except common salt are prohibited for butter in Denmark; and further that in the same country pasteurisation of milk has recently been made compulsory in all dairies with the objects of preventing the spread of contagious disease, of improving the flavour of butter, and of increasing keeping qualities of same; and whether he contemplates introducing legislation dealing with any of these matters in Ireland.

MR. WYNDHAM: The facts are as stated in the question. In Ireland all dairies from which milk is sold to the public, as well as all co-operative dairies in which butter is manufactured, are registered. With regard to preservatives, the Department of Agriculture thinks it advisable to await the report of the Committee appointed by the English Local Government Board to inquire into the use of preservatives in food, before expressing an opinion on the question of

special legislation on the subject. As regards the pasteurisation, the Department is prepared to make advances upon favourable terms to enable owners of dairies to erect pasteurising plant, but it does not, at present, consider that legislation making pasteurisation compulsory is required.

#### LABOURERS' COTTAGES AT BIRR.

MR. REDDY (King's County, Birr): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that out of forty-five applications for labourers' cottages in the Birr No. 1 Rural District, and approved of by that District Council, only seven were passed by the Local Government Board; and whether, when the next inquiry for the erection of labourers' cottages in that union is held, some inspector other than that who has recently reported will be sent to take the evidence and report upon it.

MR. WYNDHAM: The facts are correctly stated in the first paragraph. The rejection of so many applications was due to the careless manner in which the scheme was prepared, the provisions of the Act in some respects having been wholly disregarded. The inspector who held the inquiry is one of the most experienced officers of the Board, and I cannot give the undertaking asked in the second paragraph.

#### IRISH CONGESTED DISTRICTS RETURN.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will grant the Return respecting Congested Districts (Ireland) which stands on to-day's Paper.\*

MR. WYNDHAM: It is not possible to give the information indicated under all the headings of this Return. But I have collected together as much as is procurable, and will forward it to the hon. Member privately, as soon as it has been tabulated.

#### BELFAST PAUPER GRAVEYARDS.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether complaints have been

\*The following is the Return alluded to: Congested Districts (Ireland).; Return showing (1) total rateable value of the Congested District portion of county Kerry; (2) total area and population of same; (3) total amount of money expended in Kerry by the Congested Districts Board since the passing of the Act of 1801; (4) how and when has such money been expended; (5) has the money available for the purposes of the Act been distributed in accordance with Section 36, subsection 3 of the Purchase of Land Act, 1891, which says that the money be apportioned between the Congested Districts Counties in proportion to their population; (6) total amount which under this section should since the passing of the Act be paid to Kerry; (7) how many estates in Kerry have been listed for sale under the 40th section of the Land Act of 1896; (8) how many of such estates have the Congested Districts Board endeavoured to purchase: (9) what is the cause of the delay in the sale of such estates to the tenants.

made to the Local Government Board as to the overcrowded condition of the pauper graveyard, Belfast; can he say what is its area; and has any record been kept of the number interred; is he aware that the medical officer of health condemns it

as insanitary and that there are a number of working men's houses in close proximity to the graveyard, and, will he cause inquiry to be made into this matter.

MR. WYNDHAM: The area of the workhouse cemetery is about two and a half acres, and a record is kept. The medical officer of health has not condemned the cemetery as insanitary; dwelling houses have been erected in the neighbourhood. The Local Government Board has been in correspondence with the guardians on the subject of providing additional accommodation, and the Board understands that the guardians are now taking steps to this end.

PH&#x0152;NIX PARK, DUBLIN;USE FOR MILITARY PURPOSES.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord I Lieutenant of Ireland whether the military authorities in Dublin have made any request that an extended area of Phoenix Park should be placed at their service for military training operations: if so, what further portions of the park were asked for and what further portions, if any, have been given for military purposes; and will he take care that no further encroachments are made upon the areas of the park used by the public for amusements.

MR. WYNDHAM: The correspondence referred to dealt mainly with access by a shorter route to the fifteen acres, and to certain facilities for practising extended formations over wider areas. No encroachment will be made on areas used for games.

OMAGH DISTRICT CEMETERY.

MR. MUENAGHAN (Tyrone, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a loan for the purpose of providing a cemetery for the district of Omagh was sanctioned in the year 1899, and an instalment of £;1,000 for

warded in September, 1899, to the Omagh Rural District Council, and that the amount expended by the council to the 1st April, 1900, was £;2,077, on which date the control of the cemetery was transferred to the Omagh Urban Council, thus leaving a balance due to the rural district council of £;1,077; and, having regard to the fact that the several applications to the Local Government Board for the payment of this £;1,077 remain unanswered to the detriment of the rural council, which is responsible to the Ulster Bank for this sum with interest at the rate of four per cent., will he state the cause of delay, and when the money will be; forwarded.

MR. WYNDHAM: The figures are correctly stated in the first paragraph. No applications to the Local Government Board for payment of the sum of £;1,077 remain unanswered. The Board approved of the issue of a further instalment of £;800 to the Urban Council in October last. The question of the adjustment of the liabilities of the Urban and Rural District Council is still unsettled. The authorities have agreed to refer the matters in dispute for settlement by an adjusting officer of the Local Government Board, and until the formal agreement to this effect is before the Board it cannot take any action in the matter.

MR. MURNAGHAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, seeing that although the extended time allowed by the Local Government Board Order for closing the old burial ground at Omagh expired on 1st



March, the new cemetery is not ready to receive interments nor is it likely to be ready for several months, he will advise the Local Government Board to still further extend the time of closing the Drumragh burial ground.

MR. WYNDHAM: If such an application be made to the Board by the local authority, the period will be extended.

ROXBORO ROAD SCHOOL.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Roxboro Road School premises are let to Rev. Canon Greg as tenant from year to year, in contravention of the terms of the Act, vesting them in the trustees, in the several schemes drawn up by the Educational Endowment Commission and agreed to on the part of Roman Catholics and Protestants, that the value of these premises when realized should be devoted to the interests of education in Limerick; and does he intend to take any steps to secure this endowment for the people of Limerick.

MR. WYNDHAM: The justices acted within their powers in letting these premises to Dean Greg, not in contravention of the statute, as stated in the question. The several schemes having fallen through, owing to the objection raised to them, nothing can now be done without legislation, as the powers of the Commissioners are spent.

MR. JOYCE: So there is no law to prevent such trust funds being diverted from the purposes for which they were created? Are we in Ireland to be governed by no law founded on fair play and justice?

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

SHILLELAGH UNION TROUBLES.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can give the names of the witnesses summoned by Dr. Flinn on behalf of Nurse Joyce in connection with the recent Local Government Board inquiry at Shillelagh; also the names of those witnesses who gave evidence for Nurse Joyce, and of those who did not give evidence.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am communicating the information desired in the question to the hon. Member privately.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: I do not want the information privately. This is a matter of great importance, concerning as it does a medical officer of the Local Government Board, so I will put the question on Monday.

MR. WYNDHAM: A long list of names can convey nothing to the House.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: It is not a long list. There are only eight names. I want them published.

MR. WYNDHAM: I do not object to reading the names.

THOMASTOWN PETTY SESSIONAL BENCH.

MR. O'MARA: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland what is the number of Protestant and the number of Roman Catholic magistrates in Thomastown petty sessions district; whether he is aware that for twenty years no Roman Catholic magistrate was appointed in this district, and that 95 per cent. of the population are Roman Catholics; and whether any steps will be taken to remedy this grievance.

MR. WYNDHAM: The numbers are eight and none respectively. There is no

information which would enable me to reply to the second and third paragraphs of the question. The Lieutenant of the county and the Lord Chancellor will be prepared to consider the names of any gentlemen recommended to them by the hon. Member.

#### THOMASTOWN SANITATION.

MR. O'MARA: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if a resolution has been received from Thomastown Rural District Council, by the Local Government Board, asking them to send their medical and engineering inspectors to visit Thomastown and report on sanitation of same; whether he is aware that the medical officer of health reported twelve months ago some portions of Thomastown as dangerous to the public health; and whether he can give any assurance that Local Government Board inspectors will visit and report in the near future.

MR. WYNDHAM: It forms no part of the duty of the Local Government Board's engineers to advise local authorities in the manner suggested; the Rural Council should employ a competent engineer. The medical officer of health reported some time ago in favour of an improved scheme of drainage. The Board will communicate with the

Council shortly on the subject, and will I instruct one of their medical inspectors to attend and give the Council any assistance in his power.

#### POISONING SALMON SPAWNING GROUNDS.

MR. CARVILL (Newry): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware of a practice in some parts of the west coast of Ireland of poisoning the spawning resorts with pounded makkinbwee, to the injury of the salmon industry; and that the fishermen and their families, some 300 souls, resident on the island of Rossmore in the Kenmare river, complain that by reason of this poisoning their chief source of living is reduced and imperiled; and whether, seeing that at petty sessions detected persons have been frequently fined without bringing redress, he will consider what other step can be taken to put a stop to the practice complained of.

MR. WYNDHAM: Considerable damage is done to the salmon fisheries in some parts of Ireland by the poisoning of livers with the plant indicated in the question (*Euphorbia Hibernica*). The plant grows in great profusion, and it is very difficult to detect persons actually putting it in the water. The Irish Inland Fisheries Commissioners in their recent Report recommended some amendments in the law with a view to dealing with this offence, and these recommendations are now engaging the attention of the Department of Agriculture.

#### IRISH BOARD OF WORKS CHAIRMANSHIP.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Chairman of the Board of Works, Ireland, has resigned and whether his resignation has been accepted; whether any appointment has yet been made to the office; and, if so, whether he can say who has been appointed, and what are his qualifications for the office.

MR. WYNDHAM: Perhaps the hon. Member will repeat this question on Monday, and address it to my right hon. friend the First Lord of the Treasury.

#### STEWARTSTOWN; ST. PATRICK'S DAY MEETING.

MR. DOOGAN (Tyrone, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether it has come to his knowledge that arrangements have been made to hold a public meeting on the 18th instant in the vicinity of Stewarts-town, County Tyrone, to commemorate the national festival of Ireland; is he aware that, notwithstanding the fact that a number of people would require to pass into and through the town to attend the meeting, the local magistrates have issued a proclamation forbidding excursionists to pass through Stewartstown on Monday next; and whether this action of the magistrates will be reviewed and cancelled.

MR. WYNDHAM: The promoters of the meeting have been warned that it cannot be allowed in the town, because it would undoubtedly lead to a riot; but if it is held outside the town no interference with it will be permitted; nor will persons be prevented from passing through the town to take part in it, so long as nothing in the nature of a procession is formed within the town. The magistrates' action will be supported.

MR. DOOGAN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the local magistrates have issued a proclamation (I have it here) absolutely forbidding the meeting?

MR. WYNDHAM: The meeting cannot be allowed in the town, but it may take place outside.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Why should the meeting be allowed immediately outside the town but not in it?

MR. WYNDHAM: It is a matter of police precautions. Meetings of this kind sometimes lead to trouble.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): If the meeting is held outside the town will the proclamation be withdrawn?

MR. WYNDHAM: The proclamation only refers to the town.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: Will the Orangemen in the town be confined to barracks on the day?

[No answer was given.]

#### THE WEXFORD LOCAL GOVERNMENT APPEAL.

MR. JORDAN (Fermanagh, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the decision of the Court of Appeal in the county Wexford case, in reference to the action of the Local Government Board, in increasing the salaries of certain county officials, he will instruct the Local Government Board to hold an inquiry in the county Fermanagh on the matter of such increases in said county.

MR. WYNDHAM: The orders made in the case of the secretary and one assistant surveyor were brought into the Court of King's Bench. In the case of the secretary an agreement was arrived at with the county council. In the case of the assistant surveyor the conditional order was discharged, and that decision was not appealed against; consequently all the orders remain in force, and there appears to be no power to withdraw the orders or to re-open the question.

#### GREYSTONES PIER AND HARBOUR.

MR. COGAN (Wicklow, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a sum of over £20,000 was expended on the erection of a pier and harbour at Greystones, county Wicklow; that the county

surveyor inspected the works in January, 1896, and reported several defects in the works; that the Board of Works issued a warrant in July, 1896, transferring the pier and harbour in an incomplete condition to the grand jury of the county Wicklow, and that the county surveyor reported to the grand jury again in March, 1897. that nothing had been done to the works since his report in January, 1896, and that he found them in a state of partial ruin and positively dangerous; and whether, seeing that the grand jury in the same year passed a resolution that owing to the condition of the Greystones Harbour they declined to accept any responsibility in connection with it or to appoint a harbour master, and that the ratepayers of the barony of Rathdown are charged with an annual payment of £;68 for this work, and having regard to the expenditure of public money in this case, the Board of Works will take the necessary steps to put the pier and harbour into proper condition, and enable the county council to take charge of the harbour for the benefit of the locality.

MR. WYNDHAM: The statements in the first paragraph are generally correct, except that I am unable to say whether the county surveyor in January, 1896, made a report to the late grand jury on the subject. With reference to the inquiry at the conclusion of the question, I can only say at present that the Irish Government is in communication with the Treasury in this and other similar matters.

#### SALE OF THE DILLON ESTATE.

MR. HAYDEN (Roscommon. S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the legal proceedings in connection with the sale of the Dillon estate by the Congested Districts Board to the tenants, in which a hitch has arisen in consequence of the reservation of sporting rights; in whose interest has this reservation been proposed; is he aware that one of the members of the Land Commission has refused to sanction the advance of public money on account of this reservation, and that further proceedings have been initiated by the Congested Districts Board for the purpose of insisting on the reservation against the wishes of the tenants; and whether it is intended by the Board to insist on the insertion of the reservation clause in the agreements, and so jeopardise the proposed sale.

MR. WYNDHAM: The matters referred to in this question are down for hearing before the Land Commission Court. I am, therefore, Precluded from commenting on them.

#### LESLIE v. JUSTICES OK MONAGHAN.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, at the October Sessions of last year, at Monaghan. Henry K. Leslie, agent for the Earl of Dartrey, applied for a transfer of a licence to sell spirituous liquors by retail, which was opposed by a parishioner and refused on the grounds of unfitness and inconvenience of the premises, unfitness of the applicant, and of his not being in bona fide occupation of the premises, and that the Queen's Bench Division upheld this decision; can he explain why the police did not officially object to the application, as the sergeant of the district, when called by the objector,

swore that the premises were incapable of proper police supervision, and deposed to the unfitness and inconvenience of the premises; and in view of the fact that Mr. Leslie is again applying for a licence on 26th March, will instructions be given to the police to officially oppose the granting of the licence.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone. S.): Before my right hon. friend answers the question will he let me ask if this Mr. Leslie is carrying on business as a publican although he was refused a licence by the licensing authorities? If so, will he tell the House under what authority he is doing so.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry. N.): At the request of my right hon. friend I will reply to this question. The facts stated in the first paragraph are substantially correct. The house referred to has been licensed and managed for many years by a tenant of Lord Dartrey. On the death of this tenant Mr. Leslie, on behalf of his principal, paid the executors of the deceased tenant a sum of £400 for their interest in the premises and applied for a transfer of the licence to himself until he could procure another tenant. The alleged unfitness in the premises consisted in its distance from the police barrack, though that was the same as it had been for many years during the lifetime of the deceased publican. And the alleged unfitness of the applicant, who was a most respectable gentleman, consisted in the fact that he would not reside on the premises and could not personally superintend the business. These were technical legal questions not justifying police intervention. The reply to the last paragraph is in the negative. With regard to the supplementary question, Mr. Leslie would have been required to serve notice of twenty-one days before 12th January, and as the decision of the Court of the Queen's Bench was not given until the 21st December, time did not permit of the notice being given for hearing in January. Application for the new licence will be made on 26th March, and pending that the Excise authorities have granted a permit to Mr. Leslie to carry on the business.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: I have in my hand a letter from the Excise authorities, in which they say they are acting on the recommendation of the Irish Government. Am I to understand that the Irish Government claim a right in licensing matters to override the decisions of the licensing authority confirmed by the Court of the Queen's Bench in cases in which the applicant is the agent of the Irish landlord?

MR. ATKINSON: No, Sir. The Irish Government claim no such authority, and it was hardly necessary for the hon. Gentleman to ask the question or for me answer it. The hon. Member is entirely in error in supposing that the Irish Executive have given any directions in the matter.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: I have the authority of the Excise people for saying that they have.

MR. CAINE: Is or is not Mr. Leslie keeping a shebeen?

MR. ATKINSON: If the hon. Member takes any pleasure in calling it that, he is.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: Is there any statute enabling the Excise authorities to grant licences which have been refused both by the local Bench and the Court of Appeal?

MR. ATKINSON: It is not my duty to answer that.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: For the information of the Chancellor of the Exchequer I give notice that on the Inland Revenue Vote I shall call attention to this illegal action of the Excise authorities.

MR. T. M. HEALY: IS it not the duty of the Attorney General to prosecute in these cases of illegality?

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order

IRISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT;ROAD LENGTH LIMITS.

MR. KENDAL O'BRIEN (Tipperary, Mid): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether the Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1898, or any of the Orders in Council made in connection therewith limit the length of a road which may be formulated in one proposal by a district council and accepted by a county council; and, if so, can he state the provisions of the Act, or the Order which so limits the length of the road.

MR. ATKINSON: I am not aware of any provision in the Act or Orders providing specifically for the length of a road, in reference to which a proposal may be formulated.

IRISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT RULES AND ORDERS.

MR. KENNEDY (Westmeath, N.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether he is aware that, under the Local Government Board Order of 9th May, 1899, a petition to the judge of assize, pursuant to Section 10 (3) of the Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1898, to be heard at the spring assizes cannot be lodged sooner than the 15th February, while under the rules of court, dated 13th May, 1899, the clerk of the Crown and peace cannot enter a petition for hearing at spring assizes held on 1st March unless lodged by 13th February; and whether he can state who is responsible for this blunder in drafting, and what steps will be taken to give effect to the Act of Parliament dealing with this matter.

MR. ATKINSON: There is a possibility of the hitch pointed out in the question in cases where the spring assizes open on the 1st March, but I am not aware that any inconvenience has as yet been experienced. The orders were made by the Local Government Board, the rules by the judges of the Superior Court. I have already taken steps to have the matter reconsidered by the authorities.

MR. KENNEDY: Did not a case of the kind actually occur at the recent assizes at Trim?

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The question on the Paper has been fully answered.

MR. KENNEDY: Then I give notice that I will put another down.

OCCUPIERS OF LABOURERS' COTTAGES AND MEMBERSHIP OF PUBLIC BOARDS.

MR. O'MARA: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether, considering the decision of the King's Bench with reference to occupiers of labourers' cottages being entitled to sit on public boards, steps will be taken to reinstate Johnson Magee, an occupier of a labourer's cottage, who was returned by a majority for Jerpoint electoral division, Thomas-town Union, and who was compelled to resign in consequence of a letter from the Local Government Board.

MR. ATKINSON: The person mentioned has resigned. His resignation has, I believe, been accepted. There is no power to reinstate him in his office.

IRISH RAILWAY RATES;KILLARNEY'S COMPLAINT.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware of the inequality in railway charges on goods on the Great Southern and Western (of Ireland) Railway as far as the town of Killarney is concerned; whether he is aware that goods are conveyed by the said company from Dublin and Cork and intermediate stations to Tralee at a lower rate than to Killarney, though Tralee is twenty miles further from the points indicated; and whether, seeing that there is a through cross-channel rate to most other towns with which the said railway is connected, entitling traders to a free delivery of goods at their business premises, while a charge is made for cartage from the railway station to the place of business of the consignee at Killarney; and, having regard to the injury done to trade in Killarney by these arrangements, he will make inquiries into the matter, and take steps to have such railway charges arranged on an equitable basis.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR. I understand the hon. Member is not correct in his facts, and I refer him to Section 38 of the Great Southern and Western, &c, Act, 1900. I am also informed that none of the company's goods rates with Killarney include the service of delivery, and that it is not performed by the company who have no carting agent there.

VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE IRISH AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT.

MR. COGHILL: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Vice-President of the Irish Agricultural Department is to continue without a seat in this House?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I hope not. CIVIL LIST COMMITTEE; PUBLICATION OF CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General, with reference to the publication of the confidential draft of the Civil List in a newspaper, if he will institute an inquiry into the circumstances with the view of determining whether the persons concerned have brought themselves within the penal provisions of Sections 2 and 3 of the Official Secrets Act, 1889, relating to the improper disclosure of official documents or information.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): Any inquiry into the circumstances of the publication referred to in the question could be much more effectively conducted by the Committee itself. If any facts should be brought to my notice bearing on the question of prosecution they will be carefully considered, but it hardly falls within the province of the Director of Public Prosecutions in the first instance to initiate an inquiry into the circumstances attending the publication of a confidential document submitted to a Committee of this House.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I should like, arising out of this, to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer a question.

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The hon. Member cannot ask a question of another Minister arising out of that question.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Then I will ask you, Sir, a question on the point of order. In reference to the Report which the Chancellor of the Exchequer presented, I beg to ask whether you will take into consideration the fact that this confidential document of the Civil List Committee was published not only in The

Times, but, simultaneously, in the Birmingham Daily Post; and whether in any action that may be taken on the matter you, Sir, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer will take into consideration the fact that if The Times is to blame, the Birmingham Daily Post is equally to blame.

\*MR. SPEAKER: That is not a question of order. The hon. Member well knows that questions are not to be addressed to the Chair except on questions of order or procedure as they arise.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Has not an unusual course been taken by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in this case, in referring the matter to the Chair and not to the House? On the point of order may I ask, you, Sir, whether we are not entitled at some stage to put the question why only one paper has been referred to, and why the Birmingham Daily Post has not been referred to?

\*MR. SPEAKER: Not to me.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Then put the question to the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

\*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The only paper to which our attention was called, or of which I had any knowledge at all, was The Times.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: May I ask whether, now the right hon. Gentleman's attention has been called to the fact that this confidential document was simultaneously published in the Birmingham Daily Post as well as The Times, he will also include the Birmingham Daily Post in his Report?

\*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The Report is out of my hands; it is the Report of the Committee of the House.

MR. KENNEDY: Will the right hon. Gentleman issue a Supplementary Report?

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I must ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, under these circumstances, the Report having passed out of his hands, he will be good enough to call the attention of his Committee to the fact that the Birmingham Daily Post is in exactly the-same position as The Times in this matter?

\*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: If I may express my own opinion, it is that I am sure that if the Committee had known this they would have named the Birmingham Daily Post in their Report.

MR. TENNANT: Will the right hon. Gentleman bring it before the Committee?

\*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: It is practically covered.

MR. FLAVIN: Are they aware that the Birmingham Daily Post is equally guilty with The Times?

MR. TATTON EGERTON (Cheshire, Knutsford): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, after the improper publication of private and secret Papers, made in a certain daily journal on Thursday, 14th March, he will bring-in any Standing, Order to forbid the entrance into the precincts of the House of any official or reporter of any journal who publishes such private or secret Papers.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: My hon. friend is probably aware of what took place in the Committee, and, of the Report which the Committee made, which has been laid before the House by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. I hope that that will give him the answer he seeks.

PARLIAMENTARY RETURNS.

MR. KIMBER (Wandsworth): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will grant the Return, entitled Parliamentary Constituencies (Elec-



tions, etc.) (No. 2), which stands on today's Paper,&#x2020; or consent to the addition of the particulars asked for to the Return under this title already ordered.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think my hon. friend will get the information he wants from a Return about to be presented by the Home Office, on the motion of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Forest of Dean.

#### QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, to expedite public business, he will consider the advisability of having all replies to questions addressed to Ministers by hon. Members printed and circulated among Members at the commencement of business.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: If the hon. Gentleman means that any part of the questions answered across the floor of the House and their replies should be published first, I think it would only increase instead of diminishing the congestion of business. If, on the other hand, he means that the House is to be content with printed answers to the questions, it appears to me that, however desirable that might be from some points of view, it would deprive the House of the indulgence in a practice which it appears to enjoy.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Will the right hon Gentleman take any steps to prevent the same question being asked over and over again, season after season, as has been the case this session?

[No answer was returned.]

&#x2020; The following is the Return referred to:,"Parliamentary Constituencies, Electors, etc. (No. 2).;Return of (1) the average number of Electors and of population respectively represented by the 670 Members of this House, and the highest and lowest represented by one Member; (2) the number and names of the Constituencies having more than double that average number, and of those having less than half of that average number: (3) the number of Members in this House represented by Constituencies having less than the average number; (4) the number of Members returned by the one-half of the total of the Electors of the United Kingdom whose electorates are lower than the rest, and the number of Members returned by the other half; and (5) the same particulars as regards each of the four parts of the United Kingdom, viz., England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland."

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can state on what date it is proposed to move Mr. Speaker out of the Chair for the purpose of discussing the Navy Estimates.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I hope, on Monday next.

\*SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in the event of financial exigencies necessitating Votes A and 1, Army Estimates, being obtained before the close of next Tuesday's sitting, he can give, an assurance that before any other Votes are submitted in Committee an opportunity will be afforded to the House of discussing the nature of the work to be done by the British Army under the conditions of maritime supremacy.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The question of my hon. and gallant friend brings up in a

very clear way the condition in which we are in regard to getting Mr. Speaker out of the Chair on the Army Estimates. I perfectly understand that the House is not satisfied with the amount of discussion which has taken place, either on the question of Mr. Speaker leaving the Chair or on Votes A and 1. But it is really necessary in the general interests that all those questions should be decided to-day, and if that is not possible I am afraid we ought to sit to-morrow. [Nationalist cries of "Certainly, and on Sunday too."] I think we should avoid that alternative if we can. [Nationalist cries of "No."] Even to oblige hon. Gentlemen opposite, we should, I think, avoid if we can the general inconvenience to other hon. Gentlemen of a Saturday sitting.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: Surely they can sit in the interests of their own country&#x0021;

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: There is a stronger argument. I do not think that even with a Saturday sitting there could be adequate discussion of the very important military questions raised by these Votes. More than one suggestion&#x0021; has been made for getting over the difficulty. The hon. Member for Mid Lanark suggests the ingenious plan of withdrawing Votes A and I and getting the necessary amount of money by a Vote on Account for the Army. No doubt something might be said for that, but it is a plan, I remember, that Mr. Gladstone strongly objected to in 1883 or 1884, and it has the disadvantage that the continuation of the discussion on my right hon. friend's Army scheme would go on on the question of Mr. Speaker leaving the Chair. I do not think that is a convenient method, because my right hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition and the light hon. Member for West Monmouthshire have spoken on that. So, too, have I. No power to reply is left to any of those Gentlemen. I think the whole question should be raised again in a substantive form, and in a manner which would neither trench on the twenty-three days of Supply, nor exclude so important a contributor to the debate as my right hon. friend who is responsible for the scheme, and who is necessarily and naturally its chief defender. I would therefore ask my right hon. friends who are properly anxious to speak upon the question to defer dealing with it until a substantive resolution is brought before the House after Easter embodying the main outlines of the proposals, and therefore giving the House a full opportunity of raising any question they like upon it. That would, I think, be far more convenient, and at the same time meet the wishes of everybody. It would enable the necessary business of Supply to be concluded and it would not involve any sacrifice of the ordinary discussion in Supply, which, limited as it is by the twenty-three days rule is rather intended for the ordinary criticism of Government administration than for the discussion of any great constructive scheme. Having tried to meet the wishes of the House, I trust the House will meet the Government by allowing the Speaker to leave the Chair, and giving them Votes A and I in the course of this evening.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): Will the Government agree that no steps shall be taken to put into effect any of the proposals of the War Secretary until the House has had the opportunity of debating them?

SIR JOHN BRUXNER: Will the right hon. Gentleman undertake that in order to afford an opportunity of discussing this subject private Members shall not be

deprived of their rights after Easter?

CAPTAIN NORTON: Will the right hon. Gentleman give an undertaking that the debate shall come on early after Easter, and not be delayed until July or August?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I shall bring on the resolution as soon as I can after Easter, but I cannot give any pledge until I have consulted the Chancellor of the Exchequer as to the demand he is likely to make on the House with regard to financial business. I hope the House will meet me in a reasonable spirit. We must have the men for the South African War, quite apart from the general Army scheme. No progress of any material kind can or will be made in carrying out that part of the scheme which is concerned with the organisation of army corps before the resolution is brought forward.

SIR JOHN BRUXNER: And you will not take Wednesdays?

[No answer was returned.]

MR. CHAPLIN: We understand that it is the intention of the Government to afford this opportunity as early as possible after Easter, consistently with other necessary business.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That is my object, but I must not be too closely bound down.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen. S.): Am I right in understanding that although the right hon. Gentleman does not bind himself not to take steps in regard to military exigencies under the Vote, yet he will not do anything to bring the new scheme into execution beyond what is required by military exigencies? Will his resolution be of such a nature, too, as to enable the whole scheme to be amply discussed' and no part kept back on the ground that it has already been before the House?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: My desire will be that the resolution shall cover the whole ground. With regard to the organisation of the army corps, no progress of a material kind can or will, be made in carrying out that part of the scheme.

\*SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): Do I understand the right hon. Gentleman that his resolution will bear in mind the influence of our sea-power in determining the work to be done by the Army; Shall we be able to discuss that?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That, I imagine, will be for the Speaker to determine. I do not propose to mention maritime power in my resolution, but still it seems to me that the organisation of the land Army cannot be wholly separated from the question of maritime power.

\*SIR JOHN COLOMB: But will the resolution be so framed as to enable us to discuss these broader features?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not know if, on the motion that Mr. Speaker leave the Chair, the hon. and gallant Member could discuss Naval details, but he might raise the debate perhaps on an Amendment to my resolution.

COLONEL WELBY (Taunton): Will it be permissible to put down an Amendment to the resolution so as to raise a definite issue; the same as is done on Vote A?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I should think so.

MR. BRYCE: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can make any statement with regard to the order in which he proposes to take financial business next week.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: My present intention is to take the Navy Estimates first on Monday and probably to proceed with them; I do not know what the House feels about that. Then we shall take the Civil Service Supplementary Estimates.

\*MR. BLAKE (Longford, S.): Are we to understand that the motion that the Speaker do leave the Chair on the Civil Service Estimates will not be taken until after Easter?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Perhaps the hon. Member will put a question to me upon that point next week. I take it there will be no difficulty in getting through. Votes A and 1 and the motion that the Speaker leave the Chair to-night, in which case I will not put the House to the trouble of discussing whether we shall sit to-morrow.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: The Irish Members are quite prepared to sit on Saturday, but if they assent to the arrangement suggested will the right hon. Gentleman be prepared to give special facilities for the discussion of Irish subjects?

MR. WEIR: If it should be necessary to sit to-morrow will the right hon.

Gentleman arrange for a continuous sitting from now till 11 p.m. on Saturday, so as to avoid having to be here on Sunday?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: As the Navy Estimates have only very recently been laid before the House, cannot the discussion of them be taken later than Monday?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I shall be quite ready to adjourn the discussion after the statement of my hon. friend in moving the Navy Estimates, and then take the Civil Service Supplementary Estimates. As I am afraid I am not fortunate enough to carry hon. Gentlemen opposite with me I shall have to make a motion before the commencement of public business.

\*MR. BLAKE: If the right hon. Gentleman will give us some solid assurance that the motion that the Speaker leave the Chair on the Civil Service Estimates will not be proceeded with before Easter, I think we might reasonably assent to the arrangement proposed.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am most anxious not to burke the discussion in which the hon. Gentleman is interested. I assume he does not want it to come on immediately after Easter?

\*MR. BLAKE: Not the first day or two.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Then on the understanding that we get Mr. Speaker out of the Chair to-night, and also Votes A and 1, I will undertake not to move that the Speaker leave the Chair on the Civil Service Estimates until after Easter.

LESLIE v. THE JUSTICES OF MONAGHAN.

[ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE.]

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL (South Tyrone) rose in his place and asked leave to move the Adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, "the over-riding of the law as declared by the Irish King's Bench by the authorities of Dublin Castle in the case of Leslie v. The Justices of Monaghan"; but the pleasure of the House not having been signified, Mr. SPEAKER called on those Members who supported the motion to rise in their places, and not less than forty Members having accordingly risen;

\*MR. T. W. RUSSELL said the facts in this case were so simple and so plain as to appeal to the judgment of the House against the action of the authorities of

Dublin Castle. According to law, the annual licensing sessions were held at Monaghan in the month of October last. Those sessions were the only sessions at which new licences could be legally granted, and Mr. Leslie, the agent to Lord Dartrey, applied for the transfer of a licence previously held by a Mr.

Gardiner. The application, which was heard by the lawfully constituted licensing authority, the justices of Monaghan, was opposed, not by the police, but by the clergy and residents of the neighbourhood. The magistrates came to the conclusion that the premises were unsuitable and the applicant unfit, and those were two out of the three legal objections which could be urged in such cases.

The transfer was accordingly refused. The applicant appealed to the Court of King's Bench, when, before a full court of four judges, the decision of the magistrates was upheld. In the ordinary course, Mr. Leslie would have had to close his premises, as the licence expired on the 11th

October. But Ireland is an extraordinary country. Things occurred there which could take place in no other country. Notwithstanding the legal decisions, Mr.

Leslie had been selling liquor every day since, and the police refused to prosecute. The Attorney General for Ireland had stated that Leslie paid the heirs of the previous holder £;400 for the licence, that the place had always been conducted as a publichouse, and that no objection on the ground of unfitness had been taken. But the heirs of the previous holder were offered

£;600, and the Earl of Dartrey's agent stopped the sale by means that everyone from Ireland understood, namely, by the right of pre-emption. So the heirs were first done out of £;200, and then this man applied for a licence himself. Who

authorised this man to break the law? As the transfer had been refused, a new licence would have to be applied for, and that could not be done until next

October, although possibly exceptional circumstances might be pleaded. The people of the neighbourhood had tried to find out who was responsible for the

evasion of the law. The police knew nothing; they were ordered not to

prosecute; not to give Lord Dartrey's agent any annoyance. The magistrates knew nothing, except that their decision had been over-ruled by some authority which had no legal warrant for its action. Dublin Castle referred the inquirers to the Excise authorities, from whom the following letter, dated 6th February, was received;

"I have laid before the Board of Inland Revenue your letter of the 31st ult., respecting the permission granted to Mr. H. T. Leslie to carry on business pending his application to the quarter sessions, to be held on 26th March next. In reply thereto, the Hoard direct me to state that in allowing Mr. Leslie to sell they are acting upon a recommendation of the Irish Government at Dublin Castle, to whom they must respectfully refer you for any information you may require on the subject."

He (the speaker) had applied to the representatives of Dublin Castle in the House of Commons, and had been sent back to the Excise. It was a short story, but it illustrated how things were done in Ireland. What he wanted to know from the right hon. Gentleman the Attorney General was, even supposing Dublin Castle had the power to over-ride the

licensing authorities, why was that power exercised in this case? Why was that

done for Lord Dartrey's agent which would not be done for any humble applicant in County Dublin or anywhere else? This was a most unwarranted interference on the part of Dublin Castle with the law of the land, and he hoped that the Attorney General, if he could not explain this case, would at all events take great care that the action was not repeated during his time at Dublin Castle.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, X.), in seconding the motion for adjournment, said that in all the long history of scandal connected with Irish administration; although it was seldom concerned with licensing matters; he had never known so gross, so illegal, so shocking a case. What was the offence tolerated and winked at by Dublin Castle? In a county where the magistrates were practically chosen by Lord Rossmore, the head of the Orange Lodge in Ireland, they were not likely to be a bench favourable to the people, but, in this case. Lord Rossmore's Orange magistrates had actually refused to permit the transfer on the ground of the unfitness not only of the premises but also of the applicant. The case was decided practically on the authority of the decision in *Sharpe v. Wakefield*, the case upon which the whole of the English licensing law depended. The Attorney General smiled, but he laughed best who laughed last. The magistrates were entitled to take into account the distance of the house from the police barracks. He did not know who the magistrates were, but apparently they had the concurrence of the religious bodies of all denominations; a very unusual state of things in Ireland. The Earl of Dartrey's agent appealed last October or November, but for the four months that had elapsed since then, although the place had been as much without a licence as any shebeen or brothel, he had been allowed day after day to commit this breach of the law. For selling a single glass of whisky without a licence, a man was liable to a penalty of £50 or imprisonment, and the penalty was increased for subsequent offences. Why was not this man prosecuted? Why was Lord Dartrey's agent allowed to do these things? In a case of hardship it could be understood if the Government said they would not prosecute, but here there had been a legal decision. By what authority had Dublin Castle overruled the decision of the judges? In the times of James II. the suspensory power was considered to be revolutionary, and was formally condemned by the House of Commons. The reason this had happened was that a new sessions met on the 25th of this month, and this man had, he supposed, been allowed to remain unprosecuted because Lord Rossmore's friends would pack the bench for him in a fortnight's time and the Attorney General, being accustomed to the act of jury-packing, wanted to encourage the transaction. Who was Mr. Leslie? He was a member of one of the Carlton Clubs, he was a gentleman from Somersetshire, was formerly agent to King-Harman, and had been promoted to be agent to the Earl of Dartrey. If an ordinary publican sold a pint of liquor after licensed hours, he was prosecuted. Why was the law not enforced in the case of a man in the position of Lord Dartrey's agent who had broken the law for four months? If any Irish Nationalist, getting up a ball on St. Patrick's night, applied for an extension of time, he would be hooted by the police and the authorities. If any Nationalist had been found committing the smallest illegality the authorities would be only too ready to pounce upon him. Was it the law of the country that if you were Lord Dartrey's agent you could do as you

liked, while if you were a poor man the law would be immediately enforced against you? The House might say this case was unworthy of their attention, but it gave them an admirable picture of what was going on in every town in Ireland. There was no law for the Nationalists and any amount of license for the Conservatives. What were the circumstances of the case under which Mr. Leslie was granted this unusual indulgence? There was a law by which the landlords under the Land Act could pre-empt and obtain possession of their neighbours goods without paying for them. In this case the price of the house in the open market was £;600, and the landlord grabbed it for £;400, and the Government, which professed to be so anxious to uphold the rights of property, wanted to enable this man illegally to remain in possession of his ill-gotten gains. He did not know why the Government poked their noses into these cases. Why should the Government go out of their way to assist this agent? Had they not enough agents and landlords on hand, for the whole work of Dublin Castle was simply carrying on the business of landlordism? Why should the Government bring down upon themselves this additional hornet's nest? After the Government had taken up this case simply because the man concerned was the agent of a noble Earl, and allowed it to go forth that they would tolerate illegality of this kind, he believed that even the Protestants in Ireland would now come to the conclusion which the Nationalists had long ago arrived at that there was in Ireland one law for the rich and another for the poor.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn";(Mr. T. W. Russell.)

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): I do not think that the real facts of the case leave any room for the indignation shown by the two hon. Members who have spoken. These are shortly the facts in regard to the action of the Government, so far as they have taken any action at all in the matter. I do not intend to enter into the merits of this dispute between the agent to Lord Dartrey and the former tenant of his house. I may say that the facts in possession of the Government do not tally with those mentioned by my hon. friend upon this question. According to the facts in possession of the Government I understand that for some years the tenant carried on business as a publican in this house, the tenant himself having got an assignment from the preceding tenant, who had also carried on business for several years, and who died leaving a direction to his executors to sell and dispose of his interest in the house. The landlord; Lord Dartrey; exercised the right of preemption when the tenant died. According to his right of preemption he was entitled to go into possession, but although Lord Dartrey was absolutely entitled to walk in for £;120 he voluntarily increased the purchase money to £;400. As far as I can find out there is no evidence that the sum of £;600 is a fair valuation, but the fact remains that Lord Dartrey voluntarily increased the sum from £;120 to £;400. Of course the licence was the thing of real value, for the house was worth nothing without it.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the farm?

MR. ATKINSON: There was only a small bit of land attached, and its value was

comparatively nothing, for the real value was in the licensed house. The question decided by the Court was that in fixing the right of preemption they could not take into consideration the value of the licence, and Lord Dartrey thought it such a very unfair thing to the executors to deprive them of what was really the only thing of value that he refused to take advantage of the preemption price, and he increased it by the sum of £;280.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Yes, in order to get the transfer.

MR. ATKINSON: I do not mean at all to decide or attempt to decide who was right or wrong upon that contract. Lord Dartrey's agent applied to the October Licensing Sessions for a transfer of the licence to himself. The case came before the magistrates, and they decided by a majority of eighteen votes to fifteen that the premises were unfit and that the applicant was an unfit tenant. My hon. and learned friend entirely mistook my smile just now. I did not at all intend to suggest that it was not perfectly competent for the magistrates to take those facts into consideration. They decided that the premises were unfit and it was decided also that the applicant was unfit, although no objection was taken to his character. The objection taken to him was that he did not intend to carry on the business himself, and therefore the magistrates decided; rightly enough in my opinion; that he was an unfit person to hold the licence. That occurred at the October Sessions. I understand that the only objector to the transfer was one of Lord Dartrey's tenants who was under notice to quit, and who shortly afterwards surrendered his farm.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: Is it not customary to take an inhabitant of the parish as a legal objector?

MR. ATKINSON: That is the custom, but what I have stated about this man I am informed is correct. Under these circumstances, the magistrates having decided that they would not transfer the licence, Mr. Leslie determined upon having that decision brought up by a writ of certiorari. I understand that it is quite a common thing for the Excise authorities to grant licences pending litigation of that character, in order to preserve the rights which would be lost otherwise. He applied to the Excise to be permitted to sell during the interval, and I understand that such a thing is rightly done almost every day, because it would be a most monstrous thing in an application for the transfer of the licence in which the magistrates decided wrongly that permission to sell in the interval should be refused because by the non-sale in the interval the valuable interest in the licence would be forfeited. The hon. Member admits that there may be circumstances which justify the Excise authorities granting a licence to sell pending the decision of another Court. The application was made at the October Sessions, and forthwith made to remove the case to the Queen's Bench, and the decision of the Queen's Bench was not given until the 21st of December. On the 31st of December the Court of Queen's Bench delivered judgment, upholding the decision of the magistrates. I understand that neither of my hon. friends objects to the procedure of the Excise authority in granting a licence up to the time that the Queen's Bench delivered judgment and the application for a writ of certiorari because that must be on the principle that the civil rights must be protected while the case is sub judice.



MR. T. M. HEALY: There is no instrument called a licence, for it is a mere indulgence.

MR. ATKINSON: But this thing is constantly done and rightly done, and that being so Mr. Leslie determined to apply for a new licence. The ordinary time to apply for a new licence would be the 21st of Januarys.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: No, no.

MR. ATKINSON: He could have applied at the January Sessions for a licence to trade on, and he was advised that he had a right to do it.

MR. T. M. HEALY: There is no such law, and this only applies in the case of a transfer.

MR. ATKINSON: I am not pledging myself to the propriety or impropriety of these proceedings, but I am telling the House what he was advised, and he was told that this was the proper course for him to take. As three weeks notice of his application was necessary, he was too late for the January sessions, because he did not know that he had been unsuccessful in the Queen's Bench until the 21st of December, and the interval between that date and the January sessions did not allow an interval of twenty-one days to elapse. By that misadventure owing to the delay in the Court of Queen's Bench delivering judgment on the writ of certiorari Mr. Leslie was deprived of making his application at the January sessions.

MR. T. M. HEALY: What fool advised him?

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The hon. Member must not use such language.

MR. ATKINSON: Inasmuch as he could not proceed at the January sessions owing to the fact that he could not give three weeks notice, the first sessions that he could apply for the granting of an interim certificate for a new licence was the March sessions. That was entirely due to the fact that the Court of Queen's Bench delayed the delivering of their judgment until late in December. Under these circumstances Mr. Leslie applied to the Excise authorities to permit him to continue to sell until the March sessions so that his rights might not be prejudiced and for granting this permission the Irish Government is accused of exercising the prerogatives of James II. That is all the share which the Irish Government took in this matter. They received a communication from the Excise authorities setting out these facts and asking the Government if they had any objection to granting this permission to sell, inasmuch as Mr. Leslie had already paid for the licence. The reply given was that the Government had no objection to permitting him to continue to trade up to the 25th of March.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: But is that usual?

MR. ATKINSON: Yes, I understand that it is usual. This permission was granted because otherwise valuable rights would have been destroyed, and the licence was granted to sell until the owner had an opportunity of finally deciding the matter. We have done nothing except giving this man permission to sell up to the 25th of March, when his application at the licensing sessions will be finally adjudicated upon either one way or the other. That is the ordinary practice. It was not done by the authority or direction of the Executive at all.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Will the right hon. the learned Gentleman say how Mr. Leslie

would have been prejudiced if he had not obtained protection when he made application for the new licence? Is it not the fact that he was allowed to carry on the public-house business for four months without a licence?

MR. ATKINSON: The decision was given by the Queen's Bench on the 21st December, and it was only then that the licence was really lost. Whether Mr. Leslie took the right course or not I cannot say; but at all events he made application to the Excise authorities, who asked the Executive Government if they might grant permission, and the Executive said they had no objection.

\*MR. HEMPHILL (Tyrone, North): I have had some experience of the licensing system in Ireland, but I confess I have never heard of anything like the present state of affairs arising before. From the statement of the Attorney General, of course he was in no way responsible in this matter. Had it come before him originally, I am quite sure the present state of affairs would never have come into existence. I am not going into

the merits or the motives of Mr. Leslie the agent of Lord Dartrey, but there is the undoubted fact stated by the hon. Member for South Tyrone, not controverted by the Attorney General, that the personal representative of the deceased publican was offered £;600 for the interest in the public-house, and it is admitted that the value of the farm, apart from the licence, had been fixed under the Land Act at £;120. Of course, the real value of this farm, therefore, lay in the licence; the other was merely illusory. It is said Mr. Leslie was very generous in offering £;400, but an outsider offered £;600, so that Mr. Leslie got a very considerable bargain. The matter came before the quarter sessions which were the licensing authorities in Ireland, in October. There was a large attendance of magistrates, and the matter was fully discussed. There are three legal grounds on which a licence can be transferred or can be granted in Ireland. The first is the fitness of the applicant; the second, the fitness of the house; and the third, the number of public-houses in the neighbourhood. The majority of the magistrates, by a majority of eighteen to fifteen, decided that the applicant was unfit, and why? Because he was a gentleman living in a very handsome place, the agent of Lord Dartrey, one of the great magnates of the county, who in fact. could not from his position carry on the business on his own account and live on the premises. On that ground he was held to be unfit. But in addition to that the magistrates held that the premises were unfit, being such a distance from the police barracks, on which account the police could not exercise proper supervision over it. For years in Ireland that has been one of the grounds on which licences have been refused, because roadside public-houses, unless within reasonable reach of the police barracks, cannot be supervised, and the police cannot see that a house is properly conducted. At all events, in October the magistrates refused the licence. The house was then an unlicensed house. Nobody had a right to sell liquor until a new licence was granted by the adequate authority. A certiorari was moved for, and the case brought before the Court of Queen's Bench in Dublin, which

Court decided on 10th December that the magistrates were perfectly right. What then occurred? The Excise Office, in the teeth of the announcement of the magistrates in October, confirmed by the Queen's Bench, approached the Dublin

Castle authorities, and Dublin Castle authorised that Office to do what the statute gave it no authority to do; namely, to give a temporary licence to Mr. Leslie until his application was made before the magistrates in the following March. Surely never has there been a more unwarrantable act countenanced by the Executive Government, even in Ireland. There is no authority for it in the statute. There is a power, in the interval between two quarter sessions, for a magistrate to give a certificate of character, so that an Excise officer may then give a permit to sell until the following quarter sessions; but here there was no licence. This house was no more licensed than any other farmhouse in the whole country. The Excise Office evidently felt that themselves, because they would not act on their own authority and consulted the authorities at Dublin Castle who said in effect, "Why should we be stiff about this?" and told the Excise Office to do what they liked. That, of course, placed the magistrates in a very false position, and the whole of the licensing authorities throughout Ireland in a very false position. It is the more to be regretted, that at a time when public attention is so much excited in regard to this question of licensing. Dublin Castle should have given their high imprimatur to such an abuse of the law.

\*MR. BLAKE (Longford. S.): This seems to me to be very a serious question not to be set aside by the very lame explanation of the right hon. the Attorney General. It is one thing to deal under a recognised custom or practice with the case of a licence that has been issued, and which is still current and subject to an arrangement for transfer. In that case the applicant asks for permission for a continuance of the right to sell until an appeal is made against the decision of the magistrate adverse to the transfer to a higher jurisdiction. But it does not at all follow that when a final adjudication has taken place and the question is once and for all and irrevocably settled, and when the licence is thus practically at an end, that a new man should be allowed to sell liquor without a licence because he intends to make application for a new licence at a future quarter sessions. What is going to be the result of the action of the authorities? Any person favoured by Dublin Castle who professes his intention of applying for a new licence may be put in possession of a house and be allowed to sell liquor on the ground that he means afterwards to apply to the magistrates for a licence, and that the magistrates are practically constrained to confirm what had been done by the Dublin. Castle authorities. The right hon. and learned Gentleman cannot escape, and Dublin Castle cannot escape by saying that all that they did was to say that they had no objection. Was this transaction lawful? And if it was not lawful what right had Dublin Castle to interfere? The right hon. Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland has carefully abstained from staking his reputation upon the legality of this matter. He has not said it was lawful. He said that Mr. Leslie's advisers alleged it was so. But he has acknowledged that the facts were laid before Dublin Castle and that Dublin Castle authorised these transactions. So far as I understand the law, even as explained by the Attorney General, Dublin Castle had no right to authorise the Excise authorities to do what was an absolutely illegal act. And yet that was done by the Executive Government which is constantly putting itself forward as engaged

constitutionally in upholding the sanctity of the law. That seems to me to be a most objectionable transaction, calculated to create much confusion unless it meets with the general reprobation of the House.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): There is one matter of fact about which the House ought to have more clear information than it at present possesses, and that is by what authority the Inland Revenue Board acted in this case.

MR. ATKINSON: Mr. Leslie applied on the 11th January to the Inland Revenue for permission to sell, and the Inland Revenue wrote to the Under Secretary at the Castle, who replied that the Executive had no objections.

MR. T. M. HEALY: To the breaking of the law&#x0021;

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: But that is not what the Board of Inland Revenue say. They say in reply to a communication addressed to them by Mr. Leslie's

solicitor:; "The Board direct me to state that in allowing Mr. Leslie to sell they are acting upon the recommendation of the Irish Government" (not merely that they had no objections) "to whom they most respectfully refer you for any information you require." That seems to me to be absolutely inconsistent with the theory that Dublin Castle merely said that they had no objections, because that reply indicated that the Board of Inland Revenue refused to proceed on their own authority. Now, the Board of Inland Revenue is represented in this House by the Chancellor of the Exchequer who has been an interested spectator of this debate. I daresay the right hon. Gentleman has informed himself on the point, and he may be able to tell us what the Board of Inland Revenue did, and whether the responsibility lies with Dublin Castle, or whether the Board of Inland Revenue acted on its own responsibility because Dublin Castle did not object. There is another point. We ought to know something about the value of this permission given by the Excise authorities, and possibly the Chancellor of the Exchequer may be able to tell us that. Again, what right have the Excise authorities to give this permission? Have they acted under a statute, and if so under what statute? When we know the Act we can refer to it and determine, to some extent, the nature of their responsibility. This case is full of scandals, but there is one scandal not mentioned at all in which the Chancellor of the Exchequer is more interested than any one else. What is the root of all this mischief? We have been told that the farm without a licence was worth £;120, and with the licence £;600. The difference between the two values is the property of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and if he received the duty at the proper date he must have the money. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer has informed himself on the question I am sure the House would be delighted to hear from him what would not be an ex parte statement; what part the Inland Revenue Board took in this matter, and whether they acted at the instigation of Dublin Castle.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): I will attempt to answer the specific question that has been put. As I understand it, the solicitor for Mr. Leslie wrote to the officer of the Excise on the 11th January stating that his client had intended to make application for a licence at the January session, but was entirely precluded from doing so owing to the decision of the Queen's Bench being so late. His client, however, intended to make the

application for a new licence on the 26th March, and in view of that fact his client wished to know whether there was any objection to his carrying on the business till the 26th March. I appeal to hon. Members not to make too much of a technical point which I do not think is material to the ethics of the case. It is admitted that Mr. Leslie was legally entitled to conduct his business until the decision of the Supreme Court of Law-, and that if that decision had been against him he could make application for a new licence. [An HON. MEMBER That is not so.] At any rate, he thought so, and wrote to the Excise that it was no longer in his power to make application for the licence in January, but that he proposed to make application in March, and in the meantime asked the Excise to allow him to exercise the privilege of selling liquor until 26th March. The question has been asked whether the suggestion came from Dublin Castle or from the Inland Revenue to grant the permission. Now, the officer of Inland Revenue wrote to the Under Secretary at the Castle saying that he had been directed by the Board of Inland Revenue to forward a letter from the solicitor of Mr. Leslie craving an extension of the period of indulgence under the circumstances. Before taking any steps the Board would be glad to know whether his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant Would have any objection to the proposal being acceded to; but in the meantime the local officer of Excise had been instructed not to interfere with Mr. Leslie.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Read the answer.

MR. WYNDHAM: The answer was that there was no objection under the circumstances.

MR. T. M. HEALY: What circumstances?

MR. WYNDHAM: The circumstances set forth by Mr. Leslie's solicitor. The correspondence showed that the suggestion had not come from Dublin Castle.

MR. CLANCY (Dublin County. N.): This is a case which in a small way presents a perfect picture of the manner in which Ireland is governed. Both in and outside the House we have been asked to regard the government of Ireland as based upon law and order, and everything is supposed to be carried on in the purest manner; and if any attempt is made from the Irish benches at any time to cast disrespect on the judges of the land we are solemnly rebuked. But what has been the answer of the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland to the charge made by the hon. Member who raised the debate? The substance of the answer, particularly when he wanted to point out the futility of the ground that this man Leslie was refused a transfer of a licence, was this: "I disagree with the judges of the Queen's Bench; they were not right in withholding, as they did, a licence for this man on the ground they did."

MR. ATKINSON: I said nothing of the sort. The only question decided by the Queen's Bench was whether the magistrates had acted within their powers in refusing the licence.

MR. CLANCY: Then why did the right hon. and learned Gentleman enter into this matter at all? What business was it of his whether this man should have been refused the licence at all? I assume that the law has been rightly decided, but the right hon. and learned Gentleman assumes in his answer that the law was not rightly decided. Imagine such a thing occurring in England; Supposing

a bench of magistrates in England had decided that a man should not have a licence, imagine after such a decision the man daring to keep a public-house open; But in Ireland such a thing has happened, and the man has kept the public-house open in defiance of the law. Then he appealed to the Queen's Bench Court and was beaten there but he still kept the public-house open. He allowed the time to elapse in which he could have applied for a new licence to the quarter sessions in January, but he still kept the public-house open, trusting to the influence of his friends in Dublin Castle, and of the Orange Lodge of which he was a member, to keep him safe from the consequences. The right hon. and learned Member entered into the merits of the question, and told of the generous treatment of Lord Dartrey to this man. But what business was it of the Attorney General to inquire into Lord Dartrey's conduct? The only question is, Was the law broken? I admit at once that the benevolent doctrine of the right hon. and learned Gentleman might commend itself to some people in certain circumstances. If they were to take into account special circumstances of great hardship, they might, if they possibly could, wink at some violation of the law. But what if they applied that doctrine all round? Every man who belongs to Ireland knows that it has been applied to Orangemen. Conservatives, Unionists, landlords, and people of the upper classes, but it has never been applied to any man, of the National faith or who occupy a humble position in life. This case gives another illustration of how Ireland is governed. The application for leave to keep the public-house open after the magistrates had refused the licence was made to the Board of Inland Revenue and to the authorities of the Castle. Would that be tolerated in England? What connection is there between the Board of Inland Revenue and the Castle? What business has the Board of Inland Revenue to communicate with the Castle? Have they not the law before them to carry out? Does the Inland Revenue Board ask the Castle what they would do in similar circumstances in the case of a Nationalist? Not at all. The very fact that the Inland Revenue Board wrote a private letter to the Castle; which would have never seen the light but for this debate; was a condemnation of the system of government carried on in Ireland, and must carry conviction to the mind of any honest man that that system of government is absolutely indefensible. At the same time the English could not govern Ireland in any other way by upholding the law impartially. By-and-bye, when they have conquered the Transvaal, they will be obliged to govern it, too, against the will of the people. At all events, Irishmen are entitled, meanwhile, to protest that the law, while it is the law, should be impartially administered, and I think the hon. Member for South Tyrone is to be congratulated in having brought this glaring case before the attention of Parliament.

\*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.) said as this was a matter having a great deal to do with the Inland Revenue, it might not be out of place for him to say a few words. He had never heard of the case until he came into the House, and he did not profess to be so intimately acquainted with the law or its administration in cases of this kind as to be able to give a definite opinion. He thought all would admit that the mere continuance of non-

interference with selling, pending the hearing of the appeal by the Queen's Bench, was proper. The Chief Secretary had shown that there might be a case of hardship even beyond that, on which it would be right that a similar non-interference should continue to be exercised on the part of the Inland Revenue. Whether this was one of those cases or not he could not say offhand, but he would certainly inquire. But he thought non-interference after a decision of the Court of Queen's Bench against the applicant should be very rarely used. If non-interference had been exercised not in accordance with the ordinary custom, which should apply equally to all, but in favour of Mr. Leslie, because he held a certain position, he most distinctly condemned the proceeding, and should certainly interfere to prevent its continuance.

\*MR. WHITTAKER (Yorkshire. W.R., Spen Valley) said the point which he wished to emphasise was that the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland in all he had said had studiously avoided giving his own opinion upon the case. He did not venture to assert that Mr. Leslie had a right to any such permission as had been exercised. He had no such right. There was no justification for any such application, and therefore it was erroneous for the right hon. Gentleman to say that the case would be finally adjudicated upon at the March sessions. The application to be made, then, was a new application altogether.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL said that, after the extremely satisfactory statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, he desired, with the leave of the House, to withdraw the motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

NEW BILLS.

SCHOOL BOARD ELECTORATE (SCOTLAND).

Bill to admit to the School Board electorate in Scotland all persons entitled to vote for the county council election, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Weir. Mr. Leveson-Gower, Mr. Nicol, Mr. Cathcart Wason, Mr. John Dewar. Mr. Bignold. Mr. Harmsworth, and Mr. Caldwell.

SCHOOL BOARD ELECTORATE (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"To admit to the School Board electorate in Scotland all persons entitled to vote for the county council election," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 97.]

LIBEL.

Bill to amend the Law of Libel, ordered to be brought in by Sir John Willox, Sir Albert Rollit, Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, and Mr. Frederick Wilson.

LIBEL BILL.

"To amend the Law of Libel," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 5th June, and to be printed. [Bill 98.]

CROFTERS' HOLDINGS (SCOTLAND) ACT (1886) AMENDMENT.

Bill to amend the Crofters' Holdings (Scotland) Act, 1886. ordered to be brought in by Mr. Weir, Mr. John Dewar, Mr. Leveson-Gower, Mr. Cathcart Wason, Mr. Bignold, Mr. Harmsworth, and Mr. Caldwell.

CROFTERS' HOLDINGS (SCOTLAND) ACT (1886) AMENDMENT BILL.

"To amend the, Crofters' Holdings (Scotland) Act, 1886," presented, and read the

first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 99.]

BURIAL GROUNDS (LOANS) (SCOTLAND).

Bill to extend the period of repayment of Loans for Burial Grounds in Scotland, ordered to be brought in by Captain Sinclair and Mr. John Morley.

BURIAL GROUNDS (LOANS) (SCOTLAND) BILL

"To extend the period of repayment of Loans for Burial Grounds in Scotland." presented and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday, 22nd April, and to be printed. [Bill 100.]

SUPPLY (ARMY ESTIMATES).

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Main Question [14th March], "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."; (Mr. Brodrick.)

Question again proposed.

\*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): During the many years that I have been in the service of this House it has so happened that I have never, to use our ordinary slang, talked out a debate until that unfortunate event happened to me last night. And I can assure the House I should never have dreamed of intruding; on them again on this occasion if it had not been for the admitted importance of the subject; admitted by the Government in their declarations on the particular matter before us at the present time. The debate which has just occurred has filled the minds of Members of the House more no doubt with the licensing laws of Ireland and of this country than with the great questions of Army reform which are presented to the House by the Government on this occasion. But I will do my best, even after that disturbing topic has been introduced and the able speeches to which we have listened, to recall the House to the consideration of that topic which we were discussing last night, of the greatest importance to the country. Last night I was attempting, as the hands of the clock reached twelve, to discuss the composition of the somewhat mythical army corps it was the main function of the scheme of the Secretary of State for War to create. It was whispered just now in this House that in another place the Government have expressed the surprise with which they have always heard the distinguished soldiers of this country push the claims of the Regular service as against the Volunteers. There is, of course, a little tendency upon the other side ;there is a little tendency on the part of the Government, finding that Volunteers cost per head so very much less than the Regulars of this country do, finding that the Volunteers raise none of the recruiting difficulties which are raised by the peculiar position of this country as regards foreign service armies;there is a little tendency on the part of the Government, perhaps, to prefer to count heads of army corps which are composed of those forces than army corps composed of Regular forces. And I was trying to point out last night how far that was the case. Of the six army corps which the Government present to us three are mainly composed of Regular forces, the third having a certain number of Militia battalions in it; but the other three are almost entirely composed of Militia battalions and Volunteers, and we have not yet heard of the method by which the Volunteers are to be trained and brought up to the mark and placed in these army corps to make them other than



mythical and imaginary.

There is a new development in connection with this matter which we shall watch, all of us who have been reformers in this House in the past, with the deepest interest, and that is the new provision of field guns for these army corps, guns for the Militia and also for the Volunteer organisations. The House may remember that in the past many of us have frequently brought before the House the fact that the Swiss are able to create a very formidable artillery upon a Militia basis, and we, many of us, have often expressed our opinion, and asked whether it was not possible for us here to do what the Swiss have done on a Militia system; create, at all events, a decent field artillery; but the Government go beyond this, but they do not tell us, however, how they intend to secure the training of the officers of the Volunteers. The money spent on the Volunteers especially, I think Volunteer officers of this House will admit, was lost and wasted last year in the special camps, I want to know how the Government are going to provide that this Volunteer field artillery is going to be a reality in these army corps which so largely depend upon it. When this matter has been previously debated in this House, while it has always been assumed that it might be possible to create a Militia field artillery, with regard to the Volunteer field artillery the most skilled officers have always said you must adopt a mixed system, a partially paid system, and you could not rely on mere Volunteers for skilled drivers of artillery.

All this leads one to ask once more, Are the Government, with regard to these three army corps they form, face to face with the facts; have they really thought out their scheme sufficiently to give anything like reality to the scheme they have presented to the House? The First Lord of the Treasury, speaking last night, said the matter of the training of these men was one of the most important things which we should have to consider in connection with this scheme, and I am glad to see upon the Papers which have been circulated this morning that the training of the Army, and, I imagine, the training of the Militia and Volunteers, will be more closely under the Commander-in-Chief in the future than it has been in the recent past. The

House will remember that great attention has been called very recently by debates in another place to this subject of the Command-in-Chief, and many Members who are interested in the subject will remember the discussion we had here with regard to it in 1895 and 1896. At that time all of us pointed out that, while there might be ground for relieving the Commander-in-Chief of excessive centralisation, ground for relieving him notably of supply duties outside the proper duties of a Commander-in-Chief, everything which had to do with the preparation and training of the Army for war ought to be under his control. There has recently been a difference of opinion on this question, but I am inclined to think, judging from the words of a Memorandum of the Secretary of State for War, which is the last Paper laid before the House this morning, that that difficulty is likely to be solved in the immediate future. I believe that the Order, the unfortunate Order of 1895, will be modified in accordance with the words of the Secretary of State. The words to which I attach very great importance, and which, if anything can, will tend to make these army corps a

reality, and to prevent in the future the existence of that disgraceful lack of training which has admittedly existed in the past are these: "I am disposed to think the Adjutant General should come directly under his control." We all know that the Commander-in-Chief has had the general control of the Intelligence Department and of mobilisation, but he has not had the control in the same degree of the training or discipline of the Army which has been directly under the control of the Adjutant General, himself directly under the control of the Secretary of State. I read these words of the Secretary of State as being a change of front upon this question, and as meaning that Lord Roberts will have in the future control not only over the Intelligence Department and mobilisation, but also over that portion of Headquarters which carries out the preparation and training of our Army for war.

Of course, this army corps system raises the whole question of what it is that the British Army is needed for; what it has to do. The Secretary of State tells us that his two great objects are the provision of 115,000 men; I take his figure for foreign peace garrisons; for our normal peace garrisons abroad. I confess I think that the South African situation makes it highly probable that that figure of 115,000 will have to be increased in our future calculations. 115,000, taking his figure for the peace garrisons abroad, mainly in hot, unhealthy, and distant places, and the provision of a short-service Army to fill the Reserves for war. Now, on this subject of a short-service Army to fill the Reserves for war the Secretary of State appeals to have tried to make out that the Army reformers are in some sense opposed to the short-service system. I should like to ask those Members of the House who have been misled by such suggestions thrown out from time to time to hear what was the unanimous agreement of the Service Members upon that subject last year. It was in these words, which were in the original Memorandum presented to them and which were unaltered by repeated discussion by the Board of some sixty or seventy experienced Members of the House;

"The terms of service for those wishing to serve at home may be shortened to the minimum that will make efficient soldiers, in order to increase the Reserves to the utmost."

Those words have this further importance, that they are almost identical with the words which were used by the present Commander-in-Chief in 1884 and 1892. In 1884 and 1892 Lord Roberts used these words in regard to the present terms of service in the Army;

"Eight years is too long for a man who proposes to return to civil life."

He also said;

"Those who do not desire to make the Army a profession should have a short term of service and return to civil life and the Reserve."

Therefore, I think we might take it that the Service Members of the House and the present Commander-in-Chief are in agreement as to short terms of service for the troops that are to swell the ranks of the Reserves.

I want to ask the Secretary of State for War how he thought himself justified the other night in attacking, in connection with that subject, those who desired the existence of what he called a separate Army for India,

which he attributed to myself. Surely he knows from all the debates that what we have advocated is shorter service here at home for the purpose of swelling the Reserves, and a somewhat lengthened service or term of enlistment for India. Not a separate Army for India, but that double system of enlistment that gives a man a chance of two forms of Army service, upon which all military reformers are now agreed, and upon which the present Commander-in-Chief expressed himself more strongly than any other man. The right hon. Gentleman went on to discuss this subject. He used these words;

"We should have a less effective Army at home, and a more costly Army in India." What right has he to make that statement? "A less effective Army at home" he is within his right in saying, because that is a matter within his own knowledge. He is bound by such authorities as Lord Haliburton and Sir Richard Knox. At all events, the matter is arguable, and it is within the discretion of the Secretary of State to make that statement; but as to the other objection in the statement; as to our having a more costly Army in India; I confess that I believe the House will agree with me that that matter is more within the knowledge of the Government of India than within the knowledge of the Secretary of State for War. What is the official opinion of the Government of India upon this subject? It has never varied for a day. The officially expressed opinion of the Government of India upon that subject is diametrically opposed to the opinion of the Secretary of State for War, and it is so recorded by the Royal Commission on Indian expenditure. That Commission reported that the witnesses of the Indian Government state that the short-service system imposes a heavy charge on the Indian revenue, "without compensating advantage"; that the "soldier sent out is too young, is more subject to illness, and not so efficient as an older man." That was recorded by the Commission as the opinion of the Government of India, and I confess that I attach more importance to the official opinion of the Government of India than I do to that of the Secretary of State for War upon this matter. Lord Roberts was called as a witness upon the subject, and was somewhat, severely cross-examined by members representing the War Office view upon the point. He was asked how he made out that it would be cheaper for India to have a somewhat longer system, as it would be cheaper for us at home to have a shorter system, and Lord Roberts could not be got beyond this point; he said it appeared to him that the of ton or you sent people backwards and forwards the morn expensive it would be. Lord Roberts would not budge from that position. The Secretary of State puts his view above that of Lord Roberts and the Indian authorities. He said in this House on the 8th February, 1897, that the opinion of Lord Roberts on that point is important, but that there are statistics which are more important still. Those statistics are the exact statistics which were put before the Commission, and which the Commission has shown India does not admit. The Secretary of State says it is useless to raise the soldiers' pay; anyhow with this system. It is useless to try and get these 115,000 or more men for foreign service by increased pay, because he says although the country would be "willing to pay heavily" it would be useless to raise the rate of pay unless we doubled it. We should not bring in any more men.

The right hon. Gentleman goes on to suggest that, if recruiting fails, the

difficulty may be overcome by adopting compulsory service, as I understand, for home defence;compulsion for the Militia. But would that overcome the difficulty? He objects to what he calls a separate arm} for India, for foreign service, and he explained to the House why such an Army would be less effective than the present one. But upon this question of compulsion, how does he face the question that, ipso facto, the ballot for home service would create that separate army for foreign service which he so greatly deprecates? It appears to me that no man has ever contemplated as he has or breathed a word of applying the principle of compulsion to our foreign service, which is our heavier service, with its requirement of the 115,000 men that we have permanently to keep abroad. And so the difficulties of recruiting;instead of bringing elasticity into the conditions of service;remain. They are not affected in any way by this suggestion of compulsion for home service, which the Secretary for War has thrown out. But has he the authority of the Government in any way- even putting aside all other difficulties;has he the authority of the Cabinet, of which the right hon. Gentleman is a member, to make any suggestion with regard to compulsion at home? It is an unusual question, but it is a question which we are forced to ask when we have to consider it in connection with this subject. I listened to what the Leader of the House said last night. It was a sort of sigh. It appeared to me to indicate an opinion on his part altogether hostile to the argument of the Secretary for War.

\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford) was understood to ask the right hon. Gentleman for the passage in the speech of the Leader of the House.

\*SIR CHARLES DILKE: The sentence is not reported, but I will drop it. I will leave it, and will fall back on what is reported. That is the opinion of the Prime Minister, expressed on behalf of the Government last year in the House of Lords, in a debate which was followed by a division in which every single member of the Government in the House of Lords, following the Prime Minister's speech, voted against any form of compulsion for the Militia even here at home. I have talked with some of my hon. and gallant friends opposite who think that the deficiencies of this scheme may some day be remedied by the adoption of compulsion here. [An HON. MEMBER: No, no.] I said some of them. They think that the deficiencies of this scheme may some day be remedied by the adoption of compulsion here;which I do not admit, because it appears to me that compulsion for home service does not meet our needs or give us what we want, and that it does not in the least remove all the difficulties of which I have been speaking. And when I have told them that their Prime Minister and their Government are pledged against it they suggest;I dare hardly use the phrases they have used with regard to the antiquity of the Prime Minister's opinions on the subject;but they suggest that they are a survival of a very distant past. But the Prime Minister's words are very strong, and it is necessary that they should be brought before the House in this connection, as showing that this question of compulsion for home service, even if it would solve our home difficulties, which I do not think it would, must be treated as a real and grave difficulty. It was on February 20th last year that the Prime Minister spoke of

the Militia Ballot Bill as a "Bill for effecting a purpose which no one has proved to be possible." He asked, "if anyone could be found to draw and to introduce" such a Bill, would it have "the slightest chance of passing without the most angry and acrimonious debate?" That is unimportant. But what is important is this. He argued that it "would add to the dangers of the country," and that it would be absolutely impossible "to remain at the Militia ballot." I believe that what was in his mind is what is in my mind, and what I have just been trying to impress on the House ;that a Militia ballot would not meet our difficulties, and that it would be useless to have compulsory service unless you were prepared to apply it;and that was the conclusion of the Prime Minister's speech;to your Regular Army. And he said it must come to conscription for the Regular Army. That was the Prime Minister's opinion. I say if we are to have any suggestion of the question of compulsion as likely in the long run to overcome the emptiness of the present scheme, you are bound. I think, to put before the House a little more of what your meaning is, because mere compulsion for the Militia, the mere piling up of the Militia by the ballot, although it might do something for war, it does not seem to me that it would in the least diminish;I believe that in some senses it would increase;your difficulties as regards your foreign service and your normal drain of 120,000 or 150,000 men for unhealthy garrisons and India. You must remember that the way the matter would be put before the working classes of the country by their chosen leaders would be this. They would say this was a dangerous and unhealthy trade. This service in India in time of peace and this service in tropical garrisons is a thing which the country needs and for which it will have to pay. And the introduction of compulsion with the view of getting over that difficulty would be represented to them, and I think naturally, as the country being unwilling to pay the market price for the article it desires to obtain. And though that difficulty is great, and has, I believe, always been great, surely it has been enormously increased by what has recently occurred and the very high price you have had to pay in the recent war for recruits for service in distant places.

I do not know whether the Secretary of State has seen the speech which was made by the officer commanding the Imperial force which went out for the Australian Commonwealth celebrations. At every place where that force was landed this question of their pay as compared with that of the Colonials was very prominently brought forward. The character of the contrast was so greatly impressed on the minds of those on both sides;both on the Imperial force sent out and on the people among whom they were;that the commandant of that force thought it necessary to go out of his way to make his final speech on that question. He spoke of this great difference, indicating, not obscurely, his own opinion that the pay of the British Army would have to be raised. I am not attaching any importance to the opinion of the individual, but my point is that you have increased your difficulties by the high rate of pay which you have been forced recently to give and that it is impossible to suppose that you will be able to supply by compulsion, directly or indirectly, this heavier part of our responsibility;the most difficult of all of them;to satisfy permanently in time

of peace this drain of 120,000 or 150,000 men for places like India or South Africa. Therefore it is that I regret that we should have a somewhat vacant scheme, not providing in any way for the great drain which will come upon you at the conclusion of this war, but indicating the possibility of failure, without any increase of pay or any change in the conditions of recruiting, but suggesting that in two or three years time these difficulties might be met by compulsion, which, I believe, would never meet them in any way at all. The Reserves themselves have been counted by the right hon. Gentleman in his list of figures at 90,000 men. But the 90,000 men will not be there at the conclusion of this war. The number of the Reserves will have been greatly diminished by this war. Actuarial calculation will no doubt show what the number is expected to be, but it will not be 90,000, and you will also have the difficulties I alluded to just now in regard to the recruiting of the Indian Army and as to the Indian drafts. There is no suggestion in the scheme as to how the recruiting is to be met, how these difficulties are to be met, and surely before a suggestion was thrown out into the air that compulsion would some day meet these difficulties, which, I believe, it cannot solve, an attempt ought to have been made; an attempt which was fully expected by the country would have been made; to increase the pay of the soldiers, and to make those changes in recruiting which many of us believe would greatly affect the matter. The Government, however, go, I think, on the opposite tack. The Regulars are costly and the Volunteers are cheap. The Leader of the House boasted last night that there was no attempt to increase the number of the Regular forces of the country. He claimed credit last night for the Estimate on this ground. He said that the only increase in the present numbers is the 10,000 garrison veterans and the increased number of Yeomanry. I am very doubtful whether the 10,000 garrison veterans will be obtained. If they are obtained, of course they are a long-service force, and it will alter the whole balance of your system in connection with long service and make no contribution, but, on the contrary, make a detraction from the strength and value of your Reserves. The Government point to the same intention by the manner in which they bring the Volunteers into their Army corps, and I confess that their proceedings have led me to think that they attach undue importance to mere numbers as contrasted with the value of the men and their training. I shall not dwell on this matter. We have debated it in the past, but I must mention in this connection the reinforcements which have been sent out to South Africa. The 30,000 men supplied to Lord Kitchener are untrained men. They remind me of nothing so much; I see some Scotch Members present; as the 30,000 untrained men by whom Scotland lost Dunbar. I believe that was the number, and the quality of their training was somewhat similar. The supply of these untrained men and the counting of Volunteers as Army corps simply because they give you so many numbers at a cheap rate, goes to show to my mind that the Government do not attach sufficient importance to the quality of the training and the value of the men, but merely to the importance of counting heads. You are sending out as rough-riders men who have never seen a horse, and paying them a high rate of pay as mounted men. You are paying men who have never seen a horse at a rate of pay

almost double the pay of the sergeant-majors who have had the training of the Regular cavalry at Aldershot, and this appears to me to have greatly added to the difficulties of the Government in regard to this question of pay in the future. I confess that, by an earlier preparation of the reinforcements needed, I believe the scandal which occurred with regard to the pay of the Rhodesian field force would have been avoided. It has enormously added to the difficulties in the future. The Leader of the Opposition asked last night what those of us who attack the War Office on these questions exactly mean. He asked us to say whether it is the military heads of the Army, or the civilian clerks, or the politicians that we mean. I confess that I have never been a great believer in the value of the opinion with regard to the Army of Lord Haliburton and Sir E. Knox, but of the value of their services as regards work and of their ability there is no man in this House who has a higher opinion than myself, but, after all, they have been and the soldiers in the

War Office are, very largely the servants of the politicians. I think it is upon ourselves that we must take this blame. We must say that it is we here who have never given our minds sufficiently to the consideration of these questions, and that it is not the soldiers and not the civilian clerks, but we, all of us, who ought to bear the blame for this absence of preparation for war.

\*MR. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham): My only reason for intervening in this debate is that I have had a certain amount of special experience which may possibly be of use in discussing some of the aspects of this great question. I may say, by way of preface, that I have served some thirteen years in the Army, during the last two and a half of which I was Military Attaché to the British Embassy in the United States. Consequently I have had a unique opportunity of studying the military problems and reorganisation proposals of the only army in the world which resembles ours in the slightest degree. In the United States they have the same national insistence on a, voluntary system, the same Anglo-Saxon man in the street to reckon with, and the same inestimable blessing of a halfpenny press to remind Ministers that they are mortal and to instruct them in their duties. The United States have, moreover, also just emerged from a great war which has left behind it a legacy of guerilla operations, which are still in progress and which have so shown up the defects of their old military system that army reform has become one of the pressing political questions of the day. I have had the opportunity of studying the American army both in the field and subsequently under the process of reform; whilst I do not contend that they have by any means solved this question satisfactorily, at the same time I think we can learn something from their mistakes. In certain directions even we have a great deal to learn from their experience.

Before going on to these special points I may perhaps be permitted to make a few general remarks on the scheme unfolded by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War. I hope he will not think me guilty of presumption if I venture to express the opinion

that his speech was the most momentous statement ever made in the history of the British Army. We may not approve of his scheme in every detail, but I think we

must all agree that it shows a grasp of broad principles, and that, therefore, he has earned our goodwill. We shall do what is possible to assist him in the path on which he has set out. I listened last night with great attention to the strictures on his scheme passed by the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition. I hoped that from his wide experience in connection with the War Office he would have thrown out some useful hints in connection with that scheme. I must say from my own experience of the regime of the Leader of the Opposition at the War Office that he has left behind him there nothing but tender memories on account of the courteous and suave manner in which he presided over that Department. But when I come to consider his present proposals it seems to me that his only contribution to practical statesmanship in this matter was, in the first place, to suggest a deer-ease in the Army; secondly, to recommend that we should abolish the idea of an expeditionary force, as it might provoke our neighbours; thirdly, that we should increase the civilian element at the War Office; and lastly, by way of arming the country against possible dangers, he advised us to adopt the policy of the conciliatory smile in dealing with our neighbours. I think we all remember the sad fate of the young lady of Riga, and I am afraid if we adopt this policy of the smile, the smile will again be on the face of the tiger. The Leader of the Opposition then said he feared that the Secretary of State for War had some great military purpose. I venture to hope that he has. I think it is time that in putting forward a scheme of Army reform in this House the Government should have some great military purpose behind it, and I venture to express the opinion that this great military purpose is to try to bring the military forces of this great Empire up to the level of its responsibilities. Perhaps I may be permitted without presumption to offer my congratulations to the Army reformers in this House, because while they have borne the burden and heat of the day, and for many years have been sowing the good seed, it is only lately that it has fallen on good ground; ground, too, which has often been condemned in the past as barren and unproductive. Still, it has now brought forward a harvest which, though perhaps not entirely satisfactory to everyone, is, I hope, only an earnest of more good things to come. I think the Army reformers in this House for a long time have naturally felt that their proposals were not always met in the spirit in which they were made, but I do not think they should on that account abuse the right hon. Gentleman because he has now come round to their opinions. I think they should rather congratulate themselves on having converted him in some respects, and that they should combine together to help him in every way, and to give his scheme a chance instead of merely assailing it with destructive criticism.

In considering this scheme one of the first things that suggests itself to my mind as striking is that two such high military authorities as the late Commander-in-Chief and the present Secretary of State for War have agreed in their characterisation of the old system. The late Commander-in-Chief called it a Chinese system, and the present Secretary of State for War has called it a Boxer system. These are practically synonymous terms, or at any rate both are equally applicable, and it occurs to one to ask at this point whether the more



highly placed Boxer leaders are to be invited to commit suicide, according to the latest diplomatic precedent. Personally, I hope not, but I feel that until this point is settled the Prime Minister must be awaiting results with a certain amount of anxiety. I am glad that the policy of arming the "man in the street" with a rifle is no longer to be relied upon. I may perhaps be permitted to remind the House what the Duke of Wellington once said in connection with this view of national defence. When there was some talk of the possible invasion of this country by France it was suggested to the Duke that in such an event all the young men would flock to the coast and hurl the presumptuous invader back into the sea. The Duke of Wellington smiled grimly and said, "If the young men of England cannot enlist in the Army I should advise them to stay at home and not make fools of themselves." I hope we shall hear no more of entrusting the defence of this country to "young men with rifles."

There is one point which I think would strike everyone who heard the right hon. Gentleman's statement, and that is that some of the more important lessons of the war in South Africa have been well taken; and, in my opinion, if the war did nothing else but show up the defects of our military system, and teach us how to remedy them, it would be well worth while. He struck at the root of the whole matter when he said that the voluntary system is nothing to be proud of unless it produces efficient defenders. That statement has caused a good deal of comment on the other side of the House, and the suggestion has been made that the Government is going to introduce, a system of conscription. I do not think that this inference need necessarily be drawn. We require a large number of recruits each year; I do not know exactly how many; and the question is, shall we be able to get these recruits? If not, the whole scheme falls to the ground. Therefore, we must either force them into the service by compulsion, or make it worth their while to come in. I think the country will be willing to try the latter alternative first. In connection with my American experience I had special facilities for studying the problem of recruiting there, and I did so in great detail during the last two years.

I may say that I have examined thousands of American recruits, and I have talked to hundreds of them, and when I say that they are probably superior in physique and intelligence to any troops in the world, I think it is desirable that we should get the same material here if possible. The experience I learned there may possibly be useful to the House, and I may perhaps be allowed to quote a few figures. First of all, the term of military service is entirely different from our own. It is only three years, with the option of re-engagement. A very large proportion re-engage, because it is made worth while to do so. The pay of the private on joining is 1s. 9d. per day, after two years service it is raised to 1s. 10d., after three years to 2s. 0d.; after four years to 2s. 2d.; and after five years to 2s. 6d. There are no "stoppages" out of this pay, and the figures I have quoted represent what the soldier has to spend as he likes. All these rates are increased by 20 per cent, in time of war, or if the soldier has to serve beyond the seas. Of course, it may be said that the cost of living

in America is very much greater, but this counts for little in the case of the private soldier, as everything is found for him. At these rates they succeed in getting men of a high physical and intellectual standard. The average height of recruits is 5 feet 7 inches, the average age is twenty-two, and all the men must be at least able to read and write. Only from 15 to 20 per cent. of the applicants are enlisted. From these figures I deduce that if we could offer a rate of pay for really mature men; I don't mean for boys; of 1s. 9d. per day, it is quite possible that we might get as good a class of men as are to be got in America. I believe we could secure really mature men at these rates, which would mean an extra cost of something like £3,000,000 a year. From that amount, however, could be deducted what is now wasted on mere boys, who are quite unable to take their place in the field. I think that by adding to these terms some such scheme of old age pensions as was suggested in the case of the garrison regiments, it would be a sufficient inducement to tempt men to leave the labour market and come into the Army. I rejoice very much that the right hon. Gentleman suggests that cubicles should be tried in barracks. One of the greatest drawbacks to decent men enlisting are the conditions of barrack-room life, especially at night. Of course, these proposals all mean money, but the right hon. Gentleman stated that he never came down to this House without running the gauntlet of spendthrift Members who wanted him to spend more money. I think that fact alone should encourage him to risk the expense, and if he does I will do everything in my power to save him from that lamp-post in Palace-yard.

We now come to a very much debated point and that is the proposal to form these army corps. The army corps has been attacked in no measured terms in the course of the debate, and I must say my-

self that I am not at all enamoured of that form of unit. At the same time, we must give the right, hon. Gentleman's scheme a chance. If he can produce six army corps ready in all respects to take the field, I do not think we have any right to condemn his proposals offhand. He does not put them forward merely on his own initiative, but on the advice of Lord Roberts. The Leaders of the Opposition contended last night that Lord Roberts really could not know much about the matter, because he had been only two months at the War Office. I am not sure that that fact in itself may not be of great advantage to him. But his study of the military requirements of this country has extended not over two months, but over more than fifty years, from a time before the present Secretary of State for War was even born. We must give Lord Roberts and the Secretary of State a chance to produce these army corps before we condemn their proposals as absurd or ridiculous.

In some respects, perhaps, the most important part of the right hon. Gentleman's statement was that in which expressed his determination to appoint none but competent generals and commanding officers to posts of high command. He has not underrated the difficulties of this task, and the debate which took place on last Monday and Tuesday nights has afforded conclusive proof of the obstacles he will have to face in this House as well as outside. But the House and the country must support the right hon. Gentleman against the paralysing influences of good nature and aristocratic connections, and I prefer to believe that they

will. It is difficult to imagine a more vicious or demoralising influence than that of the appointment to the command and instruction of young troops at home of generals or commanding officers who, being proved inefficient in the field, have been sent home as failures. The enforcement of such a rule must, of course, bring a certain amount of hardship upon individuals, but the interests of the public service are infinitely above the interests of individuals, and all I would add on this point is that it would be a wise policy to give these officers who have committed no crime, beyond incompetence, the opportunity of resigning, without public scandal. It might also be better to allow them, if possible, to retire without any loss of pension. If the Secretary of State really succeeds in appointing none but the best men to positions of high command, he will at one stroke have done one of the first things needful to reform both the War Office and the Army.

I should like to enter my rigorous protest against the vicious practice of emasculating the War Office at the commencement of a war, when the co-operation of the trained staff is most needed, by releasing a large portion of the staff officers for service in the field. In the case of the intelligence Department, which is only a small body, I believe that at the beginning of the present war no less than seventeen officers, who had been trained to the duties of the Department, were allowed to go to the front. Such a practice would destroy the efficiency of any office, and it is also hard upon officers who have to take up the appointments temporarily. Such officers merely keep the places warm, doing all the dirty work when the strain is greatest, and are unceremoniously bundled out when the warriors return from the front. Any officer appointed to a highly paid post in the War Office should be appointed only on the clear understanding that he serves in that office, subject to his efficiency, for a full fixed term, and that no volunteering for active service can be permitted. Another practice to be avoided is the sending of our trained non-commissioned staff to the front, as under such circumstances the young recruits who pour in during the time of war have no proper instruction. Instead of the training staff being weakened at such a time, it should rather be increased. In regard to the raising of the Imperial Yeomanry, I must express deep regret that the question of the co-operative defence of the Empire has not been brought forward in some shape in this connection. It may be said that the time is not ripe. I think the time is peculiarly ripe. I have lived for some years in the Colonies and am still in touch with Colonial opinion, and my belief is, whatever the Governments of the Colonies may be saying, that the people are only too ready to take part in any scheme of co-operative defence of the Empire if you will give them the opportunity. The Governments are waiting to see which way the cat will jump, and I believe that any well-considered proposal would meet with a most enthusiastic response. Failing such a proposal, I wish the right hon. Gentleman had been able to suggest a scheme by which each of the Colonies concerned would have accepted a fixed share, however small, in the Imperial offensive Army. We ought to know just how many men we can count upon and of what arms, and they ought to, have their fixed place in the mobilisation tables. If anything of that sort is done, I hope the men we get will be mounted infantry or artillery, and

that we shall hear no more about "dismounted men preferred." With regard to the great question of the training of the Army, I hope that in any future arrangement the training will be extended continuously as far as possible all the year round. We are the only country in the world, except China, which expects to fight only in fair weather. As to the question of the proposed Volunteer artillery, I do not think it would be possible to train Volunteer batteries by giving them only thirty days in camp. Whatever may be given to the infantry Volunteers, I hope more training will be given to the artillery. Another most important point is the provision of a larger supply of small-arm ammunition for the use of our infantry. The shooting of the American infantry soldier is infinitely superior to that of our own; the reason being that he is allowed practically as much ammunition as he pleases; and is given a range to use as well. At the same time, of course, there is more room for ranges in America. One other point in connection with mounted troops is the weight of the equipment our horses have to carry. I hope the right hon. Gentleman will take advantage of the American experience in lightening the load. The American saddle is much lighter than ours, and the equipment the horses have to carry on service when chasing bands of Indians; which work may be said to resemble somewhat our present operations; is also much lighter. I should be very pleased to give the right hon.

Gentleman privately certain information which I have on this subject. The United States cavalry are very much better trained than are our cavalry in scouting, dismounted duties, and especially horse-mastership. I was glad to hear that the right hon. Gentleman is to ask for more money to be spent on man&#x0153;uvring grounds.

MR. BRODRICK: More power.

\*MR. ARTHUR LEE: As long as the right hon. Gentleman gets the man&#x0153;uvring grounds I care very little whether it is by powers or by money, as the amount involved is so small. The Germans are spending only about £;300,000 annually on their whole system of camps, while they have spent only £;6,000,000 in all. With regard to the training of officers, I am very glad there is to be a Committee to examine into the courses of instruction, at the Royal Military Academy and Royal Military Colleges. Personally, I think the course of training at these schools is at present unreal and unpractical. With the exception of, perhaps, a certain amount of drill, one learns nothing whatever that is of the slightest use in after service. I hope the Committee will investigate the courses of study and the experience gained at that excellent institution the Royal Military College at Kingston, Canada. Having had the honour of being instructor there for five years. I can testify that the course is infinitely more practical than at either of our military colleges, and this has been proved by results. The hon. Member who referred to the question of officers' expenses greatly over-estimated the figures. He quoted only his experience of certain crack regiments, and took the expenses of the whole Army to be in like proportion. There is no objection, I think, to having one or two crack regiments, but there are an enormous number of regiments, notably the Artillery, Engineers, and Infantry, in which young officers with only small allowances of £;100 a year, or even less, are able to

get on perfectly well. I must say I do not think the right hon. Gentleman's proposal to have officers' uniforms made by Government tailors will meet with any

very enthusiastic response in the Army. From what I have seen of Government tailors and regimental fitters, I am sure the results would not be very satisfactory. It would, however, be an excellent thing if uniforms were simplified and the cost reduced to the lowest possible figure.

As to the "engrossing topic" of the Order in Council, I understand that the right hon. Gentleman has stated that Lord Roberts, who has not served in the War Office previously, wishes to see the full horrors of the system before expressing any opinion upon it. If this is so, I think we are bound to respect that wish, and therefore I do not propose to enter now into the question which has recently been ventilated in another place with such unsatisfactory results. I must, however, warn the right hon. Gentleman that if this matter is not dealt with it will become even more engrossing in the future than it is at present. I will only add now that the usefulness of the Committee at present sitting on the War Office has been much impaired by the fact that they are not allowed to go behind that Order in Council, and therefore are unable to examine the real crux of the whole matter. I heartily endorse the tribute of the right hon. Gentleman to the labours of the War Office staff during the war. We hear so much of "war as made in Germany" that it is refreshing to learn that the German expedition to China was so badly organised and equipped that it was quite unable to take the field until we had fitted out and assisted it from our own stores. In this connection I may read to the House an extract from a letter which I received a few days ago from General Chaffee, who commands the American Army in China. He says;

"I really have had much pleasure in meeting with officers of the British Service who are here in China. A very splendid lot of men they are too, from the general commanding, down through all with whom I have had intercourse. I say to you very frankly that I admire the straightforward way the British have of doing things, and they have the best staff organisation in China. The equipment of the force is also good for service in China. I read the order for their mobilisation in India. It is a marvellous exhibition of foresight, and yet is nothing more than experience setting in motion the staff for a division, with everything necessary to the perfect working of the machine mentioned by name."

That is, I think, very satisfactory testimony. I am glad, also, to hear that the right hon. Gentleman proposes to appoint retired military officers to some of the clerkships in the War Office. Little enough is at present done for such officers, and they would have, at any rate, some knowledge of the needs of the Service. Furthermore, a little additional encouragement might be given to young officers. It does not stimulate officers to study their profession or to give their best energies to it if they are continually snubbed and repressed. It may seem a small matter to the House, but I fail to see why when an officer is ordered to take a journey on the public service, and has to pay his expenses out of his own pocket beforehand, his accounts should always be scrutinised in a

spirit as though he was suspected of embezzlement; or why in matters of a halfpenny he should have to enter into a lengthy and acrimonious correspondence with the Paymaster. This may be a small point, but it means a good deal to officers, and, after all, courtesy costs nothing. Moreover, it is a serious error of policy to postpone the rewards for distinguished services until the ambitious blood has become chilled, and hope deferred has made the heart sick. I thank the House for having listened so patiently to my remarks. They are not in any way intended to traverse the whole of the right hon. Gentleman's speech, but I felt that I must touch upon certain points in regard to which I had special experience. I have no desire to examine the Secretary of State's scheme in a hypercritical spirit, and in any criticism I have made, or may in future make, I wish to assure the right hon. Gentleman that I am actuated solely by a desire to strengthen his hands, and to give him every possible assistance in his courageous and statesmanlike attempt to bring the military forces of this great Empire to a level with its responsibilities.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): May I venture to appeal to the House to allow the Speaker now to leave the Chair. We have still two Votes to get, and on those two Votes exactly the same discussion can be continued; while if we are driven late there may be some difficulty in finishing the two Votes.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield): suggested that the general discussion should be continued on the present motion, and the division taken on the Votes afterwards, as on a previous occasion the debate on the War Office had been checked when the House went into Committee.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said it was really a matter of indifference which course was taken, but possibly there might be a hitch at the end, and some difficulty experienced in getting the Votes through. He thought the better course would be for the Speaker to leave the Chair at this stage.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) concurred in the view of the Leader of the House, and said he had no doubt a certain latitude of discussion would be allowed.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

(SUPPLY.)

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

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

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1901&#x2013;2.

A. 450,000, Number of Land Forces.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER: I listened to the able speech of the right hon. Member for the Forest of Dean and the hon. Member for Fareham Division, and was much much struck by the ability and technical knowledge displayed, and its usefulness in a debate of this kind. No doubt they compared very favourably with the eloquent speeches of the Leader of the Opposition, the right hon. the Member for West Monmouth, and the Leader of the House. They were businesslike. What is wanted is that hon. Members who have gained experience should put their views before the House, so that the Secretary of State for War may get some idea of what is thought in the country as well as at the

War Office.

Anyone who heard the Secretary of State for War could not help realising the enormous amount of work he has done in the War Office in times gone by, and the large technical knowledge he has acquired of the subject. No doubt his scheme is, on paper, very good. If it could be carried out, it would be one of the best schemes ever submitted to the House for re-modelling the Army. But there are several things which raise doubts as to whether it can be carried out. I have never met a single officer who has not spoken of the difficulty of getting recruits for the Regular Army. I believe even the War Office is not ignorant of these difficulties, because from a conversation I had with him nine months ago, the late Under-Secretary for War looked forward to the difficulty of getting recruits to keep up the strength of the Regular Army. Another difficulty is that of organisation. It is a magnificent organisation on paper. We have been before offered schemes of organisation on paper which were quite beautiful, and I question whether that unfolded by the Secretary for War will be very much, if at all, better than that we had at the beginning of the war in South Africa. I trust that the present Secretary for War will do more for his predecessors in transforming visionary schemes into realities, and in getting his proposals transferred from paper into action at once.

We are all grateful to the Secretary for War for having increased the artillery. There is not a single Service Member in the House who has not for years past begged the War Office to increase our artillery and raise the proportion of guns to the same figure as in foreign armies. Year after year there were debates in the House questioning whether the guns were up to modern pattern, and year after year we were told that they were quite perfect. Only the other day the Secretary for War quoted a military expert, who stated that our field guns were as good as any in Europe. That has hardly been proved in the South African War, because the Boer guns were better than ours. And why is it, if they were as good as any in Europe, that the War Office bought the other day seventy-two guns in Germany of a new pattern, for which special ammunition must be made? If our guns are quite perfect, why buy guns in Germany, not to send out to South Africa but to arm our artillery at home? No doubt the guns in South Africa were bad weapons, and I hope the Secretary for War will concentrate his attention on this question until we obtain better guns than at present.

I come to the cavalry proposals. We heard something about the re-arming of the Yeomanry, but nothing about the training and re-arming of the cavalry. The hon. Member for Fareham Division mentioned the superior training and equipment of the American cavalry, and one of the most important points in any Army reform will be to make our cavalry more efficient in scouting, more useful in feeling for the enemy, and in fighting on foot, and to make them less fond of the shock of the sabre and the lance. It was only a few years ago that the lance was introduced in our cavalry, and I think that experience has proved that the lance is the one thing to make our cavalry useless, as it attracts the attention of the enemy from a long distance. Cavalry should be the eyes and ears of the Army, and not like Yeomanry, fit only to charge a mob in bread riots. I sincerely hope we shall never have mobs rising to demand bread, and need to have to suppress

them by cavalry charges. We want our cavalry to be the eyes and the feelers of our Army, and they have not been trained at all in that way. Besides the Regular cavalry, as we have got it, there is none at present, and will not be for some time to come, until the Imperial Yeomanry is raised, with the Reserve forces. In the memorandum made by the Service Members last year it was pressed on the Government that we should have in England a force thoroughly equipped with artillery, cavalry, and a supply train, as well as infantry. That is what we have never had. We have had plenty of infantry, but have been deficient in cavalry and artillery, and there, is no proposal to produce the reserve cavalry for a long to time come.

When the Imperial Yeomanry are raised I hope it will not be the scamped article we have sent out to South Africa. We want something better trained, and I should like much to know whether it is going to differ from mounted Militia. They are to get something like a month's training, and to be treated exactly as Militia, being taught to fight on foot. The only difference will be that they are to be paid 5s. a day instead of 1s. given to the Militia, and they are to be mounted. I do not understand how the Government are to supply the mounts. If the 5s. a day went for supplying the horses and the keep of the horses, nobody could complain; but if the pay is to be 5s. free, then it will draw away recruiting from the regular cavalry and the ordinary Militia. Last year and the year before the Guards were increased so that some of them might be sent to Gibraltar or Malta, in order to relieve the line battalions there; but that increase is to be maintained, and the Guards are, to be withdrawn from Mediterranean duty. The great difficulty at the present moment is that of the foreign garrisons. Of course we have been told about the veteran garrison regiments, but we have not had the latest information as to the recruiting of these garrison regiments. It was expected that they would be recruited from the Royal Reserves, but these were for a long time unarmed and untrained, until the need for them had gone by, and moreover there was no place to put them in if the other troops had come home. I have been told on fairly good authority that the recruiting of the garrison regiments from the Royal Reserves has been a dead failure. The hon. Member for the Chelmsford Division of Essex told us that in one district only 24 out of 1,500 had volunteered, and 12 of these had been rejected by the doctor. In another garrison town where there were 4,000 Royal Reserves the magnificent number of 50 had been collected from the garrison regiments. Even if these figures were doubled what prospect is there of getting eight battalions? I quite agree, however, that there will be many more than now at the close of the war, but not the number necessary, for the men who come home will expect to get civil employment. Reservists may be very willing to go to the front for a year, but it is not very likely that they will desire to spend the rest of their lives in Malta or Gibraltar, and I am quite sure it is altogether hopeless to expect to get eight battalions for garrison duty. If three are got it may, however, be some relief, and set two battalions of Guards and one line regiment free.

On the subject of the difficulty of getting recruits, I would point out the utter fallacy of that being solved by the ballot for the Militia. No country in



the world has compulsory service for foreign service. Moreover, no country would stand it. However many troops we could get in England by compulsory service for home defence, we could not get the troops in that way to go abroad. The ballot for the Militia if carried out in the old way would result simply in buying substitutes, and we could not keep up foreign garrisons to be perpetually stationed abroad. I am pleased to find that having a Militiaman as an Under Secretary for War has done much for the Militia, and I congratulate the War Office upon it. The £3 bounty and 3d. a day for messing will be a great incentive to recruiting, but there are still two or three things lacking. The embodied Militia have been dealt with more liberally in regard to clothing than in times gone by, but there is room for improvement in the quality of the clothes. If you are going to embody the Militia you ought to give them a swagger kit, and improve the quality of the clothing in many ways, and also make it fit for foreign service, so as to avoid the necessity for re-clothing them before they go abroad. I think an immense deal might be gained for the Army if the Militia were enlisted both for home and foreign service. It is true that many Militia regiments have been got to volunteer for foreign service; but the manner in which they have been asked to volunteer has caused all sorts of jealousies. I know of one instance where a colonel never thought of volunteering, and, when reminded that he might do so, he volunteered and the regiment was not taken, while another regiment which volunteered at first was taken. Another point is that very often the regiment which volunteers is very weak, whereas strong regiments are wanted for foreign service. Or there may be very few officers, especially young officers, and that is a very serious matter. Practically all the young officers have been swept out of the Militia into the Regular Army, and there are very few regiments with senior subalterns of more than one year's training. In many regiments there is at present not a single subaltern of more than three months standing. This is a very serious matter, because it is a fact that it is very much harder to work a Militia than a Regular regiment, partly because they have not had the same training, and partly because they have civilian ideas. Another point is that the old system should be reverted to of putting a good non-commissioned officer, when he is found, on to the permanent staff. At the present moment the permanent Militia non-commissioned officers are taken from the Regular Army, and the result is that when the best non-commissioned officers in the Regular Army are abroad, there are none worth anything to send to the Militia. There is still another point. When a Militia regiment is embodied and short of men, it should be allowed in certain circumstances to recruit beyond its own district. I myself do not believe in voluntary field artillery. No doubt it is better than none at all, but I do not believe that it will ever be efficient. I would like to know whether it is intended to have any Militia artillery as well.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton) said it was intended to raise batteries of Militia artillery.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER: I am gratified at that answer. A very important point has been brought forward with regard to the Volunteers in respect to the training of officers. It has been suggested by the Secretary of State that the Militia and

Volunteers would have opportunity of training; but that is not the point. It is not a question of men taking an opportunity of learning their duty; those who are keen upon that will always take every opportunity, but there are others who are not keen about their work; what is required is some further training for the ordinary

Volunteer officer, who should be better trained, to make the battalion efficient.

There is one point with regard to the Volunteers and Yeomanry sent to South Africa in which they were deficient: there was a very great lack of discipline.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): No, no; not at all. The hon. Gentleman has no business to bring charges of this sort.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER: I do not suggest there is any refusal to march or anything of that kind, but there are very irksome details, on fatigue duty, for instance, which Volunteers and Yeomanry are never efficient in, and I hope some extra training will be given to them so as to bring them into closer touch with military matters. With regard to organisation, people in this world do not believe much in army corps as army corps, but they believe in artillery, cavalry, and infantry in proper proportions, if creating an army corps means providing these things in their proper proportion then it will be a very good thing. With regard to decentralisation, if it is intended to decentralise by giving much of the work done at Pall Mall to local commanders, the work must be done thoroughly, and the staff at Pall Mall; thoroughly reorganised so as to do away with any unnecessary clerks. With regard to decentralisation, complaint is made that one of the difficulties in that process is that local officers are quite as dilatory in their work as the War Office itself. That is due to their having been trained on War Office principles. One of the most necessary things is to do away with all the unnecessary letter writing. If it be true, as is suggested by the Secretary of State, that there are 3,500 letters to be answered daily, the reform ought to have taken place years ago. The most important part of the scheme, so far as I can see, is with regard to the promotion of general officers, and I hope that the House will receive more than a mere statement that the War Office will only turn competent men into generals. Having regard to the size of our Army we have more generals than any army in the world. At Gibraltar there are no less than five to command 5,000 men, when one general to do the Governor's work and two colonels are amply sufficient. Then at Halifax and Esquimaux, with an establishment of 2,110 men, we have a full general drawing £2,000 a year, with a house, coals, table allowance, and forage allowance, which is a somewhat large amount, taking it altogether, to pay for the command of 2,110 men. We seem to be increasing the number of generals although we do not increase the number of our troops. The policy of the War Office has resulted in the production of the most expensive article in the Army, the general. One suggestion that has been made is a very good one, which is that a man should not be promoted higher than a brigadier except for distinguished service. A scheme of this kind is not a good one unless it reduces expenditure and extravagance. Extravagance should be cut off. In our case we could do with at least half the staff officers and generals that we have at present. No doubt the ability of some of the officers in the field will have to be provided for,

but there ought to be a corresponding decrease in generals by seniority. The statement as to efficient garrisons is fictitious. There is no provision for getting recruits for the Regular Army, and we should only have skeleton battalions, very pretty to look at upon paper but of no use in the field. There is no real scheme for decentralisation, because the light hon. Gentleman cannot yet trust the generals to be less dilatory in their methods than the War Office, and there can be no decentralisation until the generals are properly trained to the work. Pall Mall is the only place as to which the Committee has no definite statement, though they know from the late Commander-in-Chief that the system existing there does not work, and that some reform is urgently required in order that the War Office should work properly. So far as reforms go there are a few small reforms in the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman, and with regard to those the right hon. Gentleman can depend upon the support of every Service Member in the House, but when it comes to great reforms we think the scheme is a mythical one and will prove a failure.

\*SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth) said that in his opinion the most important feature of the whole scheme was that it transposed the order in which the country had regarded for the last forty years our military obligations in the respect that an effective army for over sea service was put first and everything else afterwards. That was where the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman was a great reform. What he liked about the new departure was that it came down from the nebulous atmosphere of army corps, which meant anything or nothing, and gave plain figures. The right hon. Gentleman came down to the House and said that, after providing for India and foreign garrisons, the necessities of Empire demanded a force of 120,000 men organised, trained, and equipped as a field army for service abroad.

With that preface, he desired to ask if those, 120,000 men were to be ready to start on overseas service at any moment, and, if so, he desired to know when, under the scheme, those 120,000 men had sailed what remained to maintain that force for an indefinite period in the field? The second question he desired to put was what was the proportion of cavalry, of field artillery, and of infantry that would remain as a reserve ready to follow them when required for reinforcements in the field. He had never been one of those who condemned Mr. Cardwell's scheme; he always urged that it did not contemplate the exigencies of actual war, and it did not contemplate greater expense overseas in times of international peace. This scheme was based on the foundation of the necessity of meeting a state of international war. With regard to the employment of the Yeomanry, there was no indication in the minds of the Government that this time was opportune for bringing together all the army forces required, but the forces proposed to be raised under the head of Yeomanry could not possibly be so called; they were mounted men for military purposes, but certainly not Yeomanry. And why were they called Imperial? He protested at a time like this against conferring the name of "Imperial" upon a force which was not "Imperial," and which originally was only organised for the purposes of meeting invasion.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Glare, E.) called attention to the inequalities of pay as between the Colonial troops and the Yeomanry and the men of the Regular Army. He

was not interested very much in urging upon the Government the advisability of increasing the pay of the men of the Regular Army, and he must be understood as opposing the war in every possible way. The point which he raised was not merely with reference to the war but the principle which had recently been set up of paying one class of men a certain rate of pay and paying the vast bulk of the men of the Army another rate, he asked the Under Secretary of State for War to tell him the number of men under arms in South Africa at the present time who were receiving not less than 5s. a day. There were thousands of Colonial troops in South Africa who had been all through the war receiving 5s. a day. They might be worth it, for he was not competent to pass an opinion on this matter, though one might come to the conclusion from the length of time the war had taken and from the unsatisfactory position the war was in at present, that those men were not worth three farthings a day. Why should the Regular Army; the men of the Highland Brigade who fought so bravely and lost so heavily in South Africa, the men of the Connaught Rangers, the Dublin Fusiliers, and the Inniskilling Fusiliers, who had gone through the greatest possible hardship and toil; receive 1s. a day while the gaudily dressed troopers from Australia received 5s. a day? He had received representations from many men in the Regular Army pointing out that the utmost discontent and dissatisfaction existed in many corps because, although they had gone through all the hardships of the campaign in a greater degree than many of the Colonial troops, they only received 1s. per day. They were told with pride from time to time that this war, though disastrous in many respects, had in one respect been a glorious success, inasmuch as it had shown that this worldwide Empire was one and that at sound of the drum and the first appearance of danger thousands of stalwart colonists, from Australia and elsewhere, joined the colours. What did it amount to? If they offered the Australian and other troops the beggarly 1s. a day which they gave to the Gordon Highlanders and to the Dublin Fusiliers they would not get 1,000 men to come from the whole of Australia. Why was it that men were flocking still in thousands to South Africa? It was because they were offering these young men the extraordinary and unprecedented pay of 5s. a day. Before they boasted of the devotion of the colonies to the mother country, and before they said that they were in any way enthusiastic over this war, they must see whether at the ordinary rate of pay these men would come to serve. They sometimes heard a talk of conscription. The hon. Member said they would never want conscription as long as they gave 5s. a day. At that rate, they would get all the men they needed. If the right hon. Gentleman would give some reason for paying these men 5s. a day he would be satisfied, but if not he was afraid that on the next Vote he would have to move a reduction.

COLONEL WELBY (Taunton) said he most heartily welcomed the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman, and congratulated him upon his courage and devotion to duty in submitting it. He was only sorry that the plans of reform had not been adopted sooner. If the foundation of this great reorganisation had been laid in time of peace it would have been much more easy to carry out the work. To carry out a scheme like this they needed the public opinion that had been generated by the war. He thought he might fairly claim that there was an amount of public opinion

in this country tending towards Army reorganisation, which was very much greater than had been acknowledged by either Front Bench in that House. Had the foundation of this scheme been laid in time of peace hundreds of lives would have been saved in South Africa, and millions of money would have been saved. One of the great features of the scheme was the adoption of the army corps system. Personally he had advocated that system over and over again in the House; but in criticising the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman he feared that he must differ from him as to the number of army corps, or military districts, into which the United Kingdom was to be divided. He believed that one of the lessons of the war was that the army corps system was unfitted for our needs either for defence or for offence. The true unit of organisation for the Army was the division, and, after all, the army corps was merely the grouping together of two or three divisions. It would be far better, instead of trying to create these army corps, that we should divide the United Kingdom into three great military commands; South Britain, North Britain, and Ireland, into those important military districts we could put as many divisions as the organisation required. He believed that the organisation of military commands and divisions would overcome the many difficulties which were foreshadowed in the present scheme, and he would most earnestly press the right hon. Gentleman to carefully consider the scheme before he finally decided upon the shape of the permanent organisation of the Army. One of the great features of the army Corps organisation was decentralisation. The result of that decentralisation seemed to be that the organisation of the War Office became a secondary consideration, He believed that as long as the power was centred there it was absolutely necessary that there should be responsibility clearly defined; but the moment they appointed great executive officers commanding large districts in this country, who would advise with the Secretary of State for War, he thought the organisation of the War Office might well be left to the Secretary of State and the Commander-in-Chief to arrange between themselves. A part of the scheme, also, was that which arranged for peace commands to be the same as those in war. He looked upon this as being fraught with one of the greatest advantages to the Army. Not only would it be the means of training our generals and staff, but it would be the means of overcoming that difficulty which had become apparent in the present war; the want of professional zeal in our officers. He believed that zeal and the desire for efficiency were equally distributed among all classes of officers in the Army. If that was the case, we must look deeper for the want of professional zeal which had been displayed in the present war. He ventured to say that that must be traced to the Army system under which the officers had been living. Officers who were known to the great officials of the Army had a far better chance of promotion than regimental officers and minor staff officers scattered throughout the country. A man knew that, however devoted he might be to his duty, and however he might render himself efficient, unless he came under notice or made himself prominent in some way he had little or no chance of getting on. Some one had said that promotion in the Army was

seniority tempered by interest. No one had ever said that it was seniority tempered by zeal. Under the new system generals would try to pick up and select the very best men. He was perfectly certain that the duties of the Board of Selection at the War Office would be infinitely lighter and more satisfactory. The real difficulty with regard to the reduction of expenses' was the comparison between different regiments. One aspect of the question could be dealt with by the central authorities at the War Office, and that was that when a sumptuary regulation was published it should be enforced upon all regiments alike with absolute impartiality. This was not entirely a military question. Civilians could greatly help. If a regiment did not give an entertainment costing each officer perhaps £;40 it was considered mean: so that civilians could assist in lowering the expenses of officer by not requiring more than a reasonable amount of hospitality. In conclusion, he thanked the right hon. Gentleman for the splendid prospect of organisation he had put before the House. He did not believe that reorganisation was militarism, but organisation and preparation were the best means of overcoming any possible approach to the military spirit in this country. As a practical soldier, he knew how deeply rooted were many of the abuses in the Army, and he could only say that in the good cause to which the Secretary of State had set his hand it would be his prime duty and proud pleasure to afford him his utmost support.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.) thought there was no harm in having one or two costly regiments, but great care should be taken by the colonel to protect the poorer officers from being compelled by undue pressure to incur unnecessary expenses.

As to the corps

organisation, it was simply a question of whether it was intended to have in the field armies of under or over 100,000 men. The best organisation for an army of under 100,000 men was that of divisions, but for above that number the corps organisation was absolutely necessary. He should like the Secretary of State, however, to explain what the cost of that organisation would really be, as it did not appear to be fully stated in the Estimate. A great mistake had been made by the practical abolition of the Quartermasters' Department, as there was now no staff to look specially after the movements of the troops and matters of that kind. The weak point in the present proposals was, no doubt, that the Secretary of State had not sufficiently increased the attractions held out to the private soldier. Before the system of cubicles was adopted on any large scale it should be tried tentatively in order to see what the private soldier's opinion was in regard to it, but in any case such alterations were not enough to draw men into the Army. The pay was the great drawback. That should be increased by at least 6d. per day, and even then it would not be up to the American standard. He believed that most of the recruiting difficulties would disappear if such an alteration were made. The present system was the most abominable in the world. The rate of pay was all very well for a boy of seventeen, but when he reached the age of twenty-five or twenty-six he was worth a great deal more. Boy regiments might be a very good thing if they were treated as boys and not as men, but to have such a large proportion of boys as was now the case was a very expensive matter, as they had not the stamina to undergo the hardships of a

campaign. With a better rate of pay better men would be obtained. He thought such a change would not cost more than £900,000. The Secretary of State might not like to add so large a sum to his Estimates, but he would not get a proper voluntary Army without it. With regard to the Reserve, the right hon. Gentleman's proposal was too modest. The Reserve should number at least 200,000. The great secret on the Continent was to have about one fourth of the army with the colours

and the remaining three - fourths engaged in civilian pursuits. As to shooting, volley firing was really a waste of ammunition. To have good shooting individual firing must be insisted upon and much more ammunition allowed. In these matters the Secretary of State should not get his advice so much from generals who had distinguished themselves in the field or on the staff. The House of Commons knew far more about recruiting and many other matters concerning the Army, and the right hon. Gentlemen would do well to take their advice and to use his own common sense rather than to rely too much upon so-called experts.

\*COLONEL BROOKFIELD (Sussex, Rye) said that, judging from the speech of the Leader of the Opposition, the zeal for Army reform was on the Government side of the House; but he felt sure that in every quarter there would be a disposition to give a fair trial to any experiment brought forward by the Secretary of State for War at the present time. With regard to six, army corps which were supposed to be complete, he should like to ask which of them would furnish the drafts for the Army in India, because in the event of mobilisation it would not be fair to call an army corps really fit if it had just gone through the process of finding drafts for the linked battalions in India. He hoped it would be laid down in the future that if, owing to any circumstances, both battalions of one regiment were abroad at the same time, the Militia battalion at home should be embodied as a matter of course. He looked with the greatest hopefulness to the establishment of an army corps system as providing a reasonable probability of great decentralisation, but he urged that no attempt should be made to take a "trained civilian staff" into each of the army corps districts. That work should be trusted to military hands and heads entirely. In connection with the territorial regiments, the home battalion should as far as possible be kept in its own county. It was merely a matter of custom which led the authorities to send county regiments out of their counties when they might be in them. If the practice he suggested was adopted it would be a great economy to the taxpayer, extremely popular with the officers, and have an excellent effect in solving the difficulty of civil employment for the men. Reference had been made to the desirability of generals knowing those under their command, and that object would be achieved if the units were kept in their respective districts. The hon. Member for Lichfield had passed some strictures upon the discipline of the Volunteers and Yeomanry in South Africa. No one could advocate more strongly than he (the speaker) the strictest possible discipline, but as far as his experience went the discipline of the Volunteers and Yeomanry was neither better nor worse than that of the Regular troops. Once they were in the field all the troops behaved very much the same. As to the artillery, he had the honour of having under his command the field battery of the C.I. V., one of the drivers of

which was a clerk in that House, and a more useful or smarter lot of gunners and drivers it would be difficult to find. By universal consent the weak point in his right hon. friend's proposals was the difficulty of getting the men. There was a prevalent idea that all difficulties could be solved by voting more money, or by offering fancy rates of pay, but that he believed to be a mistaken notion, and that the necessities of the case would ultimately bring them face to face with the possibility of having to adopt some other than their present system of voluntary enlistment. He could not say that he at all admired the ingenuousness of those who attacked the Secretary for War upon this matter. He thought his right hon. friend spoke upon this question of voluntary enlistment in a very statesman-like manner, and he did not think that he went out of his way to grate against the susceptibilities of anyone. Some people said that it was the "proud boast" of this country that its system was a voluntary one, but who was supposed to be the boaster; the people looking on or the men who did the work? There were several practical objections to the present system, and he thought that one of the most serious objections would ultimately prove to be that it was ruinously expensive; and, the tendency being to take recruiting more and more into open competition with the labour market, that competition must end in further disastrous expenditure, and they must finally come again face to face with the same difficulty. The question was were they going to pay other people to do their work or would they insist upon everybody taking a small share of it? He believed that there was a half-way house. There was the Swiss system and the further development of our Militia and Volunteer systems, and the lessons we had learned by the employment of the Yeomanry in the present war would also suggest solutions of the difficulty. When recourse to partial compulsion was hinted at, it was most unfair to represent the Government as advocating conscription in the full Continental sense of the term, or anything like it. He believed it would be found, however, that by the light of the present war the people were in a much more advanced frame of mind than Ministers, certainly than the Prime Minister, and that they would be prepared to go a great deal further than he seemed inclined to do when he suggested the establishment of rifle clubs all over the country. Then there was the question of altering the status of officers; making them more professional and, where necessary, diminishing their expenses. Now he thought he detected in the remarks of his right hon. friend a certain tendency to sneer at the Staff College.

\*MR. BRODRICK: No, no.

\*COLONEL BROOKFIELD said that the Staff College was not at all popular, but they should not forget how extremely useful it had been. What was the matter with the system there was that they did not encourage the right sort of regimental officers to go to the Staff College. This encouragement ought to be given, and it should be made easier for the average regimental officer to go there. The Staff College had greatly raised the standard of military knowledge during the last few years. The maps and the correspondence were now done twice as well as they were twenty years ago. He believed that the discipline of the officers stood in need of very great improvement, and one very necessary step in the direction



of raising their general sense of discipline would be to make them feel more respect for the source from which all their orders came. Many of the orders that came from the old unreformed War Office only excited derision on the part of the officers who received them. He believed, also, that the system of confidential reports stood much in need of improvement; that the regulation which provided that officers should be informed of any adverse reports made about them should be strictly adhered to and that no man should be injured for life by something said behind his back and without his knowledge. He thought officers should be given less leave than they received at present; that the work at headquarters might at the same time be made more interesting. He hoped too that before long they would see them not ashamed of wearing their uniforms on ordinary occasions. With regard to officers' expenses, he had served for some years in a cavalry regiment and knew something of the difficulty. He thought most of it arose from some obsolete, snobbish traditions which were allowed to linger in regiments because the commanding officer, or other officers, had not the good sense or the moral courage to combat them. Some very absurd customs existed in, regard to wine. He remembered that upon one occasion, when his regiment was serving in India, they were in the habit of carrying all over the country old vintage port. That was a trivial item; but in this matter of wine he thought they had a good deal to learn from the Royal Artillery. He observed that their batteries on foreign service used to take over each other's wine, and the result was that they had smaller bills and much better wine. Officers might learn something on this subject if they would put to themselves two simple questions; firstly, which, without prejudice, was the smartest arm in our service? He thought that most unprejudiced people would say the Royal Field Artillery. Secondly, which arm of the service had the least wealthy officers? He thought that the answer again would be the Royal Field Artillery. They had a great deal to learn from them, and he thought that was the direction in which many of their economies should go. When orders were given or suggestions made with the object of promoting economy in the regiment, it would be better if they were sent in the form of definite orders and not simply as pious precepts. More than twenty years ago precepts of this kind were issued about young officers and their expenses, but they were never taken the least notice of, and certainly never enforced. Such instructions ought to be sent down as definite orders, and a reply insisted upon stating that they had been obeyed. He was glad that he had been in the House when those reforms in the Army were instituted by his right hon. friend, and he trusted that before a very long period of time they would see many of them carried into effect with advantage to the country.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): For some time past this debate has been in the hands of the hon. and gallant Members of this House. I confess that I have no desire and no ability to follow them through all the technical questions which they have raised and discussed. I have intervened now only because I have on the Paper an Amendment to reduce this Vote by 1,000 men. That Amendment was placed on the Paper with the assent of those who sit on this bench, and with the intention of raising the whole question of the new programme of the War Office

with respect to the permanent forces of the country. That was the intention with which this Amendment was put on the Paper last night. But the situation has now been entirely changed by what has taken place this afternoon. This afternoon the First Lord of the Treasury, by an arrangement, which I think met with general acceptance, proposed that instead of the continuation of the discussion on this particular Vote we should, at a later period; some time after Easter; discuss these new proposals of the Government on a motion to be submitted by the Government formulating their proposals in express terms, and leaving it to the House to say "Yea" or "Nay" to the principle of those proposals. The hon. and gallant Member for Great Yarmouth seemed to have some doubt whether that motion would contain a due recognition of the essential importance of naval co-operation in any question relating to the efficiency of the Army.

\*SIR JOHN COLOMB: My point was whether the motion would be so framed as to permit a discussion on the Army under the conditions of maritime supremacy.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I confess that I do not understand the casual expression which fell from the Secretary of State for War on this point. I believe that you cannot consider the work of the Army at all in relation to Imperial defence without beginning by accepting not only the co-operation of the Navy, but also the fact that the Navy must be the predominant element in our scheme. That arrangement having been made it is not, of course, necessary to move the Amendment which I was prepared to move, and still more unnecessary for me to make a long speech. I shall, therefore, content myself with addressing to the right hon. Gentleman two or three questions, in elucidation of his proposals, which he, perhaps, will be able to answer before the debate closes.

The first point to which I would venture to direct the attention of the Committee and the right hon. Gentleman is the financial effect of his programme; I mean the ultimate financial effect, which is not apparent on the face of the Estimate. The immediate financial effect is apparent and it is serious enough in all conscience, and I miss with regret and great apprehension any allusion to the difficulties of the financial problem. I will not repeat what was said by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire, but I ask the Committee to consider this one fact, which has not been alluded to before. Let us compare these Estimates not with the Estimates of 1897 or 1898, over which they show a large increase, but with the Estimates of ten or eleven years ago. At that period the Army and Navy Estimates taken together came to £31,000,000. There was then about £14,000,000 for the Navy and £17,000,000 for the Army, and that was about the normal state of things before 1891. What is it this year? The

Army and the Navy have each of them cost as much as both of those Services cost ten years ago. [An HON. MEMBER: Of necessity.] In two years the normal Estimates; the War expenditure of this country in time of peace; have doubled, and they are now £60,000,000 or £62,000,000, whereas ten years ago they were only £30,000,000. "Of necessity," says the hon. Member opposite, and so says the Daily Mail and organs of that kind, which cry out for this expenditure, apparently knowing little, or caring little, how that expenditure is to be

raised. This sort of progress in our military expenditure cannot go on. It has doubled in ten years. Does any hon. and gallant Member suppose we can go on doing that? Why, if it did go on, in another ten years we should be expending £100,000,000. We have to halt somewhere, and I ask the right hon. Gentleman what is to be the ultimate financial effect of these new proposals, which is not at present apparent.

Every increase of the numbers of the Army implies an increase in the cost, and we want to know the ultimate financial effect in respect of the non-effective charges. I will explain what I mean. I pass now to the question of numbers. After the speech of the First Lord of the Treasury last night, the Committee stand in need of some further explanation, because it appears to me that the First Lord did not state correctly the increase in numbers in the Regular forces demanded by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War. I could not reconcile what I understood the First Lord to say with what the Secretary for War set forth in his statement to the House. I understood that the Secretary of State for War said on Friday last that the increases he required were these: Regulars, 11,500; Militia, 50,000; Yeomanry, 25,000; Volunteers, 40,000: total, 120,000 increase in numbers. That is the statement I understood him to make, and which I cannot reconcile with what the First Lord of the Treasury said. I have looked at the Estimates and I am not at all clear that the financial charges for the whole of these increases is apparent on the face of this year's Estimates. There is money taken for 50,000 Reserves in addition to those already on the Paper. As to the Yeomanry and the Volunteers I am not at all clear, and it is not apparent to me that in the Estimates for this year the total charge for the Yeomanry and extra Volunteers is taken. It is apparent to me that he is not taking this year the full financial charges for the increase of 11,500 Regulars. I have looked at the comparative statement of differences and this is what I find. The increase of Regular forces taken by this year's Estimate, as shown by the statement of differences, amounts to 7,351 men. If the right hon. Gentleman will look on page 11 of the Estimates he will find that the net increase is 7,351 and not 11,500 men. That is the total increase in the Regulars charged upon this year's Estimates. The numbers called for by the right hon. Gentleman's scheme amount to 11,500 men, whereas you are only going to raise 7,351 this year, and to that extent the Estimates this year do not show the ultimate, financial effect of the new proposals. Having regard to the automatic increase which must follow any increase in numbers, and the fact that the entire charge is not provided for in the present year, we ought to have a full explanation of the ultimate effect financially and of the actual increases that have taken place. That is all I want to say about that point.

With regard to these increases, I am not going now to deal with the question as to how far they are satisfactory. The hon. Member for Taunton, who rose to bless the scheme, appeared to me to condemn it in its most essential points. I should like to have some further explanation of the speech of the First Lord of the Treasury. In his original speech the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War alluded to the commitments of this country in two continents besides

South Africa, and in explaining and defending that last night the First Lord of the Treasury assumed that, at all events, our responsibility for the colonies must be admitted. I want to ask the Secretary for War for how much in his new scheme does our responsibility for the colonies count? Can he tell us how much responsibility for the colonies enters into this new expenditure which we are now being called upon to provide for the Army? I put that question to him for this reason; the colonies are

either self-governing or they are Crown colonies. If they are Crown colonies then we have the power and the right to make them pay for a portion of the burden of Imperial defence. If the self-governing colonies count for anything in this additional expenditure proposed by His Majesty's Government, then I say those colonies ought to contribute to that expenditure. I could go further than that, but possibly I should not be in order now in doing so; but when the time comes for the settlement of the debt for the war in South Africa; which is an Imperial war for colonial defence; are you going to ride off on the claptrap that certain colonies who have gone to the front indulge in? Is that to be the answer in regard to what ought to be demanded from the colonists for their share of this Imperial war? If the colonists pay their share of the burden of this war they ought to pay at least one-third of the whole cost which has fallen upon this country. That is why I want the right hon. Gentleman to tell us if he is charging us with any expenditure for the defence of the colonies. Are you going to suggest to the colonies that they are to pay their share? It is high time that the question was looked into, for this money has been spent for the defence of people who are as rich or richer than we are.

There is one other point as to which I should like some further explanation, and that is the question of the training and selection of men for the rank of officers in the Army. I listened with great interest the other night to a speech made by an hon. Gentleman who has just joined the House; I allude to the hon. Member for Oldham; and I was much impressed by his observations upon the system of selection of officers in the Army. I do not know whether to call it an artificial or a natural selection, but whichever it is, I can assure the Secretary for War and the Government that there is no lesson of the South African War which the country has taken more to heart. There is nothing that the country is more in deadly earnest about than that there should be a system of fair play and free competition both in the entrance to the rank of Army officers and also in subsequent promotion. A year ago about this time I called the attention of the then representative of the War Office to this subject. We have had the admission that this is a scandal, especially in the case of the cavalry, and that was admitted at the beginning of last session. On the last occasion when the Army Estimates came before the House I expected to find from the representative of the War Office some statement as to what they propose to do in this matter. The answer I got was a most unsatisfactory piece of procedure. The right hon. Gentleman said that Supplementary Estimates were not an occasion on which proposals should be made to alter the law. But I do not know what he meant. At all events, nothing was done last year, and now when I come to the right hon. Gentleman's own proposals.

I find that they do not in the least meet the gravity of the case. What is the true principle to be applied in this case? It is the right of the nation, as a mere matter of public safety, to have at its call the whole available talent of the community for service in the rank of officer in the Army. The nation is entitled to insist that no capable youth whose services could be possibly obtained should be excluded. On the other hand, take the point of view of the parent. Every parent, whatever his social position may be, should have the right to say that his son should have every opportunity of access to the rank of officer in the Army. These I believe to be the only principles capable of solving this question. How far has the right hon. Gentleman gone in that direction? Has he taken anything that can be called a step at all? He tells us that trousers and tunics can be got direct from the Army headquarters instead of from the stores or the military tailors. That does not seem to me to meet the difficulty at all. I do not see how you can meet it unless you lay down the rule that the pay of an officer from the moment he enters the service shall be such as to enable him to live in the Army without any call on private expenditure, and no social pressure should be permitted which would make his life uncomfortable if he does not choose to incur large expenditure. The right hon. Gentleman spoke of sumptuary laws, but there is a sumptuary law existing in the Army at the present moment. Officer after officer has told us of the scandalous amount of expenditure incurred at present, and, which is enforced by social sumptuary laws. Surely the right hon. Gentleman will have no hesitation in putting down anything like boycotting in the Army. It is easy enough to invent a system which will give the young officer ;and the old officer for that matter; the pay to which his services entitle him, and thereby protect him from being driven into expenditure beyond it. This is a question which a civilian is as capable of gauging as a soldier, and which the civilian is as anxious about as the soldier. We do not want the Army made cheaper for rich men. That has been done in the case of similar reforms, including admission to this House, which has been made cheaper for rich men. We want a reform which will enable the country to have full command of all available resources for the Army, and to give to persons in all stations the opportunity of a free career in the Army, to which they are entitled, and which it is for the good of the Army they should possess.

LORD STANLEY: I know a number of hon. Gentlemen desire to speak on this question, but I hope they will excuse me if I reply now as briefly as possible to the various questions which have been brought before the Committee. The general view seems to be that the Secretary of State for War has come round to the view of Army reformers in this House. It is a peculiar delight to some people to be able to say, "I told you so." If in this case the Secretary of State and the Army reformers are in, the right way for effecting real progress and reform in the Army, both the Secretary of State and the Army reformers are to be congratulated. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition said in his speech the other night that we must not depend entirely for our reforms on the lessons learned in the war. I quite agree that we must not depend entirely on the lessons learned in the war, but I cannot help thinking that the

state the country found itself in after the troops went to South Africa should be considered, and it is that which my right hon. friend is trying to remedy in the scheme he has put before the House

The right hon. Gentleman and hon. Gentlemen ask us how recruits are to be obtained, and they say that in two years time or so we shall not have got them. Well, it will be another chance for them in that ease to say. "I told you so."

But, at all events, we have no right to assume that we shall not get recruits.

My right hon. friend has put forward a scheme which he believes will attract recruits, and until it is proved to be a failure we are justified in hoping that it will be a success. The question of getting new recruits is not a very large one, because the number of recruits to be added to the Army at present is roughly, some 10,000 men. But the object of the whole of this scheme is not so much to attract new recruits as to endeavour, with the forces at our hand at the present moment, to secure increased efficiency. The right hon. Gentleman said he had heard of army corps before. We have all heard of army corps before, but I would put it to the Committee that this is a genuine attempt to have army corps not only on paper, but in reality, to bring troops together in time of peace who would be employed together in time of war; to put at the head of those troops men who would be with them in war and who would have stall's whom they knew they could trust, and who would be known to all with whom they came in contact in time of war. It is our endeavour at the same time to bring up these various army corps to their proper strength in artillery and mounted men.

Some remarks have been made on the subject of Volunteer and Militia artillery, and some doubts have been expressed as to whether they will be effective. I am bound to say that if the question had been asked two years ago it would have been said that they would not be very efficient, but after one had seen and, still more, heard of the excellent work done by the Elswick and City Imperial Volunteer batteries in South Africa, one could not help giving every Possible facility for training to these batteries.

With regard to the Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteers, whatever may be the feeling of hon. Members for or against conscription, there can be no doubt whatever that these three forces stand between us and conscription at the present time, and

our object ought to be to make them to the best of our power as efficient as possible, and to rely on that loyal devotion to the service of the country they have shown in the past, to stand the extra work which, in the opinion of the Commander-in-Chief, is necessary for their real efficiency.

I will now deal with a few of the other questions brought forward. The right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean asked particularly Whether we were going to have mounted infantry regiments. That is a question not mentioned in the Estimates, but it is a question which must be and is being taken up.

Whether it is better to have mounted infantry or not is a debatable question. My own opinion is that the more men we can get in a regiment to pass the mounted infantry course the better for the Army; but that is only my private opinion, and it is probably wrong. With regard to the question of an Imperial mounted infantry, I quite agree with the hon. Members who urged that we should attempt

to get an amalgamation for joint defence of the mounted corps of the Empire, whether they be at home or abroad. Schemes to this end have been and are being put forward, but it is a question that can hardly be rushed into. It must be carefully thought out and must be done, not with one colony, but with all the colonies on a common basis. I do not think that the time when men are actually serving in the field is the time to put forward a definite plan. It is time to consider what plan we can put forward when the war is over. That will be the time to ask these men whether they and their Governments will consent to form an Imperial Yeomanry; a title which will be very suitable.

The hon. Member for Mid Kent asked several questions about the Yeomanry. He wanted to know if the Yeomanry would be brigaded, and the answer to that is, Yes. He then asked if every Imperial Yeomanry regiment would have its own adjutant. He spoke about equipment, and showed great distress at some prospect of the Yeomanry losing their swords. He mentioned that the chief use for swords would be in quelling bread riots should they occur, but, in my opinion, an implement that is supposed to add zest to Irish affairs would be more suitable for that purpose. He next referred to the training of the Yeomanry, but that is a matter that will be put forward as soon as possible in the form of an Army Order. I may, however, state that I do not think it is for my right hon. friend or myself to stand up in this House and express views on the training of these various forces. The one thing that the country is saying is that there should be no civilian interference in military training. Surely the Commander-in-Chief, who knows these men, who knows what training to give them to make them fit for the duties they will have to perform, is the right man to lay down the details of the training of these forces.

The hon. Member for Lichfield asked about Volunteer artillery and the time allowed them for training. That is not yet definitely settled, and will be settled in consultation with the commanding officers of these batteries; but we will try to get them out for as long as they possibly can remain. He then asked if a militia battalion short of men would be allowed to raise men out of its own county. I do not know what the military objection to that might be, but personally I cannot help thinking it might be possible to fall in with the hon. Member's views. He then spoke of the want of discipline in the Yeomanry and Militia.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER: General want of discipline.

LORD STANLEY: Yes, general want of discipline; and the hon. Member referred particularly to South Africa. Is it to be supposed that those men going out to South Africa have exactly the same idea of discipline the troops have who have been drilled at home? Nor is it expected or required of them. They did their duty. I never heard of any want of discipline among them, and I think it is rather a pity that they should have been selected as having shown a want of discipline.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER: I did not say want of discipline, but a want of training caused by a want of discipline at home.

LORD STANLEY: I accept the hon. Gentleman's explanation. I took his statement the other way.

The hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Yarmouth asked three questions. The first question, was what Reserves would be left to fill up gaps in the ranks of the 120,000 men. Exactly the same Reserves as at present, as they would not be taken away for other regiments. He then said we must be prepared to meet an international war.

\*SIR JOHN COLOMB: My question was the numerical proportion of cavalry, infantry, and artillery in the 120,000 men to be ready at any moment to embark.

LORD STANLEY: We should send abroad about sixty-three batteries and fourteen cavalry regiments, the remainder being infantry. The hon. and gallant Gentleman also asked what would be done in the case of a small war. There will be a system by which men going into the Reserve receive for the first year a small extra sum, for which they will hold themselves in readiness to be called on at any time to fill up regiments going a broad, without rendering it necessary to call up the whole Reserve. It is computed that about 5,000 men will be obtainable in this way.

With reference to the criticisms of the hon. and gallant Member for Fareham, I think the House will feel that, if in all our schemes we could get criticisms such as his, army schemes would be vastly improved. I agree with the hon. and gallant Gentleman on the question of the expenses of officers. He said that the whole question was very much exaggerated, and I am bound to say from my own experience that that is so. I believe myself that infinitely more trouble arises from the initial expenses of men going into the Army than arises from the expense of living with a regiment. The difficulty is not so much the yearly allowance as the large sum which has to be put down for an outfit in the first year. I believe a great deal can be done to limit the expenses of officers.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Is there any provision for that in the Estimates?

LORD STANLEY: I do not see how there can be. Suppose we are able to meet officers in some way in regard to clothing, that could hardly come into the Estimates; but we are going to try and get them what they want cheaper than at present. That whole question is being gone into. Then the hon. Gentleman asked what was the extra charge for the Imperial Yeomanry. We have taken £;300,000 this year for the Imperial Yeomanry, which is exactly half what we will take yearly in future. The amount of the pensions for widows and orphans of the soldiers killed in the present war has only been roughly calculated, and probably there will be an increase in that direction. The amount taken this year for reserve of stores is only for a limited period of four or five years and will then cease. I hope I have now replied briefly to all the questions which have been asked.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I would appeal to the House to pass this Vote now, as otherwise we may get embarrassed. Exactly the same discussion can continue on the next Vote.

MR. SAMUEL SMITH (Flintshire) asked if he would have, an opportunity of referring on the next Vote to the question of Army chaplains.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, Sir.

Resolution agreed to.

1. £;21,657,500, Pay, etc., of the Army (General Staff, Regiments, Reserve, and



Departments).

MR. F. W. WILSON (Norfolk, Mid) said he desired to draw attention to a matter which was very much in the shade; namely, rifle shooting and the provision of rifle ranges. Unless men were sent into the field properly trained to the use of the rifle they would be practically useless. But how could men be properly acquainted with the rifle unless facilities were offered them? They all knew the exceedingly great difficulty of providing rifle ranges, but he did not think that a rifle range was necessary in every case. He was connected with two rifle clubs; one with a long range, the other with a miniature range; and, in his opinion, experience could be gained by practising with a Morris tube at a miniature range. The army in South Africa was confronted with 50,000 men whose one merit as soldiers was that they could ride and shoot, whereas many men were sent out who could neither ride nor shoot. Army reforms were always admirable on paper, but difficult of execution. There was a distinguished occupant of the Government Benches who was within one shot of winning a prize at Wimbledon, but he was afraid that the present distinguished Secretary of State for War was not himself a rifle shot or he would have paid more attention to the extreme desirability of making Englishmen accustomed to the use of the rifle. He hoped no disparagement would be shown towards the Volunteers who were giving their time to train themselves as soldiers, or to the men who, in a fine national spirit, were forming themselves into rifle clubs throughout England in order to qualify themselves for the defence of their country.

\*MR. SAMUEL SMITH said he wished to move the reduction of the Vote by £100 in order to call attention to the large extent to which Army chaplains belonging to lawless ritualistic societies had been appointed. These societies were chiefly the English Church Union and the C.B.S., or the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, two distinctly Romanising societies. Two years ago the House of Commons passed a resolution deploring the lawlessness shown by certain members of the Church of England, and he would remind hon. Members that members of the societies he had mentioned were going in the teeth of the Lambeth decision given by the two Archbishops. The First Lord of the Treasury himself declared with reference to the policy of Lord Halifax and his followers, that they made no secret of the fact that they regarded the history of the Church of England for the last three centuries as unprofitable, and yet Army chaplains were appointed from the men whose aim was to bring the ritual of the Church of England into the closest possible agreement with the Church of Rome. More than half the House of Commons was returned at the last General Election on distinct Protestant pledges;

\*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is not entitled to enter into the whole question of ritualism in the Church. He must confine himself strictly to the case of Army chaplains.

\*MR. SAMUEL SMITH said he would conclude his remarks by saying that he had a list of twenty Army chaplains belonging to the two extremely ritualistic societies he had mentioned, some of whom had been appointed by the Government within the last few months.

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR (Forfarshire) said he desired to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that they were asked to vote 21 millions of money in twenty minutes. The position in which the financial business of the country was now placed was due to the fact that Parliament had been summoned at so late a date. The scheme they were discussing seemed to him to have one characteristic, and one only, and that was that it was placing a very severe burden on the country. It was impossible at that hour to go into details as to the lessons to be learned from the war, but he thought it would be rash to base the organisation of the military forces of the country on those lessons. It would be rash and dangerous, not only from the point of view of the efficiency of the Army, but also from the point of view of educating public opinion in the right direction, to base the organisation of the Army on the necessities disclosed by the war in South Africa. The scheme which had been submitted by the Secretary of State for War laid an additional burden on the country at a time when it was very little able to bear it. The country had made great efforts in regard to money, and now when trade was taking a turn the Government proposed to lay a fresh burden upon it. Ten years ago military expenditure was seventeen or eighteen millions a year; now it was twenty-nine millions, and as his hon. friend the Member for Dundee had pointed out the scheme of the Government could not be fully carried out without an increased demand for money.

Then there was a large demand for men to enter the Army. He held that the grave necessity which would justify such a demand for men and money had not been proved. He welcomed the fact that there would be a full discussion of the scheme later, but pending that discussion he would say that he thought that the call on the country to maintain three army corps of Regular troops ready at a moment's notice to embark was a most monstrous demand. No country in Europe maintained its first line of defence in that position. They would only have to go a step further and provide transports with steam up, to see the ridiculous absurdity of the demand. If the Government meant to have three army corps of Regular troops they would not only be departing from the present system, but they would be laying on the country a burden the extent of which could hardly be realised. He regretted extremely that the First Lord of the Treasury should have treated the matter as a party question. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to imagine that hon. Gentlemen on that side of the House had no interest whatever in Army reform. If there was to be continuity in the foreign policy of the country there should also be continuity in naval and military administration, but that could not be unless there was a certain amount of give and take between the different political parties. The Government seemed to think that they must take everything, and that the Opposition must give everything; but there should be a recognition of the fact that there were two sides to the question. None were more ready than his hon. friends to do what they thought ought to be done, but no sufficient reason had been shown for the additional burden which it was now proposed to put on the country. He would make the strongest and most emphatic protest in his power against the unwisdom of the policy which was proposed.

MR. BLAKE (Longford, S.) said he heartily sympathised with the opening statements of the hon. and gallant Gentleman who had just spoken. It was a

shocking thing that the House should be called on to vote twenty millions in twenty minutes. He

should never for his part have assented to the suggestion of the First Lord of the Treasury, were it not that he believed that there could not have been full, ample, and deliberate, discussion of such a gigantic scheme, if the debate went over to Saturday, and was, as proposed, closed on Saturday night. It was because he believed that the House and the country would have a, better opportunity of considering the scheme in all its details of policy and finance that the First Lord of the Treasury would keep the understanding arrived at in its spirit as well as in its letter, that the subsequent discussion would be free and exhaustive, and that it would not be taken out of the twenty-three days for Supply, that he assented to the right hon. Gentleman's proposition.

SIR J. FERGUSSON (Manchester, N.E.) said that the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Forfar stated that the Government proposed to have three army corps ready to go abroad at a moments notice, but as a matter of fact they would be no more ready to go abroad than the French army corps, which would have to wait until their reserves were called up.

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR said the right hon. Gentleman was quite right. He wished also to be permitted to say, as his previous remarks might have appeared ungracious, that he, quite recognised that the First Lord of the Treasury had done everything in his power to secure a full discussion of the scheme.

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): I only want to have it made clear that if, in accordance with the understanding arrived at, we pass this Vote, we, do not in the least degree prejudice our right to discuss the whole scheme and subsidiary matters after Easter.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) said he did not intend at all to break the arrangement which had been entered into, but there was one point which he should like made clear. They were asked to vote money at the rate of a million a minute, and of course it was impossible that the House of Commons should be able to consider the Vote in that time. The Leader of the House, however, stated that he was prepared to afford an opportunity for a full and free discussion of the whole question, not merely, he took it, of the general effect of the scheme, but such questions as the payment of 5s. a day to the Colonial forces and to the Yeomanry, while only 1s.3d. per day was paid to the Regular troops. He would like to know whether the discussion would be in Government time, or in private Members' time. Private Members would not have gained anything if the Government took Tuesdays after Easter. Hon. Members were therefore entitled to know whether the discussion would be a full and free discussion, and whether it would be taken in Government time, and not in private Members' time.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have no wish to trespass on private Members' time more than I must. The matter will be treated like the Second Reading of a Bill, and if the discussion be extended I may, of course, have to take private Members' time. With regard to subsidiary questions, there will be ample opportunity for discussing them.

Resolution agreed to.

Resolutions to be reported upon Monday next; Committee to sit again on Monday next.

SUPPLY [8TH MARCH],

Resolutions reported::

ARMY (SUPPLEMENTARY) ESTIMATES, 1900&#x2013;1901.

1. "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £;3,000,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1901, for Additional Expenditure, due to the war in South Africa, in respect of the following Army Services, viz.::

£;

Vote 6. Transport and Remounts

2,000,000

Vote 7. Provisions, Forage, and other Supplies

1,000,000

Total

£;3,000,000

ORDNANCE FACTORIES.

2. "That a Supplementary Sum, not exceeding £;100, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge for the Ordnance Factories (the cost of the Productions of which will be charged to the Army, Navy, and Indian and Colonial Governments), which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1901."

Resolutions read a second time.

First Resolution::

Motion made, and Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.) said he objected to this Report being rushed through without some explanation from the noble Lord who represented the War Office.

Looking through the figures during the last three or four years he saw that £;8,000,000 had been wasted on horses in South Africa. When the Vote was under discussion in Committee it was indicated that stud farms were to be established in Canada and in Australia. He came from a horse-breeding county in Ireland, and they should have some explanation as to what would be done in regard to Irish horses. The Government, he believed, required 6,000 horses every year. The present system was to buy the horses from dealers at £;40 apiece, and the dealers went to the farmers and bought them for £;18 apiece. The Government should deal direct with the farmers. At present only horses five years old were bought, but if they wanted to encourage horse-breeding for cavalry purposes the horses should be bought from the farmers at three years old, when they were just fit to be trained to carry a man.

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.) said that one reason for the great wear and tear of the horses in South Africa, was that the horses in the gun-teams were too few in number. The Boers used a great many more horses in their gun-teams. The present method of buying horses was bad. The Government employed dealers, and there were often two or three middlemen between the Government and the horse breeder. He knew of a case where a dealer who had an order from the War

Office came to a town in Ireland and bought old, weedy, and broken-down animals at £18 each, and sent them over to the War Office, who accepted them at £35 each. He was told of one dealer who, had bought 250 horses in one day, and netted a profit out of the Government of £5,000. This was sheer waste of the taxpayers' money. The system of the War Office was unbusinesslike, and would bring any shopkeeper into bankruptcy. He could not understand why it was allowed to continue, and he hoped an assurance would be given that that state of matters would be remedied. Another point he had not an opportunity of bringing before the House in Committee was the system of buying horses under martial law in Cape Colony. Under the autocratic rule of martial law farmers were, he believed, forced to make sales of their horses, and he thought the House should exercise its power of insisting that these sales were made on a fair basis. The principle of compulsory sale, which they in Ireland wanted to apply to land, was applied to horses in Cape Colony, and for the honour of the House and of the country they ought to be careful how the prices of these horses were arranged. The House should carefully examine the enormous amounts asked for as Supplementary Estimates, and he trusted some further details would be given as to how the money had been spent.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.) protested against the way in which the Estimates were put forward. It was almost impossible to discover which Vote was to be discussed, and without an actuarial training it was practically hopeless to attempt to arrive at a fair estimate of the amount of the excess asked for from the Papers supplied. The original Estimate of £61,499,000 had now swollen to the enormous total of £91,999,000. Such figures were staggering, and the House had no guarantee that before the end of the financial year further Supplementary Estimates would not be brought forward. The Government had frequently been pressed for particulars as to the prices paid for horses and forage. All descriptions of horses were lumped together, so that it could not be shown how small at

number of Irish horses had been bought. While orders were given that Ireland should be treated very charily in the matter, Continental countries were being scoured from end to end for horses. When the quality and condition of the Argentine horses were borne in mind, it was no wonder there had been so much delay and disaster in connection with the transport service in South Africa. The matter as regarded Ireland was even more serious in the question of forage. It seemed inconceivable that the Government should be sending to all parts of the world for forage and yet pass over the almost unlimited supplies of sweet meadow hay which could be obtained in Ireland. With regard to meat for the troops it was the same. Enormous quantities of foreign meat were purchased for the Army by the War Office, the quality of which was decidedly inferior to either Irish or Scotch meat and all for a trifling saving which did not amount to more than a halfpenny or three-farthings in the pound. The War Office had, wherever they could, given a preference to foreign meat. It was well known that good Scotch or Irish meat was in the end cheaper, because it was more nutritious, and a certain quantity of it went much farther than foreign meat.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BAKTLETT (Sheffield, Ecclesall) called attention to the great

expenditure on horses. This was a most remarkable lesson taught by the history of this war. He believed that over £8,000,000 had been spent on horses going to the war. What did that mean? It meant that if £500,000 had been spent in the earlier stages of the war, or before the war began, this vast expenditure would not have been necessary.

LORD STANLEY, in replying to the questions with respect to the purchase of horses said that, in addition to being officially interested, he was very much personally interested in this matter. As far as possible he wished to see not only in Ireland, but in England and Scotland, the War Office buyers brought more in contact with private breeders. At the same time hon. Members would understand that it was very difficult for any buyer to go about the various districts to see one or

two horses. That was almost impossible. He hoped that some scheme might be arranged whereby the vendors might be brought together. If that could be done, he would endeavour to get the War Office buyers to go to them. How that was to be done was still under consideration, but he hoped they would come to some satisfactory conclusion. He was afraid that, personally, he could not agree with the hon. Member who asked about the three-year-old horses. He knew that it would be much better for a seller to get the price of a five-year-old for a three-year-old. With regard to the horses bought under martial law, instructions had been given to pay the fair market value for the horses. The remark had been made that there had been corruption. It was easy to make the suggestion of corruption, but it was very difficult to prove it. [An HON. MEMBER: How many actions are pending for fraud?] He could not answer that question, but if the hon. Member would bring before him any case in which he had satisfied himself that there had been fraud, he would be only too glad to take any action that lay in his power. With regard to the question of home-fed meat, which had been brought up by the hon. Member for North Cork, he could not give any facts at the present moment. The whole thing was being considered, not with the view of going against the hon. Member's wish but in order, as far as possible, to meet the views of gentlemen on both sides of the House, that we should buy the meat of our own producers, instead of that of foreign producers.

\*MR. FIELD (Dublin. St. Patrick) said he found from the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General that on 27th October, 1899, a contract was entered into with the South African Cold Storage Company to supply fresh meat for the troops at 11d. per pound, but two-thirds of the supply was frozen meat. The hon. Member could say as an expert that 11d. per pound for frozen meat was a famine price. In consequence of this infraction of contract, it appeared from the War Office Papers that the sum of £27,000 was to be refunded by the Company. He wanted to know if that money had been refunded to the War Office. Here

was a company which had fraudulently appropriated that money, and when he called attention to the matter on a former occasion he did not receive any definite assurance as to the money. Frozen meat was supplied by the same firm to the troops in Cape Town at 5d. per pound, while 11d. was paid for the same class of meat to feed the English troops in the field. The Irish Cattle Trades

and Stockowners Association, of which he was president, had been in communication with the War Office on this subject for many years, and it was only very lately that a supply of live cattle had been given in the Curragh. There was this extraordinary state of things, that Ireland was a meat-producing and exporting country, and yet in almost every barracks in the land frozen meat was supplied to the men. This was really a matter of vast importance, and in the stand he was taking he was representing not only the tenant farmers but also the landlords. Moreover, the larger portion of the forage for the horses in Ireland consisted of foreign hay and Russian oats, and it was nothing less than a scandal that such a system should be perpetuated in an agricultural country like Ireland. The Government, through the War Office, was absolutely boycotting the Irish producer, and the question undoubtedly demanded the serious consideration of all who had the welfare of the community at heart.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs) considered the frozen meat contract to which reference had been made was an instance of the extraordinary business methods of the War Office, and he asked the noble Lord whether he was satisfied that, under the circumstances, the deduction of two pence in the pound was adequate. The contract was undoubtedly a live meat contract, expressly providing for drovers and butchers to accompany the animals with the troops, and yet three-fourths of the meat supplied was refrigerated meat. Under the circumstances he thought the War Office had a right to a considerably larger deduction. He further asked to what extent the Army Veterinary Department had been improved. The enormous wastage of horses in South Africa had been largely due to the undermanning of the Veterinary Department. The matter had been treated too much from the £; s. d. point of view. Important as might be that standpoint, there was another the House should bear in mind; namely, the horrible sufferings endured by the wretched animals. No one with a grain of sympathy for animals could have read the heartrending accounts of the terrible treatment; probably unavoidable under the circumstances ;to which animals had been subjected in South Africa without feeling a great amount of regret that it had not been possible to avoid or minimise it to a greater extent. Another point was that hitherto when horses had been landed at Cape Town they had been at once hurried up in droves to the front instead of being given an interval for exercise and so on after the voyage to get them into fit condition for their work. Had that mistaken policy now been changed A further question was with regard to the purchase of horses and the prices at which the animals had been bought. He remembered riding out a considerable distance with some friends in the Argentine, and he was told that the value of the horses they rode was about 75s. His informant was a German, and he thought perhaps he was imposing upon his credulity, but he afterwards made inquiries and found that the statement was perfectly correct. One of those horses had been ridden by the President of the Argentine Republic himself. He mentioned these facts to show that the price of horses in the Argentine was extremely low. He knew that the quality was poor, but suggestions had been made that a higher price had been paid than ought to have been paid. In the Argentine you could buy as good a horse as anyone needed to ride for £;10, and he trusted the noble Lord would

give them a satisfactory reply in regard to the prices paid for the horses purchased in the Argentine Republic.

COLONEL NOLAN said he could not understand what the object of the Government was in hiding the prices paid for those horses. He was glad to hear that the noble Lord opposite was anxious that the producer should get the profit which had hitherto been taken by the dealer. The horse fairs in Ireland were remarkably good, and the War Office

ought to be supplied with a list of them and arrange for their buyers to attend.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.) wished to have some information from the noble Lord with regard to the corn contracts. The corn produced in Great Britain and Ireland was heavier than the foreign corn, and if his information was correct the War Office had laid down a standard weight of 35 pounds to the bushel, but a corn weighing 38 pounds or 39 pounds could not be supplied at the same price. He wished to know whether the corn was tendered for at so much per quarter or so much per 100 pounds. He wished the Irish producer in this matter to be placed on an equal footing with the foreigner. For the last two years the War Office had been absolutely blind to their own interest in refusing to give this information.

They not only gave the preference to the foreigner, but they were also giving him an unfair advantage over the English and the Irish producers.

MR. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.) said he understood that the average price the dealers had been paying for horses in Ireland was £27, and the average price the dealer received was £35. He did not see why the Government should pursue such a system. He understood from a statement made by the noble Lord that the number of horses purchased direct from the producer was about 200, while the number purchased from dealers was 5,300. It was an extraordinary thing that, although they had many fairs in Ireland, the Government had not been able to purchase directly more than 200 horses. There was really no excuse for not going direct to the farmers of Ireland to purchase these horses and give them, something like the price which had been paid to the dealers. He considered that two millions was a very extravagant sum to ask for remounts. Something like 100,000 horses and mules had been sent to South Africa, and money had been wasted in the Argentine Republic and other places which ought now to be available for remounts.

AYES,

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Bagot, Capt. J. FitzRoy

Balfour, Rt Hon Gerald W(Leeds

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Bain, Col. James Robert

Banbury, Frederick (George

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J.(Man.)

Bathurst, Hon. Allen B.

LORD STANLEY said that the War Office would endeavour to bring buyers and breeders of horses together. As to the 2d. per pound on the foreign meat contract, mentioned by the hon. Member for the St. Patrick Division of Dublin,



that would be deducted at once. Regarding the question of the tax on incoming stock, that had never been placed on the contract. It was not imposed in the case referred to, nor in any other case, but he confessed the whole matter was unsatisfactory, and he would look into it.

MR. FIELD asked if the noble Lord would give a guarantee as to the supply of Canadian moat.

LORD STANLEY said he could not give a guarantee, but he would do his best in the matter.

MR. FLAVIN asked if the noble Lord could say anything about the corn question.

LORD STANLEY said he could not answer that at present, but he would endeavour as far as possible to meet the views of the hon. Member.

MR. FLAVIN: Will the noble Lord send me an answer by letter?

LORD STANLEY: Yes, Sir.

MR. DUFFY (Galway, S.) said he desired to ask the noble Lord a question which affected the constituency he had the honour to represent, it being a horse-breeding district. He wished to know if it was the intention of the Government to establish studs for the breeding of horses in Ireland.

\*MR. SPEAKER: That question cannot be discussed on this Vote.

Question put.

The House divided:;Ayes, 135; Noes, 43. (Division List No. 67.)

Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol

Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-

Platt-Higgins, Frederick

Bignold, Arthur

Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.)

Pretymann, Ernest George

Bond, Edward

Hope, J. F (Sheffield, Brightside

Priestley, Arthur

Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-

Howard, Cape J. (Faversham)

Purvis, Robert

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John

Johnston, William (Belfast)

Pym, C. Guy

Bullard, Sir Harry

Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)

Ratcliffe, R. F.

Caldwell, James

Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)

Reckitt, Harold James

Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbys.

Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W (Salop

Reid, James (Greenock)

Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)

Keswick, William

Remnant, James Farquharson  
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)  
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.  
Rentoul, James Alexander  
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r  
Lawrence, William F.  
Renwick, George  
Chapman, Edward  
Lawson, John Grant  
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge  
Churchill, Winston Spencer  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Ritchie, Rt Hon. Chas. T.  
Cellings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie  
Ropner, Colonel Robert  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Leveson- Gower, Frederick N. S.  
Royds, Clement Molyneux  
Dalkeith, Earl of  
Levy, Maurice  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
Dickson, Charles Scott  
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.  
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S  
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)  
Doxford, Sir William Theodore  
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)  
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford, East)  
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Smith, James Parker(Lanarks.  
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton  
Lucas, Col. Francis(Lowestoft)  
Spear, John Ward  
Faber, George Denison  
Lucas, Reginald, J. (Portsmouth  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.  
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. E.  
Stmt, Hon. Humphry Napier  
Finch, George H.  
Macdona, John Cumming  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)

Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Maconochie, A. W.  
Talbot, Rt Hn. J G. (Oxf'dUniv.  
Fisher, William Hayes  
M'Arthur, Chas. (Liverpool)  
Thomson, F. W.(York, W. R)  
Fletcher, Sir Henry  
Malcolm, Ian  
Thornton, Percy M.  
Fuller, J. M. F.  
Manners, Lord Cecil  
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray  
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)  
Melville, Beresford Valentine  
Tufnell, Col. Edward  
Godson, Sir Augustus Fred  
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.  
Valentin, Viscount  
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney  
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-  
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)  
Webb, Colonel William Geo.  
Goschen, Hn. George Joachim  
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)  
Weir, James Galloway  
Graham, Henry Robert  
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)  
Welby, Lt.-Col. ACE (Taunton  
Grenfell, William Henry  
Morrell, George Herbert  
White, Luke (York, E. R.)  
Gretton, John  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)  
Greville, Hon. Ronald  
Morrison, James Archibald  
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-  
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Ld. G. (Midx  
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Hamilton Marq. of (L'nd'nderry  
Mount, William Arthur  
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.  
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.

Hare, Thomas Leigh  
Murray, Rt Hon A Graham (Bute  
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem' th.  
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)  
Haslett, Sir James Horner  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Hay, Hon. Claude George  
Rainier, Walter (Salisbury)

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.  
Hayden, John Patrick  
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon N.  
Ambrose, Robert  
Healy, Timothy Michael  
O'Malley, William  
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)  
Jordan, Jeremiah  
O'Mara, James  
Poland, John  
Joyce, Michael  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Kennedy, Patrick James  
O'Shee, James John  
Clancy, John Joseph  
Leamy, Edmund  
Reddy, M.  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Lundon, W.  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Crean, Eugene  
Mooney, John J.  
Roche, John  
Delany, William  
Murphy, J.  
Sullivan, Donal  
Doogan, P. C.  
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.  
Thompson, E. C. (Monaghan, N.  
Duffy, William J.  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
Tully, Jasper  
Ffrench, Peter  
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)  
Field, William

O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'y Mid.  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Captain Donclan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.  
Flavin, Michael Joseph  
O'Dornnell, John (Mayo's.)  
Flynn, James Christopher  
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)  
Hammond, John  
O'Dowd, John

Second Resolution agreed to.

Adjourned at half alter One of the clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 18th March, 1901.

One other Member took and subscribed the Oath.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

GREAT EASTERN RAILWAY BILL. (BY ORDER.)

The following Instruction stood on the Paper in the name of Mr. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick's); "That it be an Instruction to the Committee, that no preferential rates shall be given to foreign produce carried over the lines controlled by this Company."

\*MR. SPEAKER: The Instruction which stands in the name of the hon. Member for the St. Patrick's Division of Dublin is not in order. As I said the other day, in regard to other Instructions on the same Bill, it deals with a matter which affects railways generally, and therefore it cannot be dealt with on a private Bill which does not raise the question.

MR. FIELD: Of course, Sir, I do not dispute your ruling, but I wish to point out that I am prepared to furnish evidence showing that this particular railway company is acting contrary to the spirit of the Hallway Act. I wish to know what opportunity will be afforded to the House to deal with this particular point.

\*MR. SPEAKER: I cannot assist the hon. Member.

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.;; Great Western Railway Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 63 COMPLIED WITH).

MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order No. 63 has been complied with, viz.;; Cromer Water Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

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

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

Metropolitan Police Provisional Order Bill.

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

LLANDRINDOD WELLS WATER BILL.

GOLBORNE GAS BILL

RICHMOND GAS BILL.

STROUD GAS BILL.

Read a second time, and committed.

STEATFORD-UPON-AVON, TOWCESTER, AND MIDLAND JUNCTION, EAST AND WEST JUNCTION

EVESHAM, REDDITCH, AND STRATFORD-UPON-AVON JUNCTION RAILWAY COMPANIES BILL.

ORDER.)

Second Reading deferred till Tuesday, 16th April.

THAMES DEEP WATER DOCK BILL (BY ORDER.)

Read a second time, and committed.

PAISLEY GAS PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

Read a second time and committed.

PETITIONS.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (HIGHER GRADE AND EVENING CONTINUATION SCHOOLS).

Petitions for alteration of Law, from Leeds: Stalybridge; Ilkeston: Liver-sedge:

and School Board for London: to lie upon the Table.

INHABITED HOUSE DUTY AND INCOME TAX.

Petitions for alteration of Law, from Northern and North Eastern Districts of

London; and Liverpool; to lie upon the Table.

POOR LAW OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1896.

Petitions for alteration of Law. from Bolton: Stockton: and South borough; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Strood; Aberdeen (three); Atherton and Tyldesley:

Over: Anvil Corner: Abersychan; Ashwater; Ashton-under-Lyne: Bradford (Yorks)

(four); Birmingham (six): Christow; Branksome: Southwark; Birkenshaw; Cardiff;

York (two): Carlisle (seven); Carron; Crediton; Ealing; Falkirk; Glossop;

Grampound Road; Glossop Dale; Holsworthy; Bulwell; Low Hesket; Lewisham (two);

Messingham; Marton; Newton Burgo-land; Okehampton; Oswaldtwistle; Petersfield;

Plymouth; Pontypool; Sheffield (ten); Salford (two); Southlands; Stonehouse;

Tavistock; Black Torrington; Tyldesley (two): North

Meols; Utttoxeter (two); Wadebridge;. Worksop; Walworth (three); Harrogate (two);

Stockton-on-Tees (three); Garndiffaith; Alloa (three); Port Glasgow; Oldham;

Leek; Penrith; Kensington; Clapton; Manchester; Taunton (two); Woolwich (two);

Malvern (four); Upton-on-Severn; Tenbury; Bensham; Lark-hall; Durham; Edinburgh

(five); Notting Hill (two); Lumphanan; Chelmsford; Broomfield; Bilbrough;

Malton; Ashton-under-Lyne; Kingussie; Kennethmont; Brixham; Athlone; Kingston-

upon-Hull; Partick; Whiteinch; Norton; Bowmore; Barnoldswick; Thomas Stansfield;

Falkirk (two); Sandford; Northwich; Blaenavon; Nottingham; Sneinton; Liverpool

(two); Cowpen; Morpeth; Bebside; Wandsworth; Newmilns; Gainsborough; Malvern

Link; Worcester; Derby; Withyham; Gloucester; Crawley: Down: London; Glasgow;

Mildmay Park; Sefton Park (two); Malton (three); Chelsea; Hatherleigh (two);

Portsmouth (three); Tregeare; South-sea; Smethwick: Bromley (two): Appledore;

Greenock (three); Rhoda Saint; Rovton; Harrington; Leeds (two); Rawtenstall; Bacup; Insch; Kirkstall; Birstal; Brierfield; Colne; North Kensington; Cubitt Town; Sowerby Bridge; Milnathort; Brixham; Rye; Middleton; Rugby; and Aberdovey (five); to lie upon the Table.

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

Petitions in favour, from Dundee; Biggar; Peterhead; Pittenween; An struther Easter (two); Kilrenny (three); Ravenscraig; Denny; Kilsyth; Falkirk (two); Airth; Dumfries; Kirkcudbright; Carluke; Kirkfield bank; Wick (two); Kirriemuir; Edinburgh (seven); Lanark; Drumlade; Port Glasgow (two); Peebles (two); Alvie; Glasgow (four); Grand Lodge of Scotland Independent Order of Good Templars; Innerleithen; Walkerburn; Auchterless; Uddingstone; Rothesay; Alva; Tillicoultry (two); Crail; Alloa (two); Larkhall; and Wishaw; to lie upon the Table.

#### TROUT FISHING ANNUAL CLOSE TIME (SCOTLAND) BILL.

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

#### RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

##### COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).

Copy presented, of Report No. 318 (British Guiana, Annual Report for 1899&#x2013;1900) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

##### EMIGRATION (COLONIES).

Copy presented, of Report on the Emigrants' Information Office for the year ended 31st December, 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

##### ARMY.

Copy presented, of Return of Military Forces in South Africa (Oversea Colonial Contingents) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

##### TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No."2561 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

#### POLICE SUPERANNUATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Ordered, That the Report and Minutes of Evidence of the Select Committee on the Police (Scotland) Bill of Session 1890 be referred to the Select Committee on the Police Superannuation (Scotland) Bill.:(The Lord Advocate.)

#### ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTONS

##### QUESTIONS.

##### SOUTH AFRICAN WAR;YEOMEN SETTLERS.

MR. THOMAS DEWAR (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Government has yet considered how far it will assist the passages of wives and families of Yeomen who care to settle in our new colonies in South Africa at the expiration of their term of enlistment; and, if so, can he make any communication to the House on this matter.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): I am not yet in a position to make any statement upon the matter.

##### THE SURRENDER OF HELVETIA.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been drawn to the insinuation of cowardice made against the officer in command of the post at Helvetia captured by the Boers on the 31st December, when that officer was severely wounded in the fight; and

whether, in consequence of the distress caused to the relatives of the officer by these insinuations, he will state the facts relating to that surrender.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): As a general court-martial will be held on the officer in command at Helvetia as soon as he is reported fit, I am not in a position to make any statement of facts in reply to the question.

MR. LAMBERT: Is it not the case that this officer was severely wounded before the surrender took place?

MR. BRODRICK: I have no doubt it was so, but I must not go into the facts.

ALLEGED SHOOTING OF BRITISH SUBJECTS BY COMMANDANT DELAREY.

MR. MACONOCHIE (Aberdeenshire, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he has yet received any official intimation of the alleged shooting of two British subjects named MacLauglan and Boyd by orders of Commandant Delarey; whether he is aware that Ronald Boyd was a British subject who had only been in South Africa two years, and held a permit from the late Transvaal Government, granted on his taking the oath of neutrality; and whether he will order an official investigation by the authorities on the spot.

MR. BRODRICK: I have no official information of the matter referred to. I will make inquiry.

GENERAL COLVILE.

MR. EMMOTT (Oldham): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that a telegram sent by the Chief of the Staff to General Colville on 24th May, 1900, to inform him by what route the 13th Yeomanry would join him, did not reach him till

some weeks after that date; and whether he has any official information showing that the explanation of the delay is that this telegram was wrongly addressed to the General Officer commanding the 9th Brigade instead of to the General Officer commanding the 9th Division; and, if so, can he state whether any inquiry has been made into the conduct of the officer who so addressed it, and how he has been dealt with.

MR. BRODRICK: The telegram referred to did not reach General Colville until after the 31st May. It appears, however, to have been correctly addressed to the General Officer commanding the 9th Division.

MILITIA RESERVISTS ON ACTIVE SERVICE.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield-Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state how many men have been taken from the Militia Reserve for the army in South Africa, and when reinforcements from that body had first to be called for owing to the waste of the campaign; and can he inform the House how many of the Militiamen now serving were members of the force at the annual training of 1899.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): 13,574 Militia Reservists have been taken for the army in South Africa. The first drafts to replace wastage left in January, 1900. No figures are available to enable me to reply to the second part of the question.

MR. FFRENCH (Wexford, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether a Militiaman belonging to the Militia Reserve who has been serving in South Africa



since January, 1900, and whose time is up next April, can be compelled by the military authorities to serve ten months longer; and, if not, whether he is entitled to get his discharge.

LORD STANLEY: A Militia Reservist when called out for permanent service is liable to serve a year beyond the date of the expiration of his Reserve service if a state of war exists.

RANK OF MILITIA OFFICERS.

MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN (Kent, Tunbridge): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that there is dissatisfaction felt by officers of the Militia in consequence of the fact that officers of other Auxiliary forces have had Army rank conferred on them while serving; in South Africa, thus giving them seniority over Militia officers of the same rank, although the Militia is the oldest Auxiliary force; and whether he can remedy this by conferring Army rank on all Militia officers serving abroad in future.

LORD STANLEY: This question is under consideration. I hope to be able to give a definite answer before long.

MILITIA; TRAINING OF BATTALIONS NOT EMBODIED.

MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state if there is to be a regular training this summer of those Militia battalions which are not now embodied: and, if so, under what conditions.

MR. BRODRICK: This question has not yet been decided.

STRATHCONA'S HORSE.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the troopers of Strathcona's Horse upon whom His Majesty bestowed medals will be permitted to wear the ribbon of the medal pending the issue of the medal itself; and whether orders will be issued to general officers commanding districts to authorise the wearing of the ribbon as laid down in King's Regulations, paragraph 2,04:8A.

\*LORD STANLEY: When the King bestows a medal on a soldier he can wear the medal and the ribbon. When the Army Order regarding the grant of a war medal for South Africa is published the instructions referred to will be carried out.

TEMPORARY STAFF OFFICERS' OUTFIT ALLOWANCES.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether a pledge was given by his predecessor to grant an outfit allowance to officers posted to temporary appointments on the staff; and, if so, whether it has been carried out.

\*LORD STANLEY: Presumably the hon. and gallant Member refers to officers taken from the Reserve. Retired List, or Auxiliary Forces for temporary staff employment, and requiring an outfit. In these cases the allowance would be given, but not more than one allowance to any individual officer.

CAPTAIN NORTON: Do not officers on half-pay receive the allowance?

\*LORD STANLEY: I think they come under the heading "Retired List Officers." I am not certain, however, and will make inquiry.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I received a pledge from the late Secretary for War that half-pay officers should have the allowance.

COMMISSIONS FROM THE RANKS; OUTFITS GRANTS.

MR. ALLHUSEN (Hackney, Central): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether he can explain why any exception is made to the giving of a grant of money towards outfit for a soldier from the ranks on receiving a commission; and can he state the amount of the grant usually given, and whether his official information shows that it has been found adequate to cover the expense of an officer's outfit.

\*LORD STANLEY: The regulations have been relaxed in cases of certain soldiers engaged on active service in South Africa. The amount of the grant is £100. The sum is adequate in the cases of most corps.

VOLUNTEER SUMMER CAMPS.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, seeing that delay in the issue of

the definite arrangements and regulations for the Volunteer summer camps increases the difficulty of securing attendance, he will take the earliest opportunity possible of making public these arrangements.

\*MR. BRODRICK: I can assure my hon. and gallant friend that every effort is being made to publish the arrangements for Volunteer camps as soon as possible; but he must be aware that the new arrangements of the present year have involved great pressure in all Departments.

QUEEN VICTORIA'S FUNERAL; 1ST SEA FORTH VOLUNTEERS.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, having regard to the fact that the 1st Seaforth Volunteers reached London from Dingwall at 5.30 on the morning of Saturday, the 2nd February, by invitation of the War Office, to attend the Queen's funeral, will he state why the staff officers in charge of the funeral ceremonies made no arrangements for the part which these Volunteers were to take at the funeral: and will he explain why no information was obtainable at the War Office with regard to the disposal of the various Volunteers who arrived in London from Scotland to attend the funeral.

\*LORD STANLEY: All country Volunteer corps not included in the funeral procession were formed into a provisional brigade, and positions were allotted to them along the line of route. The disposal of the various Volunteer detachments arriving in London rested entirely with the general commanding the home district.

PARCEL POSTAGE RATES TO TROOPS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

MR. MANSFIELD (Lincolnshire, Spalding): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether parcels sent to the troops in Africa are charged 1s. per pound postage: and whether, seeing that similar parcels sent to any part of Australia, New Zealand, or Canada- only cost 6d. per pound, he can arrange for parcels sent to the troops in Africa, to be charged at a similar rate.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): Postage at the rate of 1s. a pound is not charged on parcels for the troops sent from this country to any part of South Africa. Such parcels may be sent to the Cape Colony, Natal, the Orange River Colony, and the Transvaal for a postage of 9d. a pound. For parcels to Australia, New Zealand, and Canada the postage is not 6d. a pound, as the hon. Member supposes. To Australia, by the cheapest

route, it is 1s. for the first pound and 6d. for every succeeding pound. To New Zealand as much as three pounds can be conveyed for 1s., the lowest postage; while to Canada the rate is 8d. for the first pound and 6d. for each succeeding pound. The varying requirements of the colonies themselves render it impossible to obtain greater uniformity at present.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT (Sheffield, Ecclesall): But is it not possible to reduce the charge to the troops to 6d.?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I am sure the Postmaster General would be very glad to do it if possible, and I will communicate with him but I am afraid there are difficulties in the way.

H.M.S. "JACKAL."

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he will state whether the officers and men of H.M.S. "Jackal" were on leave of absence during the month of October; and, if so, on what dates.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): The officers and men of H.M.S. "Jackal" were not on leave of absence during the month of October last.

SLAVERY IN PEMBA AND ZANZIBAR.

MR. THOMAS BAYLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he will inform the House of the number of slaves that have received their papers of freedom in the slave courts of Zanzibar and Pemba in each of the years 1898, 1899, and 1900; and if he can give an estimate of the number of slaves still in these two islands.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.) (for Viscount CRANBORNE): The number of slaves freed in Zanzibar and Pemba during the years 1898, 1899, and 1900 were respectively, 2,735, 4,263, 1,685. His Majesty's Agent and Consul General at Zanzibar estimates the present number of slaves in the two islands at, approximately. 50,000.

BRITISH CONSULAR AGENTS IN FINLAND.

MR. DAVID MORGAN (Essex, Walthamstow): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can state what arrangements have been made with the Russian Government for filling up the appointments of British Consular Agents in Finland; can he say at how many and which of the Finnish ports appointments have been made; and, in view of the importance to British traders and shipowners of having in all the principal Finnish ports British Consular Agents to protect and watch over British interests, will the vacancies still remaining soon be filled.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (for Viscount CRANBORNE): The Consular posts in Finland held by unpaid officers, which became vacant by the resignation of the holders in 1899, have not yet been filled up with the exception of Uleaborg, to which Mr. Blunt was appointed in August last. The paid Consulate at Helsingfors, however, has been re-established, and the Consul, Mr. Cooke, is expected to arrive there very shortly to take up his duties. His Majesty's Government would be very glad to fill up the other vacancies as soon as circumstances permit.

BRITISH SHIPS IN CHINESE WATERS.

\*SIR E. ASHMEAD BARTLETT: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign

Affairs whether the Russian Government has recently endeavoured to exclude the British fleet from certain portions of the Gulf of Pechili, and has claimed the waters of the Blonde and Elliott Islands as exclusively belonging to Russia: and, if so, what steps His Majesty's Government has taken in consequence of this claim.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (for Viscount CRANBORNE): We have received no communication on this subject from the Russian Government, but the Russian Admiral remonstrated against the presence in the waters of the Elliott Islands of H.M.S. "Plover," which was engaged in pursuing pirates. The action of the Commander-in-Chief on the China Station in sending British ships to these islands appears to be in accordance with our rights under Article 52 of the Treaty of Tientsin.

\*SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: May I understand that this claim has not been accepted by His Majesty's Government?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Certainly.

BRITISH INFLUENCE IN THE YANG-TSZE VALLEY.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the information in his possession shows that there is a decline of British influence in the Chinese provinces bordering on the Yang-tsze-Kiang river; and, if so, what steps His Majesty's Government are taking to restore and maintain British influence there.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (for Viscount CRANBORNE): There is no information showing a decline of British influence in the Yang-tsze Valley.

ANGLO-RUSSIAN DISPUTE AT TIENTSIN.

MR. JOSEPH WALTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley): I wish to ask the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs a question of which I have given him private notice. It is whether he can give the House any information in regard to the reported seizure by Russia of land at Tientsin, which was mortgaged to British bondholders.

THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRANBORNE, Rochester): Since I received the private notice I have not had any opportunity of obtaining the last information from the Foreign Office. I must ask the hon. Member to put the question on the Paper.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): Can the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs say why General Barrow's orders, that the action of Russia should be opposed by force of arms, could not be carried out?

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: The hon. Member must give notice.

SHANGHAI AND TA-KU CABLE.

\*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the cable recently laid between Shanghai, Wei-hai-wei, and Ta-ku, other than the portion between Wei-hai-wei and Chefoo, shown in the Estimates, has been laid by arrangement with His Majesty's Government, and to whom it belongs; and whether in case the proprietorship of the cable is divided between the Eastern, Extension Telegraph Company and the Great Northern Telegraph Company, the nationality of the persons employed in the offices at Shanghai, Chefoo, Wei-hai-wei, and Ta-ku has been provided for in the agreement; or whether, the Great Northern Company being the Danish company which uses the Russian land lines as part of its system, the new cable is subject to

the same arrangements as those which have previously existed with regard to the offices in China of that company.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol. W.): The cable between Shanghai, Chefoo, and Ta-ku (which does not touch at Wei-hai-wei) has been laid by the Eastern Extension and Great Northern Telegraph Companies, on account of the Chinese Telegraph Administration, under an arrangement which His Majesty's Government recognises and supports. The cable is mortgaged by the Chinese administrations to the companies for twenty-five years at least, and they will work and maintain it. Wei-hai-wei will be served by a branch line from Chefoo. It is stipulated in the agreement between the Eastern Extension Company and His Majesty's Government that the branch line shall be worked by British staff, and that all traffic between Wei-hai-wei, Chefoo, Shanghai, and Hong Kong shall also, as far as practicable, be transmitted exclusively by British staff.

#### UNCLAIMED FUNDS.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can state or approximately estimate the amount of unclaimed dividends on Consols and other National funds; of unclaimed deposits and balances in Joint stock, trustees, and post Office Savings Banks: of the unclaimed dividends of joint stock and of limited liability companies: and of unclaimed funds in Chancery and other courts of law; and whether in default of specific information as to the detailed and aggregate amounts of these unclaimed funds, he will agree to an inquiry with a view to their being utilised for the relief of the taxation of the country.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: With regard to the majority of the various funds of the nature of unclaimed dividends which are in the hands of or under the control of Government, I will send to the hon. Member the information he desires, but it would not be possible to present the facts intelligibly within the limits of an answer. Perhaps I may take this opportunity of saying that the idea which appears to be prevalent in some quarters that there are large sums of such moneys lying idle is quite a mistake. The total amount is not at all huge, and the moneys are I think in all cases, where of sufficient amount, usefully employed. With regard to funds of a similar nature outside the purview of Government, I have no information, and I do not at present see how it is to be obtained: but I will consider the hon. Member's suggestion.

#### THE NEW COINAGE.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the title "Defender of the Faith" is to be retained on the new coinage; and, if so, whether he can say what particular faith is referred to.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: It does not rest with me as the Master of the Mint to decide on the Royal titles. While these remain unaltered, they will naturally continue to appear as at present on the coins.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman, if it is not his business, will he kindly tell me whose business it is, in order that I may ask that Gentleman?

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I imagine that, like other matters of the kind, it would be

the business of His Majesty, acting on the advice of his responsible Minister.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to give notice that I shall take an early opportunity of bringing under His Majesty's notice the fact that he has no earthly right to this title.

AN HON. MEMBER: Insolence.

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

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: But he has not.

MAGISTRATES AND THE OATH OF ALLEGIANCE.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in view of the inconvenience caused by existing requirements, he will advise His Majesty to issue an order under Section 2 of the Promissory Oaths Act. 1871, enabling justices to take the oath of allegiance and the judicial oath before any two justices in petty sessions assembled.

\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): I propose to take the King's pleasure on this matter.

TREATMENT OF INEBRIATES.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can state how many persons have been committed to inebriate homes under the Inebriates Act of 1898.

\*MR. RITCHIE: I can only give the number of persons received into inebriate reformatories; namely, up to the present time, 257.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS: Cannot the right hon. Gentleman say how many have been committed?

\*MR. RITCHIE: No, Sir, I am afraid not.

BRADFORD ANTI-VACCINATIONISTS.

MR. BELL (Derby): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to the arrest of Walter Mottershead, of Bradford, at 5 o'clock in the morning of the 26th February, in consequence of his child, aged two years, not having been vaccinated; whether he will give directions that such an arrest should not be made at such an hour in the morning; and whether in the event of the child not being vaccinated he can interfere to prevent the man being again prosecuted.

\*MR. RITCHIE: My attention has already been drawn to this case, but I have no authority to give any directions of the nature indicated, or to intervene in the course of criminal proceedings.

EARTHENWARE AND CHINA INDUSTRY; LEAD POISONING.

MR. JAMES HEATH (Staffordshire, N.W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will give a Return of the number of cases of lead poisoning in earthenware and china works during the years 1890 and 1900, with a statement in each case of the degree of seriousness of the ailment, and, wherever possible, the length of time for which the person was absent from work.

\*MR. RITCHIE: I will give a Return showing so far as possible the severity of the attack, the number of previous attacks and the nature of the principal symptoms; but I am afraid that it is not possible to show the length of time for which each person was absent from work.

SUGGESTED AMNESTY FOR IRISH POLITICAL PRISONERS.

MR. DELANY (Queen's Co., Ossory): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will consider the advisability of recommending His Majesty the King to signalise his accession to the Throne by ordering the release of all the Irish political prisoners at present confined in the gaols of the United Kingdom.

\*MR. RITCHIE: So far as I am aware there are no Irish confined in any prison in England or Wales who can in any sense of the term be called political prisoners. I am not responsible for Irish or Scotch prisons.

MR. DELANY: What about the prisoners referred to by the hon. Member for Galway who have been convicted by packed juries?

[No answer was given.]

VEHICULAR TRAFFIC IN THE METROPOLIS.

MR. THOMAS DEWAR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, having regard to the fact that over 1,100 persons are injured and over 50 deaths occur through, accidents caused by covered vehicles in the streets of London every year, whether it is the Government's intention to grant to the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis authority to compel proprietors of covered vehicles to have them so constructed as to enable drivers to see passing and following traffic.

\*MR. RITCHIE: I quite agree with my predecessor, who said, in answer to a question last year, that these covered vehicles are undoubtedly a danger, but I am afraid the Government have no power to grant the authority suggested.

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture if he can state how many outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease have occurred this year, whether more or less than occurred to this date last year; whether his attention has been drawn to the danger of introducing the disease by the importation of hides, skins, and offal from countries infected with the disease; and what steps he proposes to take to prevent such infection in this country.

\*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): Ten outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease have occurred this year. In the corresponding period of 1900 there were seven, but the counties affected this year are only two as against three last year. The possibility of the introduction of the disease by the importation of skins, hides, and offal, as well as by hay and straw, and in many similar ways, has been the subject of frequent inquiry and attention, but while the evidence of actual danger is not clear, especially in the case of the imports mentioned in the question, the inconvenience to the many trades concerned would be out of all proportion to the risk involved, and there is no precedent for a general prohibition of such imports. It is, of course, the duty of the Customs under the Foreign Animals Order of 1896 to seize, detain, and, if necessary, destroy in specific cases, where there is reason to believe that disease may be introduced.

MR. LAMBERT: Will the right hon. Gentleman see that in any cases of suspected infection the hides are disinfected?

\*MR. HANBURY: Of course.

FIRE DEFENCE.

MR. MALCOLM (Suffolk, Stowmarket): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been directed to a speech delivered by his predecessor in office, on 12th April, 1899, on the subject of fire brigades; whether he has considered the Report of the Select Committee thereupon issued in July, 1900; and whether, having regard to the danger and anxiety caused by the existing state of fire defence, he is prepared to introduce a measure based upon the unanimous recommendation of that Select Committee.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): The Report of the Select Committee is receiving my consideration, but I cannot hold out any prospect of introducing a Bill on the subject during the present session.

MR. MALCOLM: If a Bill based on the unanimous recommendations of the Select Committee is introduced into the

&#x2020; See 'The Parliamentary Debates [Fourth Series], Vol. Ixix., page 901. House, will the right hon. Gentleman support it?

MR. WALTER LONG: It is impossible for me to answer that, as the recommendations of the Committee affect Departments other than my own.

WIDENING OF PICCADILLY.

\*COLONEL LEGGE (St. George's, Hanover Square): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works if he can say when the proposed widening of Piccadilly will be carried out.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): This is a work, as my hon. and gallant friend is aware, which is to be carried out by the County Council, I believe they will be ready to commence it in the ensuing summer.

HYDE PARK GATES.

COLONEL TUFNELL (Essex, S.E.): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether he would consider the advisability of allowing cabs proceeding to Paddington Station to pass through the gates at Hyde Park Corner along the north side of the Serpentine and out at Victoria Gate.

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: This could not be allowed without an alteration of the Statutory Rules made under the Parks Regulation Act. I do not think it would be advisable to take any steps for the alteration of the rules at present.

EDINBURGH NEW INLAND REVENUE BUILDINGS.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works, having regard to the fact that the construction of the new Inland Revenue Buildings at Edinburgh was for some time delayed owing to the quarry from which the stone was obtained having ceased working, will he say whether a sufficient quantity of suitable stone has now been obtained from another quarry, and what progress has been made with, the buildings.

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: A sufficient quantity of suitable stone was obtained from another quarry, and the contract was completed in October. 1899.

KESSOCK FERRY, INVERNESS; CONVEYANCE OF MAILS.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, will he explain why the mails are conveyed over Kessock



Ferry, Inverness, as passengers' luggage; and will he state whether the mails are conveyed over both public and private ferries throughout the United Kingdom under similar conditions; and under what Act of Parliament this practice is authorised.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General is advised that he is entitled to claim that the postman who crosses Kessock Ferry with the mails should be conveyed for the charge applicable to ordinary members of the public and their luggage. The conditions under which mails are conveyed over public and private ferries throughout the United Kingdom are not in all cases identical. In England the Postmaster General has, as a rule, a right to the free use of a ferry not only for his mails, but for any officer in charge of them. The enactment bearing on the conveyance of postmen with mails across ferries is Section 9 of the Post Office (Offences) Act, 1837 (1. Vic. c. 3G); but there are doctrines of the common law of England also bearing on the question.

WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY; THE POST OFFICE AND STEAMSHIP COMPANIES.

SIR JOHN LENG: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he can explain what are the hindrances to the adoption by British steamship companies of the Marconi system of wireless telegraphy now in use on board of Belgian and German steamers; whether he can state what requirements are made by the British Post Office which are not made by foreign post offices; and whether such as are proved to be hindrances will be speedily removed.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The only steamship companies who have applied to the Postmaster General are those engaged in the Channel services to France. Negotiations are proceeding with those companies, and the Postmaster General is not in a position to give any further information at present.

BOLTON POST OFFICE EMPLOYEES' GRIEVANCES.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if the Secretary to the Post Office has received a petition from the employees at the Bolton post office calling attention to certain grievances in connection with the transference of rural postmen to the town, forwarded to him on the '20th November, 1900; if so, can he say when it was acknowledged; and what action does he propose to take in regard to the grievances mentioned therein.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Inquiry has been made, but no trace of the memorial from postmen at Bolton of November last having been received in the Secretary's office can at present be found. A revision of the delivery arrangements at Bolton is now in course of preparation, and in connection with this the complaints about their present duties, which are understood to have been put forward in the memorial in question by the postmen who were transferred from the rural district in 1897, will be duly considered by the Postmaster General.

CIVIL SERVICE RULES MONITOR CANDIDATES.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can explain why persons who have served as monitors in national schools in Ireland for a period of five years are not granted the same allowances in age when competing for Civil Service appointments

as are granted to members of the Royal Irish Constabulary of five years service; and whether he will take steps to instruct the Civil Service Commissioners to have monitors included amongst those classes of persons to whom age allowances are made when competing for Civil Service appointments.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: As my predecessor explained on 9th April last, it is undesirable that persons who have been trained at public expense for the position of teacher should be given special encouragement to quit that profession for the Civil Service. I cannot therefore give the undertaking suggested in the second paragraph of the question.

#### RADWINTER AND HEMPSTEAD POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS.

MR. ARMINE WODEHOUSE (Essex, Saffron Walden): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether the Postmaster General is aware of the inconvenience caused to the inhabitants of the villages of Radwinter and Hempstead, in Essex, owing to having only one delivery of letters a day, which makes it impossible for them to get a newspaper on the day of issue, while immediately adjacent villages though further from their post town have two deliveries, and whether the Postmaster General will reconsider the answer communicated last month to the Chairman of the Hempstead Parish Council: and whether he is aware that frequently the walking postman is unable to take parcels duly posted at Hempstead owing to having more than he can carry, and whether he will make inquiry with a view to remedying this state of things.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General has received from time to time applications for a second post from the inhabitants of Radwinter and Hempstead. The matter has been carefully considered, but it is found that the cost of the present service to these places exceeds the revenue from the correspondence, and that the expense of providing a second post is not justified. The Postmaster General is not aware that the postman is unable to take all parcels posted at Hempstead, but he is having inquiry made on the subject.

#### MALLAIG AND STORNOWAY STEAM SERVICE.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he will state when the proposed experimental steamer service between Mallaig and Stornoway will commence, and for how long this experimental service will be in operation; and in view of the dissatisfaction which exists in regard to the present steamer service, will care be taken that tenders are invited for the new steamer service between Mallaig and Stornoway as soon

as the precise nature of the service to be given has been determined.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The institution of any mail service by steamer between Mallaig and Stornoway is dependent upon the opening of the railway to Mallaig, upon the times at which the railway company may finally decide to run the trains, and upon the arrangements which the Postmaster General may be able to make with the company. The question of inviting tenders for a permanent mail service by steamer between the above-named places will be further considered when any service, which it may be found desirable to establish experimentally, has been in actual operation for a sufficient period.

## PONTYPOOL TELEPHONE EXCHANGE.

MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether, in view of the fact that the telephone exchange for the Abergavenny district is at Pontypool, he could state whether the transfer of the Abergavenny district to the Pontypool Telephone Exchange area is in any way barred by any condition in the Agreement with the National Telephone Company in connection with the purchase of the trunk lines by the State in 1896; and whether he could arrange for such transfer for the convenience of persons resident in the Abergavenny district and in the Pontypool Telephone Exchange area.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The limitation of local telephone exchange business to defined areas was a necessary condition of the Agreement of 1896, under which the Post Office purchased the telephone trunk wires of the National Telephone Company, and undertook the maintenance and extension of the trunk wire system. The fusion of the Pontypool and Abergavenny Exchange areas as defined by that Agreement would involve the abandonment of its main principle.

## THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES; DELAY IN PUBLICATION.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that at four o'clock

on the afternoon of the 14th instant the last number of The Parliamentary Debates to be obtained in the Library was that recording the proceedings of the 25th February; and, seeing that this represents an arrear of nine or ten days beyond contract time, can he say whether the delay is due to the extra work thrown on the reporters in consequence of the recent late sittings; and whether he will take steps to ensure a more prompt issue of the Debates. In putting this question I desire to say that it implies no reflection on the reporting staff', which I believe is doing its duty very satisfactorily.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Yes, Sir, I am aware that there has been a very regrettable delay in the publication of the Debates this session, but I am informed that within a few minutes of the time mentioned in the hon. Member's question two more daily parts were placed in the Library. I have communicated with the contractors, who inform me that the delay has been due to the breakdown of a vessel conveying new plant and material for use in the work, but that the plant and material are now in their hands and the arrears are being rapidly made up. I hope that under these circumstances no further cause of complaint will arise. The hon. Member will see that it is not suggested that the delay is due to the reporting staff.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the last number of the printed proceedings of this House in the Library now is dated 28th February; eighteen days ago?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I am not aware of the fact, but I accept the hon. Member's statement. I hope that now the new machinery has reached the contractors the delay will soon be made up.

MR. TENNANT (Berwickshire): May I ask where the new plant and machinery came from; was it made in Germany or not?

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

SHIELDAIG AND APPLECROSS (ROSS-SHIRE) CART ROAD.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether he is aware that one of the proprietors in the parish of Apple-cross, Ross-shire, has refused to give permission for the construction of a cart road between Shieldaig and Applecross; and can the Secretary for Scotland take any steps to secure the construction of the proposed road.

\*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): I am not aware of the fact referred to in the first paragraph of the hon. Member's question, and in any case the matter seems to lie with the road authority.

KING'S TITLE IN SCOTLAND.

MR. BLACK (Banffshire): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the officials in the Signet Office in Edinburgh decline to signet summonses running in the name of His Most Gracious Majesty King Edward unless the words "the Seventh" are added; and whether, in view of the fact that no Sovereign bearing the name of Edward has hitherto reigned in Scotland, instructions will be given to discontinue the practice in all writs and documents running in the name of the Crown relating to Scotland alone.

MR. JOHN DEWAR (Inverness-shire): Before the right hon. Gentleman answers, may I inquire whether his attention has been called to the fact that the Oath of Allegiance taken by hon. Members was to "King Edward" and not to "King Edward VII."?

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen. N.): Is the Lord Advocate aware that, if a rigorous rule were enforced as to the words "the Seventh," a precedent would be created which was not adhered to in the similar case of William IV.?

\*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The answer to the question on the Paper is that it has been decided, after full consideration, that His Majesty shall sign as Edward VII. all writs passing the signet and other documents running in the name of the Crown in Scotland. The Secretary for Scotland sees no sufficient ground on which to suggest an alteration of this decision as is suggested in the question. In answer to the question of the hon. Member for North Aberdeen, I have made inquiry into the

matter, and find that in the time of William IV. signet letters and summonses always ran in the name of "William the Fourth," so that precedent is adhered to. As to the question of the hon. Member for Inverness-shire, I candidly confess I have tried in vain to find a Scotch grievance in the King's designation as Edward VII. It seems to me to be really a matter of convenience of citation, and that it would lead to considerable confusion if the statutes were cited in Scotland as those of Edward I. of Scotland. His Majesty was proclaimed under the title of Edward VII., and the old idea in Scotland in regard to King James does not arise, because the statutes were not cited in the same way as now.

MR. PIRIE: May I point out that the precedent of William IV. was not always followed?

SCOTTISH CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD; ROAD CONSTRUCTION.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the Secretary for Scotland is aware that efforts are being made to induce the Congested Districts Board to construct private roads on certain estates in the congested area.; and will care

be taken that the funds of the Board are not expended in the construction of roads which are to be specially under the control of landlords and for their exclusive benefit.

\*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I am informed by the Congested Districts Board that their practice is only to entertain the question of grants for such roads as are approved by the Statutory Authority, namely, the district committee whose application is forwarded to the county council; and they are then further advised by the consulting engineer to the Board. In these circumstances there seems no reason for giving any undertaking to provide against the insinuation conveyed in the latter part of the hon. Member's question.

AVOCH HARBOUR.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade, having regard to the fact that in 1894 a landowner of Rosehaugh, at Avoch, Ross-shire, obtained a Provisional Order for the construction of a harbour, can it be stated whether Mr. Fletcher has since taken any steps to put into execution the terms of the Order; and will he state whether the Order has some time since lapsed.

MR. WALTER LONG (for Mr. GERALD BALFOUR): I understand that the works authorised by the Avoch Harbour Order, 1894, have not been commenced within the prescribed time. If this be the case, the powers conferred by the Order would appear to have ceased.

MR. WEIR: Cannot the right hon. Gentleman answer the first part of the question?

MR. LONG: No, Sir, I can only give the answer I have received. The hon. Member must put down any further question.

MR. WEIR: It is a very unsatisfactory answer.

APPEAL FOR IRISH PRISONERS.

MR. DUFFY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the cases of two prisoners undergoing penal servitude for life, one, Patrick Finnigan, in Mountjoy Prison, and another, Constable Muldowney, in Maryborough Prison, on conviction of complicity in murder; whether he is aware that His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant received petitions from all the public representative bodies, eleven in number, in the county of Galway, praying His Excellency to consider their cases; and whether, in view of the fact that they have spent eighteen years in prison, His Excellency will now give their cases his most favourable consideration with a view to the exercise of the clemency of the Crown.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The petitions referred to were received by the Lord Lieutenant, who decided, so recently as August last, that the law must take its course. But if any new fact has transpired since then it can be brought before the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, who is the dispenser of the prerogative of mercy in that island.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will add to his statement by saying that he will look into the facts of the case himself, and use his influence with the Lord Lieutenant in the exercise of the prerogative of mercy.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am afraid I could not. It would be altogether outside my sphere.

MR. DUFFY: But is it not the fact that occasions when a Monarch ascends the Throne are deemed auspicious opportunities for exercising the prerogative of mercy? Will the Government not take into consideration the fact that these men have been in prison nineteen years?

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The question has been answered.

MR. WYNDHAM: Any facts should be laid not before me, but before the Lord Lieutenant, who dispenses the prerogative of mercy.

MR. DUFFY: Well, I shall certainly bring this matter under the notice of the House.

#### LIVE-STOCK BREEDING IN IRELAND.

MR. KENNEDY (Westmeath, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will take steps to co-ordinate the administration of Government grants for encouraging improvement in the breeding of live stock in Ireland by transferring to the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland the grant now made for that purpose to the Royal Dublin Society.

MR. WYNDHAM: The grant now made to the Royal Dublin Society for encouraging improvement in the breeding of live stock in Ireland is, by mutual arrangement, administered in co-ordination with the Department of Agriculture. In framing its schemes the Society has conferred with the Department, and has endeavoured to frame its rules so as to avoid the risk of its work overlapping or conflicting with the work of the Department.

MR. KENNEDY: Does not the present system produce friction?

MR. WYNDHAM: I understand that the Royal Dublin Society and the Public Department are working in harmony on this matter.

#### IRISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT;THE WEXFORD APPEAL.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say when the Vote for the Local Government Board for Ireland will be taken, and if the Government will provide an opportunity for discussing the case of the Wexford County Council v. The Local Government Board.

MR. WYNDHAM: This question should be addressed to the First Lord of the Treasury. I am quite prepared to express my opinion in the course of any debate on this matter.

#### LOWER ORMOND ELECTORAL DIVISIONS.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state what is the reason for the delay in carrying out the recommendation of the County Council of North Tipperary with regard to the transfer to the Borrisokane Union of certain electoral divisions in the barony of Lower Ormond.

MR. WYNDHAM: The general question of the amalgamation and alteration of certain unions is engaging the attention of the Local Government Board. The recommendation of the North Tipperary County Council will be considered with other proposals of a like nature.

#### KERRY ASSIZES;JURY CHALLENGING.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state how many Roman Catholics attended as

jurors at last Kerry assizes, how many were ordered to stand aside in the trial of the Glencar prisoners, and on what grounds was such an order given; and can he explain why those prisoners who had given substantial bail for their appearance at the trial, and whom the jury acquitted, were conveyed handcuffed in pairs through the streets of Tralee to the county gaol.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have no information as to the religious composition of the panel. The number of jurors on the panel was 100, of whom 69 answered. In answer to the second paragraph, when the hearing of the cases was adjourned overnight on the 12th instant, application was made to the Lord Chief Justice for the admission of the accused to bail, but this application was refused by the learned judge. The prisoners were then conveyed by car, handcuffed, to the gaol; they were not marched through the streets. They were handcuffed by order of the gaoler, who, as responsible for their safe custody until finally dealt with by the Court, was bound to take every necessary precaution for their safe keeping.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: Can you state the number who were ordered to stand by?

MR. WYNDHAM: Fifty-four.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): Are prisoners in similar circumstances in England handcuffed?

MR. WYNDHAM: That is a hypothetical question that it would be very difficult to answer.

MR. FLYNN (Cork): Are you aware that these prisoners had been out on bail?

MR. WYNDHAM: I am perfectly aware of that. Under similar circumstances prisoners have sometimes not come up.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): Cannot the right hon. Gentleman take steps to prevent these things occurring?

MR. WYNDHAM: It is in the discretion of the officials who are responsible for the safe keeping of the prisoners.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): Do you know that the condition of bail bonds is that they are to last from day to day?

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

IRISH QUEEN'S COLLEGES.

MR. ROCHE (Galway, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state the amount of cost incurred in establishing the Queen's Colleges of Cork, Belfast, and Galway. and also the amount of present endowments and the total amounts of the annual grants since made for maintenance and such purposes.

MR. WYNDHAM: The original cost of the buildings to the State was £100,000, and additional grants amounting to £138,627 have since been made for new buildings and cost of maintenance. Each of the colleges receives an endowment of £7,000 a year out of the Consolidated Fund, together with an annual Parliamentary Vote of £1,600 in aid of expenses.

IRISH DISTRICT INSPECTORS OF CONSTABULARY.

MR. CONOR O'KELLY (Mayo, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, seeing that it is the practice of the Constabulary authorities not to allow district inspectors to remain longer than four years in the first district to which they are sent after completing their

training as cadets in the depot, he can explain why District Inspector Wallace, of Belmullet, has been retained for twelve years in that district; and can he say whether any other district inspectors in the force have been retained in control of a police district for such a length of time?

MR. WYNDHAM: There is no regulation to the effect mentioned in the first paragraph. District Inspector Wallace has been retained at Belmullet in the interests of the public service, and several other officers have remained in charge of districts for similar and even longer periods.

QUEEN VICTORIA'S FUNERAL; POLICE AND IRISH SHOPKEEPERS.

MR. CONOR O'KELLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whether he is aware that Mr. John O'Malley, a licensed publican of Belmullet, having declined to close his premises on 2nd February, on the occasion of the funeral of Her late

Majesty, in accordance with the orders of the police, they entered his shop and only refrained from putting up the window shutters when Mr. O'Malley eventually requested his assistants to close his shop; and, can he state by whose authority the Belmullet police ordered the local publicans to close their premises on the occasion referred to.

MR. WYNDHAM: The allegation that the police entered Mr. O'Malley's premises on the 2nd February is without foundation. Several publicans asked the District Inspector on the previous day whether they were required to close, and that officer expressed the opinion, erroneously, that the day came within the provisions of the Licensing Act of 1872.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Will compensation be given to the publicans for their loss of trade through having acted on instructions erroneously given by the police?

MR. WYNDHAM: I do not know whether the error was corrected in time or not. In the only other instance in which it was made it was corrected in time.

CONGESTED DISTRICT BOARDS WORK IN COUNTY GALWAY.

MR. O'MALLEY (Galway, Connemara): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will furnish particulars as to the operations of the Congested Districts Board in County Galway, similar to those which he has promised to supply in county Kerry.

MR. WYNDHAM: The information will be sent to the hon. Member in the course of a few days.

IRISH RURAL DISTRICT COUNCILS.

\*MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will take steps to extend the powers of the rural district councils in Ireland that will confer on them the right already enjoyed by urban councils to erect artisans dwellings for tradesmen in towns which have not

been urbanised under the Local Government (Ireland) Act, so as to enable these rural councils to provide for the better housing of the tradesmen in such towns.

MR. WYNDHAM: The rural district councils have extensive powers for providing house accommodation under the Labourers Acts. As at present advised, I am not prepared to extend those powers by applying the Housing of the Working Classes Acts to rural districts.



MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: Will the right hon. Gentleman undertake to break down the monopoly?

MR. WYNDHAM: I do not admit that there is a monopoly. The time has not come to apply to urban districts the powers now exercised in rural districts.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: Will the right hon. Gentleman look into the question?

MR. WYNDHAM: My reply was based on my consideration of it.

INLAND REVENUE; PROSECUTION OF MR. LESLIE.

\*DR. THOMPSON (Monaghan, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in the case of Mr. Leslie, who was a party to the recent proceedings in the King's Bench Division in Ireland, the first permission to Mr. Leslie given by the Inland Revenue authorities was to continue to carry on the business of selling intoxicating liquors pending the decision of that Court; and that this decision was given on the 21st December 1900, while the date of the application on behalf of Mr. Leslie for a new permission was the 11th January 1901; can he state whether Mr. Leslie sold intoxicating liquors or exposed them for sale between the 21st December and the 11th January; and, if so, will directions be given to the local police authorities to take proceedings against him for his breach of the law, and will the second permission granted be now withdrawn.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): The facts are set out with substantial accuracy in the first paragraph of the question. Intoxicating liquors were not sold or exposed for sale by Mr. Leslie in the interval between the 21st December, when the King's Bench Division delivered judgment, and the 23rd January, when the permission was obtained. The concluding inquiry in the question of the hon. Member for North Monaghan should be addressed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, but probably the hon. Member will be satisfied with the assurance given by my right hon. friend on Friday last.

INLAND REVENUE; QUEEN'S STORES, DUBLIN.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: On behalf of the hon. Member for the Harbour Division of Dublin, I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the Excise Bonded Stores, at 12, North Wall, Dublin, known as the Queen's Stores, have recently been sold to a shipping company; and, if so, whether it is intended that the premises be continued as bonded stores; and whether the porters employed by the Inland Revenue in connection with these stores will be continued in the service or receive remuneration if disemployed.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: It is a fact that arrangements have been made by the Board of Works (Dublin) for the sale of the Queen's Stores, North Wall, Dublin, to a shipping company; but the Board of Inland Revenue are not aware of the purpose for which the company propose to use the premises. The porters employed by the Board at the stores have received notice that their services will not be required after the 31st instant. They will receive on retirement such gratuities as they may be qualified for under the Superannuation Act.

TALLOW CONSPIRACY CASE AT WATERFORD ASSIZES.

MR. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state how many jurors were ordered by the Crown

to stand aside at the recent Waterford assizes in the case of the alleged conspiracy at Tallow, county Waterford; and can he give the grounds on which the Crown Solicitor directed John Power and other jurors to stand aside, and state the proportion of the entire panel directed to stand aside.

MR. ATKINSON: With the permission of my right hon. friend, I will reply to this question. There were 120 jurors on the panel in the case referred to. The number of jurors ordered to stand by by the Crown in the case referred to was forty-three. The Crown Solicitor ordered the juror named to stand by, as he did all others, in the discharge of the duty expressly imposed upon him by the circular letter of February, 1894; namely, that while abstaining from requiring any juror to stand by on account of his political or religious opinions he should "direct to stand by all such persons as he should have reason to believe were likely to be hindered from giving an impartial verdict, by favour towards the accused or fear of the consequences to their persons, property, or trade."

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: Were these forty-three men ordered to stand aside because their religion has been declared by the King to be abominable and idolatrous?

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; Hon. Members must not attempt to debate the answers.

FERMANAGH COUNTY SECRETARY.

MR. JORDAN (Fermanagh, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the conditions under which the salary of the secretary of the County Council of Fermanagh was arrived at, namely, on the suggestion of the Court of King's Bench, that the secretary of the council and the county council should come to a settlement, and an adjournment of the case for a week for that purpose, and seeing that the Court confirmed the order of the Local Government Board against the efforts of the council, raising the salaries of the assistant county surveyors by 50 per cent., he will grant an inquiry if the County Council of Fermanagh are willing to pay the expenses of said inquiry.

MR. WYNDHAM: I can only suggest, as I did on Friday last, that the best course will be to await the result of the Wexford inquiry.

ENNISKILLEN LAND APPEALS.

MR. JORDAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state when the Land Commission will next sit in Ennis-killen to hear the arrears of appeals to their Court in the county of Fermanagh.

MR. WYNDHAM: NO, Sir; the Commissioners are unable at present to assign a date.

PORTADOWN DISTURBANCES.

MR. CLANCY (Dublin County, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the frequency of the attacks made on the Roman Catholic Church, Edenderry, Portadown, especially within the last twelve months; whether he can state the number of times in that period the windows of the church referred to have been deliberately broken; and whether any report on the subject has been made by the local police authorities to the Castle; and, if so, whether any action, and, if any, what action, has been taken by the Executive in reference thereto.

MR. WYNDHAM: Some panes of glass in this church have been broken within the past year on three separate occasions. Respectable people of all denominations have expressed their disapproval of these mischievous and wanton acts. They are believed to have been committed by boys; and windows, I may observe, have also been broken in the Protestant Church, also, I imagine, by boys. The occurrences were duly re-reported by the local constabulary, by whom every effort was made to trace the guilty parties, though, I regret to say, without result.

MR. CLANCY: Will the right hon. Gentleman further inquire?

MR. WYNDHAM: If it is a question of my obtaining evidence where the police have failed, I doubt if I can succeed.

MR. CLANCY: Has not the right hon. Gentleman received three letters from the Roman Catholics of Portadown on this subject, and not answered a single one?

MR. WYNDHAM: That fact has not come to my knowledge.

SHILLELAGH UNION INQUIRY.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can give the names of the witnesses summoned by Dr. Flinn on behalf of Nurse Joyce in connection with the recent Local Government Board inquiry at Shillelagh; also the names of those witnesses who gave evidence for Nurse Joyce and of those who did not give evidence.

MR. WYNDHAM: The names of the persons summoned were Mrs. Brennan, Mrs. Nolan, Mrs. Moran, Mrs. Gregan, Mrs. Kavanagh, Mrs. M'Donald, Mr. Nolan, Mr. James. The first four gave evidence, the others either failed to attend the inquiry, or left before it concluded. Three other witnesses who were not summoned also gave evidence on behalf of the nurse; namely, the Rev. Mr. Busher, Mr. Trayner, and Mr. Byrne, chairman of the guardians.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that a week ago he told me in answer to a question that sixteen witnesses had been examined?

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

IRISH BOARD OF WORKS.

\*MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Chairman of the Board of Works, Ireland, has resigned, and whether his resignation has been accepted; whether any appointment has yet been made to the office, and, if so, whether he can say who has been appointed, and what are his qualifications for the office.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The present Chairman's term of five years expires at the end of this month. I hope to be able to announce the name of his successor in a few days.

CLONES RAILWAY GATES.

\*DR. THOMPSON: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he is aware of the inconvenience to the people of the town and neighbourhood of Clones, by reason of the obstruction to the traffic caused by the almost constant closure of the railway gates across one of the main roads leading into Clones, will he cause inquiry to be made whether a bridge over the crossing can be easily constructed, and if he will order an inspector to visit the place complained of and furnish a report to the Board of Trade of the result of his investigation of this public nuisance and danger.

MR. WALTER LONG (for Mr. GERALD BALFOUR): The questions affecting this level crossing have engaged the attention of the Board of Trade and an inspection was made last year. My right hon. friend will be happy to supply the hon. Member, if he so desires, with a copy of the inspector's report. I understand that the railway company are proposing to construct new sidings with the view of diminishing the amount of shunting over the crossing and have obtained powers for the purchase of the necessary land.

#### IRISH-SPEAKING POSTMASTERS.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether in appointments to the office of postmaster in Wales, a knowledge of the Welsh language is essential; and whether seeing that correspondents in the west of Ireland have had letters addressed in Irish returned to them as insufficiently addressed or not known; and whether he will take steps to prevent a recurrence of this by appointing for the present one or two Irish scholars to the office in Dublin, and by securing for future appointments in the Irish-speaking districts in Ireland postmasters with a knowledge of the language.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: In appointing postmasters at places where the Welsh language is in general use preference is given to candidates who have a knowledge of the language. In the Postmaster General's opinion, no sufficient reason exists for requiring a knowledge of the Irish language from postmasters or other servants of the Department in Ireland.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: Will the hon. Gentleman undertake to do what is asked in the last paragraph of the question?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I cannot make any promise. If the hon. Member has any special reasons to advance and will send them to me, I will forward them to the Postmaster General.

#### DUBLIN POST OFFICE REVISION.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether his attention has been directed to the revision of 1891, under which the scale of pay of the Dublin male supervising force was raised; namely, the scale previous to 1891 £;150 per annum, rising by £;8 per annum to £;190, and the scale after revision of 1891 £;200 per annum, rising by £;10 per annum to £;250; and, seeing that the former scale was retained for a clerks' class, but that all the members of this class in 1891 were advanced to the latter scale, their duties being identical with those performed by the female supervising force, whose maximum pay is only half that of males, whether the Postmaster General in the coming revision will grant the female supervising staff an increase in scale of pay, with the view of allaying the discontent which has long existed; and will he take steps to have open competitive examinations held in Dublin for at least some of the places by which it is intended to increase the Dublin female staff.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General is aware of the nature of the revision of 1891 under which the scale of pay of the Dublin male supervising force was raised; the female supervising force also obtained an improvement of pay and position at the same time. As was stated in reply to the hon. Member on

the 7th instant, the scales for the female supervising force are those proper to their class at offices such as Dublin, and no reason is seen for increasing them. It is not possible to say at present whether any of the vacancies for female sorting clerks and telegraphists caused by the revision will be filled by open competition.

#### THE ROYAL DECLARATION AGAINST ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

MR. DELANY: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can inform the House when the Joint Committee on the subject of the Sovereign's Accession. Oath and Declaration will be appointed; and whether he will consider the advisability of moving an Instruction to the Committee to inquire to what extent the Declaration is objectionable to Roman Catholics and likewise to the members of the Creek Orthodox Church.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: This matter has been initiated in another place, and until the House of Lords appoint the Committee, I am afraid we cannot take any steps; but I do not think there will be any delay in appointing the Committee.

MR. DELANY: Will the right hon. Gentleman answer the last part of the question?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think it would be undoubtedly open to the Committee to take evidence, if they wished to do so, as to the way in which the Declaration was objectionable to His Majesty's subjects.

MR. DELANY: Can the right hon. Gentleman inform me how many relatives of the King, including reigning sovereigns, belong to the Greek Church?

[No answer was returned.]

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will lay upon the Table of the House the resolutions condemnatory of the portion of the King's Accession Oath offensive to Roman Catholics which were passed by grand juries, county councils, corporations, district councils, and other public bodies in Ireland, and by representative organisations in Great Britain, Canada, Australia, the United States, and other foreign countries, in order that the Joint Committee of the Lords and Commons about to be appointed to inquire into and report on this matter may have the advantage of considering them before coming to a decision on the question.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think it necessary to publish the Return asked for. It will be in the competence of the Committee to call for any information they desire. I should have thought that the general topics suggested in the question are matters of common knowledge; and if they are not, the Committee will have full power to make themselves more fully acquainted with them.

\*MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.): Will the Committee be empowered to take evidence from Protestants who may object to any alteration in the Declaration?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: So I should suppose.

#### THE CIVIL LIST COMMITTEE; PUBLICATION OF CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS.

MR. ROCHE: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the recent unauthorised publication of documents laid before the Civil List Committee, he will consider whether effect should now be given to the recommendation of the Cottage Homes Bill Committee that the representative of the offending newspaper should be deprived of the entrance to the Lobby.

MR. YOUNG (Cavan, E.): At the same time may I ask the First Lord of the Treasury

whether, in view of the frequent unauthorised publication of official documents by The Times newspaper, he will now act upon the advice of the Cottage Homes Bill Committee and exclude its Parliamentary correspondent from the Lobby.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: In answer to these questions, I do not think I need do more than remind both hon. Members that this matter has been brought under the notice of Mr. Speaker, and that it will no doubt be dealt with by him as circumstances render desirable.

MR. ROCHE: Then I will respectfully address my question to you, Mr. Speaker.

\*MR. SPEAKER: It is not a question of order or procedure, and such questions alone should be addressed to me.

MR. ROCHE: May I remind the House that the recommendation of the Committee was that the Lobby representatives of newspapers who published privileged documents should be excluded from the inner lobbies of the House?

\*MR. SPEAKER: The House has entrusted to me the superintendence of the admission of the representatives of the press to the Lobby; but it will be impossible for me to perform that duty if I am to be questioned on the exercise of my discretion as though I were a Minister performing Ministerial duties.

MR. O'SHEE: Then how, Sir, will you intimate to the House the course which you have taken?

\*MR. SPEAKER: When I do intimate it, the hon. Member will know.

MR. ROCHE: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General whether it is proposed that the Government will institute proceedings under the Official Secrets Act against the newspaper in which publication was given to the confidential documents laid before the Civil List Committee.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (SIR ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): I cannot add anything to the answer I gave the other day to the hon. Member for Dundee.

#### CIVIL SERVICE REVISED SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said he wished to ask a question of the First Lord of the Treasury with reference to the Supplementary Estimates. It seemed to him that these Estimates, in the form in which they were to-day presented to the House for the first time, would be put in one sum from the Chair. This would enable the whole of the amount to be taken at once if the Government in their necessity thought it expedient to do so. Formerly, each Supplementary Estimate was put separately from the Chair. He wished to ask why had this innovation been introduced without notice, and what

See page 102 of this Volume.  
opportunity would be given to the House to discuss it.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said that this was a matter of the greatest importance affecting the procedure of the House, and in a few short sentences he would try and make the position quite clear. The Government in the usual course introduced the Supplementary Estimates under thirty-five different heads. Fourteen of these were discussed and disposed of. The fifteenth, the Vote for the Stationery Office, was at present under discussion. Now the Government were withdrawing the whole of the Supplementary Estimates, including the Vote under discussion, and were substituting a new Supplementary Estimate, not for a series

of sums, each sum affecting a separate Department, but for one sum of nearly £1,000,000 covering the whole of the Departments. As far as the Civil Service Estimates were concerned, was this course not without precedent? Did the right, hon. Gentleman propose to inaugurate this new practice without any discussion whatever? Under the old practice each sum was voted for a particular Department, and no portion of one sum voted for one Department could be spent on another Department. If the whole amount was voted in one sum, however, would it not be competent to spend the whole of it on one Department or on two or three Departments? This being quite a new innovation in practice, did not the right hon. Gentleman think it right that the House should have a full opportunity of discussing it?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): The hon. Gentleman has with great clearness put several questions, and I will endeavour to answer them. One was whether the form now adopted of presenting the Estimate would enable one Department to spend money intended by the House for another Department; whether, in fact, the control over the allocation of the money would not be lost. In my opinion, no such consequence will follow from the change. The allocation of the money will be as strictly limited by law as if the ordinary form of the Estimates had been maintained. The hon. Member has also asked whether there is any precedent for such a procedure in the Civil Service Estimates. I do not know whether the hon. Member will call it a precedent, but there is the precedent of Excess Votes. The analogy between the two cases is close; Votes belonging to different Departments and dealt with by different Ministers are put together from the Chair as one sum.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I asked the right hon. Gentleman not whether there was any analogous case, but whether there was any precedent in Civil Service Supplementary Estimates.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: There is no precedent. The change has been made broadly in the interests of the discussion of the Estimates. The whole of the Estimates must be obtained in order to introduce the Appropriation Bill on this day week. I propose that the whole of the Parliamentary time between now and Monday, except Wednesday, shall be devoted to the discussion of the Estimates. Is it not better that the House should devote this time to the best purposes of debate, rather than that it should be engaged in voting time after time upon matters of relatively small importance, as we have, I regret to say, been doing?

Undoubtedly the effect of the change will be to enable the whole question to be put as one from the Chair; but this will not preclude Amendments from being moved, nor will it curtail debate on any item in the Estimates. I think that if he will reflect for one moment, the hon. Member will see that the change is very much in the interests of full discussion in the House. In addition to the fundamental and important change about which questions have been asked, there have been two or three subsidiary and minor changes. The first is that I have omitted a Vote which might legitimately have given rise to some debate; the subsidy for the Viceroy of Wu-sung. It is not technically necessary to take that Vote on the Supplementary Estimates. Then there has been introduced the Estimate

for the Queen's funeral, and I have altered the order of the Estimates so that the Votes

which I believe excite most interest will not be put off by debates on minor matters.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: But the right hon. Gentleman has not answered my question as to what opportunity will be afforded the House for discussing this innovation.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I should hope that after my explanation there will not be any great desire on the part of the House to discuss the innovation. The circumstances are altogether special, and special means must be taken to meet them. The circumstances are well known to the House, and I hope that without further discussion the reasonableness of the course adopted will commend itself to all hon. Members.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) said it appeared to him that this was simply a new kind of closure, invented to meet the temporary and passing exigencies of the present session, owing entirely to the late date at which Parliament was called together. He appealed to the right hon. Gentleman whether, having invented it, he could not carry his ingenuity a little further and give the House an opportunity of saying whether or not it approved his action. Surely they were entitled to such an opportunity.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER (Cheshire, Northwich): If an Amendment were moved to an item low down on the list, would that preclude any discussion on items preceding it?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, Sir.

MR. BLAKE (Longford, S.) said the effect of the change would be to concentrate discussion on one particular topic, and it would do away with the system of one Amendment one Vote.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have been asked whether my ingenuity cannot find time for the discussion of this change. I am glad the hon. Member for Dundee refers to it as ingenuity, but I must remind him that the most ingenious man cannot turn one hour into two

or find time where it does not exist. It is no doubt in the power of the House to take time to discuss this change out of the available time for the discussion of the Estimates. If it is not in order to move the adjournment of the House, no doubt the question might be raised on the Estimates.

\*MR. SPEAKER: There is some analogy in what occurred in 1890, when the late Mr. Smith laid Estimates on the Table of the House, and the number of Votes was reduced from, I think, 157 to 106, without any previous notice, by consolidating a number of the Votes. I remember that on that occasion an hon. Member asked whether he might move the adjournment of the House, and Mr. Speaker Peel informed him that the proper course would be to move to report Progress when the House went into Committee, and to raise the question in that way.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: The case which you have put before the House is not an exact precedent. It was a case where the number of Votes was reduced from 137 to something less, and a few of them were consolidated. This is a case where the remainder of the Supplementary Votes have been withdrawn, including one actually under discussion, and they have been consolidated in one sum which covers them all. In those circumstances I would ask permission to move the adjournment of



the House in order to call attention to a definite matter of urgent public importance; namely, "the substitution for the Civil Service Estimates previously presented of a Supplementary Estimate for one sum covering all the various Departments, contrary to the uniform practice of the House.

\*MR, SPEAKER: I shall not prevent the hon. Member from discussing the change. On the occasion to which I have referred, Mr. Speaker Peel recommended the hon. Member to deal with the matter in Committee, but I did not understand him to rule that it could not be done by moving the adjournment of the House. Has the hon. Member the leave of the House?

\*SIR: E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT (Sheffield, Ecclesall): Before the hon. Gentleman moves his motion I wish to ask a question with regard to the answer just made by the First Lord of the Treasury. I understood him to say that under the Vote in its new form if a reduction was moved regarding one of the subjects which come towards the end of the Vote under discussion, that would cut out an Amendment upon an earlier item. I wish to ask whether it is not a fact that any Amendment moved must be an Amendment upon the whole sum, and whether it will not be entirely in the hands of the Speaker or Chairman to decide as to who speaks and in what order.

\*MR. SPEAKER: I cannot anticipate the ruling of the Chair, and the ruling of the Chairman of Committees on the subject is a matter entirely for him. Has the hon. Member for Waterford the leave of the House?

The pleasure of the House having been signified;

MR. JOHN REDMOND: The first complaint which I have to make with reference to the action of the Government in this matter is that they are endeavouring to initiate an entirely new practice of far-reaching importance, almost, I would say, by stealth, but certainly without any notice whatever to anybody. I venture to say that in the whole House of Commons on both sides of the House there were probably not a dozen men who came down here this afternoon, who knew that this change was to be attempted to-day. These revised Supplementary Estimates were, it is true, circulated on Saturday, but, without any notice of any sort or kind which hon. Members would have been able to take cognisance of, this new rule has been sprung upon the House. I do not know what view the Liberal Members of this House take upon this matter, but it seems to me that the right hon. Gentleman and the Government are going steadily step by step along the road at the end of which absolute suppression of independent criticisms of the Estimates is the goal. If the right hon. Gentleman is allowed now with regard to Supplementary Estimates covering all the branches of the service to introduce it as one sum so that only one divi-

sion can be taken upon it, discussion upon the different items will be destroyed, because although the right hon. Gentleman pointed out to us that we might move Amendments upon, each item, the next moment he had to admit that if an Amendment was moved upon some item low down in the list, that would preclude the possibility of moving any Amendment upon an item higher up in the list. If the right hon. Gentleman is permitted by the House of Commons to do this against the protest of a little group of hon. Members on the Irish benches; and I say that all the independent Members of this House, who desire to safeguard their

rights and liberties should join in this protest; the next thing that will happen will be that on some future day you will find a Minister coming down to this House, and, not in a Supplementary Estimate, but in the original Estimate, proposing one sum to cover the whole series of services. This question affects the right of discussion in this House and the right of individual criticism by independent Members, and I respectfully submit that it ought to be considered solely and, indeed, entirely apart from the immediate needs or circumstances of the moment. The House of Commons, by authorising a practice like this, is establishing a precedent for all time. There may be Members of this House; probably there is a majority of Members of this House; who have such confidence in the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury, and in his having control of the financial concerns of the Empire, that they do not fear putting enormous powers into his hands. But they ought to think of the future, and it is impossible for them to foretell when the time may come when there may be in office a Government that they do not trust, and when there may be upon the Treasury Bench English statesmen controlling the financial affairs of the Empire, into whose hands they do not desire to have those enormous powers put. What would be the position of this House of Commons in the future if on the original Estimates for the year a procedure of this kind happened to be followed? It is no use for the right hon. Gentleman to say that this would never be done. I say that by sanctioning this new procedure on Supplementary Estimates you are creating something that will be quoted some day as a precedent for going further, it is a fatal practice from the point of view of the House of Commons itself, and from the point of view of independent Members. It is fatal to acquiesce without a protest in this continual encroachment upon our rights and liberties. So far as the Irish Members are concerned, we who come here from Ireland are bound to protest in the strongest and most effective way against this continual deprivation of those rights which we enjoy of discussing the government of our country. One effect of this new rule will be to abolish the possibility of divisions. On the Supplementary Estimates under the old practice every individual Vote is put separately from the Chair, and the discussion on that Vote is confined to that subject; and if there happen to be any Members of the House who are dissatisfied with the undertakings and explanations given by the Government they are entitled to register their disapproval by voting against the item in the lobby. That is all to be changed now, and these thirty-five different heads of Supply are all to be grouped together. There will be a general discussion on the whole Vote, and when one Member gets up and discusses one Department, the Member who immediately follows him will raise the discussion on another Department, and thus destroy any possibility of effective debate on any Department. Some hon. Member who is lucky enough to be called upon early in the discussion may move an Amendment dealing with some particular Department in which he happens to be interested, and will raise, perhaps, a question of £10, £20, or perhaps £70. If such a case happened, and the Member called upon by the Chairman moves an Amendment, that would preclude any single opportunity of discussion on any of the items that appeared on the list before it, although the subject under discussion

might be the very last one of the thirty-five items. I think it is discreditable that a change of this magnitude should be brought on in this way without notice. It is conduct similar to what I characterised on a former occasion as Parliamentary sharp practice, and I do not believe any Government has anything to gain by it. If an

alteration in the procedure of the House of Commons, so vast and far-reaching in its importance, is to be, proposed by the Government, it ought to be done openly and aboveboard, after due notice has been given to the House of Commons, and after adequate discussion. This is an attempt to sneak through unobserved, and to smuggle this new practice into the orders and rules of this House, and to cheat the great bulk of hon. Members of their rights and privileges of debate.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I ought, perhaps, to tell the hon. Member that I took care on Saturday to inform the Leader of the Opposition of what was going to be done.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): He is not everybody.

MR. A.J. BALFOUR: No: but still it can hardly be said that I tried to sneak it through, if I told the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I do not believe in the efficacy of hard words. If the right hon. Gentleman objects to the words I have used I will withdraw them.

MR. A.J. BALFOUR: No, I do not object to them.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: The Leader of the Opposition is not in the House, but his colleagues are there, and two of them have expressed dissent from what is proposed by the light hon. Gentleman.

MR. A.J. BALFOUR: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. Member. I never suggested for a moment that the Leader of the Opposition concurred. I was only dealing with the question of informing him.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I would like very much to ask some of the hon. members of the Opposition upon that Front Bench, whether the notice conveyed to the Leader of the Opposition went any further, and whether it was conveyed to all the gentlemen upon that bench or to their followers. I venture to say, without fear of being contradicted, that

so far as the bulk of the Liberal Members of this House are concerned, they never heard of this thing until now. [Opposition cheers.] Those cheers justify me in saying that so far as the bulk of the Liberal party is concerned it is true to say that an attempt has been made to smuggle this new rule unobserved into the Orders of this House. I do not understand the right hon. Gentleman's idea of notice. No one will contend that for this most important change, this most far-reaching change, in the rules of the House it is sufficient notice to give on a Saturday afternoon a private intimation to the Leader of the Opposition that it is intended to raise this question on the following Monday. Does the right hon. Gentleman not know that according to the rules of fairness and courtesy in this House notices of changes of this kind are always given publicly in the House, and that sufficient time is always allowed to elapse to enable hon. Members to consider what action they will take? With reference to the Leader of the Opposition this may have been done, but so far as the Irish party are concerned they got no notice at all. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman thought we were so simple and ignorant of the forms of this House that this

innovation would slip through without our notice. If so, he underrated our vigilance. I confess for myself quite candidly that I knew nothing about this till I came down to the House this afternoon, because I had been away in the country, and did not receive my Parliamentary Papers, but if I had received them I should not quite have appreciated what had occurred. I find that my own countrymen were more vigilant than myself, and they were quite alive to the importance of the step about to be taken. I protest about an effort being made to put this new practice into operation without any notice at all to the Irish party. The right hon. Gentleman will gain nothing now, or at any time in the session, by this effort to smuggle in this new practice and this new rule to suppress freedom of discussion upon the Estimates. I do not know how far the protest I desire to make will be supported by independent Members of the House generally. It will be supported, at any rate, by the entire body of the Irish Members, and

so far as we are concerned, if it will be any comfort to the right hon.

Gentleman, I may say to him that this new practice which he is trying to smuggle into the rules of the House will be a renewed incentive to us to scrutinise every item of Supply whether it affects Ireland or not, and to use every form and every rule and power we possess to prevent the possibility of the most important work of this House being stifled. One advantage the right hon.

Gentleman has gained is that we must naturally speak here without looking into the precedents and without preparation. That probably has saved me some trouble and the House of Commons some time, because hon. Members might have had to listen to a much longer speech from me if proper notice had been given. What right has the Government to propose a change of this kind without giving us sufficient opportunities to look up the precedents and to come down here armed with the knowledge of what the House has done in similar cases in the past? I asked the right hon. Gentleman if there was any precedent for such a course, and he had to admit that there was not. No precedent for this vast and far-reaching change; Yet he comes down and absolutely endeavours to put it into operation without a word of explanation or apology, and without fortifying himself by even the precedents of analogous cases. There never was a case in my experience of this House when the adjournment of a question was more necessary.

I do not want the House to be adjourned; I want this question to be adjourned, so that we may have a proper opportunity of looking into the precedents and practice of the past in order intelligently to discuss the matter. I make the motion "That this House do now adjourn," because that is the only form in which I can make my protest. My desire is to call the attention of the House of Commons to what is being done, and to ask that in fairness to the House the consideration of this new Supplementary Estimate should be adjourned. If this is not done this new Estimate will come before us to-night, because I am told that, again in violation of the practice of the House as far as I know it, on the Navy Estimates the Secretary to the Admiralty will make his statement with the Speaker in the Chair, and that the consideration of these Estimates will then be immediately adjourned. That is a violation perpetrated with the sole object of turning one of the recent ballots into a farce. We had a ballot for

places for moving an Amendment on the question of the Speaker leaving the Chair on the Navy Estimates, and the first place happened to be won by an Irish Member, but in order to prevent him having the advantage of his good fortune this violation of ordinary practice is to be committed. The whole proceeding is most discreditable, and if for nothing else but the attempt which has been made to rush and smuggle this thing through, and to hoodwink Members of the House, I think a most determined protest should be made. With that object in view, I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I rise to second the motion. I cannot but think that if the Leader of the House will give this matter a little thought he will, before the debate goes too far, reconsider the course he has taken. I do not suppose it will be too late to omit these new figures at the beginning of the Estimate, and then proceed in the ordinary way. There could not be a moment in our proceedings when a violent change of this kind was more inopportune. On Friday last we granted quite twenty millions of Supply. An arrangement; most Members thought a harmonious arrangement ;to facilitate the Government was agreed to by general consent, and I understand the right hon. Gentleman got all the Supply he required for the Army until the end of the financial year. I should have thought, after such an arrangement, that no other step of this kind could be necessary. The right hon. Gentleman has stated that he has arranged these Estimates in the way he thought the House desired to discuss them. I admit there is in the arrangement an attempt to meet the views of the House, in putting, first the Vote for which we have been looking for weeks past. But there is this difficulty: the right hon. Gentleman cannot secure that the discussion should actually take place on that particular item. The right hon. Gentleman has admitted that. Any Vote may be taken, and a trifling point may cut out all the discussion on the most important Estimates. I would ask the House to look at these Estimates. The first three items are for three separate wars in three important dependencies of this country. There has been no discussion in the House with regard to any one of those three wars, and by the adoption of the change now made all discussion may be prevented. In the first war thousands of lives have been sacrificed. We have no particulars about the war in Somali-land. There is also the war in Uganda. There could not be an occasion upon which a violent innovation of this kind? could be more out of place, and I do hope the right hon. Gentleman will reconsider the matter. I admit the difficulty is very great, as the Government must get their money this week, but I really think there are other steps open to the Leader of the House to secure his end. The discussions last week were not carried on in any unreasonable spirit, and it is a bad reward to take such a big step as is now contemplated.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."; (Mr. John Redmond.)

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): The hon. Members who have spoken have taken rather different ground in addressing themselves to the change which has been made in the form of this Supplementary Estimate. The hon. Member for Waterford took exception to it in

the main because it was introduced, as he said, by stealth, because it was an attempt to smuggle through a great change without bringing it to the notice of Members of the House, and because it would form a dangerous precedent for the future. My right hon. friend the First Lord of the Treasury interrupted the hon. Member, and pointed out that he had himself taken the trouble to call the attention of the Leader of the Opposition to the change which was to be made, and I do not think any followers of the right hon. Gentleman have a right to take exception.

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE (Leeds, W.): May I point out to the hon. Gentleman that the letter only reached the Leader of the Opposition on Saturday, and, so far as I am concerned, I learned of it only this morning.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Estimates were circulated on Saturday, and on the same day my right hon. friend went out of his way to call the attention of the Leader of the Opposition to the change. I do not criticise the action of the right hon. Gentleman in the least, and I do not wish to imply that he or his colleagues accepted the change. My right hon. friend has said that the right hon. Gentleman did not accept it, but the fact that notice was given is incompatible with the charge of the hon. Member for Waterford. But the hon. Member says, "Oh, but there was no notice to the Irish party."

MR. JOHN REDMOND: To the House generally. My charge was that the universal practice of giving notice; namely, public notice, which would in the ordinary way reach every Member of the House; was broken.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: That practice was not broken. I do not wish to contradict the hon. Member rudely, but notice was given by the circulation of the Estimates. Those Estimates were in the hands of Members or at their addresses, comparatively early on Saturday morning. The hon. Member has himself answered his complaint. He says there was no notice, that he was out of town, and that he was not aware of the change, but in the next breath he told us, with some pride, that his colleagues around him had been more alert than he, and that they were perfectly well aware of the change. If they were perfectly aware of the change, what is the use of complaining that notice was not given? The hon. Gentleman went on to say that this would form a very dangerous precedent, which some day might be, extended to other matters and seriously cripple the control of the House over expenditure. I confess I am somewhat surprised to hear from that quarter of the House the kind of argument known as the "thin edge of the wedge," which is so often the object of the denunciation of hon. Members opposite.

They complain sometimes that hon. Members on this side of the House object to a change for fear of the consequences which may follow; they then ridicule that fear, and we are adjured never to hesitate to do what is right in itself, because some unreasonable person may ask us to do something which is wrong in consequence. Both hon. Members who have spoken have very much overrated the importance of the change we have made, and have misunderstood its exact effect. The question of the form in which the Estimates should be presented has in past years, on more than one occasion, been before the House and before the Public Accounts Committee. If hon. Members will consult the Reports of the Public

Accounts Committee they will find that what they lay stress upon is the right of the House to see that the money voted for particular purposes is applied to those purposes, that the appropriation of the money voted by the House is complete, and that the control exercised by the Treasury in the first place, and by the Public Accounts Committee and Parliament in the second place, is not lessened by any change in the form of the accounts. We have taken care in presenting this Estimate that the appropriation of the money should not be affected, and that the responsibility of the individual accounting officers should not be affected by anything we have done. Against every sum in this schedule the House has before it the name of the office and an indication of the accounting officer who will be responsible for the administration of the Vote, and no greater power to transfer money from one object to another, or from one subject to another, is given either to the Treasury or to any other Government Department than it at present possesses. If that is realised, hon. Members will see that there is no principle at stake in regard to the control of this House over finance, and that the question resolves itself into one merely of convenience; of the way in which the time at our disposal can best be disposed of and allocated to the business we have to perform. The hon. Member for West Islington alluded to the first two Votes, and said they raised very important questions in connection with wars which had not yet been discussed, and which the House was entitled to discuss. It is exactly in order to meet that that the Government have made this change. Those Votes are in Class 5. and as printed, and as they would have been taken under the first Supplementary Estimates they would come more than half-way down the list of Votes yet to be gone through. Therefore, with the very limited time at our disposal which can be allocated to the discussion of these Supplementary Estimates; [An HON. MEMBER: Why?] Because, as the Leader of the House has already explained, the Committee of Supply must be confined to this week, and Report taken on Monday next, if the law is to be complied with. Therefore, with the very limited time at our disposal, it was not only possible, but probable, if we continued to take the discussion, of the Votes in the order in which they stood on the Paper, that these particular Votes would not have been discussed at all, but we should have continued to spend our time on far less important matters. MR. LOUGH: One cannot move a reduction.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The hon. Member is mistaken; a reduction can be moved in respect of any item which stands in the Vote, and we have given, to the House full information as to all the items and all the details of the items included in this lump sum of £893,000. Let me call the attention of the House to what has happened. In Committee of Supply up till to-day on the Supplementary Estimates we have already spent three days; and the portion of time we have still to spend upon them in their new form is the greater part of to-day and to-morrow. We shall have another day on Report, making not less than five or five and a half days in all for their discussion this year. I believe that on no single occasion during the last ten years have the corresponding Votes, together with their Report, taken four days, and only on four occasions have they taken as much as three days. [An HON. MEMBER: They were never so large.] I find that

in 1899&#x2013;1900 there were seventeen Civil Service Votes, in 1898&#x2013;99 twenty-four Votes, and in 1897&#x2013;98 fifteen Votes.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): What about 1893?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I have not the references with me for that year, but for the last three years there were respectively seventeen, twenty-four, and fifteen Civil Service Votes, and in not one of those years did they occupy more than three days. Nor can it be said that the subjects in those years were less important than this year. I find that in 1899&#x2013;1900 there came on the question of the purchase of the Niger Company, and in 1897&#x2013;8 the special grants both for Uganda and East Africa in respect to the disturbed condition of those two countries, and especially the payment of compensation to the French missionaries in Uganda; a subject which excited, very properly, great public interest. I point out that the House is having this year more time for the discussion of the Civil Service Estimates than we have had in any of the ten preceding years. I would also call the attention of the House to the manner in which the time that has already been allocated to the purpose is being used. The Supplementary Navy Vote of three millions took part of a day. and the Supplementary Army Estimate; the importance of which nobody will deny; took half a day. But we have given two whole days to the consideration of the Supplementary Civil Service Estimates, and I will say that not a single Vote discussed on these days was of any special importance; |HON. MEMBER'S on the Irish benches: Oh &#x0021;]; or raised any question of real novelty or interest to the community at large.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON was understood to ask why the Government had not foreseen that these questions would be raised.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The hon. Member thinks that we ought to have been able to foretell last November or October twelve months what the price of coal would be during the past twelve months, or that we should have foreseen that there would be an opening of Parliament in state which required special provision to be made. I say nobody can pretend that two days were required to discuss these Votes, or that it was in the interest of the House itself, or of hon. Members who take an interest

in important questions still to be discussed, to go on as we have done to-day. We have put down the Estimate in a new form, it is true, but we have put in the forefront the Votes which, from the notices on the Paper and the information which has reached us in the usual way, appeared to be the ones which hon. Members most wished to be discussed, and I had hoped that this arrangement would give fair opportunities for discussion. The hon. Member for Water-ford complained that he had not had more notice of this change in order that he might have searched for precedents. This was unnecessary, because he has already been told by the First Lord of the Treasury that there are no precedents for bringing forward the Supplementary Estimates in this particular form, and therefore I think the time he might have given to research and discussion afterwards would have been fruitless. But there is a very close analogy; that of the Army and Navy Supplementary Estimates, which are invariably introduced in this form, under which there is nothing to prevent questions of even less importance than are



involved in the Civil Service Votes being raised. A second analogy is the Excess Civil Service Votes, which are taken by one resolution: and there is also the analogy of the Vote on Account, where exactly the same form is employed. I beg to call attention again to the fact that, while the form in which these Estimates are put to the House is altered, the responsibility of the officials in charge of the administration is not abated, 'and that no greater latitude of appropriation is given to the Government than they already enjoy and use under the existing rules. When that fact is really understood, the House will see that the change is one that raises no great principle, but that it indeed offers the best chance of reasonable discussion on those Votes on which debate is wished. I trust the House will now hasten to close this not very profitable discussion, and that hon. Members will reserve all remarks that might be made for serious consideration until we reach Committee of Supply.

SIR ROBERT REID (Dumfries Burghs): The step which has been taken in altering the form of these Estimates is admittedly without precedent. It is, to my mind, still more significant that the practice which is now to be applied to the Civil Service Estimates has hitherto been, as the hon. Gentleman has said, applied to the Army and Navy Supplementary Estimates. Now, objection was most properly taken both to the manner and the matter of the change. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House told us that the Leader of the Opposition had received on Saturday a communication of the intention of the Government on this matter. I am very sorry that my right hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition is confined to his house and unable to be here this afternoon; but I am able to inform the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House, if he was not aware of it before, that the Leader of the Opposition strongly disapproves of this attempt to alter the practice of the House.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I said so.

SIR ROBERT REID: The right hon. Gentleman is particularly emphatic. I listened to every word he said, and what I have to complain of is that he did not profess that disapproval had been expressed by my right hon. friend. I say that there have been expressions of strong disapproval. I am not at liberty to speak for my right hon. friend, but I am certain that he would not have been prepared to say that notice of the change given to himself was sufficient in a matter of this kind, of which there ought to have been public notice. I myself cannot help thinking that this is a matter in which public notice should have been given. The only public notice given, so to speak, was by a mere circular sent out on Saturday morning. I do not know whether the Leader of the House is in the habit of staying in London from Saturday to Monday and studying the Parliamentary Papers issued on Saturday, on Saturday and Sunday; but a good many of us are not in that habit. And I maintain that notice on Saturday is somewhat tardy and inadequate. I come now to the question of the matter of the change. One result has been disclaimed by the hon. Gentleman opposite. He says he has informed himself that it will not enable the money to be applied in any different manner to what it would have been under the former form. Very well, suppose that is so; but the result remains that the whole thing can be ended by one closure instead of by twenty or more. A second result is, that instead of

there being a regular and orderly discussion Vote by Vote, a detached and very often a confused discussion will be raised. The Chairman may think it proper to call one Member or another without being informed as to what subject that Member is going to speak about; and further, if a reduction is moved in regard to one of the later Votes, and accepted by the Chairman, that would preclude any subsequent reduction being moved on a prior Vote.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The hon. and learned Gentleman is aware that that objection applies pro tanto to any individual Vote in the present form, and that it is the of habit the Chairman, bearing that in mind, to give an opportunity to hon. Members before accepting an Amendment on a late Vote to move an Amendment on an earlier one.

SIR ROBERT REID: Within the limited range of the Army and Navy Votes the rule does not apply, and now it is to be applied to Civil Service Votes, which travel over a vast array of subjects ;some of great importance, and some of which have never before appeared on the Estimates. In my humble opinion, this House is gradually becoming a Ministerial chamber, and not the House of Commons. Step by step the old privileges and facilities enjoyed by Members of the House of Commons, in their character as Members of the House of Commons representing their constituencies, are being curtailed and diminished in every direction.

This is only OIK; of the many changes which have taken place within the last four or five years. I think it is a serious one, and it shocks persons like myself who may claim to be old Parliamentarians. For my part, if the motion goes to a division I shall have great pleasure in recording my vote against the change.

\*MR. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet): I hope this proposed arrangement will not be persevered with, and that my right hon. friend, seeing the very general feeling of the House, will reconsider the determination he has come to. My hon. friend the Secretary to the Treasury fails to appreciate the objections to the change proposed, of which only one individual;no doubt a distinguished Member of the House; received intimation.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN dissented.

\*MR. JAMES LOWTHER: At any rate, no public notice whatever was given, and only the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition received a private notice. I was indebted solely to the private information given me by one of the Opposition whips. When I came down this afternoon I said to him, "I suppose this will be a quiet evening," when he told me that he understood that an important question would be raised on the new form in which the Supplementary Estimates were to be presented to the House. I went to the Vote Office for details, and with the practical object of searching for precedents. I venture to say that there is absolutely no precedent for so materially altering the practice of Parliament behind the backs of hon. Members of this House. What does this amount to I We have already had every opportunity and facility taken away from individual and non-official Members for bringing on questions in which they are interested. Tuesdays are practically gone. Fridays are devoted to Supply; and now we are told: "Oh, never mind; you have forfeited your Tuesdays and lost your Fridays, but we have given you favourable opportunities for discussing in Supply

anything which you have reason to complain of. And in addition to that, the debates on the Supplementary Estimates are not to be counted in the twenty-three days devoted to Supply," but now we find that so far from our being enabled to discuss the details of the Votes the whole lot may be put in a lump from the Chair without a syllable of discussion. Usually when a change of importance has been made in our procedure, it has formed the subject, not only of debate, but on most occasions the investigation of a Committee of some strength; but in this case we suddenly find we have no voice whatever in so vital an alteration of our procedure, and must sit down without expressing ourselves upon the passage of a rule which strikes in the direction of limiting the criticism of a number of Estimates which may all be put to the House in one Vote. Under this rule one subject may be started upon which nine-tenths of the House of Commons are in no way interested, some dull matter, such as education, which bores nearly everyone to death. In fact it is notorious that the personages who were somewhat irreverently spoken of by Sir Stafford Northcote as "the bonnets" are instigated to introduce such topics, and when that subject has drawn to an end the rest of the Vote may be closed. It seems to me that if we pass this rule we abandon one of the great functions of the House of Commons. This is not a small change, but a vast interference with the privileges of the Members of this House, and I strongly protest against it.

\*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) pointed out that the evil of this rule, if passed, would be that very important matters might be dealt with without any attention having been directed to them, and without anyone being the wiser. Such a rule ought not to be brought forward in this manner, but only after due and proper notice had been given to the whole House. He regretted that, owing to the illness of the Leader of the Opposition, that question had not been raised on behalf of the whole House. He complained that it was almost impossible to tie the Government down to any promise with regard to this not being made a precedent. Why were a certain number of days to be allotted to the discussion of the Estimates, if the House was not to be allowed to discuss them? There was no real knowledge on the part of Members of the House of the change which this rule implied. It was perfectly true that a revised Estimate came on the previous Saturday, but there was nothing in the revised Estimate to attract the attention of the House to the change, and the overwhelming majority of the Members of the House would not notice from that revised Estimate that any change was being made in the procedure. One great difficulty presented by this change taking place in the discussion of the Estimates was that it allowed any inconvenient Estimate to be absolutely withdrawn from discussion. If the rule passed it could be closed upon the Committee stage, and again upon Report without any discussion being raised. If the suggestion thrown out on a former occasion by the Leader of the House that he would be willing to agree to a Committee being appointed to consider the order in which the Estimates were to be presented; a Committee in which all sections of this House should be represented; it would not remove the difficulty of the operation of the closure, but it would limit the difficulties experienced. It was not a matter to be decided by the Members on the two Front

Benches alone, but by the entire House, and if the matter was carried through now, there was a danger that the House of Commons would lose all control over Supply.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.) said perhaps the Leader of the House did not imagine that there was a strong feeling with regard to this surprising innovation on that side of the House. It would be some alleviation if his right hon. friend could give them an assurance that this proposal was only made in view of the exceptional circumstances of the present occasion and was not intended to be made a precedent. He could not conceive, if it were intended to be a precedent, that it should be done in this manner.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Hear. hear.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE: I may take it, then, that it is not intended as a precedent?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Sir. what human being ever suggested it was?

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE said he understood, then, that it was not intended to be a precedent, but was only made in view of the very exceptional circumstances. But even if that were the

object, he thought it might have been done in a somewhat different manner, and he appealed to the right hon. Gentleman that some proper consideration might be given to the subject by a Committee selected from all sections of the House. A Select Committee was the only means by which they might come to anything like an agreement as to the procedure on important questions of Supply.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford. N.): The Leader of the House evidently shares the opinion of his distinguished relative, that Parliamentary administration is rather a nuisance. The right hon. Gentleman has done more this session to revolutionise Parliamentary methods by side winds than has ever been done before. To-day we have brought before us the most extraordinary arrangement for the discussion of the Estimates the House has ever seen, an arrangement which, would never have been tolerated by the House in years gone by. The Secretary to the Treasury told us that this arrangement was conceived for the convenience of debate, and that the form in which this Estimate was brought up would enable hon. Members to discuss any matter in which they were interested much more easily than would have been possible under the old system. Here is a long list of nineteen Votes, the last of which is for a sum of £;f0, while the entire list totals up to nearly £;1,000,000. As I understand, it would be possible for me to move to reduce that last Vote by anything up to £;10, and to prevent any other Member discussing either of the eighteen more important matters which come before it. That shows that instead of facilitating debate, this arrangement is only the closure in another form. The hon. Member for Waterford has taken the lead in the protest he has made on behalf of the rights of private Members, and he spoke naturally as the representative of Members from Ireland. There is a point of very great importance to us in this arrangement of Votes. If this precedent is established, what is there to prevent the Irish Government coming down with the whole of the Irish Estimates in this form, with some little ridiculous Vote at the end, so that we should be allowed only one division and practically one discussion? My hon.

friend has performed a most important public service in calling attention to

this matter, and as far as we are concerned we shall oppose the proposal by every means in our power, because we foresee the extraordinary inroads it may make upon the rights of private Members, and the dangerous precedent it will set for future action.

LORD HUGH CECIL (Greenwich): I rise to say a few words in protest against the suggestion that the feeling on this side of the House is entirely adverse to the action of the Government in this matter. I admit that there are warm feelings on this side as to the way in which the business of the House is conducted, but they do not point in the direction indicated by my hon. friend the Member for East Somerset. The feeling is that a very great deal too much consideration is shown to hon. Gentlemen opposite, and certainly we should not throw obstacles in the way of the Government when they are doing something, at any rate, to ensure that the views of the majority should prevail in the House. It is said that sufficient notice was not given. But these Estimates are not the first Order on the Paper: therefore the time occupied with the Navy Estimate will be available for hon. Members to acquaint themselves with the particulars of the Estimates affected by this arrangement. I can understand that Members want to know when a subject is coming forward in order that they may look up their facts and prepare the speeches they intend to deliver, but everybody knew that Civil Service Estimates might be discussed to-night, and, for the purposes of their speeches, it makes no difference whether the subjects are in one or main Estimates. Therefore, for all purposes of debate, the notice was ample. I cannot myself see why the question of notice is so important. Reference has been made to Uganda. Hon. Members will, of course, spend the same time in getting up their speeches with regard to Uganda, whether the subject is discussed on a separate Vote or as an item of the whole Vote.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: That is not the kind of notice to which we were referring. We were referring to the notice which, in our opinion, ought to have been given of a fundamental change in the procedure of the House.

LORD HUGH CECIL: However much notice was given, could hon. Members, have made a more effective protest than, they have done?

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Then do away with the House of Commons altogether.

LORD HUGH CECIL: This is, in fact, a great innovation in the true interests of legitimate debate. What are the peculiar circumstances of the moment? The most peculiar circumstance is that the Government are not bringing forward any legislation whatever. The most factious Opposition desires only, I should have thought, to impede the Government in doing that of which they disapprove. The object of obstruction, as far as it is legitimate at all, is to put off the Government's proposals, to drive them back, and make them more or less impossible of achievement. That question does not arise on this occasion at all. These Estimates must, in accordance with the law, be agreed to by the 31st March. Therefore, obstruct as much as we please, we cannot possibly prevent the Government doing anything they choose after Easter. This arrangement cannot form any precedent for innovations in procedure for facilitating legislation which, in the opinion of any section of the House, is of a dangerous or revolutionary

character. In 1893, as far as I can learn from a study of the newspapers, the object of the long discussions on the Supplementary Estimates was to postpone the second reading of the Home Rule Bill. That is a case utterly remote and different from the present case. It would, indeed, be a very serious matter if the Government were to take special facilities, not merely to comply with the law as regards financial business, but to facilitate their own legislative proposals. That would be a very dangerous and serious innovation, but this is nothing of the kind. This is merely an emergency measure which must be adopted unless the law is to be disobeyed. If this alteration were not made, the only alternative would be putting all the Votes from the Chair at a given hour, or to have all-night sittings. Is it I suggested that the present method gives less facilities for discussion? The whole matter is as plain as a pikestaff. If there is only a certain amount of time to be given to the subject, you must take measures to get the subject disposed of in the time, and this measure is the least offensive and oppressive that could be devised. The truth is that the House of Commons is in the position of wanting; I was going to say to eat its cake and have it; but really the position is that of wishing to have a cake which the Irish Members have already devoured. I feel the warmest commiseration for hon. Members on either side of the House whose only desire is for legitimate discussion of the Supplementary Estimates, but the violence of their denunciations should be directed against, not the Government, but the hon. Gentlemen from Ireland who have abused the opportunities of debate. If hon. Gentlemen above the gangway opposite wish to see the business of the House conducted in such a way that all that they desire to say should have a proper opportunity for utterance, their best course is to co-operate with the Government to the utmost in suppressing the exuberant verbosity of hon. Members below the gangway.

SIR BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.): As I was engaged for many years in the preparation of these Estimates, I have some experience of the manner in which they are put together and the object for which they are framed. I am perfectly ready to admit that it would not be possible to transfer money from one Vote to another, or even from one sub-head to another, without the approval of the Treasury, but I cannot imagine what advantage the Government think they will gain by this new method which they have introduced. It will be productive of very great inconvenience, especially to the Chair. The Treasury have always tried, by the arrangement of the Estimates into classes, Votes, and subheads, to afford the clearest possible information as to the subjects referred to; they have endeavoured to put those subjects together so as not to be too large or too small, and to present completely one subject in a compact form, so that the House might deal with and dispose of one subject before it passed on to another. All that is done away with by this new plan. Under this arrangement one hon. Member may discuss the Colonial Office; if he does not move an Amendment by which the House is precluded from passing to another subject, the next speaker may deal with the Postal Service, and a third may speak about the Diplomatic and Consular Services, and so on. We should get into a most unbusiness-like discussion, without, as far as I can see, any

compensation whatsoever. It is said we should get one closure motion instead of twenty. I do not believe we should get even that advantage, because it will be open to a Member to move a reduction of the Vote by £;1, £;2, £;3, or £;10, and the closure may be necessary on each. The Secretary to the Treasury says we had full notice of this change. I must confess that when I received this Paper on Saturday morning I looked through it very carefully, but with all my twenty-two years' experience at the Treasury I did not observe these few words at the beginning. I noticed the new arrangement of Votes. and I thought it a most excellent plan to put these important items in the forefront, but all that advantage is done away with by these few words at the beginning, which practically put all the items on the same line, so that there is no reason why we should discuss OTIC before another. I earnestly hope the Government will withdraw their scheme, and consent to introduce the Estimates in the old-fashioned and constitutional manner.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Warm protests have been made by various Members of the House in regard to the policy pursued by the Government in this matter, and so well defended by my hon. friend the Secretary to the Treasury. But almost every speaker; I think I might say every speaker except one; has carefully refrained from making the slightest allusion to the governing consideration in the matter; namely, the position in which we find ourselves when we are face to face with Supplementary Estimates and the close of the financial year. The hon. Member who has just spoken based his appeal on his great experience at the Treasury, and he told us that in all that experience he had never known this course to be pursued. No, Sir; it never has been pursued with regard to Supplementary Estimates, though it has with regard to Estimates of the other kind. But has my hon. friend, in the course of his experience at the Treasury, ever known the House apparently driving the Government; or driving itself, because I suppose it is particeps criminis ; into a deliberate breach of the rules laid down by itself with regard to its financial business? My hon. friend has never known such a case, and therefore his experience gives no weight to his objection to a remedy proposed to meet so novel and serious a proceeding.

SIR BRAMPTON GURDON: I have hardly ever known the House to be called together so late.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman by his interruption has brought us back, not for the first, second, or third time, to the excuse habitually urged by those who have nothing else to say. The meeting on the 14th February was determined before it was possible for anyone to know the amount of the Supplementary Estimates, and, even if the amount had been known, would that date have been an improper one for us to have fixed? In other words, is the House really incapable of getting through the King's Speech and the necessary Estimates in the interval between 14th February and 31st March? I really cannot believe that that is the case. If such a scale of time is to be applied to all Parliamentary action. I can only say the sessions will have to be prolonged; a course, in my opinion, not to the advantage of either the comfort or the efficiency of the House. I have always been anxious to keep the session; I will

not say within the limits of six months, but somewhere approaching that period, and I believe a six months session is quite enough considering the pressure at which we do our work; moreover, we had an autumn session, and, under all the circumstances. I do not think the 14th February was too late a date to fix for the opening of Parliament. But let us turn aside for a moment from the action of the Government in opening Parliament on the 14th February. and whether they were right or wrong in so doing. Does the House really mean to affirm that between the 14th February and the 25th March we ought not to be able to get through all our financial business, provided the Government does not bring forward any substantial controversial legislation?

MR. JOHN REDMOND: It depends on the management of that business.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: What does that vague assertion, which is so commonly hurled across the floor, mean? The hon. Member complains of my management of the business of the House. My management of the business of the House has consisted simply in putting down Supply night after night since 14th February.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: No.

MR. A.J. BALFOUR: In what has it consisted, then?

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I mean the constant irritation of unnecessarily moving the closure.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I see. It is the number of times I have moved the closure, is it? I will ask two questions on that. In the first place, where should we have been with regard to the Estimates if I had not moved the closure; and, in the second place, where should we be on the 31st March if I had, as I should have had, to move the closure on every Vote before we could get the Supplementary Estimates?

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: The Speaker objected to your moving it the other night.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: How on earth we were to get the Supplementary Estimates within the limit of the law without the use of the closure I do not know. So much for this, if I may say so, thread-hare and absurd accusation with regard to meeting so late as 14th February. If we had met previously to that the hon. Gentlemen who now complain would have been the first to grumble because we met so early.

I now leave that, and come to the substance of this question. Are we guilty of an innovation which is, in the first place, dangerous, and, in the second place, unnecessary, in the procedure of the House? Those are the two points to consider. If it is necessary, it really does not matter whether it is dangerous or not; that which is necessary is that which has to be done. But is it dangerous? I have been spoken of to-night, as I have been spoken of in previous debates, as if I was hostile to the full and free discussion of the Estimates. I venture to say that nobody in his heart believes that. No one has more anxiously shown his desire than I have both that there should be an adequate, time given to the discussion of the Estimates, and that the Estimates to be discussed should be as far as possible taken in the order of their importance, and I have passed a great many innovations in our rules having those two great ends in view. If I have; as I think I may claim that I have; shown my desire that the Estimates should be fully discussed, have I in this case been driven, whether



under stress of real necessity or not, to a course which is in itself dangerous? It will be observed that hon. Members' imaginations reach forward to some future period when there shall be some unscrupulous Minister in power who will use this weapon for the suppression of the House at, large and for the throttling of discussion. But this weapon has always been, for what it is worth, in the possession of the Government of the day. I cannot believe that any unscrupulous Minister would be in the least degree influenced by the fact that, in the face of what I have shown to be a real necessity, who have, done with the Civil Service Estimates that which we have done with criticism, comment, or inconvenience in the case of the Army Estimates, the Navy Estimates, and Excess Votes. We have been told that one inconvenience of this method is that Members will jump from Vote to Vote, and that we shall have a miscellaneous and inconsequential, discussion. I hope that will not be the case. This Vote is framed exactly on the model of the Vote on Account, and I do not think the discussions on Votes on Account have gone on in an inconsequent way from one subject to another. In fact. I have known a whole evening to be devoted to the very first item. [Hear, hear.] Hon. Members say "Hear, hear," but you cannot have it both ways.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: By arrangement the whole night was spent on the first item, but the rest were closed.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Member is mistaken. The, only arrangement was as to the order in which the first two items of the Vote on Account should be put down. The House chose to discuss the Education Vote for the whole of the evening. That is the affair of the House, and the House will be able in a similar manner if it choose; as I hope it will not choose; to spend its time on the first one, or two items in the Vote now presented. There is no danger in the course we have adopted, because it, is a course obviously and avowedly adopted in an emergency. The hon. Member for East Somersetshire wished to get a specific pledge or declaration from me. I thought I gave a specific pledge or declaration in reply to a question earlier in the evening. But if the hon. Member desires such a pledge; I should have thought it unnecessary; I will give it in the most unreserved fashion. The only reason this course has been adopted is that we found ourselves driven off from day to day by the length of the discussion on the Civil Service and other Estimates until it was perfectly obvious that if we were to fulfil the law it would be only by the goodwill of those who have not shown up to the present any great anxiety that we should be able to fulfil it.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Will the right hon. Gentleman kindly say what is the pledge he has unreservedly given?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The statement I made was that this is an emergency operation, and an. emergency operation alone. The House in dealing with a practical question ought to show itself a practical assembly. Everybody knows the situation in which we are placed and the methods by which it has been brought about. We need not bandy hard words as to what has taken place. Let us describe it as an intelligent interest in Estimates. That "intelligent interest in Estimates" has, for example, been shown with regard to a Vote of £5,000 caused entirely by the rise in the price of coal. That "intelligent

interest in Estimates" has been carried to such a point that that £5,000 was discussed for at least an hour or two in Committee, and, as if that left hon. Gentlemen unsatisfied, they discussed it for another hour and a half on Report. MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Hear, hear.

MR. A.J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman is quite right from his own point of view to be proud of the achievement. Yes, but you cannot have "intelligence" carried to that point without clogging the whole machinery of Parliament. I am attacked because I do not find more opportunities for private Members. It is the "intelligence of private Members that puts me in the difficulty. It is this "intelligent interest," carried to the excess we have recently seen, which makes it impossible for me to leave Tuesdays for the discussion of abstract resolutions, and which makes the proposed arrangement of this Estimate absolutely necessary. What other course could I have taken? I assume we are all agreed that Supply must be concluded this week. That is the basis on which I start. Nobody will, at all events openly, say that they desire us to violate the statute and regulations laid down for our financial business. Very well. We have got before us; I am very unwilling to take Wednesday, because that day happens to be allocated to a Bill which excites a very great deal of interest: therefore, we have Monday Tuesday. Thursday, and Friday, with possibly Saturday, in which to dispose of Supply. In those days we have got to get the Speaker out of the Chair on Navy Estimates; we have got to get Vote A and Vote 1 of the Navy Estimates; we have in addition to get nineteen further Votes of Supply. We have already got ten Votes, but they were of an utterly trivial and unimportant character, and raised no questions of real interest whatever. We have already obtained ten Votes, but, although they were of little interest, they occupied two long days. We have nineteen more Votes before us which are of far greater importance, and, in addition, the Navy Estimates, and for the consideration of these we have only four days, or, with a Saturday sitting, five days. I do not believe that would be enough. If I do not misread the signs of "intelligent interest", that has been shown in these Votes, there will be an Amendment moved to every one. Someone has suggested that we should manage by closure, but three divisions on each of these nineteen Votes would mean fifty-seven divisions, and I do not think it would be possible to get through those, divisions in less than twenty hours, or two normal Parliamentary days out of the five possible days at our disposal. I am not talking of debate, but only of walking through the lobbies. Am I to be told that, having submitted respectfully that calculation to the House, our existing rules of closure are sufficient to enable us to finish Supply satisfactorily with reasonable discussion even by Saturday evening? I am quite sure that any candid man will see that I have not over-estimated the difficulties I have endeavoured to describe. What other course remains besides the one we have adopted? I might have come down on Tuesday or Thursday and moved a rule similar to the rule made with regard to general Supply, declaring that at a given hour on Friday night or Saturday afternoon the Committee of Supply should be closed and all the various Votes taken in their order, and that a similar operation should apply to the Report of Supply. But I suppose we would have occupied a

night in discussing such a proposal -[An HON. MEMBER: I hope so.];and when we had discussed it I suppose it would have been necessary to bring forward a rule for shortening the divisions. These are two plans. Can anybody suggest a third except the one, I have adopted? There is no third.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs): By, not spending the time of the House in altering its rules.

MR. A.J. BALFOUR: I do not know whether the hon. Gentleman supposes that he has suggested a plan for getting Committee of Supply finished this week. The House will see therefore, that the course we have adopted is one that has been absolutely forced upon us by the necessities of the situation. It is one which I hope will prevent undue strain, but whether it causes undue strain or not it is the one that holds out more hope than any other plan that -we shall be able to finish Committee of Supply within the time contemplated. I hope that I have used no undue strength of language. I have stated the motives which have influenced our action, and I have justified to the best of my ability the course which, by the force of circumstances, we have taken. Do not let anybody suppose that I watch these proceedings, or their result, with satisfaction or with equanimity. I regard them as most serious. It was long ago pointed out; I think it was by Mr. Gladstone, but I am not sure; that one or two ingenious men devoting themselves to the consideration of the Estimates could keep the House occupied during the whole of the six months. You could not work these nineteen Votes by the closure. [An HON. MEMBER signified that they could. In order to meet the interruption just made let me change the form of my proposition. One or two ingenious gentlemen taking an intelligent interest in the Estimates would be in a position to compel the closure upon every Vote that was brought before the House, without the smallest difficulty and without any undue taxing of the rules. I think there were more than two ingenious gentlemen in the House who engaged in the intelligent discussion of the Estimates. The result was, of course, necessarily that, before the new rule came into force, Supply had become a perfect scandal, and no Government could allow it to in to fare in that way with the business of the House. We sat up night after night discussing Votes like the £5,000 Vote I have already mentioned. I hope that I the Supply rule has done something to cure this with regard to the main Estimates of the year. We have left the Supplementary Estimates exactly where they always stood, and hon. Members who have not been in the House before will have a very accurate idea of what used to go on in connection with the ordinary Estimates by seeing what has gone on during the last few days in connection with the Supplementary Estimates. The right hon. Baronet the Member for Forest of Dean has referred to the suggestion to appoint a Committee to consider the sequence of Votes to be taken in

ordinary Supply. That is a little outside the motion now before the House, but allow me to say that I think it would be of great advantage that there should be a Committee of this House to settle in the first place what proportion of our general time should be given to the discussion of Supply. That cannot now be left to the discretion of the House itself; it must be laid down by rule. Let a Committee suggest rules for the purpose; let them suggest whether the present

twenty-three days given for Supply are enough, whether they ought to be augmented, how the time between them should be distributed, and how the Supplementary-Estimates should be dealt with. I have not the slightest objection to that. If anybody can suggest a plan by which the liberty of discussion shall be freely used and not unduly abused, no one will rejoice so much as I will. The question before us now is, how are we to deal with an emergency? I do venture to think that, whether the House regards the Government as to blame or not for having met on the 14th of February, we are all agreed that there is but one way to get our Votes through by the legal day, and that is the way the Government has adopted. If the House take that view, as I think they must, they must defer to a more convenient season the broad question of the procedure in Supply, and if they desire that it should be considered by a Committee upstairs or elsewhere, I shall give any such desire my hearty support.

SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): The right hon. Gentleman complains that upon this side of the House we have not shown any appreciation of the difficulty in which he is placed. We do appreciate the position in which the right hon. Gentleman finds himself, and I think that we on this side of the House have shown a desire that that should be met. What we do object to is the course which the right hon. Gentleman proposes to take. We recognise the difficulty, but we are not satisfied with the remedy. The proposal is dangerous,, but is it necessary? Without touching on the question of necessity for a moment, I venture to say that it is a very dangerous proposal;dangerous from the mode in which it has been initiated, and dangerous

from the precedent it will set up, and which;I will not say in all probability;will with absolute certainty be followed hereafter whenever a Ministry with a majority finds itself in a difficulty. There is no analogy, as the right hon. Gentleman puts it, between this case and the ease of a Vote on Account. The justification for bringing a Vote on Account;

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said be spoke of the Army and Navy Excess Votes.

SIR HENRY FOWLER: The justification for abbreviating the discussion of a Vote on Account is that every item will come up for consideration on Report. These, I think, will never come up again. I think the House of Commons ought to have the power of criticism, and we have a right to claim that there should be fair criticism of the large sum of the additional Votes. These Supplementary Estimates are almost without precedent. I think the right hon. Gentleman will have to go back many years before he finds Supplementary Estimates of between £;1,000,000 and £;2,000,000. I think' it was the boast of the right hon.

Gentleman himself;it certainly took place (luring an Administration of which he was a member;that there were no Supplementary Estimates at all. Without claiming any special knowledge in the present case, I think I may venture to assure the right hon. Gentleman that when the meeting of Parliament was fixed he knew there would be Supplementary Votes of large amount, and I do not think he was taken by surprise to such an extent as he seemed to indicate. The right hon. Gentleman puts the case on the ground that the Opposition show no disposition to meet him in dealing with the present difficulty. Well, I venture to say that the Opposition showed in all directions considerable desire to meet him on Friday

night.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am most unwilling to interrupt the right hon. Gentleman, but I never said anything of the Opposition as a whole. I said that no speaker to-night has shown any appreciation of the difficulties of the Government.

SIR HENRY FOWLER: I was putting it perhaps clumsily, but I understood him to say that there was no indication of any desire to meet the difficulties of the Government.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No.

SIR HENRY FOWLER: I withdraw that remark at once. When the right hon. Gentleman was in difficulty on Friday night he was met, and £21,000,000 was voted almost without discussion. I fully appreciate the difficulty which the right hon.

Gentleman has at the present moment. I do not think he has exhausted all the resources of negotiation. I am sure that there was a mode of meeting the difficulty without any violation of the law, which would not have involved this new and dangerous innovation in the previous practice of the House. The right hon. Gentleman says it is necessary. May I have his attention for one moment as to the necessity of the case so far as these Votes are concerned? He says it is absolutely necessary that Supply should be finished on Saturday. May I put to him that Monday could be taken for Supply, and that the Report could be taken on Tuesday? The Appropriation Bill could be brought in on Tuesday, and the Second Reading of the Bill could be taken on Wednesday.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Private Members' day.

SIR HENRY FOWLER: Somebody must suffer. It is not the private Members' day this week that I propose should be taken. I am talking of the following week. I am proposing that the Second Reading should be taken on Wednesday next week, the Committee stage on Thursday, and the Third Reading in this House and the stages through the House of Lords on Friday. Therefore it is not absolutely necessary that Supply should be closed on Saturday this week. I would put it to the right hon. Gentleman before he finally announces his decision in this matter that by the introduction of this new rule I do not believe he will save any time. I should advise the right hon. Gentleman to close the discussion next Monday. Under these circumstances he will have the opportunity of getting the Speaker out

of the Chair on the Navy Estimates, and getting the two Votes with the same rapidity as he got his two Votes in Supply upon the Army. He would thus, I think, give a fair opportunity for moderate discussion upon these Estimates. Let me strip it of all the circumstances which have aroused the right hon.

Gentleman's apprehension. There are some very important questions in these Supplementary Estimates; questions which will require a considerable amount of discussion. There are questions in the Supplementary Estimates which ought to be discussed more than a few minutes. I think the right hon. Gentleman should come to some understanding with the House that Supply should close on Saturday, and that the two Navy Votes should be obtained on the understanding that the full discussion of the naval programme should be taken after Easter. There would then remain simply these Supplementary Estimates and the Report stage upon those Votes which have already been before the House. I would submit to him that it

would be far better to come to some arrangement of that sort than, if I may say so, declare war on the procedure of the House, which some hon. Members consider an invaluable safeguard of the control of the House over Votes in Supply. I am quite satisfied that the right hon. Gentleman is right in saying that there must be an entire reconsideration of the mode in which Supply is voted, and the time devoted to it, and the carrying out of the rule which the right hon. Gentleman himself introduced. I think that can be put on its own merits. The Government is in an impasse at the present moment. Do not let the remedy be dangerous and disastrous.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The right hon. Gentleman has made a proposal to me. I think he will feel that he is placing me in an impossible position when he asks me to take one Wednesday and not another. That would scarcely be fair. Nothing would give me more pleasure than that Committee of Supply should finish on Saturday afternoon, that the Report stage should be taken on Monday, that we should then be able to reserve Wednesday for private Members, and that we should be able to finish Supply in time to comply with the law. I do not know whether the modified proposal of the right hon. Gentleman would be accepted in all parts of the House, but if so, I would be delighted to fall in with it. I know that some arrangements when acceded are never broken. Therefore, if a pledge is given, I shall be happy to accept it.

SIR HENRY FOWLER: I was not aware that the private Members' Bill set down for Wednesday is a very important one. I understand that it is the Pure Beer Bill. I do not wish to immolate that Bill unnecessarily. If you get your Report on Monday it would not be necessary to sacrifice the Bill.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: The right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton has just made a proposal to the Government, and I hope it will not be unbecoming if I say that his action is, to say the least of it, rather curious in this matter. He says first of all that the proposition of the Government is a dangerous proposition, and he objects to it. He then winds up his speech on the dangerous proposition by proposing to enter into an agreement with the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury. I think the proposition made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton is, so far as I can understand, very little better than the proposition of the First Lord of the Treasury, and I think it would be more satisfactory, if I may say so, to a great many gentlemen of the Liberal party who resent innovations of this kind if, instead of coining down at the last moment to 'patch up an agreement to make easy the path of the Government, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton had been in his place early in the evening to oppose this latest attempt on the part of the Government to muzzle the House of Commons. The right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury can hardly be surprised, I think, if he does not find the Irish Members enthusiastic to enter into a fresh agreement with them. What took place last Friday.' An agreement was made with the Government, under which they were allowed to get in one sitting the whole of the Army Estimates, amounting to the sum of £21,000,000. That sum was voted on Friday night in the space of about twenty minutes, and now what return do the Irish

Members get for the enormous concession they made thru.' Our reward is, that when the House meets on Monday the right hon. Gentleman gets up and proposes to curtail in a new way the privileges and the rights of private Members in connection with the discussion of the Estimates. I say that as long as the Government reward agreements entered into with their opponents in that way they can hardly be surprised if there is no desire to make further agreements with them. The right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury in the last speech he made referred in a somewhat pointed way to the discussion which took place on the Estimates last week. He said that two hours were taken discussing an item of £5,000. and even from the lofty position which the right hon. Gentleman occupies, he, did not hesitate to speak in a disparaging way of what he called the intelligent criticism of hon. Gentlemen from Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman may imagine that Members from Ireland ought to discuss the Estimates in a way that ought to commend itself to his way of thinking and to his satisfaction. If he expects that hon. Members from Ireland are in these matters always to imitate the example of his noble relative the Member for Greenwich, and to get up on every conceivable occasion and say that what the Government has done is perfectly right, he is greatly mistaken. I pass from that by saying that what I know of the methods with respect to the "intelligent discussion" of items in the Estimates I learned, not yesterday, or the day before, but years ago, from the action of a certain party in this House which was called the Fourth party, of which the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury has probably heard.

What is the answer to the appeal made by the First Lord that this must be done, as the Estimates must be got through by the end of the month? The answer is obviously that the Government should have called Parliament together in proper time to give Members full opportunity for discussing the Estimates as they considered necessary. The right hon. Gentleman, if the House allows him to have his way, is simply setting up a precedent whereby probably next year he will call Parliament together not on the 14th of February, but probably the 1st of March or the 14th of March, and then if any attempt is made to criticise or discuss the Estimates he will have the same story as he has now, that discussion must be curtailed because by the end of the month the Estimates according to law must be carried through. He is setting up a precedent which will make it easy for any Government in future to curtail discussion and to stifle all criticism by the simple expedient of not calling Parliament together until it is too late to say anything upon the Estimates. The right hon. Gentleman in reply to the Member for East Somerset said he was prepared to give the pledge that this proposition was simply an emergency proposition. I tried to get some understanding as to the nature of the pledge the right hon. Gentleman gave, but I think it is clear that he gave no pledge whatever. Is he prepared to get up now and say that no such proposition will be made by the Government next year, or at any future time? If this proposition is ratified by the House of Commons, nothing is more certain than that it will form a precedent for the future. The right hon. Gentleman knows perfectly well that it is only necessary for the rule to be established and acted upon in this House to make it absolutely certain

that time after time in future it will be quoted as a precedent. The First Lord of the Treasury indignantly repudiated the idea that this innovation was sprung upon the House of Commons without any notice. He said, "Why, I gave notice of this to the Leader of the Opposition." I have the pleasure and the distinguished honour of meeting the Leader of the Opposition sometimes in the lobbies of this House, but I never meet him on Saturdays or Sundays at all, and the fact that the First Lord of the Treasury late on Friday night or early on Saturday morning sent word to the Leader of the Opposition that he was going to do this is not the slightest guarantee that I or my friends ever heard anything at all about it. I say we have a right to expect in future that when an absolutely unprecedented change is about to be made the Government should at least give several full days' notice, not merely to the Leader of the Opposition, but to every Member of the House. Every Member of this House is supposed to be equal, and if that is true I maintain that in this matter full notice should be given to every Member of the House, and that notice given to the Leader of the Opposition is not sufficient. Then we are told that we had a statement on Saturday from, which we could have ascertained what change had been made. There are not twenty Members opposite who realised that this change was being made until this afternoon, and it is monstrous to say that we should realise the change which has been made in the presentation of the Estimates when an hon. Gentleman with twenty years experience of the Treasury's methods was unable to realise that any change had been made at all. If the Government intend to proceed with the interference with private Members in this manner it ought to cease to make new rules here and new rules there, it ought to issue a new rule that nobody has a right to say a word upon financial matters. That is the recommendation I make if the Government wishes to do this properly, and the Estimates would then go through the House in good time, like clockwork. Let them take my advice and without further delay bring at once into the Government and place upon the Treasury Bench the Member for Greenwich, when everything would go on smoothly.

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.): There is no doubt that we all appreciate the fact that the Government is in considerable difficulty, but what we cannot understand is why this difficulty should have become chronic this session. Everything seems to have been done that should be done, and yet we get into greater trouble. Something else seems to be wrong besides the House of Commons. Now that the hon. Member for King's Lynn has gone; has left the House; I may say one of the last things he said to me was that he hesitated whether he should go because he was afraid that if he did the Government would get into trouble. I am afraid that rather suggests that if he knew what is happening to-day it would disturb him to think that this revolutionary measure was sprung upon us in the way it has been. I study the Parliamentary Papers very carefully, but I had no idea that such a change was coining about. These Supplementary Estimates are of great importance, and surely the Government, which has so large a majority, might let the House have all reasonable time for discussion upon them. The noble Lord the Member for Greenwich, with great vigour, seemed to suggest that when he rules us we shall be managed with extreme



rigour; but surely if we are to pass these Estimates-at all we ought to consider each subject carefully. Nobody could possibly say that these Estimates are normal; nobody could suggest that a Supplementary Estimate of £1,000,000 was a matter that should pass without criticism. Now, Sir, in order to expedite matters we have another revolutionary change proposed to the House; and what is the result? That we have had another debate. It is now past seven o'clock, and we have done nothing. This is not the way in which the House of Commons should be ruled. We saw on Friday the result of such management, and it seems to me that this system of riding roughshod over us is a method to turn this House into a mere machine to record the decisions of the Government. It seems to me that we ought not to be asked to have a Vote of a million upon all sorts of subjects in bulk, because we know that when one subject has been discussed for a short time the whole may be closed. We had better face the matter at once and say this cannot be done in this way, and if it is to be done at all it cannot be done without the fullest consideration being given to it.

MR. VICARY GIBBS (Hertfordshire. St. Albans) said that the hon. Member who had just sat down had clearly shown that the House was face to face with a difficulty. He disliked quite as much as the hon. Member for North Islington anything like an attack being made upon the freedom of private Members; yet if the rule was not carried the Votes could not be got in time to, conform with, the law.

The hon. Member had said that the House must not be ridden over roughshod by anybody, but anyone who had listened to the discussion knew perfectly well there was no desire on the part of anybody to ride roughshod over them. Everybody was aware that had it been only an English Opposition a reasonable arrangement would have been made long since. This matter had been forced on by the hon. Member for East Clare. It was absolutely impossible for the Government to get through the business unless some measure of tin's kind was introduced. The suggestion that Parliament should have met earlier in the session was idle because the same tactics would have answered equally well if the session had commenced on the 7th February. The pledge given by the First Lord of the Treasury only amounted to the fact that he would not be guilty of such an innovation again until he was compelled. He desired that more definite assurance should be given that such a thing should not recur until its non-recurrence would constitute a breach of the law. He believed in no other way could the business be carried through, and therefore he should vote for the Government.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.) said the whole difficulty had arisen owing to the monstrous mismanagement of public business on the part of the Government. When making the suggestion that had the House met on an earlier date the same action would have been adopted as had been adopted during the past fortnight, the hon. Member who had just sat down had quite overlooked the fact that the reason for the right hon. Gentleman's appeal was that, owing to the shortness of the time when Parliament met to get through the financial business of the country, he was compelled to adopt this proceeding. He thought, if the pressure was so great, that the House should meet at eleven or twelve o'clock instead of three. He regarded the innovation as dangerous in itself, but the manner in which it was

introduced he considered more dangerous still. The House could not accept a private intimation conveyed to the Leader of the Opposition as being notice to the House generally. He challenged the Government to say there were six Members of the House

who were aware that the Vote was to be taken in this way. He read his Parliamentary Papers with as much care as anybody, and he had had no idea that such sharp practice was going to be practised on an unwary House of Commons. He challenged the Government to say that there were six Members of the House who knew that the Government were going to bulk nineteen Votes altogether and take them in one Vote, and practically close all discussion. The more honest course would have been to have followed the advice outlined with almost brutal frankness by the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich. The Government were responsible for the position in which they found themselves, and it did not lie in their mouths to complain of the time which the House had taken to discuss the Estimates. If the Treasury brought down these Votes in a proper manner and paid a fair amount of attention to the criticisms made upon them the Government would get the Votes in a much shorter time. Discussion of an ample and satisfactory character could not be considered obstructive. The Government had got themselves into this mess, and had attempted to get out of it by a stealthy stratagem which was not worthy of either the House or the Ministry. The shabby manner in which it was sought to sneak this new rule through the House without observation and without discussion was unworthy of even the present Government.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs): The, Leader of the House is endeavouring to set up a very dangerous precedent which I do not think should be set up. He proposes to withdraw a number of Votes from discussion. That is what it amounts to. Here we have got nineteen Votes yet undiscussed, and what does the right hon. Gentleman propose? He says, "I propose that we should discuss the few Votes which may be considered important, and that the remaining Votes should not be discussed or divided on." Let the House understand clearly what this means. It is a new rule, not incorporated in the Standing Orders and canvassed by discussion before it passes, but brought in by the First Lord of the Treasury without affording any opportunity except such

discussion as we are able to get without moving the adjournment of the House.

The operation of the new rule is this. The right hon. Gentleman says. "If you discuss all these Votes I shall not get the Estimates," so he proposes that only a certain number of Votes shall be discussed and that the remainder shall then be voted upon. That is not merely an innovation, but it is what the right hon.

Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton calls a singularly dangerous one.

The hon. Member opposite has made a singularly ungenerous attack upon the hon.

Members for Ireland, for he has stated that if it had been left to the English Opposition all this matter would have been arranged. He apparently forgets that on Friday they were quite as amenable to an arrangement to facilitate the business as the Opposition, and to level that taunt at them now is exceedingly unfair and uncalled for. What is the defence of this new rule? Although the First Lord of the Treasury says it is called for by an emergency, he cannot prevent its becoming a precedent. I would call the attention of the House to the

terms in which the right hon. Gentleman has given a pledge to the House. In answer to the hon. Member for East Somerset he said that he was prepared to give in the most unreserved manner a pledge that he would not use this power only under exceptional circumstances. But what good is a pledge like that? This is his opinion upon the present situation. A pledge is generally given with regard to something which ought to be done. Is the right hon. Gentleman prepared to say, "I pledge myself that this precedent shall not be followed." Why are the circumstances exceptional now? Simply because of circumstances for which the House of Commons has no responsibility, and for which no one has any responsibility but the Government itself. What are the exceptional circumstances? They are two, according to the Leader of the House. The first is that there is a large number of Votes which have not yet been discussed. But whose fault is it that there are so many Supplementary Estimates? Certainly it is not the fault of the House of Commons. The second circumstance is that the Government call Parliament together late, and who is responsible for that? The House of Commons was not consulted upon this matter, nor the Opposition. The convenience of the Opposition was not even consulted, for the Government simply consulted their own convenience in the matter. They knew perfectly well that all these Supplementary Votes had to be passed, and in spite of all this they call Parliament together late and insist now upon passing these Votes under all this pressure. And so it happens that for the interests of the Government the rules of the House are to suffer. Opportunities of discussing Estimates and administration are to be limited not for this present session only, but practically for all time. What are these Supplementary Estimates? The right hon. Gentleman talks as if they were of no importance at all. If hon. Members will look at these Estimates they will find that they afford the first opportunity which has been given to the House of Commons for discussing three wars, quite apart from the South African War and affairs in China; namely, the war in Somaliland, the war in Uganda, and the military operations in Ashanti. Here are three wars discussed under Supplementary Estimates, and the right hon. Gentleman proposes that we should discuss all these matters in the course of a day or two. We have also got to discuss the Hospitals Commission, and this is the only opportunity we shall get to discuss the whole of the arrangements with regard to the hospitals, which affect the comfort and lives of thousands of our soldiers, because the war is not yet over, and there are tens of thousands of our troops still fighting under unhealthy conditions. It is only the House of Commons which can bring pressure to bear to make the War Office do what is right, and now we are not allowed to discuss it. Then, this Vote will afford practically the only opportunity we shall get to discuss the Transvaal Concessions Commission. We have to discuss the Report of that Commission, which I think has had an important influence in protracting the war, and we have also to consider the methods adopted by the Treasury for raising funds for the Transvaal and Chinese wars, the Queen's funeral, and other matters, and the right hon. Gentleman proposes that we shall do all this in one or two sittings. This is a perfectly unprecedented state of things. The Government is responsible for all these

Estimates. The noble Lord the Member for Greenwich said that this rule might have been justifiable as applied to the Home Rule, Bill of 1893, and the proposition he laid down is that it depends on the character of the legislation which is to follow, He says this rule is to be a precedent in certain cases only. It is to be a precedent when the Tory Government is in power, but no precedent when the Liberal Government is in office. We know what that means. We have all kinds of precedents set up by the Leader of the House, which I venture to say will be resisted more vigorously than the present Opposition resists them if a Liberal Government attempts to put them into operation. It depends entirely upon the view which hon. Members opposite take with regard to the particular proposals which are to be considered at the time. We really ought to consider these things on their merits. It is not a question of what you are examining or what particular expenditure you are passing, but it is a question of the rules of the House and the facilities offered for criticism. When these new rules are passed one after the other the House of Commons is depriving the Opposition of what is, after all, a legitimate weapon of criticism. Time is one of the weapons of the Opposition, and it is a perfectly fair one. I have seen discussions repeatedly where a good case did not attract any attention from the Minister concerned until he saw the discussion was consuming too much of the time of the Government. Then very often a second Minister would get up and examine the question, and say that there was something in the matter after all, and he would promise either inquiry or redress. Time is one of the oldest weapons of an Opposition, and one of the most effective weapons. So far as the Liberal Opposition is concerned, it is a particularly serious matter for a Liberal Opposition to support any rules of this kind, which do not give facilities for adequate discussion, and which deprive the Opposition of facilities which they have possessed from time immemorial.

This is not a matter for arrangement across the floor of the House. It is a very vital question of constitutional liberty. We have had too many of these arrangements across the floor of the House. We had an arrangement of this kind on Friday, and what was the result? The Leader of the House, knowing, practically, at that time that he was going to make this arrangement, never informed the Opposition that he meant to do this. I do not charge the First Lord of the Treasury with bad faith in this matter, but I do say that there was a lack of straightforwardness about it. The right hon. Gentleman knew that if the Opposition and the hon. Members from Ireland and below the gangway-had known when they made that arrangement last week that the First Lord of the Treasury intended to introduce this new rule, which is a complete subversion of every method of discussion we have had on Supplementary Estimates, the arrangement come to with regard to the Army would never have been agreed to. This is our reward. The right hon. Gentleman talks now about the ten unimportant Votes which took ten nights, and he refers to the debate on the price of coal. I should like to remind Members who were present during that debate; and I do not believe the First Lord of the Treasury was present, although he came in just in time to put the closure; that the prolongation of that debate was due to the failure of the Minister in charge to explain a discrepancy between the excessive amount called

for in one Vote as compared with the amount in another Vote. Repeatedly explanations were asked for, and yet none was afforded. Why should the First Lord of the Treasury complain of these discussions? I remember that when the First Lord of the Treasury was the Leader of the Opposition upon one occasion almost a whole Parliamentary sitting was taken up in discussing an item of £100 spent upon pencils. One, if not two of the gentlemen who occupied the time of the House upon that occasion are now sitting on the Treasury7 Bench opposite. The President of the Board of Agriculture was one of them. But at that time did the Member for Midlothian come down and say that there had been a scandalous waste of time in the House? He did not come down to this House and on his own initiative, without giving any notice, change the whole rules of the House. No; the right hon. Gentleman the late Member for Midlothian had too great a regard for the dignity and usefulness of the House. We are gradually being deprived of opportunities not of debate, but of legitimate criticism of the administration of the country. The result of this new rule will be that possibly two or three matters will be discussed, but I venture to say that many matters of considerable importance will receive no discussion at all. Twice, if not three times, in the course of a few weeks since the opening of the present session the right hon. Gentleman has already introduced innovations into the rules of this House which have considerably curtailed

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. E.

Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)

Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Cripps, Charles Alfred

Heaton, John Henniker

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)

Helder, Augustus

Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.

Cubitt, Hon. Henry

Hoare, Edward B.(Hampstead

Allsopp, Hon. George

Cust, Henry John C.

Hogg, Lindsay

Anson, Sir William Reynell

Dalkeith, Earl of

Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightsde

Archdale, Edward Mervyn

Dalrymple, Sir Charles

Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham

Howard, Capt J (Kent, Faversh.

Arrol, Sir William  
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph  
Howard, J.(Midx., Tottenh'm)  
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis  
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon  
Jessel, Captain H. Merton  
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Johnston, William (Belfast)  
Austin, Sir John  
Duke, Henry Edward  
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.  
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy  
Dyke, Rt. Hon Sir William Hart  
Keswick, William  
Bailey, James (Walworth)  
Faber, George Denison  
Kimber, Henry  
Bain, Col. James Robert  
Fardell, Sir T. Gorge  
King, Sir Henry Seymour  
Balcarres, Lord  
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.  
Lambton, Hon. Frederick W.  
Baldwin, Alfred  
Fergusson, Rt Hn Sir T. (Manc'r)  
Laurie, Lieut.-General  
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r  
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst  
Lawrence, William F.  
Banbury, Frederick George  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Lawson, John Grant  
Beach, Rt. Hn Sir M. H. (Bristol)  
Firbank, Joseph Thomas  
Lecky, Rt. Hon. Wm. E. H.  
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Lee, Capt. A. H. (Hants., Fare'm  
Bignold, Arthur  
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose-  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Bigwood, James  
Flannery, Sir Fortescue  
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie  
Bill, Charles

Fletcher, Sir Henry  
Leveson-Gower, Fred. N. S.  
Blundell, Colonel Henry  
Foster, Sir M. (London Univ.  
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (Bristol, S.)  
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)  
Garfit, William  
Lowe, Francis William  
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu  
Gibbs, Hn. A.G.H (CityofLond.  
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)  
Brown, Alex. H. (Shropshire)  
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Butcher, John George  
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft  
Cautley, Henry Strother  
Gordon, Maj. Evans-(TrH'mlts  
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth  
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)  
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon  
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred  
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire  
Gosehen, Hon. G. Joachim  
Macartney, RtHn. W.G. Ellis'n  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Goulding, Edward Alfred  
Macdona, John Camming  
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)  
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)  
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J (Birm.  
Greene, Sir EW (B'rySEdm'nds  
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinbu'ghW  
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc.  
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)  
Majendie, James A. H.  
Chapman, Edward  
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)  
Malcolm, Ian  
Churchill, Winston Spencer  
Gretton, John  
Manners, Lord Cecil  
Clare, Octavius Leigh  
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton

Maxwell, W.J.H. (Dumfriessh.  
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.  
Hain, Edward  
Melville, Beresford Valentine  
Cohen, Benjamin Louis  
Halsey, Thomas Frederick  
Mildmay, Francis Bingham  
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready  
Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G (Mid'x  
Milward, Colonel Victor  
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole  
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert W.  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Compton, Lord Alwyne  
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Cook, Frederick Lucas  
Haslett, Sir James Horner  
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy  
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow  
Hay, Hon. Claude George  
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire  
its liberty and freedom of discussion, and I think it is a great misfortune that  
the Liberal Opposition, who certainly ought to have the freedom and liberty of  
speech primarily under their charge instead of making an arrangement across the  
floor of this House, are not throwing the whole of their weight into the very  
serious development of the right hon. Gentleman's tactics.  
MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place and claimed to move, "That the Question be  
now put."  
Question put. "That the Question be now put."  
The House divided::Ayes, 208; Noes. 121. (Division List No. 68.)  
Morgan, David J (Walth'mstow  
Rentoul, James Alexander  
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridg  
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
Ridley, S Forde (Bethnal Green  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)  
Ritchie, Rt Hon Chas. Thomson  
Thorburn, Sir Walter  
Mount, William Arthur  
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.  
Thornton, Percy M.



Muntz, Philip A.  
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye  
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray  
Murray, Rt. Hon A. G. (Bute)  
Ropner, Colonel Robert  
Valentia, Viscount  
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)  
Round, James  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)  
Royds, Clement Molyneux  
Wanklyn, James Leslie  
Myers, William Henry  
Russell, T.W.  
Warr, Augustus Frederick  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
Mason, John C. (Orkney)  
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens  
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse  
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E (Taunt'n  
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay  
Seely, Chas. Hilton (Lincoln  
Welby, Sir C. G. E. (Notts)  
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)  
Seton Karr, Henry  
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John L.  
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley  
Sharpe, William Edward T.  
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-under-L)  
Penn, John  
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)  
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)  
Pierpoint, Robert  
Simeon, Sir Barrington  
Wilson, John (Falkirk)  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Skewes-Cox, Thomas  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp  
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)  
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)  
Pretymann, Ernest George  
Smith, James P. (Lanarks.)  
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm  
Purvis, Robert

Spear, John Ward  
Pym C. Guy  
Stanley, Lord (Lanes.)  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne  
Stock, James Henry  
Reid, James (Greenock)  
Stone, Sir Benjamin  
Remnant, James Farquharson  
Stroyan, John  
NOES.  
Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)  
Grant, Corrie  
O'Malley, William  
Allan, William (Gateshead)  
Haldane, Richard Burdon  
O'Mara, James  
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud  
Hammond, John  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Ambrose, Robert  
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil  
O'Shee, James John  
Asquith, Rt. Hn Herbert Henry  
Harmsworth, R. Leicester  
Price Robert John  
Barlow, John Emmott  
Hayden, John Patrick  
Priestley, Arthur  
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)  
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-  
Reckitt, Harold James  
Bell, Richard  
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.  
Reddy, M.  
Blake, Edward  
Holland, William Henry  
Redmond, John E.(Waterford)  
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.  
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Brigg, John  
Jacoby, James Alfred  
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries  
Brown, George M.(Edinburgh)  
Joicey, Sir James

Rickett, J. Compton  
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson  
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)  
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Jordan, Jeremiah  
Robson, William Snowdon  
Burns, John  
Kearley, Hudson E.  
Roche, John  
Burt, Thomas  
Kennedy, Patrick James  
Schwann, Charles E.  
Buxton, Sydney Charles  
Kinloch, Sir John Geo. Smyth  
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)  
Caine, William Sproston  
Lambert, George  
Shipman, Dr. John G.  
Caldwell, James  
Layland-Barratt, Francis  
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Leamy, Edmund  
Soames, Arthur Wellesley  
Carew, James Laurence  
Leng, Sir John  
Stevenson, Francis S.  
Causton, Richard Knight  
Lloyd-George, David  
Strachey, Edward  
Clancy, John Joseph  
Lough, Thomas  
Sullivan, Donal  
Colville, John  
Lowther, Rt. Hon. Jas.(Kent)  
Taylor, Theodore Cooke  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Lundon, W.  
Thompson, E. C. (Monaghan, N.  
Crean, Eugene  
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.  
Trevelyan, Charles Philips  
Cremer, William Randal  
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)  
Tully, Jasper

Crombie, John William  
M'Cann, James  
Wallace, Robert  
Dalziel, James Henry  
M'Dermott, Patrick  
Walton, John L. (Leeds, S.)  
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)  
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)  
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)  
Doogan, P. C.  
Markham, Arthur Basil  
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.  
Duncan, James H.  
Mooney, John J.  
Weir, James Galloway  
Elibank, Master of  
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)  
White, Luke (York, E. R.)  
Fenwiek, Charles  
Moss, Samuel  
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)  
Ffrench, Peter  
Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.)  
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer  
Field, William  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)  
Flynn, James Christopher  
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)  
Yoxall, James Henry  
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)  
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipp'raryM'd  
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry  
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.  
Fuller, J. M. F.  
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)  
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. Herbt. J.  
O'Dowd, John  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon N.  
Question put accordingly, "That this House do now adjourn."  
The House divided::Ayes, 119; Noes, 205. (Division List No. 69.)  
AYES.  
Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.  
Goddard, Daniel Ford

O'Malley, William  
Allan, William (Gateshead)  
Grant, Corrie  
O'Mara, James  
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud  
Gurdon, Sir William Brampton  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Ambrose, Robert  
Haldane, Richard Burdon  
O'Shee, James John  
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert H.  
Hammond, John  
Price, Robert John  
Barlow, John Emmott  
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil  
Priestley, Arthur  
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)  
Harmsworth, R. Leicester  
Reckitt, Harold James  
Bell, Richard  
Hayden, John Patrick  
Reddy, M.  
Blake, Edward  
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-  
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)  
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.  
Hemphill, Bt. Hon. Charles H.  
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries)  
Brigg, John  
Holland, William Henry  
Rickett, J. Compton  
Brown, G. M. (Edinburgh)  
Jacoby, James Alfred  
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)  
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson  
Joicey, Sir James  
Robson, William Snowdon  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.  
Roche, John  
Burns, John  
Jordan, Jeremiah  
Schwann, Charles E.  
Burt, Thomas  
Kennedy, Patrick James  
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)

Buxton, Sydney Charles  
Kinloch, Sir John Geo. Smyth  
Shipman, Dr. John G.  
Caine, William Sproston  
Lambert, George  
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)  
Caldwell, James  
Layland-Barratt, Francis  
Soames, Arthur Wellesley  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Leamy, Edmund  
Stevenson, Francis S.  
Carew, James Laurence  
Leng, Sir John  
Strachey, Edward  
Causton, Richard Knight  
Lloyd-George, David  
Sullivan, Donal  
Clancy, John Joseph  
Lowther, Rt. Hn. James (Kent)  
Taylor, Theodore Cooke  
Colville, John  
Lundon, W.  
Thompson, E.C. (Monaghan, N.  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.  
Trevelyan, Charles Philips  
Crean, Eugene  
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall  
Tully, Jasper  
Cremer, William Randal  
M'Cann, James  
Wallace, Robert  
Crombie, John William  
M'Dermott, Patrick  
Walton, John L. (Leeds, S.)  
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)  
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)  
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)  
Donelan, Captain A.  
Markham, Arthur Basil  
Warner, Thos. Courtenay T.  
Doogan, P. C.  
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport  
Weir, James Galloway  
Duncan, James H.

Moss, Samuel  
White, Luke (York, E. R.)  
Elibank, Master of  
Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.)  
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)  
Fenwick, Charles  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer  
Ffrench, Peter  
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)  
Wilson, F. W. (Norfolk, Mid.)  
Field, William  
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid)  
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)  
Flynn, James Christopher  
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)  
Yoxall, James Henry  
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.  
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.  
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry  
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;Mr. Lough and Mr. Wm. Redmond.  
Fuller, J. M. F.  
O'Dowd, John  
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert J.  
O'Kelly, J. (Roscommon, N.  
NOES.  
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.  
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)  
Faber, George Denison  
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel  
Cavendish, V.C.W (Derbyshire  
Fardell, Sir T. George  
Allhusen, Augustus Hy. Fden  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.  
Allsopp, Hon. George  
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)  
Fergusson, Rt. Hn Sir. J (Manc'r)  
Anson, Sir William Reynell  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)  
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst  
Archdale, Edward Mervyn  
Chamberlain, J. A. (Worc'r)  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Arkwright, John Stanhope

Chapman, Edward  
Firbank, Joseph Thomas  
Arrol, Sir William  
Churchill, Winston Spencer  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John  
Clare, Octavius Leigh  
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-  
Austin, Sir John  
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.  
Flannery, Sir Fortescue  
Bagot Capt. Josceline FitzRoy  
Cohen, Benjamin Louis  
Fletcher, Sir Henry  
Bailey, James (Walworth)  
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready  
Foster Sir M. (Lond. Univ.)  
Bain, Colonel James Robert  
Colston, Chas. E. H. Athole  
Garfit, William  
Balcarres, Lord  
Compton, Lord Alwyne  
Gibbs, Hn. A.G.H. (City of Lond  
Baldwin, Alfred  
Cook, Frederick Lucas  
Gibbs, Hn. Vicary (St. Albans  
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r  
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)  
Gordon, Hn. J E. (Elgin&Nairn)  
Banbury, Frederick George  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Gordon, Maj Evans-(Tr Hamlts  
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H (Bristol)  
Cripps, Charles Alfred  
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon  
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.  
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)  
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim  
Bignold, Arthur  
Cubitt, Hon. Henry  
Goulding, Edward Alfred  
Bigwood, James  
Cust, Henry John C.  
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)  
Bill, Charles  
Dalkieth, Earl of



Greene, Sir E. W. (Bury St. Ed.  
Blundell, Colonel Henry  
Dalrymple, Sir Charles  
Greene, H. D. (Shrewsbury)  
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex  
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)  
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs)  
Brookfield, Col. Montagu  
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred D.  
Gretton, John  
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Hain, Edward  
Butcher, John George  
Duke, Henry Edward  
Halsey, Thomas Frederick  
Cautley, Henry Strother  
Dyke, Rt. Hon, Sir Wm. H.  
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Mid'x.  
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Rbt. Wm.  
Manners, Lord Cecil  
Round, James  
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd  
Maxwell, W. J.H. (Dumfriessh.  
Royds, Clement Molyneux  
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th.  
Melville, Beresford Valentine  
Russel, T. W.  
Haslett, Sir James Horner  
Mildmay, Francis Bingham  
Sackville, Col. S.G. Stopford-  
Hay, Hon. Claude George  
Mil ward, Colonel Victor  
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)  
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Seton Karr, Henry  
Heaton, John Henniker  
Montagu, G (Huntingdon)  
Sharpe, William Edward T.  
Helder, Augustus  
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy  
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)  
Hoare, E. Brodie (Hampstead)  
More, Robt. Jasper(Shropshire)  
Simeon, Sir Barrington

Hogg, Lindsay  
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)  
Skewes-Cox, Thomas  
Hope, J. F.(Sheffi'ld,Brightside  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)  
Houldsworth, Sir Wm.Henry  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
Smith,. James Parker(Lanarks.)  
Howard, Capt. J.(Faversham)  
Morton, ArthurH. A. (Deptford  
Spear, John Ward  
Howard,J.(Midd., Tottenham  
Mount, William Arthur  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Jessel, CaptainHerbertMerton  
Muntz, Philip A.  
Stock, James Henry  
Johnston, William (Belfast)  
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham(Bute  
Stone, Sir Benjamin  
Kenyon-Slaney, Col.W.(Salop  
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)  
Stroyan, John  
Keswick, William  
Murray, Col.Wyndham (Bath)  
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley  
Kimher, Henry  
Myers, William Henry  
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier  
King, Sir Henry Seymour  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
Lambton, Hon. Fredk. Wm.  
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens  
Thorburn, Sir Walter  
Laurie, Lieut.-General  
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay  
Thornton, Percy M.  
Lawrence, William F.  
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)  
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray  
Lawson, John Grant  
Peel, Hn. Wm. Rbt. Wellesley  
Valentia, Viscount  
Lecky, Rt. Hn. William Edwill.

Penn, John  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Lee, Capt. A. H. (Hants, Fare'm  
Pierpoint, Robert  
Wanklyn, James Leslie  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Warr, Augustus Frederick  
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie  
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp  
Wason, J. Cathcart (Orkney)  
Leveson-Gower, Frederick M.S.  
Pretymann, Ernest George  
Welby, Lt-Col. A.C. E. (Taunton  
Long, Rt. Hon. Walter (Bristol, S)  
Purvis, Robert  
Welby, Sir C. G. E. (Notts.)  
Lowe, Francis William  
Pym, C. Guy  
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd  
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)  
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne  
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne)  
Lloyd, Archie Kirkman  
Reid, James (Greenock)  
Wilson, A. S. (York. E. R.)  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)  
Remnant, James Farquharson  
Wilson, John (Falkirk)  
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth  
Rentoul, James Alexander  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred  
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge  
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks)  
Macartney, Rt Hon W. G. Ellison  
Ridley, S Forde (Bethnal Green  
Wolff, Gustily Wilhelm  
Macdonald, John Cummin  
Ritchie, Rt Hon. Chas. Thomson  
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)  
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
M'Ilver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W  
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye  
Majendie, James A. H.

Ropner, Colonel Robert  
Malcolm, Ian  
Rothschild, Hn. Lionel Walter  
SUPPLY;NAVY ESTIMATES.  
Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair.";(Mr. Arnold-Forster.)

\*THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast. W.): The House has for many years had the advantage of having the Navy Estimates introduced to it not only by the First Lord, but by a First Lord whose record of service is of peculiar and almost unique experience in the House; and as it happens that I am commissioned to perform the duties which Mr. Goschen so often performed with such great success in this House, perhaps it may be permitted to me to say a word with regard to the work done by Lord Goschen in connection with the Navy, because I believe his record of service is unique. He served for eight and a half years as

First Lord of the Admiralty in the House of Commons, and during every one of those years he added to his accumulated wealth of experience in regard to naval matters. I believe I am correct in saying that no civilian Minister who has ever had the honour of administering the affairs of the Admiralty ever more completely gained the confidence of the Naval service than Lord Goschen. I believe he understood to a most remarkable degree the feeling of all those serving in the Fleet, and I believe no Minister was ever more jealous for the preservation of those privileges and regarded more carefully those feelings. Knowing as I do the great regard in which Mr. Goschen was held in this House, knowing the high esteem in which he was held in the Navy, I can only say that I humbly associate myself with that feeling of respect as a Member of this House, and, as one temporarily connected with the great service of the Navy, with the feeling of the Navy. But while I desire to have him before me as an example, cannot help feeling that the fact that I, in a much less important position, have to undertake the task he performed with so much success places me in a somewhat difficult position; and I ask for, and think I shall obtain from the House, the indulgence which naturally is desired by one in so difficult a position. I think I shall merit that indulgence best if I do not attempt to embroider my theme by any matters that are not strictly relevant. My task will be made easier by the fact that my chief, the First Lord of the Admiralty, has already made a statement, very exhaustive and important, with regard to the plans of the Admiralty during the ensuing year. I do not think, however, it would be respectful to the House of Commons, which is asked to vote a sum of over £30,000,000, if I were to ask merely to be allowed to hold up that document and ask the House to receive it as read. I am not entitled to assume that every Member of this House has read that document; and, even if they had, I think they might justly demand from me an elucidation of some of the points referred to, and some enlargement of the propositions it contains. But I shall endeavour to avoid, as far as possible, going into any unnecessary detail, or wearying the House by reference to matters on which they can inform themselves

from the First Lord's Memorandum.

Now, I imagine what the House really wants to know is, very briefly, whether value has been obtained for the very large sum which the House, with great unanimity, has voted for the service of the Navy in past years, whether value is now being obtained for such sums as are being expended, and whether there is a reasonable probability that, if they grant the very large Supply which is asked for in the Estimates this year, that sum will be expended in strengthening the Navy and in additions to the Navy. I believe that I shall be able to give that assurance, and to supply facts which will convince hon. Members on both sides of the House that they

\*For "Statement of the First Lord of the Admiralty explanatory of the Navy Estimates, 1901&#x2013;1902,"see Appendix to this Volume.

are justified in acceding to what I admit is the very large sum which the Navy demands. My business is financial, but there is an old saying that an ounce of fact is worth a ton of theory, and though we may test the value of the Navy by the amount of the sums which we appropriate to its service, and may value the service it renders on the basis of the report which may be made by its representative in this House, we can value those services far better when we can put them to the test of actual fact. We must not shut our eyes to the fact that the Navy is maintained really for one purpose alone; that is, for carrying on successful war when war happens to be unhappily necessary for this country. [An HON. MEMBER: To prevent war. My hon. friend very truly says that the object of the Navy is to prevent war, but it can only prevent war by being an efficient instrument for the conduct of war when war takes place.

We have had during the, last twelve months some evidence that tends to show that the Navy is adequate for the purpose for which, we maintain it and to which we devote such large sums. We have had the operations in China, in connection with the relief of the Legations in Peking, and I think it is permissible for me to say one word with regard to those operations. I am happy to say; and I hope the House will understand that on this matter, and every other naval matter on which I speak. I am here as the mouthpiece of the Lords of the Admiralty, who instruct me, and by whom I am bound to be instructed, with regard to the technical matters of the Navy. They tell me, and I gladly accept what I think we all know to be the fact, that the conduct of the naval contingent in China has been admirable and excellent, that the gallantry of the naval contingent which followed Admiral Seymour and attempted to relieve Peking was all that we could desire from British sailors, and that the subsequent conduct of the naval detachment which was under the orders of General Gaselee was equally creditable to the Navy. I do not think it is in my province to make any selection where all have done so well; but I am permitted to make special reference to the gallant behaviour of a party of

some forty-eight of the Royal Marines who attacked and took, against great odds, the military college in the neighbourhood of Peking on the occasion of Admiral Seymour's advance. The testimony of a post-captain in the Royal Navy, which every man serving in the Navy will appreciate, was that these gallant Marines, when they attacked this fortification, climbed the walls as coolly as if they

were bird-nesting. I must not leave the subject of active operations in China without one word of tribute to the effective service which was rendered by the Australian contingent. For the first time, I believe, since the war of 1812, we have had a colonial naval contingent taking an active and effective part in the naval work of this Empire. We have had three Australian contingents. We have had the contribution of His Majesty's ship "Protector" and two other Australian contingents from New South Wales and Victoria, both taking part in the advance on Peking; and we have but one testimony, both from the naval and military officers concerned, as to the effective service rendered by these men and the excellent behaviour of the men. I confess I permit myself to hope that this remarkable precedent, which has been set almost on the day of the birth of the great Commonwealth of Australia, may at some no distant day be imitated with advantage to the Empire by the equally great Dominion of Canada.

Passing from this very brief illustration of the power of the Navy to render those services which we rely on it to render in case of emergency, I come to what is strictly my business, the exposition of the financial aspect of the naval expenditure during the coming year. The sum which the House of Commons is asked to vote is unprecedented; it is larger, I believe, than any sum, which it has ever been asked to vote to the service of the Fleet: but I think I shall be able to give good reasons why Parliament should assent to that expenditure. The total expenditure which the House is asked to vote is £30,875,676, as compared with £27,522,600 in the past year. But, in order to make that statement of figures absolutely fair, it is necessary to add on to the expenditure of last year the additional Estimate which was asked for by the First Lord, at a late period of the session, for certain specific purposes, a sum which does not come into the category of a Supplementary Estimate, and which was added to the original Estimate before it was finally sanctioned by the House. That additional Estimate of last year amounted to £1,169,300, giving a total for last year of £28,691,900, as compared with this year's Estimate of £30,875,676, or a net increase for the coming financial year of £2,183,776. I have not added on to those figures the Supplementary Estimate which has been asked for, and agreed to by the House of Commons during the present year. The items of the Supplementary Estimate have been explained very fully to the House by my hon. friend the Civil Lord: and he has shown that they were without exception due to unforeseen circumstances which could not have been contemplated at the time when the original Estimates, or when the additional Estimates, were presented to the House. I should not like to take upon myself to say that there is no possibility that unforeseen circumstances will not arise during the year to entail an equivalent Estimate. I think hon. Members will agree that it is fair to compare the original and additional Estimate of last year with the Estimate I am now submitting to the House, and from those figures we get this increase of £2,183,776.

The House will want some explanation of this very large increase in the Estimate. The House will want to know, when they are consenting to vote over £2,000,000 increase, whether all this money is being expended for the one purpose in which it is interested, namely, the effective strengthening of the

Navy. I believe that I can give that assurance to the House. A portion of the increase, of course, cannot be classed under the head of an effecting increase for the strengthening of the Navy, as there was an increase in prices. There was a large increase in the price of coal last year, which was met by a Supplementary Estimate. There was a certain increase in the price of stores and clothing which also went to the Supplementary Estimate; but I am happy to say that, unless our anticipations prove incorrect, these items will be substantially diminished during the forthcoming year. Additional expenditure without additional advantage to the Navy will be diminished in the year to come. There may be, no doubt, a certain amount of increase owing to the continuance of the war in South Africa, and there may be items owing to the disturbed state of things in China which we are not able to foresee; but whatever is spent on these heads I cannot pretend is an effective addition to the resources of the Navy. Setting aside all these matters, there is a large remaining addition which I believe will be expended in making the Navy stronger next year than it was last year.

There is an addition to the vote for personnel, the men, and officers of the Navy, of £;233,000. There is an addition to the other two important Votes which appear in the Estimates; Votes 8 and 9 ; which are concerned with the construction of ships and with the guns of the Navy; which amounts to £;1,274,000 and £;161,000 respectively, or, roughly speaking, a total of £;1,436,000. I contend that an addition of £;233,000 for personnel is a pure addition to the strength of the Navy. There is, in addition to this, another sum with reference to which I do not propose to trouble the House. That is the addition which will, I hope, be made under the head of the Works Loan Bill of the Navy. That is a matter which my hon. friend the Civil Lord will deal with at a later stage; but I think he will be able to assure the House that, whatever the amount of the addition which he may have to disclose, all of it will be spent on increasing what I may call the plant of the Navy. Now. I should like to speak first with regard to the personnel of the Navy. The increase proposed for personnel in the Estimate includes an increase of 287 officers, 1,150 seamen, 1,000 Marines, 500 stokers, 100 electricians, and one or two other small additions. There have been also other additions to the Reserves. But what I desire to speak of at a little more length, and what the House will desire to know before I go into the small amount of detail into which I propose to go, is the net result upon the total available resources of men available for manning the Fleet in case of war, because here we come in contact with the root fact of the situation; the position of the Navy in the event of war. We shall have, we hope, 118,625 men upon the active list of the Navy. We shall have 28,650 men in the Royal Naval Reserve, and we shall have, if our anticipations are fulfilled, during the financial year, 7,300 men of the Royal Fleet Reserve, or a total of 154,575 men available for manning the Fleet.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport): Exclusive of the Seamen's Pensioners Reserve?

\*MR. ARNOLD- FORSTER: The number of seamen pensioners at present is 10,000 men. We offer to all those men who are eligible the opportunity of entering the Royal Fleet Reserve and an opportunity of entering the Royal Naval Reserve. We have

reason to believe that, excluding those who on account of age are not eligible there will be an entry of something like 5,000 out of those 10,000 men into the Royal Fleet Reserve. The remaining 5,000 men will remain as they are now, classed as seamen pensioners; and I hope they will be able in an emergency to render valuable service. But I have not taken this residue into account in computing what I consider to be the effective number of men for the service of the Fleet in time of war. The hon. Member will understand that I have not counted anybody twice. On the other hand, I have omitted to count the 5,000 seamen pensioners. I am glad that the First Lord and the Board of Admiralty have decided to make this attempt to raise the Royal Fleet Reserve. I entertain a personal opinion, which I believe is shared by others, that it is a heavy tax on this or on any other country to maintain 112,000 men on the active list for service in the Fleet. It is difficult to train them and to employ them in time of peace; but, on the other hand, every naval officer knows, and everyone interested in the service knows, that the value of trained men in time of war cannot be exaggerated.

We are confronted by two alternatives: whether we shall go on adding indefinitely to this great burden; and it is a great burden; or whether we shall seek to obtain from some other source, an addition to that force eligible for service in time of war which shall have the same qualities as the trained men we have under the present system. I believe it will be found that in the Royal Fleet Reserve which it is now proposed to establish we shall have at any rate a partial solution of that somewhat difficult problem.

There are many hon. Members who are interested in another branch of the Reserve, and that is the Royal Naval Reserve, which now stands at 28,650 men. In the First Lord's statement it is recited that there has been a difficulty in recruiting for the Royal Naval Reserve up to the full strength which we desire it to attain, and that the proposals which were made not long ago in the House for improving the efficiency of the Royal Naval Reserve have not proved as satisfactory in their working as we desired. It has been found that the conditions which were imposed on the Royal Naval Reserve were too onerous, or, put in another way, they were not sufficiently attractive to bring men into the Naval Reserve to the extent we desired. The Admiralty has reckoned with that fact, and they have immediately taken steps to remedy the state of things they deplore. The terms offered to the seamen of the Royal Naval Reserve have been modified. Under the old regime they were conditions which did not prove satisfactory to the men. The pay of 1s. 3d. a day was, I think, considered insufficient in itself for men who were asked to vacate their ordinary vocations for a period of six months. The six months training at sea was regarded as too long by the men, and I am informed that the withdrawal of the gratuity of 10s. a month paid to the men of the Royal Naval Reserve under the old system operated adversely to the force. The fifteen months compulsory service at sea was not regarded with favour; the fifteen months, I mean, which entitled them to qualify for the full pension under the old system. All these facts have been carefully considered by the Admiral Superintendent and the Board of Admiralty. Steps have



been taken which I think the Admiralty are right in believing will remedy the difficulty. The sea service of the Royal Naval Reserve has been reduced from six months to three months, and the total sea service from fifteen months to nine months. The gratuity of the men serving is at the rate of 20s. per month for each of the three months served, with a further gratuity of 40ss. at the end of the period, or a total sum of £5. I expect that my hon. and gallant friends who criticise the proposal will say that the reduction of the period of training at sea from six to three months is inadvisable, but we ask them to reconsider that opinion, because in the opinion of the most competent officers of the Fleet that will not be so. Under the old system many men were called upon to serve in ordinary seagoing ships of the Navy, and the complaint was made, whether justified or not I do not say, that the duties which the men were called upon to perform were neither interesting nor dignified in their character, and were not such as to encourage men to undergo them voluntarily. It is now proposed to put the whole of the Royal Naval Reserve men who come up for their period of three months training under the direct control of the Admiral Superintendent of the Naval Reserve, who will embark them in coastguard ships, giving them during the three months training the full course of which that period allows, and who will demand from them; that which I believe they will be perfectly willing to give; the performance of the ordinary routine of bluejackets' life, and that efficiency which they are required to furnish for the service of the country. By this means we believe the efficiency of the Royal Naval Reserve will be restored and its numbers raised.

With regard to the Royal Fleet Reserve. I think in one respect it is an absolutely new departure. The Royal Fleet Reserve is to be composed entirely of trained men. At the commencement we are to draw it from two sources. There is the Seamen Pensioners Reserve, which is composed of men who have served their apprenticeship in the Navy and who are now in receipt of pensions, and are under the liability to serve in case of war. We offer to such of these men as are eligible the opportunity of entering the Fleet Reserve. If they do so, they will undoubtedly receive advantages which they have not received while members of the Reserve in receipt of pensions. Their period of drill will be reduced from two weeks to one week; they will have a gratuitous issue of clothing, or in lieu of that a sum of 10s., and they will have the higher rate of continuous service pay as opposed to non-continuous service pay. But we do not depend on the seamen pensioners for manning the Fleet Reserve; we rely on taking a certain number of that Reserve, and for the future we shall ask all seamen pensioners to enter the Fleet Reserve. We shall make it compulsory upon them to enter the Fleet Reserve. We throw open this opportunity to all seamen who have served twelve years, and to those who have served for a lesser period and who have left the Navy with a good character and have received a recommendation from the commander-in-chief of the station. We reckon that during the present year we shall bring up the total of these two classes to 7,000, and that eventually we shall raise the number of class "B," that is to say the number exclusive of seamen pensioners, to 15,000. I want the House to understand that all these men will be exceedingly valuable to the Navy, for all will have gone through a full probation of a long period on

ships at sea during their lives. I venture to make this remark. Suppose this country is in difficulties and dangers and in the competition of preparation for eventualities I think we cannot overrate the advantage which is given us by the possession of a great amount of trained material.

\*MR. WILLIAM ALLAN (Gateshead): And what about the engineers and stokers in the service?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I know the hon. Member's interest in that subject, but he must allow me to deal with it later on. I am now dealing with the Fleet Reserve.

I think any seaman and any man acquainted with naval matters will admit that the difference between a trained and untrained crew is enormous, and it will be invaluable to the Navy if we can add 15,000 trained men as we propose.

While I am dealing with the personnel, let me mention certain other arrangements. Questions have been asked on various occasions in regard to warrant officers, and I mention these in passing, for I know questions will be asked as to whether anything has been done in redemption of pledges frequently given. To such I have to say that the subject has received the very careful consideration of the Admiralty and that a Committee has been appointed, which Committee will, I hope, shortly report on the whole question of the Naval Ordnance Store Department, and I hope as the result of the labours of that Committee that opportunity will be presented to us for giving further employment to warrant officers, whose claims have so often been advocated in the House of Commons. There is another matter mentioned in the First Lord's statement; and I only mention this in passing as emblematic of the progress made on the scientific side of organisation in the Fleet; is that of the rating of electricians. This is a new rating, on which I hope we shall maintain 100 in the present year and 100 subsequently. The enormous development in the electrical department of a ship has necessitated this outside rating. These men will pass through examination into the Navy and will form, I hope, a valuable contribution to the staff of torpedo lieutenants in ships.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY (Yorkshire, Shipley) asked if they would be rated as engineers or as executive officers.

\*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: They will be rated as petty officers and chief petty officers, assistants to torpedo lieutenants, in connection with the large amount of electrical gear they have to superintend on ships. I thought the hon. Member was going to ask me about engineers. I am aware that the whole question of the position of engineer's in the Navy has attracted the serious attention of Members of the House, and none more than of the hon. Member for Shipley, and perhaps those hon. Members will not take it amiss of me if I ask leave not to go into this matter at length to-night. The hon. Member and others know what has been

done for engineers in the present year, and I am aware that what has been done has not given entire satisfaction to engineers in the Navy and those who claim to be their representatives. But the subject is much too wide and much too important for me to attempt to deal with it on an occasion like this. It will be raised at a later stage of the Navy Estimates, and I feel that I should be wasting time if I endeavoured to deal with it at the present time in the manner

hon. Members interested would wish me to deal with it. I will only say this. The question of dealing with the position of engineers in the Navy is a very difficult one. I have done my best to make myself personally acquainted with it. The difficulties we have felt, however, are not peculiar to our own Navy; they have been experienced in all the European navies and in the United States; and if we are cautious in dealing with the matter, and if I hesitate to pronounce an opinion on it, I hope that hon. Members will not charge me with being recalcitrant. The difficulty which we feel has been, and is, felt by others. There remains one matter of great interest to the House in connection with the personnel, and a statement has been made in the House, which, if carried into effect, would largely touch the question of the personnel of the Navy, and that is the question of furnishing protection for coaling stations. This matter has been mentioned by my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War, and my right hon. friend has stated that in his personal view it is desirable that the Navy should undertake to find the men for garrisoning certain coaling stations. I think he made it clear to the House, and, if he did not, I desire to do so, that the view expressed by the Secretary of State was, to a certain extent, a personal view. The view expressed by a Secretary of State for War is, of course, of very great weight, but it is also fair to state, as he said, that this matter has yet to receive the careful consideration of the Admiralty authorities. The Board of Admiralty is most anxious in this, as in all other matters, to co-operate with every other department for the service of our country, but they feel entitled and, indeed, bound to consider whether they can effectively contribute to the service of the country in this particular manner. I know I am correct in stating that the Lords of the Admiralty have not up to the present moment been able to examine with the minuteness so important a project deserves the whole of the bearings of this very grave proposition. It will be the duty of the Admiralty to review the subject in all its bearings, and I hope the House will accept my promise that when it is so reviewed they will be informed of the result; but I ask them not to anticipate the view of the Admiralty at the present stage.

I pass from the question of personnel with a few remarks upon a subject in which my hon. friend the Member for Yarmouth and others take great interest; the training of officers. The Admiralty have laid on the Table a Report with regard to the training of executive officers, which, no doubt, will be discussed at the proper time. I believe it to be a bon&#x00E2; fide contribution towards the solution of a very difficult question, and I believe it will greatly relieve the situation. I do not pretend that it goes over the whole subject; it does not touch the age of the entrance of cadets to the "Britannia," or the education to be given to lieutenants in the second course at Greenwich. It does not throw any light on a matter which has received the earnest consideration of the Admiralty, the matter of the prescribed course of the torpedo and gunnery lieutenants at Greenwich. It has been suggested that the time there is too great, that some of the subjects are too complex and too little connected with the service of the Navy at sea and that the whole curriculum might be amended with advantage. I shall have something to say when that question is raised, but I wish the House

to understand that the Report does not represent the whole of the consideration which has been given to it by the Admiralty, and when the question is raised I shall be prepared to state the views of the Admiralty in regard to every aspect of the matter.

Passing now from the question of personnel to that of materiel, I must mention Vote 9, the vote for guns and projectiles, on which an increase of £161,000 is asked for, The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Forest of Dean has sometimes criticised, with the great knowledge he possesses, the quality of our guns, and other hon. Members have criticised with absolute justice the delays in the delivery of our guns. I am glad to say those difficulties have passed away. We have caught up in the matter of guns, and delivery is now taking place with absolute regularity, and the quality of the guns is, I believe, all that could be desired. The new 7.5 gun referred to in the First Lord's statement is equal, if not superior, in ballistic power and general efficiency to similar guns of any foreign Power. Last year we asked for an additional sum for armour-piercing projectiles. I believe I can tell the House that that money is well spent, that these armour-piercing projectiles are absolutely essential to the efficiency of the Fleet, and that we are now in a fair way, for the first time, of supplying the Fleet with a full and adequate supply of these projectiles, without which no Admiralty would like, under present circumstances, to send the Fleet into action. The question of a new powder, a very important question - is under the consideration of the Explosives Committee, and we hope that a decision will be arrived at at a very early date. We hope and believe that that decision will enable us to furnish for our magazines a powder which, while it will be equal, if not superior, to the cordite now in use, will be less destructive than that powder now is of the tubes of the guns in which it is used. Perhaps I may mention at this stage that the system of gunnery training has been very largely improved, and that we are making arrangements by which the amount of ammunition at the disposal of officers commanding all ships, and gunnery training ships especially, will be largely increased. We are directing our efforts towards forming a school of gunnery at sea, while doing nothing to detract from the high state of efficiency of the gunnery training ships "Whale Island" and "Excellent," and the "Cambridge" at home; and we have introduced a system of encouragement and rewards, guided by selection, for those men who are competent to aim a gun, a very rare and very precious accomplishment; and we believe it will be of inestimable value to the Fleet in time of war.

We have asked the House to sanction considerable expenditure for anchors and moorings in connection with the new harbours for which you are asked to vote money, and for part of which you have already voted money. We are taking steps to do what is a most important thing; that is, to render the coaling arrangements for the Fleet, not only at home stations but throughout the world, adequate to the growing needs of our Navy. I come now to a matter which is also of great interest. I refer to the question of construction. But before I enter upon this subject I should like to make an announcement which, I think, will be of interest to some hon. Members of this House. We have year by year heard attacks made, which I am not prepared to say were wholly unjustifiable, on the arming of

ships with muzzle-loading guns; a class of gun which, hon. Members know, has long ceased to rank, to put it mildly, in the first place among the navies of the world. There is a Return associated with the name of my right hon. friend the Member for the Forest of Dean of ships of this and of foreign countries, and I think it will be some consolation not only to him, but to others, to know that from that Return there have been struck off the list of so-called effective ships of the Navy, no less than sixteen vessels; the "Triumph," the "Invincible," the "Audacious," the "Northumberland," the "Agincourt," the "Achilles," the "Minotaur," the "Black Prince," the "Warrior," the "Belleisle," the "Hydra," the "Neptune," the "Swiftsure," the "Iron Duke," the "Nelson," and the "Northampton." Some ships partly armed with muzzle-loading guns remain on the list, and must remain until we have effective additions to the Navy-List. I may mention the case of the "Alexandra," which carries twelve 6-inch breech-loading guns, as well as twelve very heavy muzzle-loading guns, and it will be realised that there are conditions in which this ship might be utilised and might be a formidable addition to any squadron to which she was attached.

I now come to the question of construction. We are asking for a Vote of a sum of over nine millions sterling, the largest sum that has ever yet been asked for construction in the Royal Navy. [An HON. MEMBER: New construction?] I am speaking of ships which are under construction and ships which are proposed to be commenced. Both come: technically under the head of new construction. We have now built or commenced since a period which is well within the recollection of hon. Members; that is to say, the completion of the class of ship of which the "Majestic" was a type; we have completed or commenced, or asked authority to commence, twenty-three battleships. Of these five; the "Canopus," the "Glory," the "Albion," the "Goliath," and the "Ocean"; are now completed. Others are in various stages of completion, and we are asking authority to commence three more battleships, for which the design is not yet settled. As to cruisers, since the completion of the "Diadem" class we have asked authority to commence thirty. Of these a large majority are of the armoured cruiser class; a vessel which is very greatly required in the Royal Navy at the present time. One of these, the "Cressy," is already completed, and a large number of them are in an advanced stage of building, and, we hope, will be available for service to the Navy at an early date. But when I speak of construction, I picture to myself what is the reflection which is in the mind of almost every hon. Member who hears me. They will say; "What about delay in the construction?" I want to say a word which, I think, will make it easier to discuss this question at a later stage. These delays are, of course, owing to very various causes. I believe I am justified in stating that the causes which have been responsible for these delays have diminished, are diminishing, and will pass away altogether. Of course, one of the greatest causes of delay was the delay in the supply of armour. I have taken great pains to inform myself as to who was responsible for the delay in the supply of the armour. I believe that the answer to that problem is this; that the great change in the form of the armour used is the real reason for the delay in completion. The whole method of making armour was revolutionised when first Harveyised plates, and, secondly, the Krupp system, was introduced into the

Navy. In

order to produce that kind of armour the whole plant of the armour-makers had practically to be reconstructed, and that work took time. It has been said that if the Admiralty had been awake, if they had given a pledge to the makers of armour that they would take so much armour from them in any particular year, they would have had the armour at an earlier date. I do not think that is the fact. It is not in the power of the Admiralty without legislation by this House to give any pledge of the kind. But an equivalent pledge was given when a large programme of armed battleships and armed cruisers was announced, and it had the effect that the Admiralty thought it would have. These great armour-plate manufacturers accepted that pledge, and have expended enormous sums of money. I know of two firms each of which has expended a million sterling in adding to their plant for the construction of armour, and now, for the first time, we get the result in an enormously increased output. I have been down to see this armour as it has been delivered, and the House may take it from me that we are going to get a delivery of armour during the next year such as has never been paralleled during the last six or seven years.

In regard to the question of machinery, there has been undoubtedly a great deal of delay which has hampered the completion of the ships. With knowledge which I did not before possess, I repeat what has been said by those who have spoken before me, that a large part of that delay is still due to the engineers' strike. That may appear to be a far-fetched cause, but I come face to face with this fact. The whole of the ships of the "Diadem" class were ordered prior to that strike, and they were completed prior to the contract time. Then supervened the engineers' strike, and from that time not one single ship has been completed within the contract time. I think I am justified in connecting these two circumstances; and the evidence I receive enables me to connect them as a logical consequence; and to say that delay has resulted from the engineers' strike, which affected not only the output but the whole of the machinery supplied by the contractors for the production of the articles which

we required. I do not intend to dilate upon this question. What I want to say now is that who are all agreed that this question of arrears is deplorable. | There have been arrears; there are arrears. We have not built ships as quickly as we have wanted them built. But the amount of the delay is perhaps exaggerated. The arrears have not been anything approaching what we have been led to suppose by the criticisms in the press. I have particulars of the rate of building in all the great countries of Europe, and in the United States, and I find that we still hold our preeminence in the matter of rapidity in the building of our ships, though we have not gone back to that happy state when we built the "Royal Sovereign." The "Canopus," the "Goliath," and the "Ocean" have been built and completed in two years and eleven months, three years, and three years respectively, while Russian ships have taken eight years, or six years and three months. In France the "St. Louis" has taken five years and five months, and the "Gaulois" three years and nine months. The only Rower that has approached us has been Germany. [An HON. MEM-BEE: Japan.] That is another matter. They were ships built in this country. What I want to point out is this,

that if there has been delay in construction it has not been quite as serious as some hon. Members would have us suppose. But I admit frankly that there have been arrears; they are deplorable and ought to cease. I believe the Admiralty have taken steps in regard to this matter which will commend themselves to the House. The First Lord has appointed a Committee, of which I happen to be a member. Another member of that Committee is the Controller of the Navy, an officer who has a long and ample experience of everything that appertains to the ship construction of the Navy. But we have added to that Committee two gentlemen whose names are very familiar to this House; the hon. Member for Maidstone and Sir Thomas Sutherland. By selecting two shipowners accustomed to order their own ships, and to get them, we have made the best selection we could. I am anxious that the real facts of the case should be ascertained, and that we should get at the bottom of the question of whether everything has been done which might have been done by the Admiralty with regard to the building of ships. I am bound to say, on behalf of the Department I am associated with, that I do not believe we shall find, and, as far as our researches have gone, who have not found, that there have been much more than natural causes at work, and that, although the procedure of the Admiralty has occasionally gone hardly with certain firms, whose whole effort has not been devoted to building for the Admiralty, in the majority of cases the arrangements of the Admiralty have been found reasonable and workable, and the difficulties which have supervened have been difficulties due to circumstances outside the control of the Admiralty or the contractors. If that be not so, we are in the way to find out the facts. We have invited the representatives of all the great firms to come and state their own cases and give their evidence frankly and openly.

Having got over, as far as we can, the question of arrears, we are venturing upon a new programme. We propose to commence during the coming year three battleships, six first-class armoured cruisers, two third-class armoured cruisers, ten destroyers, five torpedo-boats, two sloops, and five submarine vessels. I will not say much about submarine vessels, but I will say that I am glad that the Admiralty, under the advice of Lord Gosehen, took the view that it was wise not to be found unprepared in regard to this matter. We have a great amount of information about these boats, but we do not attach an exaggerated value to it. But who believe that an ounce of practice is worth a ton of theory, and that when we get officers and men to see these boats they will learn more from them than from many reports which come from foreign countries. One thing stands between the submarine boat and efficiency, and that is the motor by which it is propelled. But there is no disguising the fact, that if you can add speed to the other qualities of the submarine boat, it might, in certain circumstances, become a very formidable vessel. We are comforted by the judgment of the United

States and Germany, which is hostile to these inventions, which I confess desire shall never prosper. But we cannot regard our position as the same as that of other nations. The United States to-morrow, if a perfect submarine were invented, would only have more secure protection for their harbours. In Germany the harbours are no doubt carefully protected now. But we live in the narrow

waters of the Channel, and our problem is not precisely that of any other nation, and I am glad that Lord Goschen did give this instruction to the Board which has now borne fruit in this determination to put this experiment into execution and we shall see the result of it during the next financial year. Now I come to the last point; that of boilers, which has very justly and rightly been agitating the minds of many outside as well as inside the House. The facts have already been revealed in the Memorandum presented to this House in the Report of the Boilers Committee. I believe the House has but one view on the boiler question; that is. that the only solution which will be satisfactory is that which will give an absolutely secure boiler to His Majesty's Fleet, and they will not be content with anything less. I think we must consider for a moment what the situation is. There have been many complaints, in this House and outside, against the Belleville boiler. I saw the very first Belleville boiler which was placed in a French ship of war, and I have followed the question with no less interest than the hon. Member opposite ever since they have been introduced into the British Navy. I do not desire to blame those responsible for the introduction of those boilers into our Navy. I believe it would be disastrous to penalise any officer for venturing to accept responsibility. In justification of those responsible I will say that a Committee, of which the competence is acknowledged, has endorsed their conclusion that the water-tube boiler should be introduced in ships of war. And this is not only the conclusion of this Committee, but of every advisory board of every Admiralty in Europe, Asia, and America. Therefore, I am not going to take upon myself to lay any blame upon those who introduced the water tube boiler. Many hon. Members were of opinion that the trials which had taken place were not adequate or satisfactory. We are all acquainted with the history of the question, and of the expression of opinion inside and outside this House. We know that, to the great satisfaction of Parliament, Mr. Goschen consented to appoint a Committee to inquire into the whole question. This Committee has issued an ad interim Report, which unequivocally condemns the Belleville boiler and says it was not the best. This places the Admiralty in a very peculiar position, for, while the Committee has condemned the Belleville boiler, it has added two recommendations which are entitled to equal weight. It is said that water-tube boilers are essential, that there are boilers other than the Belleville which might with advantage be used, but the Committee has not reported in favour of any of them. Indeed, up to the present moment the Committee has not had an opportunity of conducting experiments which would enable it to pronounce an opinion with regard to any one of these boilers. It is absolutely imperative that the Navy should be augmented and that the ships should not be delayed. The First Lord has done what was obviously a wise thing to do. He has stopped the construction of new ships for which boilers have not been constructed, and he has ordered an inquiry as to whether any other ships can be arrested with regard to their boilers the future type of which is not yet settled. Experiments are to be made with regard to the boiler which should be used in lieu of the Belleville boiler, and those experiments will be pressed forward with the greatest possible rapidity. But in the opinion of the Admiralty



it would be wrong to allow any delay in the completion of these ships to occur if such delay merely depended on a long series of experiments. There are two types of boilers which have already received the imprimatur of the German and the United States Admiralties respectively, and one of which has received, in addition, the favourable opinion of our own Admiralty; I refer to the Babcock and Wilcox boiler. This boiler has been adopted in the United States Navy, and it has the advantage

of having been successfully tried in a large number of ships of the mercantile marine. So we are not without data to go upon in introducing these boilers into the ships of the Navy. I have been to sea with these boilers. I have my own view of their merits. But it would be unfortunate if the House of Commons were to receive the impression from me that these boilers are what the hon. Member for Gateshead described them to be. The Report of the Committee is to this effect; that this is not the best type of boiler for His Majesty's ships; but they do not report that "it is murder to send men into the stokehold," or that the boilers "are so much scrap-iron"; and when I heard it stated that one of His Majesty's ships was drifting round a buoy in the East Indies, and I see reports from the commanding officer and the engineers of this very ship stating that there is absolutely nothing to complain of in the working of her boilers, that she has made under ordinary conditions and with bad coal a speed of 19 &#x00B7; 5 knots, and that she is just leaving for the Persian Gulf, the exaggeration does appear to me so gross that it is necessary to guard against the danger that might arise if we were to accept the whole of the views of the hon. Member for Gateshead. There are scores of ships of all kinds; battleships, cruisers, and mercantile ships; running every day and all day with these boilers; scores of ships running in European waters.

MR. WILLIAM ALLAN: Merchant ships?

\*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Yes, merchant ships. Great Japanese battleships have been out to the East, and battleships of our own have only within the last few days made runs with these boilers, which have given the greatest satisfaction. I have always held, and do believe, with regard to these boilers, that they have defects which are not equally common to all other boilers, and we must be very careful that we do not get another boiler which has the same defects and disadvantages. The House must not, however, believe that all the difficulties which are attributed to the manipulation of the Belleville boiler are peculiar to that boiler, for some of them are common to other boilers. I have said this in order to justify the position of the Admiralty. The position is this. They accept frankly and freely the Report of the Committee, and they intend to make the change the Committee has recommended. Moreover, they intend to make it retrospective, as far as it possibly can be without delaying the completion of His Majesty's ships. If it is found that there is some other boiler so manifestly superior to the Belleville boiler, it is still open to the Admiralty to put it into other ships in the course of time; but they will not be frightened into any weakening of His Majesty's Fleet in order to meet what they believe to be an exaggerated and fanciful view of the situation.

I know that many of the matters I have referred to cursorily will come up at

another stage, and I shall endeavour then to meet any criticisms that may be passed; but this I do believe, that perhaps not those who have heard me, but those, who have read the statement of the First Lord will agree that though there may be matters open to criticism and additions which commend themselves to hon. Members, these Navy Estimates for the year 1901 are a reasonable and adequate compliance with the wish of the nation that the Navy should be maintained at that high standard of efficiency which is inseparable from the safety of the State. There is this great satisfaction about discussing anything with regard to the Royal Navy, that, whoever may be the exponent of the views of the Admiralty, though he has opponents to meet, and though, no doubt, some of those who differ from him are far superior to him in knowledge of technical matters;

MR. WILLIAM ALLAN: Hear, hear.

\*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Yes, Sir, I will gladly make an exception of the hon. Member for Gateshead, with regard to the matter I have just been dealing with but I do not except him from my next remark, which is this, that all those engaged in the discussion of matters connected with the Navy are as sincerely anxious as the Admiralty itself to make the Navy more efficient;

MR. WILLIAM ALLAN: As I am.

\*MR ARNOLD-FORSTER: That is why I did not except you from this portion of my statement. We are all anxious to make the Navy more efficient, and to keep it up to the standard we all desire, and though we may differ we are all anxious for the same result.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: In obedience to what I understand is the general wish of the House, to which I gladly accede. I now ask leave to withdraw the motion before the House.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Resolved, That this House will immediately resolve itself into the Committee of Supply.;(Mr. A. J. Balfour.)

Considered in Committee;;

(In the Committee.)

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

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS REVISED SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1900&#x2013;1901.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a Supplementary Sum, not exceeding £;893,316, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31 st day of March, 1901, for the following Civil Services and Revenue Departments. viz.;;

CIVIL SERVICES.

Class V.

£;

Vote 3. Colonial Services

212,300

Vote 2. British Protectorates in Uganda, etc.

200,000

Class VII

Vote 1. Temporary Commissions

9,000

Class II.

Vote 23. Stationery and Printing

110,000

Vote 27. Secretary for Scotland, Office of  
100

Class III.

Vote 2. Miscellaneous Legal Expenses

400

Class IV.

Vote 5. Wallace Collection

3,333

Vote 8. London University

70

Class V.

Vote 1. Diplomatic and Consular Services

15,800

Vote 6. Treasury Chest Fund

66,108

Class VI.

Vote 1. Superannuation and Retired Allowances

10,000

Vote 5. Savings Banks and Friendly Societies Deficiencies

51.758

Class VII.

Vote 2. Miscellaneous Expenses

4,600

Vote 6. Local Loans Fund

4,337

Vote 7, Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York (Visit to the Colonies)

20,000

Vote 8. Funeral of Her late Majesty

35,500

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

Vote 2. Inland Revenue

20,000

Vote 3. Post Office

130,000

Vote 4. Post Office Packet Service

10

Total Civil Services and Revenue Departments

£;893,316

\*MR. LOUGH moved the reduction of the item by £;100. His desire in doing so was to ask some explanation from the Colonial Secretary with regard to the military

operations in Ashanti, of which very little was known in this country. Those military operations, we understood, were carried out entirely by black troops, who had not been employed on such an important expedition before, and were carried out very successfully, and he joined in the praise given to them for the way in which they had carried out their task. He, however, regarded war as a bad business, and a proof of bad diplomatists being in power, though when we got into war it had to be carried through in a businesslike manner. The Blue Book which had been distributed was almost completely filled with the record of military operations to which he desired to make no further reference, as his object was to consider the clauses which led to their being undertaken. Turning to the question of policy, the Colonial Secretary was responsible for the settlement of the country after the military expedition of 1896, which had led to the late war. A military expedition went up to Coomassie in 1895, and in connection with that expedition a great constitutional change took place in the government of Ashanti. After that expedition Ashanti was united with the Gold Coast; King Prempeh, who was acknowledged as over-lord by the other native kings, was forcibly removed from the country, a British Resident was appointed, and the natives were called upon to pay not only the cost of the expedition, but the war of twenty-three years before, when Sir Garnet Wolseley seized the country, in the shape of an annual tribute.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): No, no. They were called upon to pay £12,500 per annum.

\*MR. LOUGH said that was for the old war. The natives were required to pay a capital sum of £250,000, and they were also asked to pay the cost of the expedition of 1895&#x2013;6.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The hon. Gentleman is labouring under a misapprehension; £12,500 was the total sum they were asked for.

\*MR. LOUGH thought that if the right hon. Gentleman looked into the figures he would find that the total amount came to an annual payment of £20,000. But in addition to this heavy annual tribute on the poor natives, all the gold ornaments of King Prempeh and treasure that could be found in the country had been taken away.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Some of the articles were plated, others were pure gold, but the total value was quite insignificant. They had been valued by an expert at £1,000. They were exhibited for some time in London, and afterwards sold.

\*MR. LOUGH said the right hon. Gentleman entirely failed to appreciate his point. The whole of the possessions of these unfortunate savages might not be of any value to us, but of very great value to them. And if these savages attached some sacred or historic value to these articles, it might be a means of conciliating them and making them content under our rule if we had to remove them from the country.

\*MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: One of the most valuable of the articles was the sword of the executioner. I do not know if the hon. Member wishes that to be returned?

\*MR. LOUGH said he undoubtedly wished it to be returned. He appealed to the House to consider this question seriously. Why could not the Government say to these

people that so long as we remained rulers of the country their gold ornaments would always be safe? This was the first step in a policy of loot which had been pursued by the right hon. Gentleman from that day to this. We took the gold ornaments, the treasures, the sword of the executioner, and the king himself, and the result was that we disturbed twenty-five years of peace which had existed under our rule, and produced chaos and confusion in the country by disturbing the institutions with which the people were familiar. He implored the Committee to consider the results of the expedition in 1896. Let them take the Jesuits in Coomassie itself. Instead of being as it had been previously a prosperous African city, it was in a state of absolute desolation. By removing King Prempeh the Government got into bad relations with all the chiefs, who would have been able to deal with King Prempeh, he being able in turn to deal with us. We, however, took him away, and dealt directly, and eventually bad relations arose with all the minor kings. The Resident at Coomassie had unlimited power in the matter of fining these chiefs, and was under no obligation to make any return of the fines he exacted. That in itself was a bad system to encourage, and some restraint should be put upon it. The Resident in collecting the taxes also allowed the chiefs to keep 10 per cent. of all the money they got.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The sum which the chief has to find is a fixed amount, and he is only allowed to keep 10 per cent. of that. He would have no advantage in collecting a larger sum, because we do not ask for a larger sum, and should not receive it.

\*MR. LOUGH complained of the right hon. Gentleman's constant interruption. He thought that the right hon. Gentleman's points were very thin. The Government fixed a sum which had never been collected in any one year, and which was, in his opinion, absolutely uncollectable. The Government fixed the amount at about 300 ounces of gold a year. He would ask the right hon. Gentleman, as a matter of fact, did the Government ever get from any king in one year the full amount which they had fixed?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The charge was fixed at the time when Sir Frederick Hodgson went to Coomassie. The war broke out immediately afterwards and consequently it was not collected, it is only now that we are going to receive it.

\*MR. LOUGH contended that notwithstanding the right hon. Gentleman's explanation within the maximum fixed the Resident is entitled to take as much as he could and to allow the kings to retain 10 per cent. of whatever they brought in.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: If the hon. Gentleman complains of my interruptions and I cease to interrupt him he must not take it that I agree with what he says.

\*MR. LOUGH: I do not object to being interrupted if I am inaccurate.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Oh, it is all inaccurate.

\*MR. LOUGH said he challenged the wisdom of the Government in insisting upon annual payments of this kind. When Sir Frederick Hodgson went to Coomassie in 1895 he insisted that a large payment should be made by each king. He found fault with the Government because it had not succeeded in establishing good relations with the subject kings. Turning now to the military operations of last year, he had to bring before the House one of the most extraordinary stories it

had ever heard. In December, 1899, there came to Accra an idiot boy who said that he knew where the Golden Stool was, and that if a white officer and some Hausas were sent secretly with him he would take them to the spot. The Governor actually accepted the story of this mad boy and sent out an expedition to seek for the Golden Stool and the treasure concealed with it. In March, 1900, the Governor went up to Coomassie, where he had a palaver with the Ashanti kings and chiefs at which he made a speech to them. These natives had tried all they could, as he ventured to think, to remain peaceful subjects of this country, but when Sir F. Hodgson demanded from them this large tribute and the Golden Stool, and told them that the over-lordship of Prempeh would never be restored, they made no answer and were extremely dissatisfied. It was from that palaver that the siege of Coomassie arose and this dreadful war broke out. The Hausa soldiers behaved most gallantly, and we lost 200 or 300 of them, and perhaps nearly 1,000 carriers. The slaughter among our opponents, who it must be remembered were British subjects and had been so for twenty-five years, was immense, but no attempt had been made to calculate it. He wanted the Committee to consider three points. First, in regard to the Golden Stool. To the Ashantis this was a most serious matter. The Golden Stool meant a throne on which the king sat as the over-lord of all the other kings and chiefs. Now, why should we remove that Golden Stool from Ashanti? This war had been caused entirely by the unsympathetic policy of the Colonial Office and the inability of the resident Governor to deal with these people who were struggling for an idea, namely, that the over-lord of the country should be allowed to be the means of communication between them and us. What was wrong in that? He did not say anything now about King Prempeh, for there was another alternative, Atcheri Boanda, whom the Ashantis, if we objected to Prempeh, would accept as an over-lord, and who was willing to render homage to us. Why should we not accept that system of government under which the people were willing to live? He maintained that the whole attempt to take the Golden Stool had been a mistake. His next point was the tribute. This tribute was not for the purpose of governing the country, but for the cost of Sir Garnet Wolseley's war in 1873-4, and the expedition of 1896, and the last war - a total of £400,000. It was no wonder that these natives were driven into revolt. We had got in Ashanti one of the richest gold-producing countries in the world, and the idea of making these poor people pay the cost of our acquiring their own country seemed to him one of the most iniquitous propositions ever made. He would leave the morality of the transaction aside, because that argument might not appeal to many hon. Gentlemen opposite. We had never got the tribute, and why should we continue to send costly expeditions to exact it? It was absolute folly to torture these poor people into rebellion. Another point was that during these four years, in which we have been mis-governing the country, we have allowed the free importation of arms there. [An HON. MEMBER: From Birmingham.] In regard to policy, then, he might sum up the matter by asking five questions. He would ask the Colonial Secretary whether the constitutional principle of a native over-lord who would be an intermediary between the Ashantis and this country to facilitate government might not be accepted by the Colonial Office. Second, he

asked the

Colonial Secretary to promise that there should be no more hunts after the Golden Stool, that we should leave it in the country, and assure the Ashantis full protection in that and their other property. Third, he would ask the Colonial Secretary to promise that the fines which the Residents were allowed to exact from the chiefs without giving any report to the Government of the Gold Coast, or to the Colonial Office, would be put a stop to, and that a strict record of the fines exacted after proper trial should be kept. Fourth, the total cost of the three wars would amount to £;900,000. We would never recover. that £;900,000, or even the interest on it; it was far too large a sum, and he would ask that all these attempts to exact this money might be abandoned. Finally, he would ask whether some better means of collecting the tax might not be arrived at than by a commission of 10 per cent. on the amount collected. The Ashantis were a valiant people, with many good qualities, their country was one of the richest in the world, and we should treat them with some sense of justice. He begged to move the reduction of the Vote by £;100.

Whereupon Motion made, and Question proposed, "That item A, 1, Class 5, Vote 3, be reduced by £;100.";(Mr. Lough.)

\*MR. SYDNEY BUXTON thought his hon. friend was fully justified in raising this question, and he would like to associate himself in regard to what had fallen from him with reference to the military-operations. It was essential that the Governor should be rescued, and that those besieging him in Coomassie should be thought a lesson for the future. He thought the ability and efficiency with which the military operations had been carried out reflected great credit on General Sir J. Willcocks and the men of the West African Field Force whom he commanded. If we were to have these expeditions on the West Coast of Africa it was satisfactory that instead of using white men or the West Indian regiments we should be able to fall back on what was really a very efficient and economical force. Some further explanation and defence of these two expeditions was demanded from the right hon. the Colonial Secretary, and some justification for the policy which led to them. The first did not involve any actual fighting, but the second, involving very considerable fighting and bloodshed, was a bolt from the blue. The unexpected had happened, as unfortunately had been too frequently the case in the record of the present Government, and the Secretary of State must bear the responsibility for what he could only call a costly muddle. The reason given by the Governor in his despatches why this war suddenly broke out was, that there had been compulsory labour enforced in one of the sections, that various attempts had been made to recover the Golden Stool, and the imposition of very considerable fines for past wars. These were all matters which had been the subject of negotiations for a long time, and the Government and Colonial Secretary ought to have appreciated their importance, and to have done something to soothe the irritation caused by them. The general proposition he ventured to lay down in regard to this war, and in regard to the wars we had had in every one of our colonies on the West Coast of Africa, during the past five years, was, that in his system of colonial development and extension the right hon. Gentleman had been too much in a hurry,

and had been treading in many cases on the susceptibilities of the natives and interfering too rapidly with their customs, laws, and systems. Some tact, discretion, and patience was needed in dealing with these tribes. The right hon. Gentleman admitted that plea?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No, I do not.

\*MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said that at all events his argument was that, while he agreed with the general view that these colonies must be developed, there were many ways of developing them, and he thought the right hon. Gentleman had tended to move too quickly. As regarded this particular outbreak, he attributed it largely to two causes. In 1896 an expedition was sent up to Coomassie which did not meet with armed opposition. The right hon. Gentleman's instructions to the Governor were that he was to see that King Prempeh made submission to the English Government and accepted an English Resident. Prempeh agreed to the Resident, and had to make submission in the most humiliating way. That was necessary under the circumstances. But after Prempeh had submitted, the Governor, acting under the direct instructions of the Secretary of State, made further demands - the immediate payment of a fine of 50,000 ounces of gold as an indemnity for past wars. Prempeh said that he had not 10,000 ounces of gold in his pocket. But the Governor would not accept that plea, and though he had given the King and the tribes no notice, he by what seemed to them an act of treachery, took possession of the person of Prempeh and his immediate followers, sent them down to the coast, and then to Sierra Leone, where they were still in prison. Now, however great a tyrant Prempeh might have been, and however bad his moral qualities, at all events we had acknowledged him some years before, we had negotiated with him, we had never given him notice either that we were going to raise this claim for a large sum of money, or that we would take him, in default, a political prisoner out of his country and never allow him to return to it. He maintained that the Ashantis were fully justified in thinking that we had committed an act of treachery, and therefore it was not likely that they would trust us again. Moreover, when Prempeh was taken prisoner he was promised good treatment. When a discussion was raised some little time ago on the point that Prempeh was hardly receiving that treatment which, under the circumstances, he should have got, the right hon. Gentleman, with a sneer, described the King as a drunken blackguard, or words to that effect.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I do not recognise my own words. Perhaps that is the interpretation of the hon. Gentleman.

\*MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said he had not the reference by him, but the right hon. Gentleman spoke in such a way of this man as to imply that whatever his treatment it was not worse than he deserved. It was treatment on which the tribes might naturally feel sore. Then what happened? The Governor went up to Coomassie, which had been in the meantime fortified and armed. He then called a palaver of the chiefs and kings of the neighbouring tribes and made them a speech, in which he said they must be under no misapprehension that Prempeh would ever be restored as king; that the Queen was now paramount chief, that being the policy of the Government. He (the hon. Member) had no objection to that particular part of the speech; but the Government went on to talk about



compulsory labour for the service of the State, which the chiefs did not seem to have at all appreciated; and then he raised the question of the indemnity. This question had been raised before by the Governor, who himself said that it was most distasteful to the chiefs, and had been received by them with the greatest dissatisfaction. Then the Governor raised the question of the Golden Stool, and said it must be given up to the Queen. That was a matter on which the chiefs and kings felt most strongly, and which most likely would induce them to take up arms against the British Government. While the Governor was negotiating with the people in this way he did what, again, must have seemed to them almost an act of treachery by sending up an armed force to endeavour to obtain the Golden Stool by stealth. Under these circumstances, it seemed an extraordinary thing that the right hon. Gentleman should have sent up the Governor to make these extreme demands on the Ashantis with a totally inadequate force and with only one or two days preparation. He (the hon. Member) had endeavoured to show adequately the actual historical facts of the case; and he maintained that this was a most unfortunate way of dealing with these tribes, who naturally did not wish to be brought under-British control. Surely, it would have been better for the right hon. Gentleman to have endeavoured to gain his ends by tact, patience, and consideration for the susceptibilities of these tribes, rather than by armed force to the great

effusion of blood, and great loss to the colony and to the Empire. His hon. friend the Member for Islington had asked various questions to which he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would give adequate answers. Many very difficult matters were arising in the colonies. In several of his despatches, Sir F. Hodgson, the Governor, mentioned as a reason why he was in such a hurry that the gold miners were anxious to get up country; and there were other matters on which there would be acute differences of opinion before long. If these little wars, and big-wars too, were to be avoided in future, it must be by some greater desire than at present to respect the susceptibilities of the natives.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The Committee has listened to two speeches. The first was from the hon. Member for West Islington, who takes, I believe, a great interest in this matter. He is a private Member who has never held any official position, and who may therefore easily fall into error, as we all do when we are unacquainted with the inner side of questions of this kind. But he asks very fairly for information to enable him to form a final opinion. I respect his desire, and I shall endeavour to fulfil it; and, although I do not agree with a great deal that he has said, I am hopeful that I may persuade him that there are reasons leading to this policy of which he is necessarily ignorant, and which when he knows them may probably alter his views. But it is quite a different thing with the hon. Member who has just sat down. He has been inside. He knows all the inner facts with reference to these matters. He is, therefore, pitting one official policy against another, and, of course, the issue becomes much more important. The hon. Member who has just sat down has explained that his idea of colonial policy is a policy of tact, patience, and discretion. He has also stated that he thinks it most undesirable to interfere with native customs; and that the system of development which is

now going on, although it may have some advantages, nevertheless has been pressed with great precipitancy by the present occupant of the office of Colonial Secretary. That indicates a different policy, indeed; but I do not know that I should describe in the terms which the hon. Gentleman used the policy of my predecessor which he would press upon me. When I first came into this office I rather hoped that my action would be less the subject of contention than it had been in the past; that colonial questions would be treated as a non-party matter; and that I might expect, especially as I desired as far as possible to continue the policy of the office, to have the support of gentlemen who in other things might be political opponents. But I have been disappointed. I have not had their support: and perhaps the time has now come when it is desirable that the issue should be clearly stated and the two policies should be presented to the House in all their consequences, so that the House may judge between them. What is the theory of the hon. Member for Poplar? It is that all these colonies were enjoying a sort of Elysian happiness; that these natives, who, as the hon. Gentleman says, have their good qualities, were engaged in peaceful, innocent pursuits; that the colonies were proceeding gradually towards a higher civilisation, and that if they had only been left alone no evil consequences could have resulted. And then upon this picture a baneful shadow is cast the shadow of the Colonial Secretary. Everything is changed. War takes the place of peace and harmony, and the Ashanti, who was no doubt ploughing his furrows and living under his own vine and fig tree, is suddenly interfered with, his Golden Stool is taken from him and all sorts of outrages are perpetrated on him in his domestic and political life, and his constitutional customs are interfered with. All these things follow the terrible advent of the bogey-man of the colonics. War, the loss of life, bloodshed, and the expenditure of treasure all follow. [An HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear. I am glad I have rightly represented the opinions of hon. Gentlemen opposite. That is all a romance, and it has the character peculiar to romance; there is not an atom or shadow of foundation for the story which is related. What are the real facts? It is worth while asking, because this is a matter which is raised again and again. It was discussed in 1807, and now it is raised again as if it were a new question. The facts are these. Africa, as far as we were concerned with it, was some ten or twenty years ago a mere question of outposts. We and other European nations had stations on the coast, and the great interior was left to itself. Whether the condition of the great interior was the condition depicted by the hon. Member for West Islington in his natural ignorance of the circumstances, whether the tribes of Africa were engaged in constitutional disputes, is a different question, but, at all events, we had no responsibility for the state of affairs in the centre of Africa. But about that time began what has been called the scramble for Africa, and that scramble was going on during the period when the hon. Member for Poplar was Under Secretary for the Colonies. What action did the Colonial Office take in those circumstances? Their action was characterised by "tact," "discretion," "patience," and "noninterference"; in other words, they did nothing. In the most critical stage of our history as an empire in Africa, the Colonial Office

was silent and inept, and the result of that was that our colonies in West Africa and elsewhere were being surrounded and their value destroyed by the advance of other nations. If we remained "quiet," "tactful," patient, and "indifferent, other nations did not pursue that course of policy, and they pressed forward their posts. very often in apparent indifference to our previous claims. The danger was serious that in a very short time we should find all our colonics on this coast enclosed and depreciated, just as our colony of Gambia had been many years ago. Well, when we came into office we found every important and critical question left unsettled. Of course there was no war in times like that. When the policy is one of avoiding a war at all costs it is easy enough to keep the peace ; for a time; but meanwhile you are losing your position. Our position was in danger, and we had to take serious steps. I am not going into details of our relations with foreign countries, but we had to raise a considerable force, the West African frontier force. At that time we had no force whatever worth the name that could protect our rights and position in West Africa, while foreign countries had huge forces at their disposal. We had to create a- force; and let me say I rejoice that hon. Members opposite agree with me in praise of that force, and of the way in which it has been conducted by Sir James Willcocks, who was senior officer under General Lugard, and also of the action of other native forces concerned in putting down the native rebellion. But we had to create this force, and the result of that was that we had to come to terms with foreign countries. We had, at the same time, to negotiate with Germany and France. We have made arrangements which have not excited much public attention, but as to which? will only say that I think they were fair arrangements, in which we gained all, or nearly all, that we hoped to gain, and, perhaps, as much as we could expect to gain in peaceful and friendly negotiation with other Powers. We have secured, therefore, vast Hinterlands for these colonies which otherwise would have been shut in, and which have now become spheres of influence or British protectorates. And we have no longer. I am happy to say, an international question. We have settled the questions which the hon. Member and his Government left unsettled. That is something. I only state this to the Committee now to point out that as long-as we were allowing foreign countries to take our territory, and to repudiate all obligations, it was a, very simple matter. It did not matter what happened in these countries. We allowed them to go into foreign hands, or if they remained independent we were not responsible for what happened within them. Rut the moment we had defined boundaries internationally agreed upon we entered upon a new series of obligations and responsibilities. For my part. I am perfectly ready to agree with anyone who would say that it would have been better for other countries as well as for us if this scramble for Africa had been still further postponed. But it was not we who began the scramble, and we could not fail to take our part-in protecting our interests. But from the moment that this new condition of things was established we had to deal with protectorates and spheres of influence for which hitherto we had no responsibility. The hon. Member for Poplar complained of the present colonial policy because, forsooth, he said that we were interfering with the customs of the natives. What are the

customs of the natives with which we are interfering? Human sacrifice is one, fetishism of all kinds is another, and slavery is another.

MR. LOUGH: I did not mention either of those, or blame you for them.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I am not now directing myself to the speech of the hon. Member. His time will come. The hon. Member for Poplar said we had interfered unjustly and imprudently with native customs. He did not indicate the customs, of course; but the only customs with which we interfered were human sacrifice, fetishism, and slavery.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: I did not mention any of these, and none of my remarks could possibly have been directed to them. My argument was that with a little more tact, a little more patience, and a little more discretion, the friction between the natives and ourselves might have been solved.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Unfortunately I have a habit of desiring to get to close quarters. All that the hon. Member says is vague. He says we interfered with native customs, but he did not specify them. I defy the hon. Member to find anything else with which we have interfered beyond human sacrifice and other cruel and savage fetish customs and slavery. [Mr. BUX-TON assented. | Oh, yes, the hon. Member agrees, but he is one of those who is continually attacking this Government because we do not take sufficient steps to stop slavery. I want the Committee to consider what that means. We have suddenly, by the necessity I have endeavoured to explain, become responsible for vast areas of country in which we now exercise protectorates and spheres of influence. The hon. Member and a few of his friends are continually pressing us ;we do not want to be pressed, because we, at any rate, sympathise with their views;to interfere with native customs and to interfere with slavery;not merely with the slave raids, but with slave-holding, with domestic slavery. That has been pressed upon us again and again; and although the hon. Member was in office himself I did not observe that he was particularly keen with regard to it. We have been more so. We have declared in all these places that the legal status of slavery shall be abolished. We have gone further than the hon. Member went or ever dared to go. We have done that, knowing what the consequences are. The consequences are war. It is not a, question of tact, discretion, or patience. When you say to these savage tribes, who for centuries have exercised these rights of slave-raiding, who regard labour as something discreditable, and to whom it is necessary they should have slaves in order to preserve their personal dignity," From this day, when the British flag and the British protectorate come, there is an absolute prohibition of slave-raiding, then you have to fight for your principles. And that is why in this ease the hon. Member and my predecessors left all these things without dealing with them; because, although they had such strong views upon slavery, they did not dare to prohibit it or interfere with it. Their "tact, discretion, and patience" resulted in peace being kept: and now we are prepared to give effect to the policy ; which I believe to be the policy of both sides in this House;of saying boldly that we will not allow these customs to continue. It is on that account we find ourselves in frequent contest with some of these native populations. That is the general statement. Now apply it to this case of Ashanti. What is the

case? The hon. Member for West Islington has not said enough in praise of the Ashantis. They are a very brave and gallant native race. They have been the predominant race in that part of Africa; but what is the result of being the predominant race? They themselves would do no work whatever. They insisted upon having slaves, and were constantly attacking the tribes in their neighbourhood. There was no peace or security for life or property within reach of them, and trade was impossible throughout the territory. They maintained themselves by a tyranny which was natural to them as a great African tribe, but which we could not tolerate from the moment we had any responsibility. The hon. Member would have been the first to criticise us if we had allowed it to continue. The Ashantis were a slave-raiding people. They were guilty of human sacrifices; they exercised a tyranny over the neighbouring tribes, and by their superior strength and fighting ability they kept this "overlord-ship" of which the hon. Member speaks. The hon. Member speaks of these savage tribes of Africa as though he was speaking of a modern European Power. He talks of the Ashantis fighting for their "constitutional rights." The Ashantis, if they understood what constitutional rights meant, would explain that their constitutional rights were to exercise absolute power and authority over all neighbouring tribes, to make slaves of them, to procure from them all the labour they required; and, if they did not get it, and tribute also whenever they desired it, to torture them, sacrifice them to their fetish, and generally treat them with the utmost barbarity. Seeing the condition of civilisation in which they were, we may make allowance for the Ashantis that they knew no better; but it is absurd to treat these tribes as if they were members of a civilised community: and nothing of the kind was attempted. The hon. Member has spoken of the Ashantis as having been British subjects for twenty five years; but in that he is absolutely and entirely mistaken. We never claimed any authority whatever over them until recently. That we claimed their territory as within our sphere of influence, excluding the influence of other European Powers. is true; but we claimed nothing in the nature of sovereignty over them. They were an independent Power under treaty with us, made after the original expedition to which the hon. Member has gone back, under which they were to pay us a certain indemnity. They have never paid that indemnity. In the time of Sir William Maxwell the question of that indemnity came up. But now let me pause for a moment. I make a great distinction between the hon. Member for West Islington and the hon. Member for Poplar. The hon. Member for West Islington spoke in harsh terms of the Resident at Coomassie, who, he said, was left too free a hand and showed no discretion. He spoke of Sir Frederick Hodgson as having followed the advice of a mad boy, and generally conveyed the impression that these officers of the Crown, working under very difficult circumstances, were either fools or knaves. I will answer him with all courtesy, and I hope I may persuade him to deal differently in future with these officers. But what shall I say to the hon. Member for Poplar? He spoke of Sir William Maxwell as guilty of an act of treachery, and he was so pleased with the word applied to an Englishman now dead, appointed by the Government of which the hon. Member was a member; so pleased was he with the phrase that he went on to speak

of Sir Frederick Hodgson as also guilty of an act of treachery, and I think he was also appointed by the Government of which the hon. Member was a member. These two Englishmen, or Scotchmen ;I believe both are Scotchmen;these two Britons. appointed by the Government of which the hon. Member is the representative in the House on this question, appointed to responsible positions in places in which the difficulties are tremendous, in which a man carries his life in his hand every day, in which if he has not the confidence of his superiors here he could do nothing, and in which, therefore, a certain amount of discretion must be left to him;these two British Gentlemen the hon. Member declares with real delight, and he gloats over the fact, were guilty of acts of treachery. They were guilty of no such acts. The thing is impossible. I implore the Committee to resent these attacks on men who have saved the Empire abroad. You may attack the Colonial Secretary. That is all right. That is a political business. If the hon. Member had said that I had been guilty of treachery I would have said "Of course." I know that in his opinion and that of his friends I am not guilty of anything else.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: I simply said that in all these matters the Secretary of State is responsible for what is done, I explained the reasons why I used the word, and the particular incidents to which I referred. But the responsibility is, of course, with the right hon. Gentleman, not with the officials.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: That is a curious way of putting responsibility upon me. What the hon. Gentleman said was that Sir William Maxwell and Sir Frederick Hodgson were guilty of acts of treachery. Then he says I was responsible. Of course I am officially responsible for everything that my subordinates do, but that does not in the least diminish, or attenuate the charge he brought against these two officials. I am responsible. I accept responsibility as I have said. Neither Sir William Maxwell nor Sir Frederick Hodgson was guilty of acts of treachery. As regards Sir William Maxwell, that is really ancient history. It is now five years ago that Sir William Maxwell went up to Coomassie. He was not opposed on the route, and a great palaver of chiefs was called. He explained his demands, and those demands were refused.

MR. LOUGH: What were they?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Oh, I will not go into that. That is not the point. The hon. Member is referring to a matter which was debated in 1896, and I certainly decline to deal with it in 1901. Sir William Maxwell's demands were refused, and he removed Prempeh to the coast as the king who had refused his terms. The expedition accordingly was so far successful that it was concluded without a single drop of blood having been shed. And when you come to ask what is the cause of the subsequent disturbance, I have no hesitation in saying that it was the blood-lessness of the previous expedition. The people of Ashanti in common with every savage tribe, hold it to be a point of honour to fight for their chief, and to fight for their cause. They are ready to accept defeat, but they are not ready to accept the consequences of defeat without actual conflict. If you want to get at the bottom of the recent disturbance you will find it in the fact that these people were called upon to suffer the consequences of defeat without having been defeated. The result was

they nourished the intention of rising on the first opportunity, and anybody who reads the Blue-book will see that preparations were being made, and it was quite certain that sooner or later the Ashanti warriors would desire to try conclusions with the British before they finally submitted. The hon. Member for West Islington says, very truly, that Sir Frederick Hodgson went up to Coomassie. He says that there was a mediaeval fort established at Coomassie. I am thankful that it was not a mediaeval fort, or it would not have sustained the siege it had to sustain.

MR. LOUGH: I did not say mediaeval. I quoted from the Blue-book; a square fort with round towers at the corners.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I will not pursue that. If the hon. Member quotes from the Blue-book he is quite safe. But this fort was established there very properly, and very properly Sir Frederick Hodgson, in accordance with instructions to every Governor on the West Coast to take an early opportunity of visiting these Protectorates in the Hinterland, decided to go up to Coomassie. He went with a small force, not a provocative force, and called a meeting of the chiefs, to whom he desired to explain the intentions of the Government. Let me first deal with the incident of the Golden Stool. That really is of collateral and not of very great importance. Sir Frederick Hodgson did not ask my permission to go for the Golden Stool, but, speaking now after the event, I entirely approve of his attempt to secure it. The Golden Stool is of very great "moral and intellectual value." It is not loot in the sense the hon. Member supposes. It has no great pecuniary value. If we got it we should not have melted it down for bullion.

But in the opinion of the tribe and according to the custom of the tribe the possession of the Stool gives supremacy. And if, therefore, we could secure this stool we should be doing more for the peace of Ashanti than, probably, by any armed expedition. Therefore, it was of the greatest importance to get hold of this symbol of sovereignty if who could possibly do it. The hon. Member for West Islington ridicules the proceedings of the Governor. He says he got hold of a mad boy. What does he mean by that? Does he know the boy?

MR. LOUGH: I quoted from the Blue-book. It says, "He came to the conclusion that the boy was mad."

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The boy was at all events apparently in possession of his senses when he stated to Sir Frederick Hodgson that he had come from certain chiefs who were custodians of the Golden Stool, and were prepared to deliver it up to the British Government if they would send a representative to receive it. I think he will find that the Blue-book says the boy seemed mad with terror. The exact words are these. It was after the boy had been summoned to carry the expedition through a country which was supposed to be hostile, and in which there had been evidence of hostility. The track came to an abrupt ending on the edge of a dense forest, and at that point the report says, "The boy was now practically off his head with fear." If everyone who showed signs of fear after such an experience as the boy had were to be shut up in a lunatic asylum, I think there would be need for very much extended accommodation. The hon. Member has entirely misunderstood what he has read in the Blue-book. There is no pretence for saying the boy was mad. No Governor would be justified in

neglecting the information which was sent to him that he could have this emblem if he sent for it. Sir Frederick Hodgson did send for it, but the expedition failed because, as we understand, the chiefs themselves became afraid and refused to deliver up the Stool, and the boy was unable to indicate the exact spot where it was. To say that the Governor was wrong in seeking for it is altogether

a mistake, considering the extreme importance which a symbol of this kind has among a savage population. The second complaint made by the hon. Member is that Sir Frederick Hodgson asked for interest for the expenses of the wars of 1876 and 1893 and the present expedition.

MR. LOUGH: I said that that would be seen in the despatches. The right hon. Gentleman himself includes in the Estimates before us the amount which is to be recovered from the Gold Coast, if possible.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Sir Frederick-Hodgson did nothing of the kind. The hon. Gentleman is, at all events, a sufficient arithmetician to know that the interest on those sums would be enormously greater than what we are asking for. It is all clearly stated. When we undertake responsibility for these protectorates, when we have to prevent slave raiding, to interfere with native customs, who must establish a police and get some kind of income from the population. The chiefs before us got a tribute. Our tribute is, at all events, regularly paid. It is not exorbitant, and is not capable of being made an engine of extortion by the chiefs. We must have a reasonable contribution from the population for which we are responsible. We decided to ask for £12,500 a year as a direct tax of about 4s. per head on the male population, to be collected by the kings and chiefs of the various tribes on the understanding that they were to receive 10 per cent. for the collection. That is a condition to which I attach the greatest importance, and which I am making in every case in which a native tax is collected. We do not want to destroy the authority of the native-chiefs, but to regulate it. We are not making these vast territories parts of our colonies, but protectorates over which our control is more or less indirect. We desire to govern through the chiefs, to regulate their action, but not to interfere with their dignity and position. Therefore we allow them to take a certain proportion of every tax collected for the budget of the protectorate itself. We

wanted £12,500 towards the expenses of the protectorate, and we were advised by Sir Frederick Hodgson ; although the hon. Member for Poplar said we acted against his advice;

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: No, I did not say that.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I refer the hon. Member to a report of his speech. I will read a quotation from the despatch sent to Sir Frederick Hodgson, who naturally knew most about local prejudice. He suggested it should not be called a tax or a tribute, but interest on the debt incurred in the wars of 1876 and 1893, which he stated the Ashantis would understand as perfectly just. In a despatch to Sir Frederick Hodgson I stated, "I observe that you concur with these proposals, and that you agree that the collection of this revenue is not likely to cause any serious trouble." We had to collect revenue, properly due, for the protection



and government of the protectorate, and the question was by what name it should be called; a direct tax or tribute or interest. We took local opinion, and that local opinion was to the effect that under the latter name it would be more acceptable to the Ashantis. I daresay the Ashantis, like most other people, objected to any tribute or tax; but was that the real cause of the outbreak? Certainly not. In the statements some of them made to our agents on the Gold Coast they put as the first reason for their objection to British rule, our interference with slavery. They said we were interfering with their domestic labour and their right to hold slaves.

MR. LOUGH: Is that in the Blue-book?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Yes. I thought the hon. Member said he knew the Blue-book. Here is the quotation;

"King of Luabin Yaw Sapong states that about two years ago he heard that the Ashantis were plotting to fight the English, and getting guns, powder, and lead from the coast in small quantities, for these reasons: that they thought the Government would send their king and chiefs back after punishing them by staying in strange land for some time, but they had seen no sign of their returning back to Ashanti; that their slaves used to run away from them, and were helped by the Government giving them freedom: also they were forced to roof houses, and had been stopped to deal in slaves; and also the white man at Coomassie lined them too much."

Another quotation has been put into my hand, a despatch from the Governor, in which he states;

"The other and larger party had determined to fight unless the Governor complied with the following conditions, which they had been requested to state:—(1) Prempen to be given back, and to regulate and collect any annual payment to be made. (2) Permission to buy and sell slaves as in the old time."

I think, Sir, I have now answered the questions put to me by the hon. Member.

MR. LOUGH: The question of fines.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Oh, yes. I really hardly understand the hon. Gentleman's complaint. It is quite natural that the Resident should be empowered to impose a small fine for minor breaches of discipline. We do not wish to destroy the authority of the chiefs by imprisoning them, therefore a certain discretion to inflict small fines; in no case have fines been of a large amount; must necessarily be left to the Resident. But when the hon. Member says the Resident is under no obligation to report those fines. I do not know where he gets that information.

MR. LOUGH: In the Blue-book. Sir Frederick Hodgson, speaking of the cause of the war in a more serious way than the right hon. Gentleman has spoken of it, says; "The responsibility of fining rests entirely with the Resident, who has not been required to report to the Governor this exercise of power on his part. I became aware of the fact that there was discontent arising from this cause when on my way to Coomassie, the King of Adansi having made it a matter of complaint when I met him at Kwisa. It was also mentioned to me by Opoku Mensa, the senior member of the Coomassie Native Committee. But for the sudden outbreak of the revolt it was a matter which? should have carefully looked into."

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I do not understand why the hon. Member should fall into an error, which is becoming common in these times, of quoting paragraphs without their contexts. Here is the context which has been omitted by the hon. Member; "The imposition of lines is necessary in connection with the maintenance of authority, and I cannot find that the exercise of this system had in any way been abused."

Well, Sir, I have now endeavoured to reply to the questions put to me, and also to put the Committee in possession of the general principles involved in this matter. It is not to be supposed that native wars such as this in which we have been engaged are the peculiar result of the presence in office of the Colonial Secretary. The hon. Member is no doubt aware that there have been small wars not only in those parts of Africa which are under the Colonial Office, but also in East Africa, in Nigeria, and in Somaliland, which are under the Foreign Office. I have always observed that when it is desired to complete the case against the Colonial Secretary he is confronted with his colleague and chief, the Prime Minister, and he is told that the Prime Minister is always anxious and desirous for peace if peace can be preserved with honour. I beg humbly to say that I share that view with the Prime Minister. But, for the moment, let us suppose that there is a distinction to be drawn. Then how does the hon. Gentleman account for the fact that even with the beneficent and peaceful influence of the Prime Minister there have been, I think, five native wars in countries which are under the Foreign Office? Surely under those circumstances there must be some general influence at work. It is not due to the particular iniquity of the Colonial Secretary. What that general influence is I have endeavoured to represent to the Committee. It is that this Government has decided from the first to deal with a strong hand with those questions which the party opposite allowed to drift. We have settled those questions of boundaries and spheres of influence in West Africa satisfactorily and peacefully so far as European Powers are concerned. That was a gigantic work.

But from the moment we undertook responsibility for those spheres of influence it became necessary, unless we were to take the advice of hon. Members opposite not to interfere in native customs, that we should be prepared for the attacks of native tribes whose customs we had interfered with. For one man; I have pointed this out before; that is killed in a war of this kind, hundreds of men will in future generations have life and peace and security for their possessions.

This great continent of Africa possesses every advantage for the races native to it. Why have the native inhabitants not multiplied? Why are they still so largely, out of proportion to the gigantic extent of the continent? It is because for centuries, possibly for thousands of years, there have been going on these internecine contests between different tribes, attended by terrible loss of life. First one tribe assumes superiority; then another, equally arbitrary, cruel, and tyrannical, obtains the primary position. That state of things has been put a stop to. The moment we came into our sphere of influence or protectorate we made it our business to establish once and for all that great Pax Britannica which we established in India., where similar conditions existed

before our rule was firmly established. We have had to go through trials and difficulties and bloodshed before that rule was established; but once it was established there was ample compensation for all we suffered, and ample compensation to the natives who will benefit by our more generous and more just rule. It has been said that the colony is a burden to the United Kingdom, that this Vote of £;400,000 which the war has cost must be borne by the Imperial Exchequer. I have not the slightest doubt whatever but that the whole of it will be repaid. It is, properly speaking, a loan, though, in accordance with precedent, it is put down as a grant-in-aid. If it had not been for the last rebellion the surplus from the Gold Coast would have amounted to more than £;50,000, and we should have been able to pay off

at least one-half of the cost of the previous expedition. I believe that the surplus will be increased in future, and I have not the slightest doubt that this expenditure will be repaid to the British Exchequer in the course of a reasonable number of years. The hon. Member for Poplar said that in our policy we have been too hasty. We have not only secured the boundaries, but we have undertaken the development of the territories within those boundaries. Within five years we have added 446 miles of railway to the West Coast of Africa. Within the same period the exports of British produce -produce of British origin, not of foreign manufactured goods;passing through Great Britain have increased from a little over £;2,000,000 a year to over £;3,000,000 a year. That is to say, we have increased the exports of this country to the colony by 50 per cent. That is not a bad record. It is one of which I am not at all ashamed.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: I wish to make a personal explanation. The right | hon. Gentleman more than once said that I accused two of our officials of treachery. What I said was that their action might be looked on by the Ashantis as treachery. I apologise if I did not make myself clear, but I should be the last man in the House to accuse any public official of treachery.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I am glad to hear that explanation of the hon-. Gentleman, and I entirely accept it.

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

Committee report Progress; to sit again, to-morrow.

Adjourned at five minutes after Twelve of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 19th March, 1901.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

BRITISH WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC AND MANUFACTURING COMPANY BILL.

Order [25th February], That the Bill be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, read, and discharged.

Bill withdrawn.

STANDING ORDERS.

Resolutions reported from the Committee:

1."That, in the case of the London County Council (Tramways and Street Widenings) Petition, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with: That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 2. 4, 5. 7. 8, 8A, 8B, 8C, 9. 10, 10A, 11, 11A, and 11B

be struck out of the Bill: That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

2."That, in the case of the Brompton and Piccadilly Circus Railway Bill [ Lords the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with: That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that Railways Nos. 2,3,4,5,6,. and 7 be struck out of the Bill: That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

3."That, in the case of the Chester Corporation Tramways Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with: That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that Tramways Nos. 1. 2, and 3. and so much of Tramway No. 6 as lies beyond the City boundary, be struck out of the Bill: That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

4."That, in the case of the South Lancashire Tramways Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with: That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 7 and 8 be struck out of the Bill: That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

5."That, in the case of the Wigan Corporation Tramways Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with: That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that Tramway No. 2 be struck out of the Bill: That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

6."That, in the case of the Thames Piers and River Service Bill, Petition of the 'Watermen and Lightermen of the River Thames' for dispensing with Standing Order 129 in the case of their Petition against the Bill, the said Standing Order ought to be dispensed with."

7."That, in the case of the Barry Railway Company, Petition for leave to deposit a Petition for Bill, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with: That the parties be permitted to deposit their Petition for a Bill."

Resolutions agreed to.

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (TRAMWAYS AND STREET WIDENINGS).

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

Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. John Burns and Mr. Lough.

SELECTION.

Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection, That they had selected Mr. Baird to be a member of the Parliamentary Panel of Members of this House to act as Commissioners in pursuance of the provisions of the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, in the place of Sir Charles Dalrymple.

Report to lie upon the Table.

PETITIONS.

BEER BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Leighton: Liverpool; and Coates; to lie upon the Table.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (HIGHER GRADE AND EVENING CONTINUATION SCHOOLS).

Petitions for alteration of Law, from Scarborough; Barnsley; and National Union of Teachers; to lie upon the Table.

## LICENSING (SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS).

Petitions for alteration of Law, from Warbleton; and Midhurst; to lie upon the Table.

## LIQUOR TRAFFIC LOCAL VETO (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Duniper Green, in favour: to lie upon the Table.

## PARLIAMENTARY FRANCHISE.

Petitions for extension to women, from Manchester; Birmingham and other places; and Women Workers in the Cotton Factories of Lancashire: to lie upon the Table.

## POOR LAW OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1896.

Petition from Isle of Wight, against alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions for alteration of Law, from Erith; and Thorn hill; to lie upon the Table.

## SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Redhill;. and Guildford; to lie upon the Table.

## SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Sheffield (forty-one); East Renfrewshire (two); Mossley; Bainbridge; North Shields; Bampton; Birmingham (eleven); Hands-worth; Inverness (eleven); Sparkhill; Droylsden; Tiverton; Goole; South London; Plymouth; (three); Kings-wood; Tottenham; Redditch; Edinburgh (eleven); Burslem; London (four); Glasgow (twelve); Chorley; Upper Holloway; Frant; Manchester (two); Liverpool (eighteen); Rotherham; Knighton; Motherwell (three); Eastbourne; Ealing Dean; Margate; Shrewsbury; West Kensington; Blooms-bury; Walworth (two); Ticehurst; Kennington (two); Brixton Hill; Chernside West; Heaton Mersey; York;. Leeds (thirteen); Tiverton-on-Avon;. Camberwell (three); Peckham (two);, Stratford; West Ham; Ashurst;. Brighton; Chailey (two); North Taw-ton (two); Torry; Birkenhead (three);. Lewes (two); Withington (three); Clapham (three); Elgin; Bishops Stortford (three); Leytonstone (twelve); Forest Gate; Bath; Harrow Green; Pollokshaws; Winchester; Bristol (seven); Llandyssiliogogo (two); Wheatley Hill (two); Cilfynydd; Penzance; Cardigan; Littlehampton; Farnham; Ecclesall; Kenton; Salisbury; Falkirk (two); Clynder Rosneath: Newquay; Wyllye; St. Ives (four): Woodhouse Hill"; Elland; Hanwell; Rastrick; Abernethy; Gloucetser (two); Lanark (two); Brockley; Lambeth: Wilmslow: Woodford Green; Muirhead: Penpont; Garston (two); Mile End; Portswood; Harrow; Penycae; Lockerbie; Lewis-ham; Pudsey Valley; Hohn: Dalkeith; Bradford; Stockport: Dartford; Ashwater; Llanfyllin (four); Grantown-on-Spey; Old Machar; Ivybridge; Peterhead; Sparkbrook (two); North Kensington; Deptford (two): Worcester: Wilmslow; Pagham; Tranent; Brad-ford-on-Avon; Corsham (two); Bathgate; Kilburn; Machynlleth; Oldham; Finsbury; Bradford (Yorks.) (five); Great Lumley; Queen's Park;. Huntingdon; Croydon (eighteen); Maldon; West Croydon (three); South Norwood (two); Woodside; Thornton Heath (three); Norwood; Upper Norwood (four); Upper Caterham; Staly-bridge; Maidenhead; Reach: Baildon; Lee; Market Lavington; South Petherton; Taunton (three); Dublin; Wishaw; School Board for London; Staines; Tockwith; Cambridge; Fulbourn; Leicester (fourteen); East Lambeth; Chesterton; Bridgwater (two); Sack-more; Exford; Brixton (two): Altrincham; Clitheroe; Cubitt Town; Tenby Derby; Griffithstown; Washford; Rugby; Banff; Dunfermline; Hare-court; Bridlington; Morley (three); Watchet; Old Kent

Road; Wolverhampton (two); Rushden; Waterhouses (two); Penrhyn; Durham (three):  
Delton; Wellington; Willenhall; Short Heath; New Brancepeth (five); Tudhoe  
Colliery (three); Highworth; Aberdeen (two); Seaford; Brandon Colliery; Ripley;  
Middleton (eight); Thirsk; Barwick-in-Elmet; Nicklefield; Uddingstone;  
Stockwell; Cottingley; South Nuffield; Red Hill (three); Greenock (two) Mil-  
torn; Ossett (two); Shotts; Milton; St. Just; Scarborough (three); Higham;  
Criccieth; Watford; Knaresborough (two); Pateley Bridge; Cilcain; Lennen  
Cramlington Colliery (two); North Seaton; Winchester; Chesterfield (five);  
Norton; Appledore (two); Penrith; Sheerness (two); Langwarthby; Newbiggin;  
Stainton; Wigton; (two): Kes-  
wick; Anfield; Newmains; Malvern (two); Northumberland; Great Malvern;  
Llanllwchaiarn (two); Gulval; Hey moor; Tregavra; Long Rock; Penzance (ten);  
Mousehole; Marazion; New Mill; Melksham; Ysbytty Ifan; Deiniolen; Hipperholme;  
Marple (two); Hyde Town; Brimington (three); Whittington Moor; Ryton-on-Tyne;  
Birtley; Royton (three); Oldham; Leith; Brampton; Aberchirder; Nymps-field:  
Stroud (three); Nailsworth; Heanor (two): Stonehouse; Charfield; Barnsley  
(four); Woodchester; Dolwyddelan; Radcliffe (three); Halton Lea Gate; Cromhall;  
Cotlessie; New burgh; Farnworth (twelve); Llandudno (two); Kensal Town:  
Kirkdale; Penmaenmawr (nine): Dwygyfylchi (two); Houghton le-Spring; Tavistock;  
Dewsbury; Milnrow (two): Denton; Sandiacre (three); Batley; Whitefield; Long  
Eaton; Hols-worthy (two); Frodsham; Edmonton; Dulwich; Kidderminster (three);  
Ilkeston (two); Partick; Haltwhistle; Darlington; Droylsden; Bolton (four);  
Swindon; Langley Moor (two); Brandon, Colliery (three); Esh Winning; Stonehaven:  
Upholland; Ormskirk; and Browney Colliery; to lie upon the Table.

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

Petitions in favour, from Ayr (four); Stonehaven; Saltoun; Campbeltown (two):  
Govan (two); Perth (three);: Harthill; Bowmore; Sanquhar; Newburgh; Wick;  
Edinburgh (three); Ceres; Craigneuk; Motherwell; Airdrie Kilbrandon and  
Kilchattan; Dalziel (two); Cupar; Rothes; Dunfermline;: Forres; Strathaven;  
Dunbar; Carluke (two): Broughty Ferry; Douglas; Ecclefechan (two); Kirriemuir;  
Thorn-hill; Dalkeith; Peterhead; Marnoch (two): Thurso; Bathgate; Eastwood;  
Glasgow (three); Stornoway; Largs (two); Renton; Cromarty (three); Brae-mar;  
Kelso; Peebles (three); Saltcoats;: Helensburgh; Morebattle; Fraserburgh;  
Stonehaven; Alloa; Rutherglen; Dalmuir; Blairgowrie; Clydebank; Dunfermline;  
Dennistown; Lanarkshire; Caldercruix (two); Shotts; Ardessier; Blantyre; Tain  
(two); Fountainbridge; Partick; and Dunoon; to lie upon the Table.

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

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

#### SUNDAY CLOSING (WALES) ACT (1881) AMENDMENT BILL.

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

#### VIVISECTION.

Petition from Bristol, for prohibition; to lie upon the Table.

#### RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

#### SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1884.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 14th March, 1901, declaring that  
William C. Hoskins, Labourer, Royal Laboratory, War Department, was appointed

without a Civil Service Certificate through inadvertence on the part of the Head of his Department [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

#### FACTORY AND WORKSHOP (USE OF LEAD IN THE MANUFACTURE OF POTTERY).

Copy presented, of Reports received by the Secretary of State for the Home Department from Professor T. E. Thorpe, C.B., LL.D., F.R.S., Principal of the Government Laboratory, on the Use of Lead in the Manufacture of Pottery [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

#### SOUTH AFRICA.

Copy presented, of Papers relating to negotiations between Commandant Louis Botha and Lord Kitchener [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

#### REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE (ENGLAND, SCOTLAND, AND IRELAND).

Return ordered, "showing, for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1901, (1) the amount contributed by England, Scotland, and Ireland, respectively, to the Revenue collected by Imperial officers; (2) the expenditure on English, Scottish, and Irish services met out of such Revenue; and (3) the balances of Revenue contributed by England, Scotland, and Ireland, respectively, which are available for Imperial Expenditure (in

continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 336, of Session 1900).";(Mr. Lough.)

#### IMPERIAL REVENUE (COLLECTION AND EXPENDITURE) (GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND).

Return ordered, "relating to Imperial Revenue (Collection and Expenditure) (Great Britain and Ireland) for the year ending the 31st day of March, 1901 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 337, of Session 1900).";(Mr. Lough.)

#### WEXFORD COUNTY COUNCIL v. LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD.

Return ordered, "giving the Report of the Judgment delivered in the Irish Court of Appeal on Monday the 25th day of February last, together with the Affidavits on both sides, and the Letter of the Local Government Board referred to in the said Judgment with the Reply of the County Wexford County Council thereto.";(Sir Thomas Esmonde.)

#### LEAD POISONING.

Address for "Return showing, with reference to the cases of Lead Poisoning reported during the years 1899 and 1900, in the earthenware and china industry (a) the severity of the attack, (b) the number (if any) of previous attacks, and (c) the main symptoms referable to Lead Poisoning.";(Mr. Jesse (Collings.)

#### ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

#### QUESTIONS.

#### SOUTH AFRICAN WAR;PEACE NEGOTIATIONS WITH BOER GENERALS.

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can now make a statement as to the present position of the pourparlers which it is alleged have been or are being conducted with General Botha, General De Wet, and possibly other generals, with reference to a cessation of active hostilities, as regards all or certain portions of the forces still opposing the British arms in South Africa.

The following questions also appeared on the Paper::

MR. SCHWANN: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can now give the result of the negotiations, reported to have been established with General Botha and other generals in South Africa, with reference to the cessation of

active hostilities between all or certain portions of the forces still opposing the British arms in that country.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT (Sheffield, Ecclesall): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is now in a position to give the House information as to the recent peace negotiations with the Boer generals.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): General Botha has informed Lord Kitchener by letter that he is not disposed to recommend the terms of peace, which Lord Kitchener was instructed to offer him, to the earnest consideration of his Government. He adds that his Government and his chief officers entirely agree with his views. I propose to lay the Papers connected with the negotiations on the Table to-night.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): Can the right hon. Gentleman say what were the terms offered?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The hon. Member will find them in the Papers which I propose to lay.

HOSPITALS COMMISSION; PAYMENTS TO COMMISSIONERS.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can state the amount of salary paid respectively to members of the Hospital Commission in addition to the amount allowed for personal expenses.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): A sum of £1,250 was paid to each member of the Commission except the chairman.

MR. DALZIEL: Do we understand that he was unpaid?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes.

NEW ARMY PENSION SCHEME.

MR. SCHWANN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state when the pensions which the Government have promised and sketched the details of will be declared and paid to the widows and orphans of men who have perished in South Africa in the British ranks; and will the scheme apply to the widows and children of all men who have lost their lives in action, by accident, or in consequence of wounds or disease caused by service in the campaign.

\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): The date will shortly be fixed by warrant. As regards the second paragraph, the scheme will apply to the widows and children of men on the married establishment; which includes mobilised Reservists, embodied Militiamen, Volunteers and Yeomen; who since October, 1899, have been killed in action, or died of wounds or injuries received, or of disease medically certified as contracted or commencing while on active service.

WARM CLOTHING FOR RETURNING TROOPS.

MR. ORR-EWING (Ayr Burghs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that the private funds from which invalided soldiers returning home from South Africa have been supplied throughout the campaign with greatcoats and warm clothing are now exhausted, and that in consequence such soldiers are constantly returning without them; and whether he will undertake that such necessary clothing for the voyage will be supplied from Government sources.

\*MR. BRODRICK: The Clothing Regulations (paragraphs 425&#x2013;430) fully provide for the issue of the necessary warm clothing for invalided soldiers. Under



the orders of the general officer commanding at the port of embarkation general officers commanding Cape and Natal were instructed in June last to ensure compliance with these regulations. No reports have been received of men returning without proper warm clothing.

MR. BURDETT-COUTTS (Westminster): Will the right hon. Gentleman inquire how many invalided soldiers arrived by the "Simla" last week, and by the "Bavarian" a short time before, without any greatcoats?

\*MR. BRODRICK: I will certainly inquire.

PURCHASES OF ARMY HOUSES IN CANADA.

\*MR. GILBERT PARKER (Graves-end): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can explain why the agents of the Government, purchasing horses for the use of the Army in South Africa, have only purchased 3,738 in Canada as against 7,901 purchased in Australia, and 26,310 from the United States; and whether the Canadian Government have drawn the attention of His Majesty's Government to this matter.

\*THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): The purchase of horses in Canada was limited by the shortness of the season and the approach of the Canadian winter, and the prices of the horses and cobs were much higher than those paid for similar animals obtained in the United States and in Australia. Some correspondence has passed respecting this matter with the Agent General for Canada.

MR. MALCOLM (Suffolk, Stowmar-ket): Is there any chance of remount depots being established in Canada?

\*LORD STANLEY: Yes, it is hoped to establish a remount depot in Canada. The whole subject is now under consideration.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): Does Canada contribute anything towards the cost of the war?

[No answer was given.]

MR. MACDONA (Southwark, Rother-hithe): In what way does the Canadian winter prevent the purchase of the horses?

\*LORD STANLEY: We cannot purchase horses in winter and send them on a tropical passage to South Africa.

YEOMANRY TRAINING.

MR. STOCK (Liverpool, Walton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state what period of training will be required for Yeomanry regiments this year: whether the date of coming out will be left to the discretion of colonels of respective regiments; whether training under canvas will be compulsory; and whether recruiting is to be practically unlimited up to a strength of 500 men per regiment.

\*LORD STANLEY: As I have already explained to the House, an Army Order will shortly be published giving the necessary information.

QUEEN VICTORIA'S FUNERAL; SCOTTISH VOLUNTEERS.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state how many Volunteers came to London from Scotland on the invitation of the War Office for the purpose of attending the ceremonies on the occasion of the Queen's funeral on 2nd February last; and will he say how much was paid for

their travelling expenses, food, and accommodation.

\*LORD STANLEY: The numbers of Volunteers from Scotland amounted to twenty-four officers and 800 men. It is not possible to state the figures required by the second paragraph without a detailed examination of the various accounts.

VOLUNTEER SERGEANT-MAJORS' PAY.

MR. LOWE (Birmingham, Edgbaston): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War will he explain why the sergeant-majors of consolidated battalions of Volunteers with more than six companies at headquarters receive only the same rate of pay and allowances as sergeant-majors in charge of outlying companies of administrative battalions; and whether he will consider the propriety of either granting to the former an increased rate of pay, or of granting them the same rank and pay as warrant officers sergeant-majors in the Militia.

LORD STANLEY: Volunteer corps of six companies and upwards are entitled to a regimental acting sergeant-major, who is selected from the permanent staff by the commanding officer of the corps and receives the pay of his rank and 6d. a day extra. This non-commissioned officer, whether in a consolidated or scattered battalion, is responsible for the duties of regimental sergeant-major, and his work is not confined to the particular company or companies at headquarters where he may be stationed. There is, accordingly, no reason for the differentiation of pay suggested.

MARK IV. BULLETS REJECTED.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state how many Mark IV. bullets have been broken up since the commencement of the South African campaign; and in what respect they were useless.

LORD STANLEY: The number of Mark IV. bullets broken up since the commencement of the war is about four and a half millions. Cartridges made with these bullets were, under certain conditions, found to strip in the barrel. It was therefore undesirable to make these bullets up into cartridges.

MEDICAL ARRANGEMENTS AT SHOEBOURNE.

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that no provision exists in cases of illness among officers at Shoeburyness, there being no hospital, no arrangement for nurses, and not even a single member of the Army Medical Corps: whether he is aware that this week a young officer who had served in South Africa was taken ill with double pleurisy which resulted in double pneumonia, that he was left in his own quarters, where he died, and had it not been for his parents would have had no nurse or medical appliances; that recently in consequence of an officer developing scarlet fever, the whole batch of officers in that officer's quarter had to be put under tents; and whether immediate steps will be taken to provide a suitable hospital, nurses, and appliances at Shoeburyness for officers when taken ill there.

MR. BRODRICK: It has not been found possible to provide accommodation for hospital wards for officers at home stations except at Netley and Woolwich, and in special cases at Aldershot. Officers, except when suffering from wounds or illness from active service, are only admitted to these hospitals on the recommendation of a medical board. At Shoeburyness there are two medical officers. For the ease of pneumonia one day and one night nurse were engaged

from the beginning by the medical officer and remained to the last. As regards the case of scarlet fever some young officers residing in the same corridor were very properly removed. It does not appear a hardship that they were placed under canvas.

MR. BARTLEY: Can the right hon. Gentleman undertake that some accommodation should be provided for these severe cases, so that an officer need not die without any attention, as this young officer did?

MR. BRODRICK: The officer in question was attended by a proper medical officer, and by a day nurse and a night nurse, and I do not admit that in the officers' quarters proper attention is not given to officers who are ill.

SOLDIERS' PENSIONS; CASE OF PATRICK GUINAN.

MR. REDDY (King's County, Birr): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that an application for an increase of pension was received by the Secretary, Royal Hospital, Chelsea, on 26th ultimo, from Patrick Guinan, pensioner of the 55th Regiment of Foot, who had eleven years service from 1858 to 1869, of which nine years were in Africa and India; and, seeing that this man was discharged on account of debility from climatic causes, received a good conduct badge, is now in receipt of only 4d. per diem pension, and is more than sixty years of age and unable to work, whether his case will be considered with a view to an increase of his pension.

LORD STANLEY: The application was received at Chelsea and the applicant was informed that he was receiving the full amount of pension to which he was entitled under the regulations. The man was discharged as unfit for further service owing to melancholia and this disease was not due to service, but was developed by intemperance. The case is not one for further consideration.

NAVY; BELLEVILLE BOILERS.

SIR CHRISTOPHER FURNESS (Hartlepool): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can state the number and description of ships, now in course of construction for His Majesty's Navy, for which Belleville boilers will be retained on the ground that the work is so far advanced that any alteration of type of boiler would delay the completion of the ships; can he explain why this type of boiler is to be retained when the Boiler Committee cannot recommend it as the best adapted to the requirements of His Majesty's Navy, and definitely advise that in future ships these boilers be not fitted in any case; and will he give the total number of ships fitted with Belleville boilers, with number of engineers, artificers, and stokers on board of these ships.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): The question of what ships now in course of construction and designed to receive Belleville boilers can be furnished with other types of boilers without delay is under the careful consideration of the Admiralty, but the necessary inquiries have not yet been completed. It is not proposed to retain the Belleville boiler in ships in which other boilers of a better type can be inserted without involving serious delay. The total number of ships fitted with Belleville boilers is as follows:

Twenty-six vessels in commission or ready for commissioning, and forty in the hands of the makers. The seagoing complements of the former class are: 120 chief

or other engineer officers, 263 artificers, 2,995 stoker ratings. The seagoing complements of the other ships under construction are: 246 chief or other engineer officers, 533 artificers, 6,400 stoker ratings.

ROYAL MARINES; PENSION REGULATIONS.

MR. REGINALD LUCAS (Ports-mouth): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, in view of the fact that non-commissioned officers and men of the Army are allowed to continue serving after completing twenty-one years service, and thereby increasing their pensions, the Admiralty are prepared to extend the same privilege to the Royal Marines, by adopting the principle laid down in the Royal Warrant (Army) Article 1164, so as to place them on an equal footing with the Army in respect to pension.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The question referred to by the hon. Member is at present under the consideration of the Admiralty, and the existing Regulations are being reviewed, but no decision has yet been arrived at.

CHINA; ANOLO-RUSSIAN DISPUTE AT TIENTSIN.

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 in regard to the reported seizure by Russia of land at Tientsin which is mortgaged to British bondholders.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): I have little to add to my answer of the 15th March on this subject,\* pending a settlement of the immediate difference by the military authorities on the spot.

Sentries on both sides remain in their previous positions, with strict orders not to assume the aggressive. No disturbance is anticipated.

MR. JOSEPH WALTON: May I ask whether negotiations are proceeding, between the British and the Russian Governments with regard to this matter?

LORD G. HAMILTON: I must ask for notice of that question.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can give the House the correct version of the incident arising from the dispute as to the railway siding at Tientsin, and especially whether the British officer in command has received instructions from His Ma-

\* See page 72.

esty's Government, or from His Majesty's Minister at Peking, not to resist the seizure by Russian troops of the land necessary for the railway siding.

LORD G. HAMILTON: No instructions of the character suggested have been issued.

ANGLO-GERMAN AGREEMENT AND MANCHURIA.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: On behalf of the hon. Member for North Roscommon, I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Anglo-German Agreement about China applies to Manchuria.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRANBORNE): The first clause of the Anglo-German Agreement expresses the agreement of the two Powers to observe freedom of trade on the ports in the rivers and littoral of China wherever they can exercise influence. The second clause states that they will not make use of the present complication to obtain for themselves any territorial advantages in Chinese dominions, and will direct their policy towards maintaining undiminished the territorial condition of the Chinese

Empire. This provision is without qualification.

JAPAN AND CHINA ; FO-KIEN.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: On behalf of the hon. Member for North Roscommon, I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any information to the effect that Japan has notified the Chinese Government that if the Manchurian Convention is signed Japan will insist on establishing a protectorate over the province of Fo-Kien.

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: No, Sir.

CANTON AND HAN-KAU RAILWAY CONCESSION.

MR. YERBURGH (Chester): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the concession for the construction of a railway from Canton to Hankau, which had been obtained by an American syndicate, has been transferred by them to the Belgian

syndicate which already held the concession for a railway from Peking to Hankau.

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: We are informed that the concession has not been transferred, and is still owned by the American company, but that the stock holders of the company have disposed of part of their holdings to the Belgian syndicate.

ALLEGED TURKISH EXCESSES IN MACEDONIA.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what information His Majesty's Government have as to the correctness or otherwise of the reports that Turkish soldiery have been committing excesses at the town of Uscub, in Macedonia, and the neighbourhood thereof; and what is the nearest place to this district at which a British Consul is stationed.

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: According to information received from His Majesty's Vice-Consul at Uscub, an encounter is reported to have taken place in January last at Ishtib, which is situated about forty-five miles to the south-east of Uscub, between Turkish troops and certain Bulgarians, who had barricaded themselves in a house to evade a search for arms, which was being conducted by the Turkish authorities. One gendarme and two Bulgarians are said to have lost their lives. Fifteen Bulgarians were subsequently arrested at the same place, and have been since sent to Uscub. We have no evidence which justifies us in describing these proceedings as excesses committed by the Turkish soldiery. A British Vice-Consul is permanently stationed at Uscub.

BILBAO HARBOUR; LOSS OF THE "AVLONA."

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether his attention has been called to the recent loss of the steamship "Avlona," of Glasgow, owing to the insufficient lighting of the entrance to Bilbao Harbour; and will he consider the expediency of calling the attention of the Spanish authorities to the subject.

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: The answer to the first paragraph of the question is in the affirmative. The question of calling the attention of the Spanish authorities to the subject is under consideration.

LICENSING LEGISLATION.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home

Department whether he will be able to introduce his promised measure dealing with intemperance before Easter; and whether it will apply to the whole of the United Kingdom.

\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): I am afraid that the answer to the first paragraph must be in the negative. As regards the second, I do not think that one Bill can deal with the whole of the United Kingdom. The Scotch and Irish licensing laws differ considerably from the English.

CHILD DRUNKENNESS IN GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

MR. FLOWER (Bradford, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can state the number of children between the ages of twelve and sixteen years of age who were arrested for drunkenness in England and Wales during the years 1899 and 1900.

\*MR. RITCHIE: I can only give the number of arrests which resulted in convictions; namely, in 1899, seventeen; twelve boys and five girls. The figures for 1900 are not yet complete.

MR. FLOWER: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, as representing the Secretary for Scotland, if he can state the number of children between the ages of twelve and sixteen years of age arrested for drunkenness in Scotland during the year 1900.

\*THE LORD ADVOCATE (MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): I regret to say that I am informed by the Prison Commissioners for Scotland that it is not possible to give the hon. Member the information he desires without reference to the police authorities, but if he will renew his question in the course of ten days I shall undertake to let him have it.

MR. FLOWER: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the number of children between the ages of twelve and sixteen years of age arrested for drunkenness in Ireland during the year 1900.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): There were eight children within the limits of age mentioned convicted of drunkenness in Ireland in 1900. I am not aware how many arrests were made in that period; if my hon. friend desires information on that point it will be necessary to make local inquiries throughout Ireland, and this would occupy some little time.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet): Is there any evidence as to the houses at which the children got the drink?

[No answer was returned.]

MR. EUGENE WASON (Clackmannan. and Kinross): How many were boys and how many girls?

MR. WYNDHAM: I cannot say.

JUSTICES AND THE OATH OF ALLEGIANCE.

MR. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether there is any necessity for justices of the peace, who are also Members of Parliament and have as such already taken the Oath of Allegiance to His Majesty the King, to again take this Oath at quarter sessions before acting as justices of the peace.

\*MR. RITCHIE: I have already stated that I am advised that there is no necessity for magistrates to take any oath afresh in order to be able to continue to

exercise their functions.

#### CONVICT BENNETT;LETTERS TO THE PRESS.

MR. ALLHUSEN (Hackney, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to a letter from the murderer Bennett, published in an evening newspaper of 18th March: whether convicted felons are allowed to communicate with the press, either directly or indirectly; and whether he will take steps to ensure that in future no prisoner, either before trial or after conviction, shall be able to communicate with the press.

\*MR. RITCHIE: Convicted prisoners are not allowed to communicate directly with the press, and such permission was in this case refused. It is impossible to prevent indirect communication.

#### ROYAL NAVAL RESERVE;ENROLMENT OF BOYS FROM MERCHANT SHIPS.

MR. CHARLES M'ARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can state the number of boy sailors in merchant ships now enrolled in the Royal Naval Reserve under Section 6 of the Mercantile Marine Fund Act, 1898; what amount in respect of light dues has been refunded to the owners of ships carrying boy sailors since the said Act came into force; and under what head of charge is this item brought in the Estimates.

\*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. HANBURY, Preston, for Mr. GERALD BALFOUR): The number of boy sailors enrolled in the Royal Naval Reserve from the 1st April, 1899, to the 10th instant was 730. The amount paid to owners of ships as rebate of light dues in respect of boys carried during the year from 1st April, 1899, to 31st March, 1900. was £;621 8s. 10d. Payment for the current year is not due until the 31st instant. This item is provided for in the Naval Estimates Vote 7 (Royal Naval Reserve) sub-head (a).

#### FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE REGULATIONS AT STOWMARKET.

MR. MALCOLM: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether, having regard to the immunity from foot-and-mouth, disease enjoyed by the petty sessional division of Stow-market, he will remove the restrictions now weighing so heavily upon the farmers residing in that division.

\*MR. HANBURY: An Order was made on the 16th instant, altering the boundaries of the Suffolk Foot-and-Mouth Disease Scheduled District, which will no longer comprise the petty sessional division of Stow market. The Order comes into operation to-morrow.

#### COMMUNICATION BETWEEN LIGHTHOUSES AND SHORE.

MR. CHARLES M'ARTHUR: I beg-to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is yet in a position to carry into effect the provision of Clause 2 (5) of the Mercantile Marine Fund Act, 1898, which requires that communications between lighthouses and the shore shall, as far as possible, be available for private messages at reasonable charges; whether the Departmental Committee appointed at the beginning of last year to consider this subject has made any report or recommendation; and whether, in the interest of passengers, sailors, shipowners, merchants, and underwriters he can hold out any hope of the establishment. in the near future, of reporting stations for passing vessels at central points on the more important trade routes such as the Fastnet, Tuskar. the Smalls, and

Inistrahul.

\*MR. HANBURY (for Mr. GERALD BALFOUR): My right hon. friend regrets that he is not in a position to give a definite reply to my hon. friend's question. The subject of making electrical communication with lighthouses available for private messages has presented and still presents many serious difficulties which are engaging the attention of the Departments concerned. My hon. friend may rest assured that the matter is not being lost sight of.

GREAT EASTERN RAILWAY; PREFERENTIAL RATES FOR FOREIGN PRODUCE.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he will cause inquiries to be made by the Railway Department of the Board of Trade of the Great Eastern Railway Company respecting the through rates for foreign produce; and whether he will cause to be examined the rate book at Harwich which shows the charges for land carriage of foreign and native produce, and communicate to the House the results of these inquiries.

MR. HANBURY (for Mr. GERALD BALFOUR): No, Sir; my right hon. friend cannot make such an inquiry as that suggested. If persons are aggrieved by preferential rates for foreign goods they should adopt their legal remedy. The hon. Member is no doubt aware of Section 27 of the Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1888.

EDUCATION; APPLICATIONS FOR RECOGNITION UNDER THE HIGHER ELEMENTARY MINUTE.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether he can give the number of school departments on account of which application has been made to the Board of Education for recognition under the Higher Elementary Minute, and the number of such applications granted up to date.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): Leaving out the application of the London School Board, which was for seventy-nine schools in block, some twenty-four applications have been received for the recognition of specific schools. Recognition has practically been given to a dozen schools, in some cases conditionally.

BOARD SCHOOLS IN STEPNEY.

MAJOR EVANS GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether, seeing that the site scheduled by the School Board in Arbour Square, Stepney, is directly opposite to the St. Thomas's Voluntary School, in which a number of places are available, he can explain why it has been decided to build a board school and destroy house property on this spot.

SIR J. GORST: So far as I am aware, it has not been decided to build a board school there.

VACANT SCHOOL PLACES IN STEPNEY.

MAJOR EVANS GORDON: I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether he can give the number of board and voluntary schools in the school areas H, L, J, and K of the Tower Hamlets, and the number of school places at present required in each of these areas.

SIR J. GORST: In Block H there are three board schools and one voluntary school, and a deficiency of 997 places; in Block L, two board schools and three voluntary schools, and a deficiency of 448 places; in Block 1, two board schools



and two voluntary schools, and a deficiency of 102 places; and in Block K, one board school and one voluntary school, and no deficiency of school places.

#### NEW CODE; TRAINING COLLEGE EXAMINATIONS.

\*MR. MORRELL (Oxfordshire, Woodstock): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether, inasmuch as a first class in a training college is awarded only on the aggregate of marks obtained after examination in a very wide series of subjects, and a large number of subjects in the training college; curriculum are not essential for teachers in primary elementary schools; and seeing that many students of superior quality as teachers are lost to the profession because, though well qualified in essentials for work in a primary elementary school, they have not secured sufficient marks in the non-essentials to make up a first class aggregate, necessary for good appointment, he would consider the propriety of so far modifying the new Code as to make a first class obtainable by proficiency in those subjects, and those only, which are essential to teachers in primary schools, at same time giving further certificates for proficiency in other subjects as may seem desirable.

SIR.J. GORST: The Board of Education are now engaged in considering measures to encourage a variety of courses of instruction in different training colleges. Such measures would necessarily involve a corresponding variety in the scheme of examinations.

#### COINAGE OF CROWN PIECES.

MR. HOLLAND (Yorkshire, W.R. Rotherham): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will consider the propriety of refraining from coining five shilling pieces in the new silver coinage.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): I am requested by my right hon. friend to state that, as at present advised, he does not think it advisable to discontinue the coinage of five shilling pieces.

#### ROAD CONSTRUCTION IN THE ISLAND OF MULL.

MR. NICOL (Argyllshire): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if he can explain why the Congested Districts Board of Scotland gave grants of £;375 and £;113 towards the construction of two roads in the Island of Mull, seeing that these roads only lead to two farms and are of no use to the general public.

MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I am informed by the Congested Districts Board that the grants to the two roads referred to by the hon. Member were given on the recommendation of the District Committee as laid before the Board by the County Council. Both these bodies had an opportunity of considering the objections which were made to one of the roads, but adhered to their recommendations. The matter was then referred for the advice of the consulting engineer, who reported favourably, considering that the roads might form a useful part eventually of an extended scheme, and, further, give facilities for the erection of fishermen's holdings. In the circumstances, the Secretary for Scotland cannot accept the hon. Member's statement that the roads in question are of no use to the general public.

#### KILMARNOCK SHERIFF COURT; ABSENT JURYMAN.

MR. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether his

attention has been drawn to the case of Samuel Reid, a working mason, residing at Stevenston, Ayrshire, who was cited to attend the sheriff' court at Kilmarnock on 27th July last, and failed to attend: whether he is aware that the notice was not served owing to his having been absent from home in the course of his employment, leaving his house shut up; and as he is not a proprietor, and has no property, and his name does not appear in any roll save as a tenant, whether he is eligible as a juror; and whether, under the circumstances, the Lord Advocate can see his way to remit the fine of £;6 1s. 1d. imposed, as Samuel Reid has a family of nine children, is in delicate health, and is dependent upon his wages.

\*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I have made full inquiry into the matter brought to my notice by my hon. friend. I find it to be the fact that Samuel Reid's name is on the jury list, and that it had been placed there erroneously, as he is not qualified to act. But I also find that Reid was duly summoned and personally received the notice in ample time to have attended. It was his duty to attend; and, at least, it would have been proper for him to send explanations at the time of his failure to attend, which he did not do. He has not been treated unjustly. But in view of the man's circumstances as stated by my hon. friend, and of the fact that he was not qualified to act as a juror, I hope that an approach to Exchequer for the remission of the fine may be successful.

SCOTTISH CONGESTED DISTRICTS; CROFTER HOLDINGS.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if ho will state what balance was in hand on the 28th February last out of the money granted by Parliament for the purposes of the Congested Districts Board (Scotland); and will he say how much of the grant has been expended in the acquisition of land suitable for crofters and the extension of existing crofters' holdings.

\*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I have already informed the hon. Member that particulars such as he asks for in this question will be found in the forthcoming Annual Report of the Congested Districts Board.

HOLDINGS IN THE ISLAND OF LEWIS.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if he will state the acreage of lands suitable for new holdings recently secured by the Congested Districts Board at Aignish, Gross, and Croir, Island of Lewis.

\*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I am informed that no purchases have been as yet concluded in these districts.

MR. WEIR: Did the right hon. Gentleman say only yesterday that purchases had been made?

\*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: No; yesterday's question was whether efforts were being made to effect purchases. I answered that in the affirmative.

ROAD CONSTRUCTION IN SCOTTISH CONGESTED AREAS.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if it is the practice of the Congested Districts Board of Scotland to accept, without inquiry, the decision arrived at by the district committees in regard to outlay for the construction of roads in the congested area.

\*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: No, Sir.

## REPORT OF THE CONGESTED DISTRICTS (SCOTLAND) RILL.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if arrangements will be made for the Report of the Congested Districts Board (Scotland) to be in the hands of Members before the House goes into Committee of Supply on Civil Service Estimates.

\*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The Third Report of the Congested Districts Board for Scotland will be issued as soon as possible after the 31st instant, and I will arrange that the Secretary for Scotland Vote will not be taken until it is in the hands of Members.

MR. WEIR: Will the right hon. Gentleman use his influence with the First Lord of the Treasury that this Vote shall not be closed?

[No answer was given.]

## SALARIES OF IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that principal teachers in Irish national schools were, before 1st April, 1900, in consequence of insufficient attendance, receiving salaries prescribed for classes lower than those to which they respectively belonged; whether it is these salaries that have been taken into account in fixing the permanent salaries of such teachers; and, if so, whether it is the intention of the Commissioners to give every such teacher the full financial benefit of his classification, should the average attendance rise to prescribed standard, or should he be appointed to another school having an average attendance up to the required standard.

\*MR. WYNDHAM: Before the 1st April, 1900, some teachers, owing to insufficient attendance at the schools, were receiving salaries lower than those attaching to the classes in which they were included, and in fixing the provisional salaries of such teachers the actual payments made to them were taken into account. The question of the future payment of such teachers is engaging the consideration of the Commissioners, who are in correspondence with the Treasury on the subject.

## IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS HOLIDAYS.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, in view of the fact that in the course of last year the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland received a memorial, signed by the Roman Catholic Bishop of Cloyne and by the Roman Catholic clergymen who are managers of schools, and also from other bodies of clergymen who are managers all over Ireland, respecting the curtailment of the annual vacations to national teachers, whether he can state what action has been taken by the Commissioners thereon, and whether they intend to accede to the request of men. who have an interest in Irish education, and are intimately acquainted with its working.

\*MR. WYNDHAM: I have referred this question to the Commissioners of, National Education, and have received from them a reply as follows: Several memorials, signed by managers of National Schools with respect to the new rule as to vacations were submitted to the Board during the past year, and in view of the fact that managers seemed to misunderstand the rule, an explanatory circular was prepared by order of the Commissioners and issued at Christmas last. No further action seemed to be required.

#### IRISH NATIONAL EDUCATION OFFICE ;VACANCIES FOR CLERKS.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state when the seven vacancies in second division clerkships in Irish National Education Office will be filled up; and whether some members of the abstracters, assistant clerks, class will be promoted to these vacancies, as they have complied with Treasury regulations by serving six years as abstracters.

\*MR. WYNDHAM: A general re-organisation of different departments of the Education Office is in progress, and pending the completion, of this work it is proposed that no permanent appointments be made to fill the vacancies which now exist.

#### IRISH TOOK LAW OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATIONS.

MR. MURNAGHAN (Tyrone. Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, considering the magnitude of the pension scheme contained in the Poor Law Superannuation (Ireland) Bill, now standing on the Order Book, he will take steps to inform himself, before the Second Reading, of the probable charge on local rates should the Bill become law, having regard to the operation of a similar pension scheme in England; and whether he will obtain an actuarial report from Mr. Finlaison, actuary of the National Debt Commissioners, or other expert as to the probable annual burden on the rates, in like manner as was done in 1890 when the Police Superannuation (Scotland) Bill was before Parliament.

\*MR. WYNDHAM: I am informed that there would be considerable difficulty in ascertaining with any degree of accuracy the charge on local rates should; this Bill become law; I am making further inquiry into the matter, however. In answer to the second paragraph, I am not aware of the circumstances, under which Mr. Finlaison was employed, as alleged.

MR. DALY (Monaghan. S.): When will the right hon. Gentleman be in a position to give further information?

\*MR. WYNDHAM: I am inquiring into the matter, and will make a further-statement before the Bill is taken.

#### COUNTY DOWN CONSTABULARY.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, with reference to recent promotions to the position of acting sergeants in county Down, whether he will make personal inquiry I into the statement that the promotions have been made on their merits; and whether he will ask for a detailed explanation of the appointment of six non- Roman Catholics to one Roman Catholic in a county where the Roman Catholic constables outnumber those of all other denominations.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have made personal inquiry and have received the assurance of the Inspector General that promotions in the constabulary in Down, as elsewhere, are strictly governed, not by considerations of religion, but of merit. I may mention that an examination of the records show that the religions of men serving in the force throughout Ireland on the 1st January last were as follows:;Head constables: Roman Catholics 170, Protestants 81; sergeants:: Roman Catholics 1.334, Protestants 535; acting sergeants: Roman Catholics 305,

Protestants 118; constables: Roman Catholics 6.230, Protestants 2,147.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I am much obliged to the right hon. Gentleman for the trouble he has taken. Will he kindly further ascertain why there has been only one Roman Catholic promotion as against six Protestants in this county?

MR. WYNDHAM: I imagine it was because there were six Protestants fit and only one Roman Catholic.

COMMISSIONS OF ASSIZE; EXCLUSION OF IRISH MAYORS.

MR. KENNEDY (Westmeath, N.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether, seeing that chairmen of County and district councils in Ireland are, pursuant to statute, included in the commissions of the peace under which complaints brought by their respective councils are tried at petty sessions, he will follow this statutory precedent and reconsider his decision to exclude certain mayors of county boroughs from the commissions of assize on the ground only that the councils of those boroughs may be litigants under such commissions.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): If the hon. Member will refer to my detailed answer to a question on this subject put to me by the hon. Member for East Clare on the 20th February of last year,\* he will see that there is no real analogy between the cases he mentions in his question. The answer to the question now put is, therefore, in the negative.

MR. KENNEDY: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the same principle applies to both, and that the difference is only one of degree?

Mr. ATKINSON: I am aware, on the contrary, that it does not apply.

SUMMARY JURISDICTION; CASE OF MR. HALPIN.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether the Proceedings against Mr. Halpin, councillor for Clare, will be abandoned, as in the case of similar proceedings against Messrs. Lynch and M'Inerney.

MR. ATKINSON: Yes, Sir. I hope that the hon. Members opposite will give facilities to pass the Bill which is intended to assimilate the law of England and Ireland in this respect.

\* See The Parliamentary Debates [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxix., page 587.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: When will the Bill be brought in?

MR. ATKINSON: To-day.

LAND PURCHASE IN COUNTY WEXFORD.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if, in view of the circumstance that land purchase is now stopped in county Wexford, to the inconvenience of a number of tenants who have arranged for the purchase of their holdings, he will expedite the inquiry which has been ordered to be held; and if he will state when he will be in a position to make a statement upon this subject, and also as to the intentions of the Government in regard to land purchase in Ireland generally.

MR. WYNDHAM: The answer to the first paragraph is in the affirmative. The inquiry is being pressed with all possible despatch. In reply to the second paragraph, I must refer the hon. Member to the Leader of the House.

VALUATIONS AT BANTEER, COUNTY CORK.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland

whether his attention has been called to the case of a trader in Banteer, county Cork, the valuation of whose premises has been raised from £;1 10s. to £;10; whether he can say upon what principle the Commissioners of Valuation proceed in regard to valuation where the tenant makes improvements at his own expense; and was the local district council or poor law board consulted in regard to valuation of the premises; and, if not, can he say why this was not done.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Commissioner of Valuation reports that prior to 1898 the trader referred to, presumably Mr. J. Sheehan, owned two small cottages in Banteer valued at fifteen shillings each. These were replaced by a substantial new house which was valued in that year at £;10. If Mr. Sheehan considered this valuation excessive he could have appealed. The Valuation Acts do not require the commissioner to consult the local rating authorities.

MR. FIELD: Does the right hon. Gentleman intend to apply the English system of valuation to Ireland?

MR. WYNDHAM: I have said more than once that there is no intention to interfere with the Irish system.

THE IRISH ESTIMATES.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can say when the Vote for the Local Government Board for Ireland will be taken, and if the Government will provide an early opportunity for discussing the case of the Wexford County Council v. The Local Government Board.

MR. A.J. BALFOUR: Of course, I shall be glad to take the Irish Estimates on any day that is most convenient to the Irish Members; but I may observe that before Easter there will be two opportunities at least on which it would be legitimate to raise the important question of "Wexford County Council v. The Local Government Board." Those occasions will be the Second and Third Readings of the Appropriation Bill.

THE CORONATION OATH.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the fact that there is no Church established by law in Ireland, the language of the Coronation Oath will also be referred to the Committee about to be appointed to consider that part of the King's Accession Oath offensive to Roman Catholics.

MR A. J. BALFOUR: I am sorry to say I have not been able to refer to the  
AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Hartley, George C. T.

Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm

Aird, Sir John

Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol

Chamberlain, J. A. (Worc'r

Allhusen, Augustus Hy. Eden

Bentinck, Lord Henry C.

Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry  
Allsopp, Hon. George  
Bignold, Arthur  
Chapman, Edward  
Archdale, Edward Mervyn  
Blundell, Colonel Henry  
Churchill, Winston Spencer  
Arkwright, John Stanhope  
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith  
Cochrane, Hn. Thomas H.A.E.  
Arnold-Eorster, Hugh O.  
Boulnois, Edmund  
Cohen, Benjamin Louis  
Arrol, Sir William  
Bowles, Capt. H. E. (Middlesex)  
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready  
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis  
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John  
Colston, C. E. H. Athole  
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John  
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu  
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)  
Bailey, James (Walworth)  
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Bain, Colonel James Robert  
Burdett-Coutts, W.  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Baird, John George Alexander  
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.  
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)  
Baldwin, Alfred  
Cavendish, R. F (N. Lancs.)  
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)  
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r  
Cavendish, Y.C. W.(Derbysh.)  
Cubitt, Hon. Henry

Coronation Oath, but, if my memory serves me lightly, there is nothing offensive to Roman Catholics in the Oath, though there does occur in the Oath a phrase that the King will uphold the Church as established by law in Ireland, The Oath, I think, ought to be referred to the Committee, as that phrase seems somewhat out of place.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

PRESENCE OF THE SOVEREIGN IN PARLIAMENT; That they concur with the Commons in their Resolution, "That it is expedient that a Select Committee be appointed to join with a Committee of the Lords to consider the accommodation available in

the House of Lords when the Sovereign is personally present in Parliament, and the advisability of substituting Westminster Hall on such an occasion for the House of Lords," as desired by this House.

CREMATION BILL [Lords].

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Friday, and to be printed.

[Bill 101.]

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

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Business of Supply, if under consideration 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, 195; Noes, 145. (Division List No. 70.)

Dalkeith, Earl of

Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop

Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter

Dalrymple, Sir Charles

Laurie, Lieut.-General

Royds, Clement Molyneux

Dickson, Charles Scott

Law, Andrew Bonar

Russell, T. W.

Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-

Lawrence, William F.

Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-

Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield

Lawson, John Grant

Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-

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

Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse

Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin

Lee, Arthur H (Hants, Fareham

Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert

Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart

Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage

Seely, Charles Hilton(Lincoln)

Elliot, Hn. A. Ralph Douglas

Leveson-Gower. Fredk. N. S.

Sharpe, William Edward T.

Faber, George Denison

Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.

Shaw- Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew

Fardell, Sir T. George

Long, Rt Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.

Simeon, Sir Barrington

Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward

Lonsdale, John Brownlee



Sinclair, Louis (Romford)  
Fergusson, Rt Hn Sir J. (Manch.  
Lowe, Francis William  
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)  
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)  
Smith, H. C (N'th'mb., Tyneside  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth  
Smith, James P. (Lanark.)  
FitzGerald, Sir RobertPenrose-  
Macartney, Rt Hn W.G. Ellison  
Smith, Hon.W. F. D. (Strand)  
Fitzroy, Hon. Edw. Algernon  
Macdona, John Gumming  
Spear, John Ward  
Fletcher, Sir Henry  
Maconochie, A. W.  
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk  
Flower, Ernest  
M 'Arthur, Chas. (Liverpool)  
Stanley, Lord (Bancs.)  
Garfit, William  
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinb.,W.)  
Stewart, Sir M. J. M' Taggart  
(Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)  
M'Killop, James(Stirlingshire)  
Stock, James Henry  
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.  
Majendie, James A. H.  
Stone, Sir Benjamin  
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin&Nairn)  
Malcolm, Ian  
Stroyan, John  
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'rH'ml'ts  
Manners, Lord Cecil  
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier  
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon  
Maxwell, W. J. H(Dumfriessh.  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
Goulding, Edward Alfred  
Milward, Colonel Victor  
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'dUniv  
Graham, Henry Robert  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Thorburn, Sir Walter

Greene, Sir E W (BrySEdm'nds  
More, Robt. Jasper(Shropshire)  
Thornton, Percy M.  
Greene, W.Raymond-(Cambs.)  
Morgan, Hn. Fred. (Monm'tsh.  
Tollemache, Henry James  
Greville, Hon. Ronald  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray  
Hain, Edward  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
Tritton, Charles Ernest  
Halsey, Thomas Frederick  
Morton, Arthur H.A. (Deptford  
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward  
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Mid'x  
Mount, William Arthur  
Valentia, Viscount  
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry  
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robt. Wm.  
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute  
Warr, Augustus Frederick  
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf 'd  
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)  
Wason, John C. (Orkney)  
Haslett, Sir James Horner  
Myers, William Henry  
Welby, Lt-Col A.C.E. (Taunt'n  
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)  
Nicholson, William Graham  
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John L.  
Heath, J. (Staffords, N. W.)  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Whitmore, Charles Algernon  
Helder, Augustus  
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens  
Williams, Rt Hn J. Powell-(Bir.  
Hope, J. F.(Sheff 'ld,Brightsde.  
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry  
Barker, Gilbert  
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh., N.  
Howard, Capt. J. (Kent, Fav'rsh

Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward  
Wilson-Todd, W. H. (Yorks.)  
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil  
Purvis, Robert  
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R (Bath)  
Hudson, George Bickersteth  
Rankin, Sir James  
Wolff; Gustav Wilhelm  
Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)  
Reid, James (Geeenock)  
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-  
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick  
Renshaw, Charles Bine  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Johnston, William (Belfast)  
Rentoul, James Alexander  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.  
Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge  
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh  
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.  
NOES.  
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N.E.)  
Caldwell, James  
Ellis, John Edward  
Allan, William (Gateshead)  
Cameron, Robert  
Emmott, Alfred  
Allen, C. P. (Glouc., Stroud)  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Farquharson, Dr. Robert  
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herb. Henry  
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H  
Farrell, James Patrick  
Atherley-Jones, L.  
Carew, James Laurence  
Fenwick, Charles  
Austin, Sir John  
Causton, Richard Knight  
Ffrench, Peter  
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)  
Cawley, Frederick  
Field, William  
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)  
Clancy, John Joseph  
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond

Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.  
Colville John  
Flynn, James Christopher  
Bell, Richard  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)  
Bigwood, James  
Craig, Robert Hunter  
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry  
Blake, Edward  
Crombie, John William  
Fuller, J. M. F.  
Boyle, James  
Daly, James  
Furness, Sir Christopher  
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.  
Dalziel, James Henry  
Gilhooly, James  
Brigg, John  
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan  
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbt. John  
Broadhurst, Henry  
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson  
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles  
Grant, Corrie  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Doogan, P. C.  
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton  
Burt, Thomas  
Duffy, Wm. J.  
Hammond, John  
Buxton, Sydney Charles  
Duncan, James H.  
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William  
Caine, William Sproston  
Elibank, Master of  
Harwood, George  
Hayden, John Patrick  
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin  
Soames, Arthur Wellesley  
Heaton, John Henniker  
Markham, Arthur Basil  
Soares, Ernest J.  
Hemphill, lit. Hn. Charles H.

Mellor, Rt. Hon. J. William  
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (North'nts  
Holland, William Henry  
Mooney, John J.  
Stevenson, Francis S.  
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.  
Murphy, J.  
Strachey, Edward  
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)  
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.  
Sullivan, Donal  
Jacoby, James Alfred  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
Taylor, Theodore Cooke  
Joicey, Sir James  
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)  
Thomas, J. A. (Gl'm'rg'n,Gower  
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.  
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper ryMid  
Thompson, E. C. (Monaghan, N.  
Jordan, Jeremiah  
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)  
Tomkinson, James  
Joyce, Michael  
O'Connor, James (Wicklow,W.  
Trevelyan, Charles Philips  
Kennedy, Patrick James  
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)  
Tally, Jasper  
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth  
O'Dowd, John  
Vinceent Col. Sir CEH (Sh'ffield)  
Kitson, Sir James  
O'Kelly, James(Rosse'mm'nN.  
Wallace, Robert  
Labouchere, Henry  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)  
Lambert, George  
O'Shee, James John  
Warner, ThomasCourtenay T.  
Leamy, Edmund  
Perks, Robert William  
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan  
Leng, Sir John  
Price, Robert, John

Weir, James Galloway  
Levy, Maurice  
Reddy, M.  
White, George (Norfolk)  
Lewis, John Herbert  
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)  
White, Luke (York, E. R.)  
Lloyd-George, David  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)  
Lough, Thomas  
Rickett, J. Compton  
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)  
Lowther, Rt. Hn. James (Kent)  
Roche, John  
Wodehouse, Hon. A. (Essex)  
Lundon, W.  
Roe, Sir Thomas  
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)  
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.  
Schwann, Charles E.  
Yoxall, James Henry  
M'Cann, James  
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;  
M'Kenna, Reginald  
Shipman, Dr. John G.  
Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.  
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)  
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)  
NEW BILLS.

#### MILITARY INSTRUCTION (SCHOOLS AND CADETS).

Bill to provide for the regulation of Military Instruction in Schools and in Cadet Corps and Companies and Cadet Battalions, ordered to be brought in by Sir John Kennaway, Mr. Griffith-Boscawen, Mr. Cubitt, Sir Henry Fletcher, Mr. Lambert, Mr. W. F. D. Smith, and Colonel Williams.

#### MILITARY INSTRUCTION (SCHOOLS AND CADETS) BILL.

"To provide for the regulation of Military Instruction in Schools and in Cadet Corps and Companies and Cadet Battalions," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 1st May, and to be printed. [Bill 102.]  
HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES.

Bill to make further provisions for the Housing of the Working Classes, ordered to be brought in by Dr. Macnamara. Mr. John Burns, Captain Norton, Dr. Shipman, Mr. George White, Mr. Samuel, and Mr. Bell.

#### HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES BILL.

"To make further provision for the Housing of the Working Classes," presented,

and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday.] 8th April, and to be printed. [Bill 103.]

#### CROFTERS' HOLDINGS (SCOTLAND).

Bill to amend the Crofters' Holdings (Scotland) Act, 1886, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Cathcart Wason, Mr. Bignold, Mr. John Dewar, Mr. Leveson-Gower, Mr. Harmsworth, Mr. Weir, and Mr. Gordon.

#### CROFTERS' HOLDINGS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"To amend the Crofters' Holdings (Scotland) Act, 1886," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 17th April, and to be printed. [Bill 104.]

#### SITES VALUES (LONDON) RATING.

Bill to provide for the rating of Sites Values in London, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Sydney Buxton, Mr. Moulton, Mr. John Burns, Mr. E.J. C. Morton, and Mr. Lough.

#### SITES VALUES (LONDON) RATING BILL.

"To provide for the rating of Sites Values in London," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 8th May, and to be printed. [Bill 105.]

#### FOREIGNERS' MARRIAGES.

Bill for the better protection of British subjects who intermarry with Foreigners in the United Kingdom of Great

Britain and Ireland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Macdona, Mr. Talbot, Mr. Rothschild, Sir Joseph Dimsdale, Mr. Churchill, Lord Hugh Cecil, Captain Nolan, Mr. T. P. O'Connor. Dr. Farquharson, Mr. Samuel Evans, Mr. E. J. C. Morton, and Mr. Schwann.

#### FOREIGNERS' MARRIAGES BILL.

"For the better protection of British subjects who intermarry with Foreigners in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 106]

#### REGISTRATION OF CLUBS.

Bill to provide for the Registration of Clubs, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Caine, Mr. Eugene Wason, Mr. Hain, Mr. Lloyd-George, Mr. Schwann, and Mr. Samuel Young.

#### REGISTRATION OF CLUBS BILL.

"To provide for the Registration of Clubs," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday, 24th June, and to be printed. [Bill 107.]

#### SUMMARY JURISDICTION (IRELAND)

Bill to make provision with respect to entering into recognisances and finding-sureties in certain cases in Ireland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Attorney General for Ireland and Mr. Wyndham.

#### SUMMARY JURISDICTION (IRELAND) BILL.

"To make provision with respect to entering into recognisances and finding-sureties in certain cases in Ireland," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 108.]

#### SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

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

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS REVISED SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1900&#x2013;1901.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £;893,316, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the following Civil Services, and Revenue Departments, namely::

CIVIL SERVICES.

Class V.

£;

Vote 3.

Colonial Services

212,300

Vote 2.

British Protectorates in Uganda, etc.

200,000

Class VII.

Vote 1.

Temporary Commissions

9,000

Class II.

Vote 23

Stationery and Printing

110,000

Vote 27

Secretary for Scotland, Office of

100

Class III.

Vote 2.

Miscellaneous Legal Expenses

400

Class IV.

Vote 5.

Wallace Collection

3,333

Vote 8.

London University

70

Class V.

Vote 1.

Diplomatic and Consular Services

15,800

Vote 6.

Treasury Chest Fund

66,108



Class VI

Vote 1

Superannuation and Retired Allowances

10,000

Vote 5.

Savings Banks and Friendly Societies Deficiencies

51,758

Class VII.

Vote 2.

Miscellaneous Expenses

4,600

Vote 6.

Local Loans Fund

4,337

Vote 7.

Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York (Visit to the Colonies)

20,000

Vote 8.

Funeral of Her late Majesty

35,500

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

Vote 2.

Inland Revenue

20,000

Vote 3.

Post Office

130,000

Vote 4.

Post Office Packet Service

10

Total Civil Services and Revenue Departments

£;893,316

\*SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.): I rise to put a question as to the position in which the House now stands under the operation of what is admitted to be an unexampled and unprecedented proceeding.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): No.

\*SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: The right hon. Gentleman contradicts me when I affirm that it is unprecedented. I was unable to be here yesterday, but I read in the reports of the proceedings that the right hon. Gentleman himself said there was no precedent. Therefore I am justified in saying that it is unprecedented by the words which came from his own mouth. I wish to know how is the Committee to deal with this Vote? Now far is it allowed to discuss a Vote on the subjects which the order Paper contains? There are a great many items grouped in the one Vote. Is the Committee at liberty to discuss and to vote upon all the subjects severally contained in the Paper? Under the old system. even with the prospect of the guillotine in the end, the House was allowed to discuss and divide on

every Vote. Is the Leader of the party opposite going to give under this new proceeding the same facilities to the House as have hitherto been enjoyed in dealing with Supplementary Estimates? Can an Amendment be moved on every subject contained in the Order Paper, and can a division be taken upon each question? If anybody may move an Amendment upon any matter contained in the Paper, and take a division upon it, we shall know how to proceed. But in that case I do not see exactly how it is worth while to revolutionise the financial principles upon which the House always proceeds in this matter.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I desire to ask whether the procedure of the House with regard to the Civil Service Estimates as now drawn will not be precisely the same as the procedure with which the House is perfectly familiar in regard to Supplementary Estimates for the Army and Navy, both of which contain items of the utmost difference, and whether it is not also the same as the procedure, with which the House is familiar, in dealing with the Excess Votes, in which case both the subjects; and the accounting officers are different.

\*MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): On the point of order I would remark that in the case of the Army and Navy the items are all under one official head. In the case we have before us there are many official heads of Departments.

\*THE CHAIRMAN: I think the House will wish to follow the same procedure as it does in the case of Votes on Account. The question there is put in one lump sum. and the, question in this case is put in one lump sum. In both cases the Votes are divided into a number of items. Of course I shall endeavour, as far as I possibly can, to call hon. Members who wish to address the Committee in the order in which the items come.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT (Sheffield, Ecclesall): As you have cited the question of a Vote on Account, I desire to ask whether the effect of moving a reduction with regard to an item low-down in the list would be to exclude the moving of a reduction with regard to an item higher up in the list, and whether it is not entirely open to you to call Members who wish to speak, if you see fit, without regard to the exact order in which the Votes are taken.

\*THE CHAIRMAN: I shall make a point of endeavouring to call hon. Members in the order in which the items come, because I bear in mind the rule of the House that if an item low in the list is taken it is impossible to go back to a former one.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): The right hon. Gentleman has not answered the question of my right hon. friend in regard to the possibility of having successive divisions upon what are really separate Votes although now lumped together in one Vote. Would it be possible to have a series of discussions and divisions on the items as they occur?

\*THE CHAIRMAN: That is so, until such time as the whole Vote is taken.

THE ASHANTI EXPEDITION.

MR. C. P. SCOTT (Lancashire, Leigh) said he ventured to think that this Vote was one not to be lightly considered. It affected the credit and interest of this country, and he thought, therefore, the Committee should have more information from the Colonial Secretary as to what made the war necessary. Many of them listened on the previous evening with a great deal of attention to what had been

said by the Colonial Secretary on the subject, but they listened in vain for any precise statement upon this matter. They did not want to be told in general terms what were the difficulties of the position in South Africa and what were the difficulties and aims of the Colonial Office, but they wanted to know the particular reasons that made this particular war necessary or justifiable. On the previous night the Colonial Secretary indulged in vague generalities and fell foul of the late Government. He told them that the British Government had undertaken responsibilities in Africa and it was only when he came into power as Colonial Secretary that an adequate sense of the position demanded was shown by the Government. The hon. Member thought the Colonial Secretary did certain injustice to the late Government in that matter. He did not think the late Government were so blind to the interests of this country or to our obligations as the right hon. Gentleman represented. It was perfectly true they did not go to war with anybody. That was perhaps the reason why the Colonial Secretary found fault with them. He believed the late Government entered into negotiations with Germany which settled some outstanding difficulties with Germany; but the Colonial Secretary seemed to think that wars of this kind were absolutely necessary, and it was that which made his speech so unsatisfactory. We had no guarantee that we should not be embarked on a series of wars of this kind. The Colonial Secretary seemed to indicate that if we did our duty we were bound to go to war with one of these nations after another. That required a little explanation. The right hon. Gentleman had also told them that we were called upon to suppress slavery and the slave trade and human sacrifices; but these obligations were not new. They extended to all spheres of influence, and no doubt there had been an increase in our obligations as compared with what they were formerly. What he wanted to know was, what was the particular justification for this war in which we were now engaged? It was to that the Committee ought to direct their attention. It was pretty obvious from the Blue-book that we drifted into this war at a time when our forces were engaged to the utmost in South Africa. The first telegram in the Blue-book was an inquiry from the Colonial Secretary asking what was up. The Colonial Secretary found that there were disturbances, and he had not the slightest idea what led up to them or what they were all about. We entered upon this war and seemed to stumble and blunder along without any adequate preparation, and we were only extricated from it by the extraordinary gallantry of the soldiers and officers in command. What led up to the war? Sir Frederick Hodgson went to Coomassie, apparently under instructions from the Colonial Secretary, and put forward demands, the most provocative he could put, to the Ashantis. He informed them positively that King Prempeh would never come back. They were in hopes that he would come back. Not satisfied with that, he told them they would have to pay a heavy tribute. The Colonial Secretary made light of the amount of it, but £12,500 was not a small amount for a people to pay who were impoverished by the destruction of their commerce. Beyond that, Sir Frederick Hodgson made a demand for the Golden Stool, which was the emblem of authority in Ashanti. If they surrendered the Golden Stool it meant that they ceased<sup>1</sup> to be a nation, and became a scattered number of tribes. If that was to

be done, it should be done with an adequate: force and after proper preparation. If we were going to take away the liberties of the people it ought to be done deliberately and founded upon a thoroughly thought out policy. Nothing of that kind was done. The expedition was undertaken without any knowledge of the feelings of the Ashantis, and it was undertaken at the worst time of the year. The Colonial Secretary ought to have given them a little more information as to the reasons which made a step of that kind necessary, and as to the necessity that existed for entering upon a war which involved such bloodshed and such immense loss to the colony and the Ashantis themselves. They were told that a policy of this kind was rendered.

necessary by our obligations. They were told that we were bound to put down slavery. There was no question of putting down slavery or human sacrifices in this instance. It was a question simply of raising tribute and getting hold of the Golden Stool which was the symbol of authority. If we were going to govern these countries we ought to endeavour to do so by entering into a friendly understanding with the chiefs. The French managed to get on better; they did not engage in these little wars.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): said the hon. Member was quite mistaken. In the last few months the French had had wars with two of the principal chiefs.

MR. C. P. SCOTT: said the policy of France would bear favourable comparison with ours in that respect and in a great many others, he trusted that they were not to understand from the Colonial Secretary that this was the beginning of a series of wars to be undertaken with no more justification than this war, and that our policy in the future might be a little more in accordance with the dictates of humanity than it had hitherto been.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) contended that the Colonial Secretary's assertion that the reason for the opposition encountered by the last expedition to Coomassie was the objection of the natives to any interference with their slave dealings was incorrect, as it was conclusively Proved by the Blue-book that the whole of the disturbances were caused by the refusal of the Government to restore King Prempeh. The treatment of that unfortunate man had been perfectly scandalous, and it was no excuse to attack his personal character. In 1896 the Ashantis offered no opposition to the force sent out to Coomassie, and the Government could have imposed whatever conditions they chose, restored order in the county, and secured all they were striving for, through the authority of King Prempeh. Instead, however, of attempting to rule the country through the king, they kidnapped and imprisoned him, and down to the present day no satisfactory explanation of their action had been given. The result of those proceedings was to be found in the shedding of blood, the uprising of the natives, and the trouble for which the House was now called upon to pay. If the Government were going to war and to impose large burdens upon the taxpayers in order to put down savage practices in any part of the world, England would always be at war, and the expense would be untold. But what really was at the bottom of this business was the same thing as was at the root of the South African trouble. There had unfortunately been discovered in Ashanti

rich deposits of gold, and almost simultaneously with this expensive and sanguinary military expedition there were floated in the City limited liability companies for the exploration and exploitation of the gold-fields of Ashanti. There never was case in which it was more clearly proved that gold was a perfect curse to the people of the country in which it might be discovered. The Colonial Secretary had said that the war was undertaken to put down the slave trade. That trade, if it existed now, had existed for many, many years past, and why was no attempt to suppress it made long ago by the present or some preceding Government? According to the right hon. Gentleman, the Government had been consideration itself, and had done everything possible to smooth over the difficulties. To disprove that, one case might be cited of the manner in which these people had been treated. They might be called savage people, and no doubt it was a great mistake that the Almighty, when He created the world, did not make all the populations as highly civilised as the English people. The habits and customs of these people were no doubt shocking in many respects, but, after all, they deserved some consideration as human beings created by God, just as were other people. In 1896, when the British expedition arrived without opposition at Coomassie, there was a great ceremony. The troops were drawn up in a square. in the midst of which a species of throne was constructed of empty boxes and so forth. On this throne the commander of the expedition took his seat, and nothing would suit these people, who wished to conciliate native opinion, but that this unfortunate native king should be marched out and made, on bended knee, to kiss the boots of Sir Francis Scott, the British commander. Even this degrading, humiliating, and scandalous exhibition was not sufficient: the poor old aged mother of the king was forced to go through the same ordeal. The only excuse made when the matter was brought forward in the House of Commons was that, according to a native custom, no submission was complete unless the conquered person made this obeisance to his conqueror, and that in order to impress upon the minds of these people the fact that they had been thoroughly conquered it was necessary that the king and his mother should go through this exhibition. That this description was not exaggerated was shown by Baden-Powell's "Downfall of Prempeh," a most interesting book and profusely illustrated, the first illustration being;

\*THE CHAIRMAN: I must remind the hon. Member that we are not now discussing the expenditure on that expedition. Upon this Vote the hon. Member must confine himself to the last expedition.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND explained that he was endeavouring to show the causes which led to the recent military operations for which the Committee were now asked to pay. He believed that with proper treatment those operations would never have been necessary. He would not labour that point beyond saying that if any person imagined that what he had said about the treatment meted out to the king and his mother was untrue, he referred them to General Baden-Powell's book, and there they would see exactly what he had described. Could anybody imagine that it was possible to deal with a wild and untrained people of this kind if we outraged every feeling that they might have; if we did everything in our power to humiliate them and treat them with contempt; and if we treated their king in a

way which must be deeply resented? The recent military operations had cost us many valuable lives, which certainly might have been sacrificed in a better and nobler work, and now the House was asked to pass hundreds of thousands of pounds which need never have been incurred if, instead of attempting to ride absolutely roughshod over those people. King Prempeh had been allowed time to agree to the terms which were offered to him in 1896. Had this been done the whole country might have been ruled with perfect order, and the outrages spoken of by the Colonial Secretary would have been done away with. There were other portions of Africa where there was contentment and satisfaction, where the native chiefs were allowed to remain among their people, and if that had been done in this case he maintained that the necessity for all this miserable expenditure and terrible bloodshed would have been done away with. There were no doubt abuses in foreign countries which the Colonial Secretary and the Government might think it necessary to spend large sums upon, but there were plenty of abuses in this country which it would be equally-well worth while to spend money to do away with. Some hon. Members on the opposite side deeply resented his frequent interference in those debates, but he was never asked to vote the money for these miserable wars without having it forced upon his mind in the strongest possible way that there were scores of ways in which the money might be more gloriously and usefully spent than in carrying on these wars. The hon. Member for West Islington had done good service in calling attention to this matter, for the practice of asking the House to pass hundreds of thousands of pounds in this way was one which ought to be protested against on all sides, and if the great mass of the people of this country could realise and understand how uncalled for all those operations were, and how little return ever came to England, Scotland, or Ireland for that expenditure, he believed they would set their faces against them, and they would not tolerate a single penny-piece spent in this way.

The Colonial Secretary last night delivered a ferocious attack upon the Under Secretary for Colonial Affairs in the late Government. All he could say was that the late Government, whatever else might be laid to their blame, never entered in an unreasonable and light hearted way into wars of this kind, and the Colonial Secretary seemed to make this a matter for blame. He (Mr. Redmond) held that it was to their credit that they did not. This war would never have been entered into to put down slavery. and it was a disgraceful and a horrible state of affairs at this period of the world's history to find that wherever gold was discovered, whether it was in North, East, West, or South Africa, two things happened;(1) limited liability companies were formed in the City of London, and (2) costly expeditions were sent out to seize the land wherever this gold might be. This took place in South Africa, and it was exactly what had taken place in Ashanti. It would be infinitely better and nobler and more in accordance with the dictates of humanity if the rights of these people were respected to some extent, and if this attempt to plant the British flag everywhere and anywhere at all costs was stopped; for it was the besetting sin of this country and of all Englishmen that they were so filled with the idea of the merits of their own rule and the pride of their own greatness that they

could not tolerate or understand other people in any part of the world being desirous of living according to their own wishes in their own country. Until these small wars were given up there would be a continual waste of the public money of the country, and it was a disgrace that the benches of the Liberal party were empty while this kind of thing was going on. If there were an adequate representation of working people in this House there would be other voices raised protesting against this expenditure. In this matter the voices of the majority of those who ought to speak for the taxpayers and working people were silent, but his voice and the voices of other Irish representatives would be raised, and he believed that in this way they were doing a great service not only to the people they represented, but also to the great mass of the people of this country, who cared nothing about gold-mining and company promoting in the City, and who were sick at heart when they read in their newspapers that every day hundreds of thousands of pounds were voted in this way in the House of Commons, not one penny of which went to better the condition of the people of Great Britain or Ireland. All this money was being spent simply to carry the sword, into the land of people in distant parts, whose only crime was that God made them what they were instead of making them highly civilised British subjects.

MR. THOMAS BAYLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield) said his hon. friend, in his impassioned speech, appeared to have forgotten that we were responsible for this protectorate in the eyes of Europe. He had forgotten that in 1896 the King of Ashanti was the most cruel and heartless man this world ever produced. We sent out an expedition there to stop one of the most cruel things that was ever perpetrated in Africa.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: You said the same thing about Kruger.

MR. THOMAS BAYLEY: But there was no gold then in this case.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Oh, yes, there was.

MR. THOMAS BAYLEY said the late war was the remains of the 1896 war, and the Government were perfectly honest and straightforward on this question. They had two keynotes with which he thoroughly agreed; one was that wherever the British flag flies we must stop human sacrifice; and the other was the abolition of slavery. He only wished that the Foreign Office had been as firm and determined on the East coast as they had been on the West coast of Africa. He believed that the Government and the Colonial Secretary were honest in their efforts to stop human sacrifice and slavery. He noticed that a sum of £12,500 a year was to be raised and would have to be collected by the hut tax. He thought it would cost more in small wars and collections than the sum was worth. and it would cause also a great deal of bad feeling. He thought the Government might consider some better way of raising that sum. He gave both the Government and the Colonial Secretary credit for putting their foot down in Ashanti in a determined manner.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) said that if all hon. Members on that side of the House were convinced that these wars were entered upon for legitimate British interests they might not have grudged the expenditure of not merely this sum of money but the expenditure of ten times the amount. It would be in the recollection of hon.

Members on both sides of the House that the complaint against the Government had been that they had not taken sufficient measures to repress slavery in East Africa. Therefore, if they criticised the expenditure of £;400,000 on wars in West Africa, it was because they believed that these wars were not waged to abolish slavery but from some other excuse. If his hon. friend the Member for Chesterfield had, before making his speech, carefully read the Blue-books, he would not have made the observations he did. What were the two grievances of the Ashantis? According to Sir F. Hodgson himself they complained against the abolition of slavery; but they said: "You British are not sincere, because while you insist on our abolishing slavery you maintain it in another form." And Sir F. Hodgson admitted that at p. 113] of the Blue-book, by declaring that he had insisted on the compulsory supply of carriers and of men to make roads, but that the chiefs declared they were unable to obtain a sufficient number of labourers to work in the native gold pits, to carry on their ordinary farm labours, and also to supply labourers for public purposes, such as working on the public roads and the conveyance of public stores. The Ashantis might be savages, but at any rate they were a very intelligent race, and they could see the utter hollowness of the demand made by us for the suppression of slavery when we were forcing slavery upon them.

A great deal had been said about the mad boy and the quest for the Golden Stool; but, in fact, that was a mad enterprise from beginning to end. What did that mad boy say? He told certain British officers that he had been through several Ashanti villages, and that the Ashantis were assembling in their temples and singing songs all night. We had seen a good deal of that assembling and singing in temples all night much nearer home, and he did not think it was much more sensible than that in Ashanti. And the mad boy said that if the Governor would pay him a large sum of money he would lead an expedition to find the Golden Stool. But all that had nothing to do with the abolition of slavery. What was the defence of the Governor for following the lead of the mad boy? The fact was that the quest of the Golden Stool was something like the quest of the Holy Grail. Sir F. Hodgson said that if he could only get possession of the Golden Stool he would be able to govern the country for all time. Sir F. Hodgson crossed the Prah on '22nd March, but up to that time there had been no insurrection. The Governor in his despatches, in fact, repeatedly declared that he had no idea that there was any discontent amongst the tribes, but, on the contrary, that he had been received with all respect. The proof of that was that he went up from the coast to Coomassie with an escort of only thirty Hausas, that he had been met by no obstacle, and had never been molested in the country which was supposed to be seething with discontent. What happened when he arrived at Coomassie? There was a great reception and the surrounding tribes and their kings marched past him, with one exception, which came in later on. What sign was there in that of any great insurrection? On the 30th March; it would have been far better if it had been the 1st April; the Governor heard the story from the mad boy as to the Golden Stool, and he sent an armed expedition, guided by the mad boy, into the interior of the country. The Governor said in his despatch: "The 1st April was a day of extreme



anxiety to me." He was not at all surprised. For two or three days this armed expedition marched about the country; the mad boy went into the villages and told the natives that "these people"; meaning the Governor's expedition; "have come to wage war against you." After that it became clear to the villagers that it was simply a raiding expedition in quest of the Golden Stool. The result was the revolt, the war, and the expenditure of £400,000. Now, who was to blame for this war? The chieftains were not merely loyal but submissive, and prepared to demand redress in a perfectly constitutional way. Was there anything more constitutional than for these chiefs to come to Coomassie to receive the Governor with welcomes and to present him with salutations?

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham) said that the hon. Member was forgetting that an insurrection might spring up in these savage countries under mistaken notions.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that, of course, an insurrection might spring up in this foolish manner if this country allowed its policy to be guided by mad boys. If that sort of action was characteristic of the Colonial Office he could understand that we would have not three wars, but many more in the next few years. All this showed that the war was precipitated not only because there was a quest for the Golden Stool, but because of the irritation in the minds of these people at the annexation of their country. Questions had been put to the right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary the previous night: dates were given and incidents were referred to; but the right hon. Gentleman in his reply, instead of addressing himself to the points put, entered into an elaborate defence of the administration of his own office. The question was what had happened in this particular case; not whether it was necessary to defend Ashanti, or to develop the gold mines. The gold mines had never been mentioned in these despatches. Was the war, in the ordinary cant phrase, "inevitable"? The right hon. Gentleman said, "When I came to the Colonial Office there was nothing done; but the moment I came on the scene there were six wars."

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I said nothing of the kind.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Oh. but I have got it all here.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: What I said was that I am responsible for three wars, and the Foreign Office is responsible for three wars.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: The right hon. Gentleman said that as soon as his Ministry came into office there were six wars. That did just as well for him. The right hon. Gentleman said that when his hon. friends now on the Opposition Benches were in office they did nothing. Quite true. Their

Estimates provided for no wars. They had better ideas of profit and loss in business than that. And now he could quite understand that the right hon.

Gentleman had got into the habit of talking of these wars as if they were all feathers in his cap. If he only went on, the right hon. Gentleman's headgear would be like that of a Red Indian. He ventured to say that the right hon.

Gentleman in defending his action the previous evening did not do so with the sobriety due to this important and solemn matter. After all, human life was worth some respectful treatment. They ought to have some justification of the foolish policy of the Government in regard to the Golden Stool and of the hundreds and thousands of the corpses of savages festering round the fort of

Coomassie. It was not enough to say, "Look at the great colonial policy of the last five years." That was no answer. "I have opened up new markets," said the right hon. Gentleman; but that also was no answer. If we went into wars they profited trade to a certain extent. £400,000 of trade was something, if we spent nothing else. But that was not the sort of industry that was wanted to open up new markets. He ventured to say that the community generally would not benefit by it; that these people in Ashanti would prefer to conduct their operations quietly; and it was only when the right hon. Gentleman went out of his way to offend their sentiments in connection with their native affairs that they forced on this war. A poll-tax equivalent to 4s. per head had been demanded upon this savage community. Where were we to get it from? We were collecting the taxes in Uganda in the form of boa constrictors and hippopotami; the only products of the country. But so far as he was aware there were not even those fiscal resources in Ashanti. It was true there were certain native gold mines; but we had abolished slavery, and it was by slave labour that these mines were worked. Still, we demanded the tax at the hands of the chiefs; He quite agreed that we should abolish slavery, but at the same time we should not compel them to pay that which the slaves had earned. The right hon. Gentleman had not addressed himself to the question with a proper regard for its solemnity. He drew attention to what

he described as the ridiculous language-used by Sir F. Hodgson to the chiefs with reference to the Golden Stool, and said it would have been better if the Colonial Secretary had addressed himself to a defence of the Government in respect of the action of Sir F. Hodgson. In his address to the chiefs Sir F. Hodgson asked, "Where is the Golden Stool? Why am I not sitting on it at this moment? I am the representative of the paramount Power; why have you relegated me to this chair?" (referring to a biscuit box). This was childish babble to address to these savages in the name of the Sovereign of a great country like this, and it was calculated only to lower, not to enhance, British prestige. The right hon. Gentleman had said we had to defeat them, it was necessary to kill them, in order to show that we were a great nation; but we had gone through that process before, and they knew the superiority of British arms. Was it necessary to repeat the process periodically? If so, a greater condemnation of the policy of the Government in this matter could not be conceived. It was not a question of protecting the country or compelling these people to free their slaves. If it was a question of the freeing of slaves. we might commence that at Zanzibar. SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT did not consider the speech of the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down a practical one. The Ashanti affair was closed, and although there might be regrettable incidents connected with the dealings with these kings it was impossible to go back into the matter. On the whole the results had been good. The outcome of British control in Ashanti would result in the safety and prosperity of hundreds and thousands of natives in the future, as had been truly said by the Colonial Secretary on the previous evening. He protested against the statement of the hon. Gentleman that the late Government had too good an idea of profit and loss to indulge in this way; had the policy of the late Government been pursued in Africa we should not have had any possessions to

deal with at all. either in Ashanti or South Africa. It was futile at this time to talk of the mistakes which: had occurred, although he admitted there might be some. For

instance, he did not think that the mission which had been sent by King Prempeh was fairly dealt with. His main complaint against the Colonial Secretary with regard to the Ashanti question was. very different to any of those just put forward. In his opinion there was a want of sufficient force at Coomassie previous to the outbreak; that was a serious question, and he did not know who was-responsible for it, but someone undoubtedly was, and the failure to maintain sufficient force at Coomassie was entirely responsible for the terrible loss of life that had occurred. It was perfectly plain to everybody that a very terrible tragedy had only been narrowly averted by the escape of the Governor. He desired to know why so very small a force was left in the country of a warlike and unsubdued people without any immediate provision being made for its reinforcement; that was a point upon which they were entitled to have the views of the right hon. Gentleman. What had happened in Ashanti would work for good; we should possess in the country and the neighbouring regions a colony of great and increasing wealth, which would be useful to this country in the future in taking its products, and which would give employment to many British subjects, and under the British rule the black races would be much better off than ever they had been before, and under the British Government they would attain to a certain degree of civilisation.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said he-had hoped that the answer given by the Colonial Secretary on the previous evening would have enabled him to avoid troubling the House to go into the division lobbies on this question, but unless that answer was amended he should be compelled to press for a division. In answer to the suggestion that this expedition was for the purpose of putting down human sacrifice and slavery he challenged anyone to say whether there had been any human sacrifice or whether slavery had been allowed in the country during the last five years. The Government had accomplished their purpose of abolishing human sacrifice and slavery-years before the outrage took place. He-called the attention of the Committee-to the fact that this was merely a general argument thrown out by the right hon. Gentleman to justify a war for which he could find no other justification whatever. Sir Frederick Hodgson had given three causes for the war, none of which were sufficient causes. The first was the heavy tribute which he said must be paid by the natives, and in this case there appeared to be a difference of opinion between the right hon. Gentleman and Sir Frederick Hodgson. The right hon. Gentleman said it was a poll tax on the whole male population of Ashanti. Sir Frederick Hodgson said it was interest on the cost of the late expedition. The right hon. Gentleman stated that there was a balance of £50,000 in the Gold Coast budget. If there was he did not think it would be; fair to the Gold Coast to sweep away all that to pay the money due for Ashanti. The right hon. Gentleman said at one time that it was a poll tax of four shillings, and at another time it was the interest on outlay. This attempt to chevy these people out of the money had been the first cause of the war. With regard to the Golden Stool he thought the Secretary for the

Colonies should do something to soothe the irritated feeling of the natives. We were still searching for the Golden Stool, and the light hon. Gentleman stated on the previous night that he approved of the search. Was it to go on eternally, and was it to be "unconditional surrender" until we got the Golden Stool? Surely we might take a practical view of the question, and the right hon. Gentleman might announce that there had been sufficient bloodshed and loss of money over this matter. The right hon. Gentleman said we had admitted these natives to the Pax Britannica. He hardly ever made a speech on the colonies without quoting the words Pax Britannica. Where had the Pax Britannica been since he came into office? There had been eight wars in Africa, and there would never be any other policy so long as the right hon. Gentleman was in charge of the Colonial Office. The Ashanti war was "over" simply because the natives were tired for the present. Could it be said that with the sense of injustice in their minds they were not preparing for another war? They would break out again and again unless we met their just complaints in a kindly and conciliatory spirit. It was because that had not been done that he moved the reduction of the first item of the Vote by £;100.

Motion made, and Question proposed. "That the Item, Class 5, Vote 3, be reduced by £;100, in respect of disturbances in Ashanti.";(Mr. Lough.)

MR. BROADHURST (Leicester) said one of the most painful features of the debate was the absence from it of a number of hon. Members who were leading lights in the different religious communities of the country interested in foreign missions. In years gone by we used to hear the voice of the missionary interest raised in favour of the civilisation of Africa by peaceful processes, and not by warlike proceedings such as we seemed to depend upon now. The hon. Member for the Chesterfield Division of Derbyshire was handsomely caught in the colonial net so cunningly spread on the previous night, and he was innocent enough to believe that this war in Ashanti was undertaken out of a pure desire to put an end to human sacrifices. It was noticeable of late years that the loadstone which called the Government to relieve oppression was generally found in the gold mines, and here it was again. When this Government professed to go to the relief of human beings it would be found, if it were looked into a little further, that speculators were near the scene of their action. Talk of a crusade to suppress human sacrifices. Could there be anything more monstrous than such a profession in face of the account on page 46 of the Blue-book of the state of things that was found at Coomassie? Why, it was a disgrace to a civilised nation. We should have heard nothing about the stool if it had been a wooden one. An orange box would have been perfectly satisfactory. There would have been no demand for it had it not been that it was supposed to be made of the precious metal. Were we suppressing slavery? Before we went to the native chiefs in the name of freedom we should remove the compound at Kimberley. What had we there? How were the wealthy men who were the friends of the Government, and who were the authors of the war in

South Africa, producing gold out there, but by a system of slavery?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN asked whether the hon. Member was in order in the line he was now taking.

\*THE CHAIRMAN pointed out that it was not in order to discuss matters relating to Kimberley on this Vote.

MR. BROADHURST said he recognised that the reference was inconvenient to the Secretary for the Colonies, and if it was ruled out of order he would not pursue the subject. He might be allowed to say that the Secretary for the Colonies based this expedition for loot in Ashanti on the ground that he was going there for the prevention of further human sacrifices and the prevention of slavery. He only desired to show that we ought to take the mote out of our own eye before we attempted to pluck the beam out of our brother's eye. The right hon. Gentleman could not deny that there had been "blackbird hunting" in the interest of some of the authorities in South Africa. That resulted in the capture of a poor creature who preferred suicide by drowning to slavery in the mines, He understood that the right hon. Gentleman had assured the House that he was going to inquire into the truth of that.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I must appeal to you again. If the hon. Gentleman is in order I must go fully into the statement he is now making. I ask you whether he is in order in referring to these matters in Rhodesia and Kimberley.

\*THE CHAIRMAN: I understood the hon. Member to say that he was not going to refer to them.

MR. BROADHURST: I do not wish to pursue it except for the purpose of illustration, and I really think if the Colonial Secretary would allow me for a moment to pursue my statement, under the guidance of the Chair;

\*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Gentleman is entitled to a passing reference, but to go into this question and state a number of facts, which the right hon. Gentleman says he may have to contradict at a later stage, is clearly outside the scope of this discussion.

MR. BROADHURST said he supported the motion for the reduction of the Vote because he believed the Government, in pursuing a policy of universal war in Africa, were pursuing a deadly and disastrous policy, not only financially, but for the reputation and good name of our common country. The Colonial Secretary seemed to think a, great argument in favour of his policy was that he had made more wars than the Liberal party. Then there seemed to be a conflict between the Colonial Office and the Foreign Office as to which had made most wars. The Liberal party ruled Africa on the lines of peace, and he sincerely hoped that when they returned to power again they would resume the policy of peace, and that they would not attempt to teach savages the wickedness of human sacrifices by indulging in great slaughter, with modern weapons, of the poor savage people we sought to rule. The basis of this movement in Ashanti was the curse of gain. He could vote with a clear conscience against that policy.

\*SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I wish to say, in a few sentences, why I shall vote for the reduction of this Vote. It is on account of the defence which has been put forward by the Colonial Secretary. He has claimed credit for this Vote as being an instance of the superiority of the present Administration over the late Administration in regard to the number of wars in which it has been engaged. Whenever such a policy is advocated upon such grounds as that, I shall vote against every sixpence.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.) said this was the third expedition which the British Government had indulged in for the purpose of introducing civilisation into Ashanti. Civilisation introduced by the British Government was always introduced with the bayonets of soldiers. The Government went to these countries with the Bible in one hand and the sword in the other. He thought the English race should give effect to their missionary instincts a little more in their own country. There were some English towns where some good might be done. If the hon. Member for West Islington had not moved the reduction of the Vote, he would have moved a reduction of £18,000, that being the amount of additional taxation which it represented so far as Ireland was concerned. He protested against the policy of introducing civilisation by warfare on savage peoples, who were practically defenceless, because they could not possibly withstand quick-firing guns and new deadly inventions. It was a policy which would make the British name detested wherever conquests were made.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: May I make an appeal in the interest of the discussions that are to come? It is evident that if we discuss this Vote at too great length we will find little time left for the consideration of the other Votes. I would therefore beg the House to try to come to a decision.

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.) said the dishonourable means by which King Prempeh was entrapped must have

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)

Elibank, Master of

Lloyd-George, David

Allan, William (Gateshead)

Ellis, John Edward

Lundon, W.

Allen, C. P. (Glouc, Stroud)

Esmonde, Sir Thomas

Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.

Asquith Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry

Farquharson, Dr. Robert

M'Dermott, Patrick

Barlow, John Emmott

Farrell, James Patrick

M'Kenna, Reginald

Barry, E. (Cork, S.)

Fenwick, Charles

M'Laren, Charles Benjamin

Bell, Richard

Ffrench, Peter

Mansfield, Horace Rendall

Boyle, James

Field, William

Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe

Brigg, John

Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond  
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John W.  
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)  
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.  
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)  
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson  
Gilhooly, James  
Moss, Samuel  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John  
Murphy, J.  
Burns, John  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.  
Burt, Thomas  
Grant, Corrie  
Norton, Capt. Cecil William  
Buxton, Sydney Charles  
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton  
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)  
Caine, William Sproston  
Hammond, John  
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'ryMid  
Caldwell, James  
Harcourt, lit. Hon. Sir William  
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)  
Cameron, Robert  
Hayden, John Patrick  
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-  
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)  
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.  
Hemphill, lit. Hon. Charles H.  
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)  
Carew, James Laurence  
Holland, William Henry  
O'Dowd, John  
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton  
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Causton, Richard Knight  
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)  
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.)  
Clancy, John Joseph  
Jacoby, James Alfred

O'Malley, William  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.  
O'Mara, James  
Craig, Robert Hunter  
Jordan, Jeremiah  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Crean, Eugene  
Joyce, Michael  
Partington, Oswald  
Crombie, John William  
Kearley, Hudson E.  
Price, Robert John  
Daly, James  
Kennedy, Patrick James  
Reddy, M.  
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)  
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan  
Kitson, Sir James  
Reid, Sir R. T. (Dumfries)  
Dewar, John A.(Inverness-sh.)  
Labouchere, Henry  
Rigg, Richard  
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles  
Layland-Barratt, Francis  
Roche, John  
Donelan, Captain A.  
Leamy, Edmund  
Roe, Sir Thomas  
Doogan, P. C.  
Leng, Sir John  
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)  
Dully, William J.  
Levy, Maurice  
Schwann, Charles E.  
Duncan, James H.  
Lewis, John Herbert  
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)

weighed with the natives, and he did not think that sufficient attention had been given to the matter. Methods of sharp practice against weaker opponents were very much to be deprecated. They were out of place in the Colonial Office, however well they might be suited to Birmingham. The Colonial Secretary had not replied to the many criticisms which had been addressed to him that day. The First Lord of the Treasury had appealed to the House generally to accelerate the



progress of the Vote through the House. The business of the House would be much accelerated if Ministers did not treat the criticisms coming from the Irish Members with the contempt they had shown. It would seem that the war was made for the Golden Stool. Perhaps the Colonial Secretary wanted it as a stool of repentance, from which to do penance for all the wars he had made.

Question Put.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 137; Noes, 254. (Division List No. 71.)

Shipman, Dr. John G.

Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings

White, Luke (Yorks., E. R.)

Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh.)

Tomkinson, James

Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)

Smith, Samuel (Flint)

Trevelyan, Charles Philips

Williams, Osmond (Merioneth

Soares, Ernest, J.

Tully, Jasper

Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)

Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (N'thants)

Wallace, Robert

Young, Samuel (Cavan, East),

Stevenson, Francis S

Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)

Yoxall, James Henry

Sullivan, Donal

Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.

Taylor, Theodore Cooke

Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan

TELLERS FOR THE AYES;Mr. Lough and Mr. Broadhurst.

Tennant, Harold John

Weir, James Galloway

Thomas, A. (Glamorgan, E.)

White, George (Norfolk)

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.

Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham

Helder, Augustus

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Dewar, T. R (T'rH'mlets, S Geo.

Higginbottom, S. W.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Dickson, Charles Scott

Hoare, E. Brodie (Hampstead)

Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.

Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.

Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.  
Allsopp, Hon. George  
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield  
Hogg, Lindsay  
Anson, Sir William Reynell  
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph  
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield Bightside  
Archdale, Edward Mervyn  
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred. D.  
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry  
Arkwright, John Stanhope  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Hoult, Joseph  
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.  
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore  
Howard, Capt. J. (KentFaversham  
Arrol, Sir William  
Duke, Henry Edward  
Hozier, Hon. James Hy. Cecil  
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis  
Dunn, Sir William  
Hudson, George Bickersteth  
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John  
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin  
Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)  
Austin, Sir John  
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart  
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse  
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy  
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton  
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick  
Bailey, James (Walworth)  
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas  
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton  
Rain, Colonel James Robert  
Faber, George Denison  
Johnston, William (Belfast)  
Ralcarres, Lord  
Fergusson, Rt. Hn Sir J. (Manc'r  
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir J. H.  
Baldwin, Alfred  
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst  
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh  
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J.(Manch'r  
Finlay, Sir Robert Rannatyne  
Kenyon Slaney, Col. W. (Salop

Banbury, Frederick George  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Kimber, Henry  
Hartley, George C. T.  
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-  
Lambton, Hon Frederick Wm.  
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin  
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon  
Laurie, Lieut.-General  
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol  
Flannery, Sir Fortescue  
Lawrence, William F.  
Reach, Rt. Hn. W.W.B. (Hants.  
Fletcher, Sir Henry  
Lawson, John Grant  
Reaumont, Wentworth C. B.  
Foster, Sir Michael(Lond. Univ.  
Lecky, Rt. Hon. Wm. Edw. H.  
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.  
Fuller, J. M. F.  
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Farham  
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.  
Furness, Sir Christopher  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Bignold, Arthur  
Garfit, William  
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie  
Rill, Charles  
Gibbs, Hn. A.G.H (City of Lond.  
Leveson-Gower, Fredk. N. S.  
Bond, Edward  
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)  
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.  
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex  
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick  
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (BristolS.  
Brassey, Albert  
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin&Nairn  
Lonsdale, John Brownlee  
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John  
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'rHmlets  
Lowe, Francis William  
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu  
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-  
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)  
Bull, William James

Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Burdett-Coutts, W.  
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)  
Butcher, John George  
Goulding, Edward Alfred  
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth  
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.  
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)  
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred  
Cautley, Henry Strother  
Greene, Sir E W (B'rySEdm'nds  
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. E.  
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)  
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)  
Macdona, John Gumming  
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.  
Gretton, John  
Maconochie, A. W.  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn J.(Birm.  
Greville, Hon. Ronald  
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)  
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Wore.  
Groves, James Grimble  
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W  
Chapman, Edward  
Guthrie, Walter Murray  
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire  
Churchill, Winston Spencer  
Hain, Edward  
Malcolm, Ian  
Clare, Octavius Leigh  
Halsey, Thomas Frederick  
Manners, Lord Cecil  
Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H. A. E.  
Hambro, Charles Eric  
Maple, Sir John Blundell  
Cohen, Benjamin Louis  
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Ld. G. (Midx  
Martin, Richard Biddulph  
Colomb, Sir John Charles R.  
Hamilton, Marq. of (Londndry  
Maxwell, W. J. H.(Dumfriessh.  
Colston, Chas. Edw.H. Athole  
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert Wm.

Melville, Beresford Valentine  
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow  
Hardy, Laurence (Kent Ashf'rd  
Mildmay, Francis Bingham  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Hare, Thomas Leigh  
Milward, Colonel Victor  
Cox, Irwin Edw. Bainbridge  
Harmsworth, R. Leicester  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Cripps, Charles Alfred  
Harwood, George  
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.  
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)  
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.  
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy  
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)  
Haslett, Sir James Horner  
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)  
Cubitt, Hon. Henry  
Hay, Hon. Claude George  
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)  
Cust, Henry John C.  
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley  
Morgan, Hn. Fred (Monm'thsh.  
Dalkeith, Earl of  
Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Dalrymple, Sir Charles  
Heaton, John Henniker  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
Morrison, James Archibald  
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
Morton, Arthur A. A. (Deptford  
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney  
Thorburn, Sir Walter  
Mount, William Arthur  
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.  
Thornton, Percy M.  
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.  
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander  
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray

Murray, Rt Hn. A Graham(Bute  
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)  
Tritton, Charles Ernest  
Murray, Charles J.(Coventry)  
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert  
Valentia, Viscount  
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)  
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. E.J.  
Vincent, Col. Sir C.E.H. (Sh'ffld  
Myers, William Henry  
Seely, Charles (Lincoln)  
Walker, Col William Hall  
Nicholson, William Graham  
Sharpe, William Edward T.  
Warr, Augustus Frederick  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Simeon, Sir Barrington  
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-under-L.  
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens  
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)  
Whitmore, Charles Algernon  
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay  
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)  
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)  
Parker, Gilbert  
Smith, H. C (North'mb. Tynes'i'e  
Wilson, John (Falkirk)  
Parkes, Ebenezer  
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Peel, Hn Wm. Robert Wellesley  
Spear, John Ward  
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh, N.  
Pierpoint, Robert  
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich  
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)  
Pretymann, Ernest George  
Stanley, Hon. A. (Ormskirk)  
Wolff, Gustay Wilhelm  
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-  
Purvis, Robert  
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart  
Wrightson, Sir Thomas  
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert

Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Rankin, Sir James  
Stock, James Henry  
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)

Reid, James (Greenock)

Stone, Sir Benjamin

Remnant, James Farquharson

Stroyan, John

TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.

Renshaw, Charles Bine

Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley

Rentoul, James Alexander

Start, Hn. Humphrey Napier

Original question again proposed.

TRANSVAAL CONCESSIONS COMMISSION.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield), in moving to reduce the Vote by £200, said he was well aware that everything uttered in the House of Commons was used in the Cape by the one party or the other for political purposes. He did not wish in any way to intensify the racial struggle now proceeding, but there were times in the lives of men as of nations when criticism of private and urgent affairs was necessary in the public interest. For that reason he had no hesitation in bringing certain facts before the Committee; but he was able to do so only in a partial manner owing to the limited reference and to the fact that the Concessions Commission had not yet reported. That Commission would go down to history as one more of those Commissions appointed by the Colonial Secretary for "whitewashing" purposes, and not in the interests of South Africa.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: To which Commission is the hon. Member referring?

MR. MARKHAM said he was referring to all of them, but particularly the Concessions Commission. It was a remarkable fact that the Colonial Secretary, not being content with the dissatisfaction caused throughout South Africa by the line taken with regard to another Commission, had on this Commission appointed a representative of Messrs Wernher, Beit, and Co. What interest could he serve by appointing on a Commission of three members a gentleman in the employment of and directly connected with the firm of Messrs. Wernher, Beit and Company? He had no desire to shelter himself behind the privilege attaching to Members of the House, and he was perfectly willing to repeat out of doors, if called upon to do so. the statements he was about to make. It would be within the recollection of the House that it was only a few years ago that the Colonial Secretary alluded to the party of which he was so distinguished an ornament as a celebrated gang of thieves and swindlers: he (the speaker), however, was going to charge these men with being nothing more nor less than a common gang of thieves and swindlers. To be a celebrated thief or criminal was a matter of certain notoriety, but to be a common thief was a matter which surely would not commend itself to the attention of anyone. The Government had made appointments on these Commissions, and the Committee should

judge whether or not they were in the public interest. The gentleman to whom the hon. Member objected in this instance was Mr. Loveday. he had nothing to say personally against Mr. Loveday, nor did he wish to throw any dirt upon him, but as this was the only opportunity he had of attacking the constitution of the Commission, he was obliged to bring Mr. Loveday's name into the matter. Mr. Loveday was a member of the firm of Messrs. Eckstein, otherwise Messrs. Wernher, Beit and Company, who were nothing more nor less than a common gang of thieves and swindlers. [Order, order;] Hon. Members cried "Order, order." He was prepared to stand an action in the law courts before a jury of his countrymen on that statement. He had already in the public press and in his own constituency made that accusation against Messrs. Barnato Brothers, but had not yet received a writ for libel. The fact he desired to bring before the Committee was that the representatives of these men held every position of importance throughout South Africa. Mr. Loveday was a director in the Pretoria Lighting Company, and the hon. Member for Warwick and Leamington on a previous occasion contradicted the statement that he was interested in the concessions.

MR. LYTTELTON (Warwick and Leamington): May I ask what meaning the hon. Member attaches to the word "concessions"?

MR. MARKHAM replied that in a book published by Mr. C. S. Goldman (who was connected directly with the firm of Messrs. Wernher, Beit and Company), it was stated that the Pretoria Lighting Company was a concession.

MR. LYTTELTON said that was not quite an answer to his question. What was the meaning the hon. Gentleman himself attached to the word "concession"? There was a perfectly clear meaning to the word in the Transvaal.

MR. MARKHAM said he was not there to go into the meaning of words, and referred the hon. Member to Johnson's Dictionary. He certainly knew the meaning himself perfectly well. Mr. Loveday was a director of this company, which had a concession from the late Transvaal Government. He was also a director of the Transvaal Consolidated Land and Exploration Company, and a representative of Mr. Beit in that company. This company owned 2,357,549 acres of land in the Transvaal. Mr. Loveday appeared also as a director of the Eastleigh Mines, Limited, another worthless company, floated many times over. The Committee must quite understand that he did not accuse Mr. Loveday of being a dishonourable man.

AN HON. MEMBER: You said he was a member of a firm of thieves and swindlers.

MR. MARKHAM: I did not say he was a member of a firm of thieves and swindlers; I said he was a director of a company which Messrs. Eckstein, otherwise Wernher, Beit, and Co., controlled. That is a matter of great distinction. Continuing, the hon. Member said that when the Commission arrived at Cape Town it was met by Mr. Van Hulsteyn, the solicitor of Messrs. Wernher, Beit, and Co., who was immediately appointed to represent the Imperial Government at the sittings of the Commission. By some unknown influence Mr. Van Hulsteyn had been occupying a position in Government House, Cape Town, for which he was not paid. He was, however, paid by Messrs. Eckstein. What happened when the Commission arrived at Pretoria? According to the facts supplied to him, many of the concessions



belonging to Messrs. Eckstein were not inquired into. The matter of concessions was one of the most important questions in the Transvaal. As he read the reference, the Concessions Commission was limited solely to the concessions given directly by the late Transvaal Government. But the most important concessions in Swaziland, nearly all belonging to Messrs. Eckstein, were not inquired into at all, though they were registered in the South African Republic, and also approved of before being registered by the late Transvaal Government. Everything of any note in Swaziland had been ceded by concession-mongers to Messrs. Eckstein. The king in that country, and his advisers, became drunkards and dissolute beings, and these concession-mongers went from all parts of Africa to obtain concessions, and yet this Commission had taken absolutely no notice of most of those concessions. There were many matters in connection with South Africa

and with this Commission he should like to bring forward, but he would not be in order in so doing. The proceedings of the Commission were, however, reported in a paper called *The Friend of the Free State*, and therefore he would be in order in referring to what happened at Bloemfontein. On the arrival of the Army at Bloemfontein, the military authorities seized the printing plant of *The Friend of the Free State*. Shortly afterwards, Messrs. Wernher, Beit and Company obtained control of that paper. No public tenders were called for, and it was the only paper allowed by the authorities to appear in the colony and north of the colony. Why was it Messrs. Eckstein obtained control of that paper? Why was it given to them without any public tenders being called for? It was to their interest to acquire that paper, which they did. He was debarred from dealing with some of these questions, but he wished to say a word or two in this connection. He would read an extract from one of Mr. Eckstein's own papers, which stated ;

"The fact of Mr. Phillip's admission into the firm of Messrs. Wernher, Beit and Co. does not signify his withdrawal from the Hand in addition to his severance from Messrs. H. Eckstein and Co. Messrs. Wernher, Beit and Co. hold a large interest in the Rand through the Eckstein firm, and the change means merely his withdrawal from the 'Corner House' to join the larger firm."

If such a charge was made by an hon. Member of this House after due and careful consideration of the facts, were the Government going to persist in this policy of granting concessions and appointments to those who had done so much to bring about this unhappy war in South Africa? He believed that it was the wish of all sections in this House that there should be a pure administration in South Africa, but if the Colonial Secretary thought he was a match for Wernher, Beit, and Co. and their associated companies, he was very much mistaken. The right hon. Gentleman might be able to twist words into a form to misrepresent the views of his opponents;

\*THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think that expression, applied to the right hon. Gentleman, is one that ought to be used.

MR. MARKHAM said he would withdraw the word "misrepresent," and as he was only a novice in Parliament he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would accept his apology. He would only say that the right hon. Gentleman was able to make black

white, and white black. He wished to know why this course was persisted in by the Government in spite of the protests they had received from South Africa in regard to the appointments made. Hon. Members opposite might think he had got a crank in his head with regard to those appointments, but if that was their view it was for them to show that the statement was incorrect. He took his stand on the question of principle that the very men who brought about this war, and who had created this corrupt Government in the Transvaal from its commencement, were those men to whom he had referred. These were the innocents "who went out to corrupt Mr. Kruger and his party. Corruption had followed on the methods those financiers adopted. The very future prosperity and happiness of that country depended upon the granting to the people of that equitable form of government against which one word could not be said, and by showing this favouritism they were going a very long way towards bringing this country into perpetual turmoil by appointing men who had not the confidence of the people in South Africa. He did not know whether he should be in order or not. but with the permission of the House he should like to give one example of the kind of roguery which had gone on in South Africa. He held in his hand a document which would send those directors, if they were in this country, into penal servitude for many years.

\*THE CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. Member connect this in any way with the Commission? If he can he will be in order, but not otherwise.

MR. MARKHAM said the only way he could bring it in would be to show that Mr. Loveday was a co-director with a gentleman who was connected as a director with this company. This was one of the swindles which the British public had so long suffered under; the Barnato Consolidated Mines. It might interest the British public to know that though the mines had been dealt in to the extent of millions sterling, and represented millions sterling to-day, there was a secret clause in the Articles of Association which gave them, without the public knowing anything about it, 25 per cent. of all the profits the company made. These gentlemen put that into their pockets.

\*THE CHAIRMAN: I fail to see what connection this has with the personnel of the Commission.

MR. MARKHAM said he would not pursue that point; except in the law courts, if those firms took him there. Unless they did so, the Government should not appoint any more of these firms' representatives directly or indirectly to any position of trust in South Africa. If the Government were prepared to undertake that, his object would be accomplished. He had no axe to grind; he was acting solely in the public interest.

With regard to the question of the settlement of soldiers on the land, he said there was only one Member of the House who had made attacks on the soldiers of the Empire on anonymous correspondence. That gentleman was the Colonial Secretary. [Oh, oh.] On anonymous correspondence the right hon. Gentleman had charged the soldiers of the Empire with being guilty of little less than murder. Let hon. Members read the book. [Cries of "Quote," and "What book?"] The right hon. Gentleman did not deny the accusation.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I cannot deny the statement, because I do not understand the allusion.

MR. MARKHAM said that on the 1st August, 1879;[Cries of "Oh, oh &#x0021;"] If the right hon. Gentleman the Colonia Secretary made a statement which was wrong then, it was just as wrong to make that statement in 1900. In that speech the right hon. Gentleman did attack the soldiers of the Empire. Upon that date he moved;

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty praying Her Majesty to appoint

a Royal Commission to inquire on the spot into the policy which had led to these and other wars in South Africa, and which has resulted in large annexations of territory and increase of responsibility, in spite of repeated protest from successive British Governments."

That was the motion made by the Colonial Secretary, and in his speech in support of that motion he quoted the case of the chief named Macomo, who had been declared to be a rebel, and against whom an expedition had been sent. Upon that occasion the right hon. Gentleman said;

"No attempt was made by the Colonial authorities to reassure the chief (Macomo) or to settle the quarrel amicably, but a large armed force of 1,200 men, consisting of soldiers, free lancers, Fingoes, and others, went at night, burnt all his huts, shot down his people right and left, and carried oft women and children to gaol."

The right hon. Gentleman further characterised the acts of the expedition as bloody, brutal, foul, barbarous murder, and further declared that "it was high time that the right name should be applied to an action which almost made a man ashamed to be an Englishman."&#x2020;

\*THE CHAIRMAN: This matter does not seem to be at all relevant. I invite the hon. Gentleman to address himself to the Vote before the Committee.

MR. MARKHAM said he did not wish to trespass further on the indulgence of the House, but if the Government persisted in this policy they would bring about incalculable harm to South Africa, and they would only be serving the interest of a clique, and not the higher and better interests of the people. [No, no.] If he was proved to be wrong in his statements he was prepared to pay, and pay substantially. He now contented himself by moving the reduction of the Vote by £;200.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Item. Class 5. Vote 3, be reduced by £;200, in respect of the Transvaal Concessions and Land Settlement Commissions.";(Mr. Markham.)

&#x2020;The speech of Mr. Chamberlain referred to (1st August, 1879) is reported in The Parliamentary Debates [Third Series, Vol. ccxlviii., page 1853]

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I have listened to the hon. Member's speech with feelings of absolute despair of being able to comprehend the workings of the hon.

Gentleman's mind. I hoped that I should come across some reason which would bear some distant reference to the Vote for the two Commissions, upon which Members of the House served, appointed to obtain information with reference to certain matters of considerable importance in South Africa. I learn from the speech of the hon. Gentleman that he views my proceedings and my character with much asperity.

MR. MARKHAM: Hear, hear.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Well, that again is not itself a conclusive argument against the composition of these Commissions. Then I learn from the hon. Gentleman; and this was a fact which he stated over and over and over again; that he was prepared to face a jury of his countrymen and to repeat outside the House certain statements which he made inside the House. That is very interesting, although it is a kind of bravery which I do not put very high. It must, I think, be rather painful to the House that the privileges of the House should be taken advantage of in order to use such extremely violent and strong language with regard to persons who cannot defend themselves.

MR. MARKHAM said he did not wish to be misrepresented.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The hon. Gentleman would. I think, have done better if, instead of saying in this House, as a preliminary of the campaign which he apparently is going to conduct, that Messrs. Eckstein, Wernher, Beit and Co. were common thieves and swindlers, and that Messrs. Barnato and Company; I do not know the names of these companies, but I understood him. to say that the firm of Barnato Brothers or the Barnato Consolidated Mine were also common thieves and swindlers; if, before saying that in this House, he had written it outside the House. We should then have known what all this professed anxiety to meet in the law courts meant; but to say

it in this House and afterwards outside is a very small foundation upon which to found a suit for libel. If the hon. Gentleman has these opinions, let him by all means put them in writing outside the House and let him challenge those persons to prosecute. But, granted for the sake of argument that the charges are true, what on earth has that to do with these two Commissions; the Commission for inquiring into certain concessions granted by the Transvaal Government and the Commission to inquire into the possibility of settling upon the land in South Africa British subjects? The last words of the hon. Gentleman were that when he had been summoned before a jury of his countrymen, and come off with flying colours, then he hoped that we should not persist in a policy which was ruining South Africa. How on earth is the appointment of these Commissions going to ruin South Africa? There is absolutely no relevance whatever between the speech of the hon. Gentleman and the motion before the Committee. Now, really the one pin's point upon which his argument is based is his statement that as regards one of the Commissions we have appointed a gentleman to whom he takes exception, because, he says, he was indirectly or directly connected with a firm which was connected with Wernher, Beit and Company.

MR. MARKHAM: No; Eckstein.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Which is connected with Eckstein; it is one further off than I thought; which is connected with Wernher, Beit and Company, who he is going to prove are swindlers when they summon him before a jury of his countrymen. It is upon that he has based this tremendous indictment of the South African policy of the Government; it is upon the connection of one member of the Transvaal Concessions Commission. The hon. Gentleman makes it another point of grievance against the Government that the reference to the Commission was not wide enough and did not cover the concessions in Swaziland. That is perfectly true, because

a great number of those concessions go back some time and have nothing whatever to do with the immediate point we wish information upon, which is the value of the concessions given by the Transvaal Government; and up to the present time we have not assumed any authority in Swaziland. We have not annexed Swaziland. But, as no doubt the question of the future of Swaziland will shortly become one of importance, the hon. Gentleman may take it from me that the concessions in Swaziland will also have to be inquired into.

MR. MARKHAM: By the same people?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I do not know whether they will be inquired into by the same people; but I am certain they could not be inquired into by people more qualified than the particular Commission that was asked to examine into the limited question of the value and legality of the concessions which have been granted by the Transvaal. The concessions we have in view were known to all Members of the House. There were complaints made before the war by Uitlanders and others. It was said, for instance, that the dynamite concession was an illegal concession. That was alleged by a committee which was appointed by the Transvaal Government to inquire into the Transvaal concessions. The dynamite concession was perhaps one of the most important concessions. There was the concession to the Netherlands Railway Company, another concession which required inquiry. There was the concession to the Selati Railway Company, which has been the subject of inquiry in Belgium; and there were scores of concessions forming monopolies the legality of which it was desired to inquire into. It was desired also to inquire into the bona fides of persons who held shares in these concessions, and how far, even if the concession itself was void from some illegality, it would be equitable to respect the rights of persons who might have become shareholders in the concessions in a perfectly fair and legitimate manner. That was the object of this Commission; and the House will see that it is one of the very greatest importance to us, and that it is to the interest of the Government that every concession that is illegal should be exposed, because if it is illegally and wrongfully granted it may be possible for us to dispute it, and, of course, the funds which will thereby fall to the credit of the Transvaal Colony will be of the greatest advantage in the future administration of the State.

We appointed to that Commission, in the first place, as chairman, my hon. and learned friend the Member for Warwick. The hon. Member for the Mansfield Division, in a sort of universal condemnation of every body concerned, found a supposed connection between Mr. Loveday and Wernher, Beit, and Company. Does the hon. Member attach any portion of his condemnation to the hon. Member for Warwick? My hon. friend requires no defence from me in this House. The second member of the Commission was a valued and valuable member of the Colonial Service, Mr. Ashmore, who had been the Treasurer in Cyprus, a man of most undoubted integrity, of special ability, and of special capacity to deal with the kind of financial subjects which were likely to be brought before the Commission. Is anything said against him, or his honour, or capacity? I am here to defend him. When we had appointed those two gentlemen here, we asked Sir Alfred Milner to nominate someone of authority, of capacity, of local knowledge,

who could be adjoined to those two gentlemen and who could assist in the inquiry which we were about to make; and it was in consequence of that that Mr. Loveday was suggested and appointed. I know of nothing, and I challenge the hon. Member, instead of making these very vague accusations, to give something more of a definite shape ;I challenge the hon. Gentleman to produce, in this House or out of it, anything which is to the discredit of Mr. Loveday. At all events, I know nothing of that kind. Sir Alfred Milner knows nothing of that sort. As far as we know, he is an honourable man, who is entitled to the position we gave him. Is really every man in the world to be considered as dishonourable, to be spoken of in company with persons who are described as common thieves and swindlers, because, forsooth, he happens to be, or to have been at one time or another, connected with some South African speculation, or with some of those engaged in South African speculation? I think that on a previous occasion I heard the hon. Gentleman say that, although he had sold his shares, he had been at one time interested in South African speculation. No one is going to blame him for that; but surely, if that is the case, he must have been in this indirect way connected with some of these firms.

MR. MARKHAM: I never have.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I accept the hon. Gentleman's statement. If so, he must have been connected with other capitalist firms.

MR. MARKHAM: No, never.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Pardon me; the hon. Gentleman does not understand. I understood him to say, and upon that I am basing my observations and argument, that he had been at one time a shareholder in some of these South African speculations and mines.

MR. MARKHAM: A capitalist and holding capital is a very different thing.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I never referred to him as a capitalist.

MR. MARKHAM: No; being connected with capitalists.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: If the hon. Gentleman has been at any time a co-shareholder with any of these capitalists, either with Wernher, Beit and Company, or Eckstein or Barnato, or any other of these gentlemen, he is open to precisely the same charge he is bringing against Mr. Loveday. As far as I know, as far as any information which is in my possession goes, the connection, if there was any connection, between Mr. Loveday and these firms was no more direct than such a connection as I have supposed to exist, on his own statement, between the hon. Gentleman and the company of which he was a shareholder.

I wish to say at once that, while most certainly I have not allowed myself in any way to be influenced by what is called the capitalist element of South Africa;I do not know these gentlemen, I hardly know one of them even by sight; it did not happen to me in

my way of business to come into any communication with them; they do not come to me upon these matters, and I doubt whether there is any man in this House who really knows less of them than I do;but, while I am not going to allow myself to be influenced by them in the policy which I shall recommend to my colleagues or which the Government will adopt, on the other hand. I do say that I am not going to be precluded from using in any position in South Africa or in this country

any man who happens to have been at some time or other connected with some capitalist or another in South Africa. If I were to make such a self-denying ordinance as that, to begin with, I should be cutting myself out from all possibility of gaining the assistance for the Empire in what may still be a very difficult task of the men of the greatest capacity, the greatest energy, and the greatest zeal, and, I need not say, the greatest public spirit, in South Africa. One cannot make such a general statement as that. If the hon. Member knows anything which is really to the discredit of any person who has been appointed either by me or by Sir Alfred Milner, either to a Commission in this country or to any post in the administration in South Africa, and if he will bring that knowledge before me, I will promise him to have the closest investigation made into the matter; and, if I find his statement to be true, most certainly such person shall be dismissed from that position. But I will not consider it to be a charge that a man has been connected with one of these large firms in South Africa, with whom probably everybody in South Africa has been connected; I will not allow that to be considered a fatal charge which prevents his being employed in any position.

Another charge has been brought against Mr. Loveday by the hon. Gentleman which might be considered by some to be even more serious; namely, that he was a burgher, a Boer, and was actually fighting a short time ago against the British forces. That has not prevented me from appointing him in the belief that he was the best man, and the man most capable of giving the requisite information in this case. But I think this is a clear proof that it was not our friends we were trying to advance in the matter, and that we were seeking from, in fact, the whole

populations of South Africa the best men we could find. The hon. Gentleman, who sees Wernher, Beit and Company everywhere, made an allusion to a paper which he says was purchased by Messrs. Eckstein or controlled by Messrs. Eckstein.

MR. MARKHAM: It was acquired by them.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I accept the word; a paper that was acquired by them. What on earth has that to do with these Commissions, and why should not Messrs. Eckstein acquire a paper if they desire to do so? What business is it of ours who acquires a paper? There are some papers that I would not buy at any price, but if I did buy them I should not think it was the business of this House to complain. I again call the attention of the House to the enormity of the charges which have been brought by the hon. Gentleman, and the extreme slenderness of the base upon which these charges rest. All I say is that, so far as I know, there is not a single word in the statement of the hon. Gentleman against the personal character of any of the five men who have been appointed on these two Commissions. If the hon. Gentleman has a different opinion. I call upon him for facts, and not mere statements and indirect insinuations which other people have brought, and of whom I know nothing.

MR. MARKHAM: The right hon. Gentleman has made white appear black, and black white, as I said he would do. [HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh] What I say is, that when the Army appeared at Bloemfontein Messrs. Eckstein suddenly appeared as proprietors of the paper, and that no public tenders had been called for it.

MR. MALCOLM (Suffolk, Stow-market): I rise to a point of order. I ask whether this subject is relevant to the motion before the Committee,

\*THE CHAIRMAN: It does not appear to be relevant.

MR. MARKHAM: The right hon. Gentleman has referred to my position as being a shareholder, and with the permission of the Committee I would like to point out that, being in business myself, and not having passed from the stage of being a business man to that of a diplomatist like the right hon.

Gentleman; [Cries of "Order, order &#x0021;"]; a shareholder is not in the same position as a man who is an alternate director, acting as the representative of Messrs. Eckstein. [HON. MEMBERS: Yes.] Well, if they do, I am sorry for their business capabilities.

\*MR. LYTTTELTON: I certainly do not think it necessary to defend myself against the charge of being a capitalist. [Cries of "There was no charge."] I rise simply for the purpose of saying two or three words with regard to my friend Mr. Loveday, with whom I have been associated for four months, whom I believe to be one of the best and most honourable of men, and whom I know to be absolutely incapable of anything but the most straightforward and honourable action in public affairs. The hon. Member interpolated a statement that he did not wish to make any charge against Mr. Loveday. His words were that he did not wish to throw dirt at Mr. Loveday. Then what was his object in making that speech? Does he suggest that Mr. Loveday is improperly under the influence of Messrs. Eckstein? [Cries from the Government Benches of "Answer."]

MR. MARKHAM: I will consider that.

\*MR. LYTTTELTON: Does the hon. Member intend, or does he not intend, to convey to the Committee that Mr. Loveday was under the improper influence of Messrs. Eckstein? If he does not intend to convey that to the Committee, then his observations were irrelevant and impertinent. But if the hon. Member has not the courage to say in this House whether he intends to make that charge, but shelters himself behind one of those generalities, unfortunately too common nowadays, of desiring "not to throw dirt," then I must suppose that the hon. Member was neither irrelevant nor impertinent, but that he was merely inaccurate, and that he did make a charge, and that the purport of his words was in truth and

in fact that Mr. Loveday was under the improper influence of Messrs. Eckstein. Let me examine that. It is perfectly true that Mr. Loveday was a director of the Electric Lighting Company of Pretoria. Is everybody who is a director of a company in which another person has an interest under the improper influence of that person? I think not. But I have better evidence in regard to this matter in favour of Mr. Loveday than that. Mr. Loveday was a director of the Pretoria Water Company, in which Messrs. Eckstein had a large interest. The question of the validity of that concession came up long before the Commission got to South Africa; I think it was in 1898; and Mr. Loveday, notwithstanding that he was supposed by the hon. Gentleman, in his ignorance, to be under the influence of Messrs. Eckstein, was the prime mover in the Volksraad of the Transvaal in procuring the cancellation of the concession. The hon. Gentleman opposite bows his head, so that he knew that.



MR. MARKHAM assented.

\*MR. LYTTTELTON: What does the Committee think of the candour of the hon. Member who comes to this House and accuses Mr. Loveday, who was doing honourable service in the Transvaal long before the hon. Member was ever heard of;

MR. MARKHAM: There was no concession at all.

\*MR. LYTTTELTON: There was a concession. What does the House think of the candour of the hon. Member making such a charge against an honourable man as that he is under the improper influence of Messrs. Eckstein, and not disclosing to the House the fact, which he knows, that Mr. Loveday's exertions were devoted to procuring the cancellation of the concession in which Messrs. Eckstein were primarily interested? I speak with no warmth about myself. I can well afford to pass by the observations of the hon. Gentleman. I am satisfied that no such charges as have been made against this Commission, over which I have the honour to pre-

side, would have been made except by a new Member, and I grant to the hon. Gentleman the indulgence for which he so repeatedly craved, and which is always extended to new Members for having done so.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland Division) said he understood this Vote referred to the mission of the hon. Member for West Belfast to South Africa. It was somewhat remarkable that the Committee should be asked to vote money for a Commission before any Report had been presented by it, or any statement made by the hon. Gentleman who was a member of it. He had seen no Report, public or private, as to what the hon. Member for West Belfast had done in South Africa. He understood the hon. Gentleman took some evidence, but none of that evidence was before the House, and it seemed to him very extraordinary that in these circumstances they should be asked to vote this money. He was entitled to express surprise because this was a question on which, as an Irishman, he felt very strongly. He understood that the object of the hon. Gentleman was to promote something of the nature of what was called in the history of Ireland "the plantation of Ulster"; the plantation of the land of the Boers by people from this country. He did not know how far he would be entitled to discuss the merits of such a policy on this Vote, but he might say that, if there was any tragic page in the history of Ireland which was stained with war, bloodshed, and fury more than another, it was the record of the confiscation of the lands of the original inhabitants and the plantation of them by people of another race and religion. He pressed upon the right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary not to make the task of the settlement of the Transvaal and the Orange River Colonies more difficult by introducing into them a people of foreign origin or by adopting a policy of confiscation and spoliation. He had not been in South Africa himself, but he had spoken to many gentlemen who had been there, and he was informed that the portion of country over which the hon. Member for West Belfast had conducted his investigations

was not eminently suited for the settlement of men of a new race. The life there must be pastoral, and any men that we could send out from this country would find it absolutely intolerable. Therefore he called upon the right hon.

Gentleman to utter a warning to the many thousands of people in this country who

were contemplating going to these new States, that they would not find in the pastoral districts a favourable sphere for their energies or the investment of their capital.

SIR J. FERGUSSON (Manchester, N.E.), on a point of order, said that an Amendment had already been moved on this Vote, and it did not seem to him to be a very convenient course to begin debate on a new subject until that Amendment had been disposed of.

\*THE CHAIRMAN: If the right hon. Gentleman will look at the Paper he will find on page 4 that the Section begins "O.; Transvaal Concessions and Land Settlement Commissions." What has fallen from the hon. Gentleman is pertinent to that section, and therefore it can be raised on the Amendment before the Committee.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I can satisfy the hon. Member in a very few sentences. In the first place, I express surprise at his surprise that the Vote appears in this form before the Report of the Commission has been issued. It is a most common occurrence, when the work of a Commission extends over a considerable period, that a Vote should be taken for their expenses, and that is the case here.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: I am quite willing to defer discussion if the opportunity will come later on.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The hon. Gentleman cannot discuss his particular point now. We are not considering the policy of the Commission; that will come on at a later date. In a case of this kind we sent out a Commission of Inquiry, and we shall have to consider whether the evidence and Report shall be published. Of course, they will be published if we proceed upon them; but the matter must be considered along with Sir Alfred Milner. I think it may relieve the mind of the hon. Member if I say that there is no intention on the part of the Government to repeat the experiment of "the plantation of Ulster," whatever we may do.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER (Cheshire, Northwich) said that he understood some one had procured the concession from the Transvaal Government for the supply of water and gas to Pretoria, and he wanted to know who was in possession of that concession now.

AN HON. MEMBER: "A concession" for waterworks.

\*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order &#x0021; This concession has nothing to do with the Vote under discussion.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER: I always endeavour to keep in order. We all know that when a concession is given, it is merely handed over to another party at a big profit. What I want to know is, who is in possession now of the waterworks concession.

MR. LYTTTELTON: Exclusive powers were granted to concessionaires in 1897, and the Committee of the Volksraad cancelled these exclusive powers in 1898. The suggestion of the Committee of the Volksraad was that a valuation of the concession to the waterworks company should be made, and that the power of supplying water to Pretoria should be entrusted to the municipality.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE asked whether it would not be in order, in discussing the recommendations of the Commission for settling soldiers in the Transvaal, to discuss the policy of appointing that Commission at all.

\*THE CHAIRMAN: Certainly anything as to the appointment and personnel of the Commission would be in order.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Or the desirability of appointing the Commission, at all?

\*THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. DALY (Monaghan, S.) said that it seemed to him that £7,800 was a very large sum for the Committee to vote without any statement being made with regard to it, and he was not inclined to allow the Vote to pass without opposition. He could not see that much trouble would arise if this matter was postponed until the details were before the House, and he thought that, if it was desired that the wheels of Parliament should revolve more freely, the Government would be well advised to postpone this Vote until such time as the details were available. If the Vote was allowed to pass on this occasion, the Committee would have no further opportunity of discussing the matter, therefore their only opportunity was to inquire now closely into the way in which the money had been spent. The statement which had been made with regard to this matter had been satisfactory to nobody. He, personally, had never before heard so laboured a statement. He had been absolutely amazed at the crudeness of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman, who had asked the House to pass this Vote without giving any explanation whatever. The point the House desired to know was what the concessions were. The right hon. Gentleman surely did not think the House was so simple as to pass this amount of money without knowing what the concessions were in Part 2, which had reference to the possibility of settling soldiers in South Africa. He did not approve of large sums like this being voted upon such meagre information as had been given to the House. If the right hon. Gentleman saw his way to explain this matter fully, it might be possible to get the Vote through, but in the absence of any explanation he did not think hon. Members would be justified in passing the Vote, and he should certainly oppose it.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said the Committee was very often called upon to vote money for Commissions and matters of that kind before the Reports of the Commissions were published. But with regard to other Commissions, half the evidence had usually been published, either in the newspapers or in the House; whereas in this case they had no informa-

tion, either in the papers or otherwise. The question he wished to put was whether any evidence had been taken by the Commission, and if so, when it was likely to be printed, and whether it was complete. If it was, it was quite time that the Report should have been published. He had great doubts as to the wisdom of the policy of appointing this Commission at all. It would only exasperate the Boers, and lead them to protract the war to the utmost. All sorts of reports had been circulated among them, and on the top of all these was this Commission appointed to consider whether we could not settle troops in South Africa. Before we could give the farms to our troops somebody would have to be expatriated, and he could only condemn the unwisdom of appointing a Commission which would give the Boers the idea that our object in prosecuting this war was not to give equal rights to all, but to obtain not only the gold mines but the country as well.

Hon. Members had probably, like himself, read articles which distinctly recommended that, the Boers having now practically become rebels, their farms

should be forfeited and given to the Yeomanry. If there was anything calculated to keep the Boers in arms it was such a thing as this. If they were under the impression that their farms would be taken away and given to the English troops, he ventured to say that even a nation of arrant cowards would fight to the last kopje before they would give in. The appointment of the Commission was one of those foolish things which had been done first of all to lead to the war, and afterwards to prolong and embitter it. As the result of this policy there, no doubt, would be the idea in the minds of the Boers that there would be a Cromwellian settlement all over the country. If that was so, it would be the result of the official acts of this country. He believed the right hon. Gentleman was fully convinced of the unwisdom of his act, although, no doubt, when he entered upon it he thought the Boer war was over, and now the Commission had come over and had said that the whole thing was impossible. He was perfectly convinced that this Commission would cost not only the amount of the Vote; £7,800; but millions of money, as it would make the Boers fight to the last. There was no one more responsible for prolonging the war than the right hon. Gentleman himself. He (Mr. Lloyd-George) should support the motion for reduction.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN moved, "That the Question be now put." At the same moment MR. MARKHAM rose.

\*THE CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. Member wish to withdraw his Amendment?

MR. MARKHAM: Yes, Sir. The hon. Member, continuing, said that he had no desire to make an attack on the hon. and learned Member for Warwick.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I wish to ask you, Sir, whether, the closure having been moved and accepted, the hon. Member is entitled to withdraw his motion.

\*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is entitled to say why he wishes to withdraw it. AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.

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

Fisher, William Hayes

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)

Fitzroy; Hon. Edward A.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)

Foster, Sir M. (London Univ.)

Allhusen, Augustus H. Eden

Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.

Garfit, William

Anson, Sir William Reynell

Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r

Godson, Sir Augustus Fred.

Archdale, Edward Mervyn

Chapman, Edward

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

Arkwright, John Stanhope  
Churchill, Winston Spencer  
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.  
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.  
Clare, Octavius Leigh  
Goulding, Edward Alfred  
Arrol, Sir William  
Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.  
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)  
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis  
Cohen, Benjamin Louis  
Greene, Sir E W (B'rySEdm'nds  
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John  
Colston, Charles E. H. Athole  
Greene, H. D. (Shrewsbury)  
Austin, Sir John  
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas  
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)  
Bailey, James (Walworth)  
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow  
Greville, Hon. Ronald  
Bain, Colonel James Robert  
Cox, Irwin E. Bainbridge  
Groves, James Grimble  
Balcarres, Lord  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton  
Baldwin, Alfred  
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)  
Ham, Edward  
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)  
Cross, H. Shepherd (Bolton)  
Hambro, Charles Eric  
Bartley, George C. T.  
Cubitt, Hon. Henry  
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Mid'x  
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin  
Dalkeith, Earl of  
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry  
Beach, Rt Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)  
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)  
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robt. W.  
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.  
Dewar, T. R. (T'rH'ml'ts,S.Geo.  
Harris, F. L. (Tynemouth)  
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.

Dickson, Charles Scott  
Harwood, (George  
Bignold, Arthur  
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-  
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.  
Bigwood, James  
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles  
Haslett, Sir James Horner  
Blundell, Colonel Henry  
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph C.  
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley  
Bond, Edward  
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph  
Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.  
Brassey, Albert  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Helder, Augustus  
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John  
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore  
Higginbottom, S. W.  
Brookfield, Col. Montagu  
Duke, Henry Edward  
Hoare, Edw Brodie (Hampstead  
Brown, Geo. M. (Edinburgh)  
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin  
Hogg, Lindsay  
Bull, William James  
Faber, George Denison  
Hope, J F. (Sheffield, Brightside  
Burdett-Coutts, W.  
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst  
Hoult, Joseph  
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.  
Finch, George H.  
Howard, Capt J (Kent, Faversh.  
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Hudson, George Bickersteth

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: But you had accepted the closure.

\*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member evidently expected me to accept it. I call upon Mr. Markham.

MR. MARKHAM said that it was his last wish to cast any reflections, either directly or indirectly, upon the conduct of the hon. Member for Warwick. With regard to Mr. Loveday, he did not accuse him nor make any charge whatsoever against him. With the permission of the Committee, therefore, he would withdraw his Amendment. [Nationalist cries of "No, no."] Then he might be permitted to

say that, so far as he was concerned, in case it should be taken as casting an imputation upon the conduct of the hon. Member for Warwick, he should take no part in the division.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Then, Sir, I move, "That the Question be now put."

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

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 195; Noes, 93. (Division List No. 72.)

Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)

Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford

Smith, James Parker(Lanarks.

Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse

Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute

Spear, John Ward

Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.

Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath.

Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)

Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.

Newdigate, Francis Alexander

Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart

King, Sir Henry Seymour

Nicol, Donald Ninian

Stock, James Henry

Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.

Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay

Stone, Sir Benjamin

Laurie, Lieut-General

Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)

Stroyan, John

Law, Andrew Bonar

Parkes, Ebenezer

Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley

Lawson, John Grant

Partington, Oswald

Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier

Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage

Pemberton, John S. G.

Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)

Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.

Pierpoint, Robert

Thornton, Percy M.

Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.

Platt-Higgins, Frederick

Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray

Lowe, Francis William

Pretyman, Ernest George

Valentia, Viscount

Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)

Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward  
Vincent, Cl. Sir C. E. H.(Sheffield  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Purvis, Robert  
Walker, Col. Wm. Hall  
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred  
Randles, John S.  
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)  
Macdona, John Cumming  
Rankin, Sir James  
Wason, John C. (Orkney)  
Maconochie, A. W.  
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne  
Webb, Colonel William George  
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverp'l)  
Reid, James (Greenock)  
Welby, Lt. Col. A.C.E. (Tauntn  
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire  
Renshaw, Charles Bine  
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u-Lyne  
Markham, Arthur Basil  
Rentoul, James Alexander  
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)  
Maxwell, W.J. H. (Dumfriessh.  
Renwick, George  
Wilson, John (Falkirk)  
Mildmay, Francis Bingham  
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Milward, Colonel Victor  
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.  
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh, N.)  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander  
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H.(Yorks.)  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Saunderson, Rt Hn. Col. Edw. J.  
Wolff, Gustay Wilhelm  
More, Root. Jasper (Shropshire  
Sharpe, William Edward T.  
Wrightson, Sir Thomas  
Morgan, David J. (Walthamst.  
Simeon, Sir Barrington  
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)  
Morgan, Hn. Fred, (Monm'thsh.  
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)



Morrell, George Herbert  
Skewes-Cox, Thomas  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)  
Morrison, James Archibald  
Smith, HC (North'um. Tynes'de  
NOES.  
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. F.)  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)  
Abraham, William (Rhondda)  
Grant, Corrie  
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)  
Allan, William (Gateshead)  
Hammond, John  
O'Dowd, John  
Barlow, John Emmott  
Harmsworth, R. Leicester  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)  
Hayden, John Patrick  
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.)  
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)  
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.  
O'Malley, William  
Bell, Richard  
Holland, William Henry  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Boyle, James  
Jameson, Major J. Eustace  
Reddy, M.  
Brigs, John  
Jones, William (Carnarvons.)  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Broadhurst, Henry  
Jordan, Jeremiah  
Rigg, Richard  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Joyce, Michael  
Roche, John  
Burt, Thomas  
Kennedy, Patrick James  
Roe, Sir Thomas  
Came, William Sproston  
Kitson, Sir James

Shipman, Dr. John G.  
Caldwell, James  
Layland-Barratt, Francis  
Sullivan, Donal  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Leamy, Edmund  
Taylor, Theodore Cooke  
Clancy, John Joseph  
Leng, Sir John  
Thomas, A. (Glamorgan, E.)  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Levy, Maurice  
Thomas, J. A. Glam., Gower  
Crean, Eugene  
Lewis, John Herbert  
Thompson, E. C. (Monaghan, N.  
Daly, James  
Lloyd-George, David  
Trevelyan, Charles Philips  
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)  
Lough, Thomas  
Tully, Jasper  
Doogan, P. C.  
Lundon, W.  
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan  
Dully, William J.  
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.  
Weir, James Galloway  
Duncan, James H.  
M'Dermott, Patrick  
White, George (Norfolk)  
Dunn, Sir William  
M'Kenna, Reginald  
White, Luke (York, E. R.)  
Emmott, Alfred  
Mansfield, Horace Rendall  
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)  
Farquharson, Dr. Robert  
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)  
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)  
Farrell, James Patrick  
Moss, Samuel  
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)  
Fenwick, Charles  
Murphy, J.  
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)

Ffrench, Peter

Norton, Capt. Cecil William

Yoxall, James Henry

Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond

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

TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

Furness, Sir Christopher

O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid)

Gilhooly, James

O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)

Question, "That the Item, Class 5, Vote 3, be reduced by £;200, in respect of the Transvaal Concessions and Land Settlement Commissions," put accordingly, and negatived.

Original Question again proposed.

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

BRITISH EAST AFRICA PROTECTORATE.

\*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said the British East African Protectorate had a finance of the strangest description. It was, he believed, the only subject on the Civil Service Estimates in regard to which there was always a Supplementary Estimate, and that Supplementary Estimate generally largely exceeded in amount the original Estimate for the year. That made this Protectorate unique in its finance. That it was no exaggeration to say there was always a Supplementary Estimate was shown by the fact that there were two Estimates each year in 1896, 1897, 1898, 1899, 1900, and also this year. Financial purists who objected to Supplementary Estimates would find this case certainly by far the strongest that existed in the Estimates, and doubtless notice would be taken of it. Different reasons were given in different years by the Foreign Office for the Supplementary Estimate. Sometimes the Committee were frankly told that it was in consequence of deficiency on revenue, and at other times, as on the present occasion, that it was due to wars. But each year when the Appropriation accounts appeared there was always a muddle of the finances of the protectorate; wars, the ordinary pay and upkeep of the troops in time of peace, police, justice, charges which ought really to appear in the Uganda Railway Vote, telegraph charges; all were muddled together in the most inextricable fashion, and he was afraid that those accounts had hardly justified in past years the particular explanations which had been given of the Supplementary Estimates. In 1900 there was a very large Supplementary Estimate, mostly accounted for by wars, and the then Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs promised that there would be a very great reduction in the Estimates this year. As the Committee could see, however, by the large Supplementary Vote now before them, and the ordinary Vote in the Estimates, the promise had not been kept. The explanation was that the Foreign Office had been carrying on officially and publicly two wars, and, he believed, a third war had, as a matter of fact, been raging, but of that the Committee had no information. The Appropriation Accounts showing the allocation in past years of the two Votes; the

Supplementary and the ordinary; for this protectorate brought together a most curious collection of items, including compensation to slave-owners. He mentioned that in case the Under Secretary of State could give the Committee any information in regard to it.

This protectorate presented the very worst specimen of either colonial or protectorate finance appearing in the Accounts. Even Uganda, which had had a curious financial history, had not involved this constant supremacy of the Supplementary over the ordinary Estimate. The wars to which the excesses were attributed were conducted by an Office, the real duty of which was not to carry on wars, but to conduct the diplomatic and consular business of the country. The better one thought of the Foreign Office, the more fit one thought it was for its task, the less one wished that it should have this sort of business on its hands. The foreign affairs of this country were sufficiently complicated, and the demands on the attention of the Foreign Office in regard to China and other parts of the world were quite enough, without that Office being called upon either to administer protectorates or to engage armies and carry on wars. There was nothing in which this country differed more from every other country than in the fact that here we had Colonial Office armies. Foreign Office armies, the Indian Army-employed in Africa, and a medley of troops and war expenditure charged on the Civil Service Estimates; all entirely outside the control of the War Office, both as regards the command and the composition of the forces. The Foreign Office could not provide generals, but had to hire its troops, to some extent, and its officers, very largely, from the War Office and the India Office to carry on these wars, with the result that there were these Supplementary Estimates year after year. The concealment, both of the finance and of the wars, was very considerable. The country was not allowed the ordinary sources of information. Those who served the Foreign Office on that coast were not permitted to make

any statement as to what was passing, and very little indeed was known in this country as to what really did occur. In the past the country had gradually become aware of much that passed on that coast; in the course of time people heard the details of the wars, and of the troubles which led to those wars, from two sources; the Primitive Methodist missionaries and the Church of England missionaries in East Africa.

He desired to ask the Under Secretary of State whether he was able to report to the House any change in the views of the Government as to the future of this strip of territory? Might the country look to the Foreign Office contemplating the possibility of divesting themselves of the control and the government of this land? The original reasons given for the Foreign Office holding such places at all was that complications might arise with other countries. But there was much less risk nowadays of complications with foreign countries on the British East African coast than in almost any other part of the world in which this country was interested. Sir Arthur Hardinge, having received the promotion he deserved, had been replaced by another officer in chief command. Sir Arthur Hardinge held very peculiar views, which he frankly stated both publicly and privately. The Committee desired to know, with regard to the future of this

territory, what chance there was that the promises by which the Government were supposed to be bound, under the advice of Sir Arthur Hardinge, would be gradually got rid of. In British East Africa we were supposed to be obliged to tolerate an exceptional condition of affairs, in order to avoid risings and petty wars. We had recognised the institution of slavery to a degree in which we had never recognised it in any other part of the world, and had been told this was necessary to avoid troubles with Arab chiefs. But risings had not been avoided, year by year the Committee were asked to vote large sums of money; £200,000, £300,000, and sometimes £400,000; for these wretched little wars with the very Arab chiefs who were supposed to be conciliated by the promises which had been made. He had always denied that any promise had been made which was different from the ordinary pledges which had been given over and over again, and which were not supposed to commit us to any recognition of slavery. The promise which was made when we took over the government, not by anyone sent out from home, but by a junior officer in the Navy who became Prime Minister to the Sultan of Zanzibar, was that for the future we would observe the laws and customs of the country. Such promises had been made hundreds of times in India, but had never been supposed to commit us to a recognition; certainly not for a prolonged period; of the status of slavery. The Secretary of State, who was supposed to have authorised the promise, had stated publicly that he had never intended such a promise to be made, or one in any way committing us as to the future. The facts that had been revealed from time to time as to the slavery in the protectorate were such that he asked whether the time had not now come when the Government could give some pledge as to the future. If we were not able to avoid these worrying little wars, involving the payment of such large sums of money, at all events we should abolish the legal status of slavery in British East Africa as we had abolished it in every other part of the Empire. In order to get a statement from the Under Secretary of State he moved to reduce the Vote by £1,000.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Item, Class 5, Vote 2, be reduced by £1,000, in respect of British East Africa."; (Sir Charles Dilke.)

\*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRANBORNE, Rochester), who was very imperfectly heard in the gallery, was understood to express the opinion that the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean was over-suspicious with regard to the Supplementary Estimate under discussion. The right hon. Gentleman had said that various excuses were put forward year after year, and he apparently had no very great confidence that the reasons put forward for the extra expenditure altogether corresponded to the facts.

\*SIR CHARLES DILKE: They are not complete.

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: Personally, I am not conscious of any incompleteness. The right hon. Gentleman had a very great experience of public affairs, and the noble Lord confessed that his suspicious attitude made him somewhat uncomfortable as to how affairs were arranged in the older days. On the present occasion he came before the Committee quite frankly, without any artifice; he perceived whatever, and asked that they should find the money necessary for the

particular war we had undertaken in East Africa. Before going into the particulars of that expedition, however, he would refer briefly to the general matters about which the right hon. Gentleman had spoken. Those matters were, if he might say so, entirely irrelevant to the Vote before the Committee, because money was taken only for the particular subject referred to.

The right hon. Gentleman had said that the finance of the protectorate was always in the greatest confusion; that the expedients adopted by the Foreign Office were almost chaotic in their character; and that troops were borrowed from anywhere to carry on these wars. It was perfectly true that one part of the British Empire went to another part to obtain assistance, but that was one of the great advantages of belonging to a great organisation like the British Empire; that one part could help another. But it was not at all the fact that the Foreign Office authorities had nothing to rely upon themselves. There were a series of bodies of troops, some in Central Africa, some in Uganda, and some in British East Africa, and before long there would be some in Somali-land also. The right hon. Gentleman stated that no information was given to the House of Commons as to what occurred in this protectorate. The reason so little was heard of these small expeditions was that in the midst of all the great events of the British Empire they were really of only slight public interest. What was it that gave the House and the country information as to the war in South Africa? It was the presence of special correspondents on the spot. Would anybody suggest that any of our great newspapers would be well-advised in sending special correspondents to watch these punitive expeditions? Of

course they would not, and consequently that great source of information was not available. The same amount of secrecy as was undoubtedly necessary in foreign affairs was not requisite in regard to these expeditions, and the right hon.

Gentleman had only to place questions on the Paper; he would find no reluctance on the part of the Foreign Office to reply fully. The only reason Papers had not been laid on the Table concerning affairs in East Africa was that the information was not yet complete, and, considering the small amount of matter in hand, it was thought to be wiser to wait until full and complete despatches had been received. If, however, the Committee was very anxious about the matter, there probably would be no unwillingness to lay on the Table the incomplete papers.

The right hon. Gentleman had referred to the question of slavery, but that had nothing to do with this Vote, and the war which had been undertaken had nothing whatever to do with slavery. Slavery was a very important question; it had been debated over and over again in the House, the position of the Government had been several times stated, and he (the noble Lord) would be prepared to deal with the question on the proper occasion. The particular war in British East Africa to which the right hon. Gentleman had referred was in Jubaland, whereas the other had to do with Somali-land, and it was for these two wars that the Committee were asked to provide this money. The war in Jubaland had nothing to do with slavery, but, as so often happened, with a case of murder. The British Agent, Mr. Jenner, a most valuable public servant, had great sympathy with the people among whom he moved. He unfortunately had too much confidence in his

influence over the people, and consequently trusted them in a way which was now a cause of regret. It appeared that he had some difference with a chief who was accused of complicity in a crime which had been committed a little while previously, and for which a certain amount of punishment had been imposed by Mr. Jenner. In consequence, this chief conceived a great hatred for Mr. Jenner, and, in concert with another chief, waited for a favourable opportunity for revenge. At the end of November, Mr. Jenner, with only a small escort, went up country for

surveying purposes; he was followed and murdered. When a British officer in the execution of his duty was murdered, the first duty of the Government was to see that that murder was promptly avenged, and hence this expedition. The total force, when it moved off, numbered about 1,500 men. These troops took a little time to get together, as some had to be obtained from India, and then they had to be properly rationed, and everything else made ready. They marched some distance up the valley of the Juba, and then fifty-seven miles in a north-westerly direction, when they were suddenly attacked by Ogadens. and, as small expeditions go, a really sanguinary battle ensued. He was sorry to say that amongst those who were killed on the British side were Colonel Maitland and another officer. The difficulties of the country were very great. They could hear the enemy talking on each side of them, so close did they get to them without being seen. The flying column behaved admirably under such circumstances. They had not yet received the written reports from the officers in command in regard to what actually happened, and he anxiously awaited those reports, which would immediately be laid on the Table. With regard to the future, certain precautions were going to be taken, and if all went well there ought to be no more fighting. Of course it was impossible to make expeditions without paying for them, and the long and short of this Vote was that the Committee were now asked to vote the money for that purpose. It was an absolutely unexpected expedition which was forced upon the Government, and no amount of businesslike capacity on the part of the Foreign Office or on the part of the Colonial Office could have led them to foresee that Mr. Jenner would be murdered in November. Consequently, no amount of foresight could have avoided the expedition.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): I wish to congratulate the noble Lord upon the very accurate knowledge which he appears to possess upon this subject. I agree with him to this extent; that a murder was committed of a British officer, and that entailed a punitive expedition, and that has been successful; but, unfortunately, it has

entailed considerable loss on our side and on the other side. I do not think that the noble Lord representing the Foreign Office was entirely justified in putting aside the very pertinent remarks made by my right hon. friend. Though this Estimate may have been necessary, what we complain of is that, with the exception of the speech just made by the noble Lord, we have had no explanation of the circumstances which rendered this expenditure necessary. With these large amounts perpetually occurring the Government give us cause to complain; that this country is put to large expense in regard to these protectorates, and we

have no proper opportunity of controlling this expenditure. To that point the noble Lord made no reply at all. This is not only the case in regard to warlike operations, but also in regard to other matters. It is not in order now to discuss that unfortunate Uganda railway, but whether it is in regard to war or to railways the Government show the same unbusiness like qualities which have followed their operations in British East Africa. I agree with the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean that the time has come when such questions as this should come under the control of the Colonial Office, and should not remain in the hands of the Foreign Office. It is clear that in the earlier stages of these spheres of influence and protectorates when they have to be delimited they should be in the hands of the Foreign Office, but when there is no question of delimitation they should be under the control of the Colonial Office. I am not pressing the noble Lord to hand this over to the Colonial Office, because we had information given to us in regard to that Office last night which did not commend itself to my views at all. I think it must be acknowledged that the natural place for a colony is to be under the Colonial Office, and not the Foreign Office. The noble Lord declined to discuss a question which I think is pertinent and of great importance, and that is the question in regard to the legal status of slavery in East Africa, which still remains.

\*THE CHAIRMAN: As this money is only taken for a military expedition, a discussion of the legal status of slavery will not be in order.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: All I will say upon that point is that I hope the noble Lord will give this matter his best attention, and not be too much bound by the action of his predecessor. As regards this Supplementary Vote I shall not oppose it, but I hope the noble Lord will be able to look into the finances of British East Africa and see that these perpetual Votes are not so constantly recurring under his auspices.

\*MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) said that if the noble Lord would turn to the last report of the Comptroller and Auditor General he would find that the accounts in previous years for this particular Vote had not been sent in with full details at all. A considerable number of vouchers had been lost, and the figures were merely reminiscent of what the facts might have been. He thought the whole question of the British Protectorate of East Africa could not be considered merely in the light of what it had cost in the present year. He proposed to recall to the mind of the Committee what were the hopes with which the Government went into British East Africa and how year after year those hopes had been falsified. They took over the territory in 1895, and the representative of the Foreign Office in this House at that time told the Committee that the estimated cost would be £30,000 a year. The Colonial Secretary also spoke at that time, and described this protectorate as a vast and fertile territory where we should ultimately establish the Pax Britannica, which would enable the people to live quietly together and engage in agricultural and other pursuits. He hoped this Committee before it sanctioned this Estimate would realise how far those hopes of successful agricultural pursuits and the establishment of the Pax Britannica had been justified by the course of events. In 1895 the original



Estimate was £30,000, but the Supplementary Estimate for that year amounted to £20,975; in 1897 the original Estimate exceeded the former original Estimate and the Supplementary Estimate put together, for it amounted to £65,000, and this was followed by a Supplementary Estimate of £36,700. In the year 1898 the amount asked for was £75,000, and this was followed by yet another Supplementary Estimate of £35,000. In the year 1899 £90,000 was asked for, and this was followed by a Supplementary Estimate of £54,000. In the year 1900 the original Estimate was £99,000, to which was added a smaller Supplementary Estimate, this time of £11,000. In 1901 the original Estimate was £87,000, but the Supplementary Estimate which they were now discussing amounted to £140,000. Therefore, this country, which was to cost £30,000 a year, was costing £227,000 for this year alone, and every single year since England first took it over the original estimated cost had been enormously exceeded, and never less than doubled. In return for this expenditure the trade they got was nothing approaching the vast amount of money which had been expended in this protectorate. Every penny of these Supplementary Estimates had been voted not in the peaceful development of the country; not to establish the Pax Britannica, but in carrying war into the homes of the natives. Were they wise in continuing a policy which had falsified every one of their hopes and belied all their calculations, and which had shown every official prophecy on the subject to have been wrong? Mr. Jenner had been killed, and it was the duty of the British Government to take such measures as were necessary to secure the safety of the British Residents there in the future. But the point to be considered was, in his opinion, whether they were wise in sending British Residents into those territories at all, for the cost of protecting them there far exceeded anything which they might expect to get in return. If his right hon. friend proceeded to a division he should certainly support him in the Lobby. They were having these unexpected and unexplained Estimates hurled at their heads too often. The hon. Member for Poplar had shown that this result was mostly due to placing the control and management of these protectorates in the hands of a Department which was not suited for the work. Was it wise, prudent, or businesslike to take the administration of these territories out of the hands of the Department which possessed trained people to do that particular work? He remembered that the present Secretary of State for War promised the House he would not have a Supplementary Estimate this year for Uganda. He was able to do so with confidence, because, as has since appeared, he knew that the Foreign Office Army was fully occupied elsewhere. Evidently, the Foreign Office meant to show that they could have their little wars as well as the Colonial Office.

MR. J. P. FARRELL said that the part of the Empire which he represented would not be benefited by the expenditure of these enormous sums for this most unfortunate expedition. He did not know of a single case where the loss of one life had cost so much to the country. This officer went into that country without escort and without any military protection, knowing that his life was in danger, and he undertook this survey and was murdered by this chief who had vindictive feelings towards him. The result was this punitive expedition, and

because one British official had lost his life some forty troops had been killed or wounded on our side and some 400 of the enemy had been destroyed. No less than 400 people had been killed in order to avenge the death of one officer, and the sum of £140,000 had been placed upon the taxes of this country. He could not congratulate the Government upon this way of establishing the Pax Britannica. The country had been called the white man's grave, for it was very marshy, and malarial fever there was most deadly. What did England gain by all this? The hon. Gentleman who had just spoken had proved that in trade they received nothing like an adequate return for this expenditure. They must arrive at the conclusion that the policy of the Government in this respect had been extravagant and had not been successful, and instead of benefiting British trade it had been a great failure. He thought the claim that they should abandon such a policy was a reasonable and just one. In Ireland they got no benefit whatever, and this policy increased their taxes in a shocking and extravagant manner. The facts placed before the Committee that evening were startling in the highest degree. He had always understood that slavery was not tolerated in any country where the British flag floated, and yet it was admitted that slavery was in full force in this protectorate.

\*THE CHAIRMAN: The question of slavery does not arise.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: They should have more information about the staff of officials than had been yet given to the Committee. It had been pointed out that the press of this country was not represented in these expeditions, and the public had to rely on officials for information. If all the information was to be judged by that supplied by the officials of this House, there was considerable room for improvement as to the truth of the facts furnished. If the Government were determined to carry on this system of throwing money into this bottomless hole of East Africa, they should give some information as to their policy; and special facilities should be afforded the Press to accompany the expeditions. There was no knowing what horrible cruelties were being perpetrated on both sides. What was the reason why a force of only 1,500 men cost £140,000? That seemed to be a very large sum. How long a period did it cover? The Irish people paid their share of this immense expenditure, but did not benefit in the slightest degree from these punitive expeditions, which indeed only added to their misfortunes. He hoped the right hon. the Member for Forest of Dean would press his motion to a division.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I appeal to the Committee to bring this branch of this discussion to a close as soon as possible, as there are other matters of great interest and importance with which the Committee very much desire to deal.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said they were dealing with the first item of this Vote, and he desired to ask, on a point of order, whether, when the first item was disposed of, they would be able to go on to the next.

\*THE CHAIRMAN: That is so.

\*SIR CHARLES DILKE said he proposed to divide on this motion. The Chairman had ruled that on this occasion they could not deal with the question of the legal status of slavery in this Protectorate, but at the same time it would be in the minds of hon. Members that no pledge had been given by the Government

on the subject.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): I think that we Irish Members on a question like this, involving so much money;

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Doxford, Sir William Theodore

Lowe, Francis William

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Durning-Lawrence Sir Edwin

Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Faber, George Denison

Loyd, Archie Kirkman

Allhusen, Augustus H. Eden

Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r

Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)

Anson, Sir William Reynell

Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst

Macdonald, John Cumming

Archdale, Edward Mervyn

Finch, George H.

Maconochie, A. W.

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne

M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinb., W.

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Fisher, William Hayes

M'Killop, Jas. (Stirlingshire)

Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis

Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond

Majendie, James A. H.

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon

Maxwell, W. J. H (Dumfriessh.

Austin, Sir John

Fletcher, Sir Henry

Milward, Colonel Victor

Bailey, James (Walworth)

Flower, Ernest

Molesworth, Sir Lewis

Bain, Colonel James Robert

Garfit, William

Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)

Baird, John George Alexander

Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick

Moon, Edward Robert Pacy

Balcarres, Lord  
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin&Nairn  
More, Robert Jasper (Shropsh.)  
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A.J. (Manch'r  
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-  
Morgan, David J. (Walthamst.  
Banbury, Frederick George  
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Bartley, George C. T.  
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim  
Morris, Hon. Martin H. F.  
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin  
Goulding, Edward Alfred  
Morrison, James Archibald  
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol  
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)  
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptf'd)  
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.  
Greene, Sir EW (B'rySEdm'nds  
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute  
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.  
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)  
Murray, Col, Wyndham (Bath  
Bignold, Arthur  
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.  
Newdigate, Francis Alexander  
Bigwood, James  
Greville, Hon. Ronald  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Blundell, Col. Henry  
Groves, James Grimble  
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay  
Bond, Edward  
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton  
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)  
Brassey, Albert  
Hain, Edward  
Parker, Gilbert  
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John  
Hambro, Charles Eric  
Parkes, Ebenezer  
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu  
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Mid'x  
Pemberton, John S. G.  
Bull, William James

Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry  
Pierpoint, Robert  
Burdett-Coutts, W.  
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.  
Pilkington, Richard  
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.  
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashfd  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Cautley, Henry Strother  
Hare, Thomas Leigh  
Pretymann, Ernest George  
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lanes.)  
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th  
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward  
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)  
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.  
Purvis, Robert  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Haslett, Sir James Horner  
Randles, John S.  
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)  
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley  
Rankin, Sir James  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)  
Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.  
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne  
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r  
Helder, Augustus  
Reid, James (Greenock)  
Chapman, Edward  
Hogg, Lindsay  
Remnant James Farquharson  
Churchill, Winston Spencer  
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside  
Rentoul, James Alexander  
Clare, Octavius Leigh  
Hoult, Joseph  
Renwick, George  
Colston, Charles Edw. H. A.  
Howard, Cpt. J. (Kent, Faversh.  
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)  
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas  
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)  
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.  
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)  
Jackson, Rt. Hon. Wm. Lawies

Rutherford, John  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
Cox, Irwin Edw. Bainbridge  
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick  
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Johnston, William (Belfast)  
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)  
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)  
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir J. H.  
Saunderson, Rt. Hon. Col. E. J.  
Cross, Herbert S. (Bolton)  
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)  
Sharpe, William Edward T.  
Cubitt, Hon. Henry  
King, Sir Henry Seymour  
Simeon, Sir Barrington  
Dalkeith, Earl of  
Lambton, Hon. Frederick W.  
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)  
Dalrymple, Sir Charles  
Laurie, Lieut-General  
Skewes-Cox, Thomas  
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)  
Dewar, T. R. (T'rH'mlets.S. Geo  
Lawson, John Grant  
Smith, H. C (North'mb.Tynesd.  
Dickson, Charles Scott  
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)  
Smith, James P. (Lanarks.)  
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Spear, John Ward  
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield  
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie  
Stanley, Hon. A. (Ormskirk)  
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph  
Leveson-Gower, Fred. N. S.  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol,S)  
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart

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

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

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 204; Noes, 117. (Division List No. 73.)

Stock, James Henry

Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.

Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.

Stone, Sir Benjamin

Webb, Col. William George

Wolff, Gustay Wilhelm

Stroyan, John

Welby, Lt.-Col. A.C.E (Tauntn)

Wrightson, Sir Thomas

Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley

Whiteley, H (Ashton-and-Lyne

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier

William's, Col. R. (Dorset)

Young, Commander (Berks, E.)

Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)

Willox, Sir John Archibald

Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray

Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES;Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther,

Valentia, Viscount

Wilson, John (Falkirk)

Vincent, Col. Sir CEH(Sheffield

Wilson, John (Glasgow)

Walker, Col. William Hall

Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh., N.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.

Field, William

O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N

Abraham, William (Rhondda)

Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)

O'Malley, William

Allan, William (Gateshead)

Furness, Sir Christopher

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.

Allen, Charles P. (Glouc. Stroud

Gilhooly, James

Partington, Oswald

Barry, E. (Cork S.)

Goddard, Daniel Ford

Reddy, M.

Boyle, James  
Hammond, John  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Brigg, John  
Harmswoth, R. Leicester  
Rigg, Richard  
Broadhurst, Henry  
Harwood, George  
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)  
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)  
Hayden, John Patrick  
Robson, William Snowdon  
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson  
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.  
Roche, John  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Holland, William Henry  
Roe, Sir Thomas  
Burns, John  
Jameson, Maj. J. Eustace  
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)  
Burt, Thomas  
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.  
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)  
Buxton, Sydney Charles  
Jordan, Jeremiah  
Shipman, Dr. John G.  
Caldwell, James  
Joyce, Michael  
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Kearley, Hudson E.  
Soames, Arthur Wellesley  
Causton, Richard Knight  
Kennedy, Patrick James  
Soares, Ernest J.  
Cawley, Frederick  
Kitson, Sir James  
Spencer, Rt. Hn. CR (Northants  
Clancy, John Joseph  
Lambert, George  
Sullivan, Donal  
Colville, John  
Langley, Batty  
Taylor, Theodore Cooke  
Condon, Thomas Joseph



Leamy, Edmund  
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.  
Craig, Robert Hunter  
Leigh, Sir Joseph  
Thomas, J A(Glamorg'n, Gower  
Crean, Eugene  
Leng, Sir John  
Thompson, B.C.(Monaghan,N.  
Daly, James  
Levy, Maurice  
Tomkinson, James  
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)  
Lloyd-George, David  
Trevelyan, Charles Philips  
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan  
Lundon, W.  
Tully, Jasper  
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.  
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.  
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)  
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles  
M'Dermott, Patrick  
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.  
Donelan, Captain A.  
M'Kenna, Reginald  
Wason, Eugene(Clackmannan  
Doogan, P. C.  
Mansfield, Horace Rendall  
Weir, James Galloway  
Duffy, William J.  
Markham, Arthur Basil  
White, George (Norfolk)  
Duncan, James H.  
Morton, Edw. J.C. (Devonport  
White, Luke (York, E.R.)  
Dunn, Sir William  
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)  
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)  
Elibank, Master of  
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipp'r'ry, Mid  
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid  
Ellis, John Edward  
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)  
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)  
Emmott, Alfred  
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.

Young, Samuel (Cavan, East  
Earquharson, Dr. Robert  
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)  
Yoxall, James Henry  
Farrell, James Patrick  
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Mr. Caine and Mr. Thomas Bayley.

Fenwick, Charles

O'Dowd, John

Ffrench, Peter

O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)

Question put accordingly, "That the Item, Class 5, Vote 2, be reduced by  
£1,000, in respect of British East Africa."

AYES.

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

Burt, Thomas

Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)

Abraham, William (Rhondda)

Buxton, Sydney Charles

Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)

Allan, William (Gateshead)

Caldwell, James

Dewar, J. A. (Inverness-sh.)

Allen, C. P. (Glouc, Stroud)

Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)

Donelan, Captain A.

Barry, E. (Cork, S.)

Causton, Richard Knight

Doogan, P. C.

Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)

Cawley, Frederick

Duffy, William J.

Boyle, James

Clancy, John Joseph

Duncan, James H.

Brigg, John

Colville, John

Dunn, Sir William

Broadhurst, Henry

Condon, Thomas Joseph

Ellis, John Edward

Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson

Craig, Robert Hunter

Emmott, Alfred

Burke, E. Haviland-

Crean, Eugene

Farquharson, Dr. Robert  
Burns, John  
Daly, James  
Farrell, James Patrick  
The Committee divided:;Ayes, 121; Noes, 212. (Division List No. 74.)  
Fenwick, Charles  
Lough, Thomas  
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh  
Ffrench, Peter  
Lundon, W.  
Shipman, Dr. John G.  
Field, William  
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.  
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh.  
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond  
M'Dermott, Patrick  
Soares, Ernest J.  
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)  
M'Kenna, Reginald  
Spencer, Rt. Hn. CR(Northant.  
Fuller, J. M. F.  
Mansfield, Horace Kendall  
Sullivan, Donal  
Furness, Sir Christopher  
Markham, Arthur Basil  
Taylor, Theodore Cooke  
Gilhooly, James  
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)  
Thomas, A. (Glamorgan, E.)  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)  
Thomas, J A(Glamorg'n,Gower  
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton  
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)  
Thompson, E. C.(Monaghan, N.  
Hammond, John  
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)  
Tomkinson, James  
Harmsworth, R. Leicester  
O'Coonor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)  
Trevelyan, Charles Philips  
Harwood, George  
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)  
Tully, Jasper  
Hayden, John Patrick  
O'Donnoll, John (Mayo, S.)

Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)  
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.  
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)  
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.  
Holland, William Henry  
O'Dowd, John  
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan  
Jameson, Major J. Eustace  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Weir, James Galloway  
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonsh.)  
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.  
White, George (Norfolk)  
Jordon, Jeremiah  
O'Malley, William  
White, Luke (York, E. B.)  
Joyce, Michael  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)  
Kearley, Hudson E.  
Partington, Oswald  
Wilson, F. W. (Norfolk, Mid.)  
Kennedy, Patrick James  
Reddy, M.  
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)  
Kitson, Sir James  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Huddersfld  
Lambert, George  
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries  
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)  
Langley, Batty  
Rigg, Richard  
Yoxall, James Henry  
Beamy, Edmund  
Roberts, John H. (Denbighsh.)  
Leigh, Sir Joseph  
Robson, William Snowdon  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir Charles Dilke and Mr. Caine.  
Leng, Sir John  
Roche, John  
Levy, Maurice  
Roe, Sir Thomas  
Lloyd-George, David  
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)  
NOES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.  
Chapman, Edward  
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)  
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte  
Churchill, Winston Spencer  
Greene, Sir EW(B'rySEdm'nds  
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel  
Clare, Octavius Leigh  
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)  
Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.  
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole  
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)  
Anson, Sir William Reynell  
Cook, Frederick Lucas  
Gretton, John  
Archdale, Edward Mervyn  
Corbett, A. Cameron(Glasgow)  
Greville, Hon. Ronald  
Arkwright, John Stanhope  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Groves, James Grimble  
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.  
Cox, Irwin Edw. Bainbridge  
Hain, Edward  
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Hambro, Charles Eric  
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John  
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)  
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Ld G (Midd'x  
Austin, Sir John  
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)  
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nd'rry  
Bailey, James (Walworth)  
Cubitt, Hon. Henry  
Hanbury, Rt. Rn. Robert W.  
Bain, Colonel James Robert  
Dalkeith, Earl of  
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashfd.  
Baird, John George A.  
Dalrymple, Sir Charles  
Hare, Thomas Leigh  
Balcarres, Lord  
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham  
Harris, Fleverton (Tynemouth  
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r

Dewar, T. R. (T'rH'ml'ts, S.Geo.  
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.  
Banbury, Frederick George  
Dickson, Charles Scott  
Haslett, Sir J. Horner  
Bartley, George C. T.  
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-  
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley  
Bathurst, Hon. Allen B.  
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield  
Heath, Jas. (Staffords, N. W.)  
Beach, Rt Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)  
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph  
Helder, Augustus  
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Hogg, Lindsay  
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.  
Doxford, Sir William Theodore  
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield Brightside  
Bignold, Arthur  
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin  
Hoult, Joseph  
Bigwood, James  
Elibank, Master of  
Howard, Capt J. (Kent, Faversham  
Bill, Charles  
Faber, George Denison  
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.B.)  
Blundell, Colonel Henry  
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r  
Jackson, Rt. Hon. W. Lawies  
Bond, Edward  
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst  
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse  
Brassey, Albert  
Finch, George H.  
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick  
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Johnston, William (Belfast)  
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir J. H.  
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)  
Fitzroy, Hon. Edw. Algernon

Kenyon, Hn. G. T. (Denbigh)  
Bull, William James  
Fletcher, Sir Henry  
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.  
Burdett-Coutts, W.  
Flower, Ernest  
King, Sir Henry Seymour  
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.  
Garfit, William  
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.  
Cautley, Henry Strother  
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)  
Laurie, Lieut.-General  
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)  
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)  
Gordon, Hn. J. E (Elgin&Nairn  
Lawson, John Grant  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-  
Lee, A. H. (Hants, Fareham)  
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)  
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm  
Goschen, Hon. George J.  
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie  
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r  
Goulding, Edward Alfred  
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S,  
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.  
Pemberton, John S. G.  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Long, Rt. Hn Walter (Bristol, S.  
Pierpoint, Robert  
Stewart, Sir Mark J.M Taggart  
Lowe, Francis William  
Pilkington, Richard  
Stock, James Henry  
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Stone, Sir Benjamin  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Pretymann, Ernest George  
Stroyan, John

Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)  
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward  
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley  
Macdona, John Cumming  
Purvis, Robert  
Sturt, Hn. Humphry Napier  
Maconochie, A. W.  
Randles, John S.  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W  
Rankin, Sir James  
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray  
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire  
Rasch, Maj. Frederic Carne  
Valentia, Viscount  
Majendie, James A. H.  
Reid, James (Greenock)  
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield  
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire  
Remnant, James Farquharson  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Mildmay, Francis Bingham  
Rentoul, James Alexander  
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.  
Milward, Colonel Victor  
Renwick, George  
Webb, Col. William George  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Ridley, S. Forde (BethnalGreen  
Welby, Lt-Col A.C.E. (Taunt'n  
Montagn, G. (Huntingdon)  
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas Thomson  
Whiteley, H (Ashton u-Lyne  
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy  
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)  
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)  
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire  
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.  
Willox, Sir John Archibald  
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
Wilson, A. S. (York. E.R.)  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander  
Wilson, John (Falkirk)  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.



Samuel, H. S. (Limehouse)  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Morrison, James Archibald  
Saunderson, Rt Hn. Col. Edw. J.  
Wilson, J. W. (Worcester, N.)  
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford  
Sharpe, William Edward T.  
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H (Yorks.)  
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)  
Simeon, Sir Harrington  
Wolff, Gustay Wilhelm  
Murray, Col. Wyndham(Bath)  
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)  
Wrightson, Sir Thomas  
Newdigate, Francis Alexander  
Skewes-Cox, Thomas  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)  
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)  
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay  
Smith, H. C. (N'h' mb., Tyneside.  
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)  
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
Parker, Gilbert  
Spear, John Ward  
Parkes, Ebenezer  
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk

Original Question again proposed.

#### THE SOMALILAND EXPEDITION.

\*SIR BRAMPTON CURDON (Norfolk, N.) moved to reduce the Vote by £10,000 in respect to Somaliland, and said that in accordance with the appeal of the First Lord of the Treasury to the Committee to give every Vote a fair chance, he should be as brief as possible in his remarks. His object in moving the reduction was to call attention to the revival of a practice which had long fallen into disuse in this country; the use of mercenaries in our wars. He referred to the employment of the Central African Regiment, first of all in Somaliland and then in West Africa. So long as native troops were used in their own particular country he offered no objection: but he certainly did object to their being moved into other countries as soldiers. In the future the Central African Regiment might become after years of training as reliable as the Sikhs, but at present they could not be trusted either in victory or defeat. It was in the recollection of the Committee that a discussion arose last year on the question of these men being removed to the Mauritius for garrison duty, the result being that they followed

out their natural instincts and rebelled against discipline, broke out of barracks, and raided villages, murdering men and outraging women. He had never found out who was responsible for their being brought to Mauritius. They were severely punished and removed to Somaliland. He could only describe them as mercenaries, because they had not been long enough under the dominion of Great Britain to have any feeling of patriotism for our cause. A great many of our Yeomen who had gone out to South Africa went out for the fun of the fighting; but at the same time they felt that they were fighting for their country, and were buoyed up by the feeling of patriotism for our cause. He made no objection to Indian troops in China, because they had been so long under our rule that they had an attachment for us and were proud to fight for us, but the native troops which were now being employed in Somaliland were nothing better than mercenaries, whose instincts were almost animal, and it was a very dangerous thing to send these men to fight in a country when we could not restrain them in the moment of victory or depend upon them in the moment of defeat. He agreed with what had been said as to the disadvantage of placing these protectorates under the Foreign Office. British Central Africa, for which he claimed to speak, was earnestly desirous of being transferred to the Colonial Office. He moved the reduction of the Vote by the sum. of £;200.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Item, Class 5, Vote '2, be reduced by £;10,000, in respect of Somali-land (Grant in Aid).";(Sir Brampton Gurdon.)

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: The hon. Gentleman who has moved this reduction devoted a great part of his remarks to protesting against the use of these men in Somaliland. I can comfort him in that regard; they have not been used in Somaliland. Though they were in garrison there at the time of the out break of hostilities, they were unfortunately afflicted with illness, and were not available. I do not admit at all that these men behaved badly on the Mauritius, as the hon. Gentleman suggests.

\*SIR BRAMPTON GURDON: Not at all; I stuck up for them. I said they were only following their natural instincts.

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: Nor can I allow them to be called mercenaries Of course they are mercenaries, in the sense that they are paid; but then so are the British soldiers, of whom we are all so proud. I think it is a strong order to say that these men do not feel their position as subjects of the British Empire as much or even more than we do. Hon. Members seem to have forgotten the enormous benefits conferred upon these men by their being under British rule, and it is very natural that they should be proud of their position in the Empire. I entirely repudiate the idea that they are mercenaries in any adverse sense of the word, and if we find, as we do, that these native troops are far more suitable for the conditions under which warfare in various parts of Africa is carried on we ought to use them. These troops we employ are far cheaper than any other troops that we could possibly employ. They are far cheaper than British troops and far cheaper than Indian troops, and upon every ground, therefore, from the point of view of cheapness and from the point of view of patriotism, we ought to employ them. Representing as I do the Foreign Office, I ought not to pass by altogether what

has been said as to the administration of Somaliland and the other protectorates which are administered by the Foreign Office. The House may rest assured that there are special reasons why these protectorates should be administered rather by the Foreign than the Colonial Office. We have Protectorates whose frontiers adjoin those of France, Germany, and Italy, and questions constantly arise which can only be dealt with by the Foreign Office, and it would only tend to delay matters if these protectorates were transferred to the administration of the Colonial Office. That is the case of Somaliland; on the east we have the Italian hinterland, and on the west the French colonies, and those two nations are in constant relations with the protectorate.

AN HON. MEMBER: The same consideration applies to West Africa.

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: Things in West Africa are in a very much more forward state undoubtedly. When once these countries are brought under settled government then they can be transferred to the Colonial Office, but that is not yet the case with Somaliland. I now propose very shortly to give an account of the expedition in Somaliland as I did in the case of Matabeleland, but I ought to preface it by the remark that it is very much a matter of conjecture, as we have not yet got to the end of operations. The object of the operations which are taking place in Somaliland is to check the depredations and attacks of a certain Mullah, who has for several years past been a great danger to the peace and order of that part of the world. He is a Mahdi, if I might say so, on a small scale, and I might very well rest the case there, because anyone who is familiar with what took place in the Soudan, which led to our expedition in that country, will have a full knowledge of the evils connected with Mahdism. This man was first heard of in 1896, but he did not attain any importance until 1899, when he returned from a pilgrimage to Mecca as the leader of a certain sect which proceeded to make proselytes in Somaliland, following the ordinary course of religious zealots. He claimed to rule the whole of the centre of Somaliland, from which he was good enough to say the English must go, although they might hold the coast. He then commenced a system of raiding accompanied by murder and robbery, and his despotism became such a nuisance that the tribes under our protection, having fought against it, cried out that they were gradually losing faith in our power to protect them. Their cattle were being carried away and the people were being murdered, and we were told that if we did not interfere they would be compelled to make friends with the Mullah to save themselves. The matter was complicated by the views of the Abyssinians. The Abyssinians applied to us to know whether we were going to permit the existence of this source of disorder, and asked for a reply. Matters went on, and the power and audacity of the Mullah increased, and it was finally represented to us by our officer on the spot that the situation had become dangerous. The same information came from the Abyssinians, so that the position of the Mullah could no longer be tolerated. At the end of November last year, therefore, the Government resolved to make preparations to check the Mullah. The British Central African Regiment was not available, but a body of Somalia was raised, with British officers and arms. Recently, I am glad to say, we hear that the Mullah has been engaged with the Abyssinians, and that they soundly defeated him. An advance on our side is now

under consideration in order to subdue him finally. With regard to the future of Somaliland, I may say that this year the trade has reached its highest level since the opening of British rule, and the revenue has also improved. I do not deny that the temporary military expenditure has increased, but on the whole the outlook is by no means unfavourable, and I hope the expenditure will be confined to a limited amount. I need say no more, and I hope I have said enough to satisfy the Committee with regard to this Vote.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said the speech which had been delivered by the noble Lord would not bring conviction

to the mind of anyone as to the justification of the proceedings which the Government had taken in South Africa. Such flimsy pretexts had never been given in the House of Commons for the expenditure of one million of money as those just given by the noble Lord as a reason for these military operations in Somaliland. The Mullah had made a pilgrimage to Mecca, and on his return had endeavoured to convert the people of his country to his own religious views. If that were a crime sufficient to necessitate a military expedition, then the British were guilty of that crime in a greater degree than any other nation of the world. The noble Lord had characterised this man as a barbarian and a general nuisance, and the British taxpayer was therefore to be called upon to find the money to make war upon him. It was a self-evident proposition that the Abyssinians were a civilised people and able to take care of themselves, because if they had not been nothing was more certain than that the Government would have made war upon them for the purpose of capturing their country. There was one curious fact with regard to the policy of the Government in Africa, and that was that, although they were always in hot water with somebody, they took care not to get into hot water with any people they did not think were weak enough to be subdued. The noble Lord had just said there was another expedition under consideration. Why, what reason was there for another expedition? He objected to this item of expenditure, not only because to some extent it fell upon Ireland, but from the English point of view that Members had a right to complain that the Government, when they considered it necessary to indulge in a warlike expedition against a mad Mullah, did not take precautions to have a proper military expedition launched against him, but were continually coming to the House for supplies. The noble Lord said this man was to be persecuted because he had endeavoured to impose his religious views upon other people.

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: I did not say anything of the kind.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said he wished that sentiment had been acted upon in respect to Ireland, where the whole object of past Governments had been to impose their religious views upon the people of that country. He was glad that a reduction had been moved in this Vote. He strongly objected to these continual Votes for war-like expeditions. Whatever the case might be with regard to the necessity of these expeditions from a British point of view, from the Irish point of view there was absolutely no justification for the expenditure of a single penny in this direction. He did not know what the constituents of the Liberal Members of the House were like, but from the action of the Liberal party from time to time upon questions of this kind he was inclined to think that

their constituents could not be up to much. There could be no doubt in the mind of the noble Lord that those Irish Members who represented Irish constituencies had got a mandate from the people who elected them to offer the strongest opposition in their power to expenditure of this kind, "The previous Vote which had been passed was very similar to this one, and now they were asked to vote £200,000 for a war against some unfortunate Mullah who happened to hold religious views different from the noble Lord opposite and his noble relative the Member for Greenwich. This Mullah might not be ritualistic enough to suit the Member for Greenwich, but that was no reason why his head should be cut off and a military expedition launched against him. From the point of view of the Irish taxpayers they were perfectly justified in opposing this expenditure. They knew that the members of the Government would be the last people to refuse to admit that there was in Ireland the most pressing need for the expenditure of money in order to develop the industries of the country. The people of Ireland were in a state of distress, and yet they had the greatest difficulty in getting the House of Commons to listen to Irish representatives. They were asked to vote hundreds of thousands of pounds for these unnecessary, dangerous, iniquitous, and sanguinary wars in every part, of Africa, and if they offered the slightest objection they were told that they were obstructing and interfering with the business of the House and the country. Whenever a Vote of this kind came up it must be apparent to all hon. Members that it would be far better for the interests of this country if, instead of being compelled to come to this House, they were allowed to remain at home and manage their own affairs.

\*SIR BRAMPTON GURDON said that after the explanation given by the noble Lord he would ask leave to withdraw his Amendment. [Cries of "No, no" from the Irish benches.]

Permission to withdraw being refused.

MR. BROADHURST said he understood from what the noble Lord had just stated that another expedition was to take place immediately in Africa. He wished to know if it had been already organised, when would it be put in motion, what was its object, was the expedition unavoidable, and was there any prospect of preventing it? They did not often get to know anything of this kind until the bill was presented to Parliament. The noble Lord had treated them with a frankness and an open-mindedness to which they were not accustomed. As he had told them so much about the matter, perhaps he would not mind telling them a little more. When was this expedition to take place and what was the length of time that would be necessary to secure the object in view? Perhaps the noble Lord could tell the Committee what the probable cost would be and how much this country was likely to benefit by the expedition when it was over.

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: The object of the expedition is to defeat the Mullah and to destroy his power. If there is any chance of his power being destroyed without an expedition, no one will be more delighted than the Government. I am bound to say that I do not think the expedition can be avoided. The situation has become intolerable. This man's barbarity injures our trade; and hurts our subjects, and he must be destroyed. The Mullah was originally a religious leader, but his religious character has disappeared and his barbarity and tyranny remain.

\*MR. JOHN BURNS (Battersea) thought the House of Commons was very much indebted to the hon. Member for ' getting this information from the noble Lord. It was all very well for him to say that this Mullah was mad;

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: I have never the used word "mad" in the whole course of these proceedings.

\*MR. JOHN BURNS said that perhaps in the mind of the noble Lord he was something worse than mad; he was religious. He wished to deal with the statement of the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs to the effect that in the neighbourhood of Somaliland a native chief had arisen who had become a nuisance to British interests. He had become such a nuisance that he had to be hunted down at all cost. If the noble Lord thought that this hunting of Mullahs could go on indefinitely east, west, north, and south, in the present strained condition of the finances of the British Empire, then he had embarked upon an expedition the end of which no man could see and the cost of which the British taxpayers would seriously resent if the Government were to give them an opportunity. They resented Mullah hunting in general and the Somaliland one in particular. The noble Lord stated that this expedition was going on, and would go on until this Mullah was destroyed. But they were not going to destroy this Mullah and his power so easily. He started this game in 1896, and in 1899 he became serious. He presumed that the Mullah was an Arab and had paid a visit to Mecca, and in consequence some disagreement had ensued. Therefore, he came back from Mecca and became a nuisance. He was accused of stealing cattle, but there were British subjects in other parts of Africa who were engaged in that occupation at the present time. Did the Government also propose to destroy the cattle stealers there? The chief offence of this man was that, under the, guise of religious inspiration, this religious enthusiast had started "lifting" the cattle of his neighbours. But that was a, congenial and reciprocal pastime in Somaliland. His fellow-countrymen north of the Tweed indulged in the same pastime 200 years ago. Cattle stealing was a tribal pastime, in Africa, almost as popular as foxhunting and breaking down farmers' fences was in this country. Surely that was no reason why they should kill the men who indulged in it. They appeared to have determined to rout out of Africa every tribe that showed courage, every chief who displayed independence, and every native community which had courageously determined to stick to their own language, religion, habits and customs, and if England continued this policy much longer these oppressed people would join together in one common cause, and a, condition of things in Africa would arise which all the European Powers combined would not be able to overcome and subdue. They tried the same thing on with the Mahdi. and then they transferred their attention to Kruger and to Steyn, and they would have liked to have done the same thing with Menelik, but he was too strong. The Italians tried to do the same thing, and he rejoiced to think that the Abyssinians wiped out the demoralised Italians at Adowa.

\*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order; The subject to which the hon. Member is referring has no bearing upon this Vote.

\*MR. JOHN BURNS said he would bow at once to the Chairman's ruling. The noble Lord talked about the enforcement of discipline as if discipline and military

rule were synonymous with the development of British trade. That was not true, and he believed that just in proportion as they tried to subject these native tribes to military discipline to that extent they would damage their trade and interfere with commercial interests; not only this, but they would damage the future relationship of this country with the people whom they ought to be in kindly, benevolent, and friendly contact with. Who were the people they had chosen for this expedition? They had employed 1,600 Central African irregulars.

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: Native levies.

\*MR. JOHN BURNS said that by employing those men under British supervision they were only producing tribal animosities. [Ministerial cries of "Oh, oh &#x0021;"]

He could assure hon. Members

opposite that they were not going to howl him down, and so long as he was in order he should exercise the attenuated rights left to a Member of Parliament of expressing his views. He believed that the employment of these irregulars was going to do a great deal of harm to British interests, and as one who had had a year's experience of them in one of the worst parts of Africa he would say-that just in proportion as they used force to destroy native habits and customs they were damaging trade, weakening their prestige, and accentuating permanently the very thing they hoped to remove. He would read to the Committee an extract from the writings of a very distinguished African, Sir Andrew Clarke. He said;and his remarks apply to East Africa;

"We should be happier in our rule on the West Coast ;and I speak from experience, for I was out there for some time myself;if we had confined ourselves to pure trading. At present we can only succeed by forced labour, and that always means the deterioration of both English and native. Remember this, that on the West Coast we are only re-occupying ground which was occupied by the powerful and pious influence of the Roman Catholics;I refer to the government of the Portuguese, years ago. They spent money and lives, but failed, and now there remain of their rule only the ruins of convents and old palaces, which you will see crumbling to dust in the jungle, with ceilings painted by Italians. Nature is too strong for the European, and it will be the same with us. Our work in the Hinterland may prolong our stay, but in time it will be handed over to natives, controlled and guided by a half-caste and bastard population of our own race. And awful then will be the condition of West Africa. It will be a solemn warning to England, and an object lesson on the absolute necessity for firm decision between the true colonisation of our race and the occupying of territory merely for the purposes of money-getting."

And to confirm him on page 28 of the Central Africa Protectorate Report there appeared the following;;

"There is a steady increase of contagious venereal diseases among Europeans and natives,"

and other horrors incidental to this undisciplined-territory grabbing.

That was the civilisation which they intended to give to Somaliland by such expeditions as the noble Lord was now engaged in. This country, through lack of judgment and tact, in sixty years had undertaken sixty-three wars and expeditions against native tribes in east, west, north, south, not only of Africa,

but of Asia. The people of this country were getting tired of such campaigns in Africa, alternating with expeditions on the north-west frontier of India. Was the Government going to enforce equal rights to all men in South Africa and destroy the Boers, who were rightly struggling to be free? He protested with all his force against the House of Commons surrendering its supervisory duties and its controlling power to the Cabinet. So long as the House of Commons surrendered its duty of control in such matters, and allowed inexperienced military men to manage such affairs, so long would the taxation of the country continue to go up. It was because he believed their Empire would be diminished and not increased by such expeditions, because he believed that their honour was attacked and their prestige was being slowly whittled away, that he deprecated the speech made by the noble Lord. He should condemn the Somaliland expedition as long as he was a Member of the House, for such expenditure was only squandering their money, irritating the native tribes against them, and making the name of England a bye-word and reproach to the smaller nations of the earth. He appealed to every hon. Member on this side of the House, and to the better intentioned hon. Members on the other side; to the old-fashioned Tories who were getting tired of the new diplomacy and this world-wide brigandage and filching away of native rights and customs from people who had a right to any religion which they cared to profess; to vote against this policy, which was permanently damaging the British Empire, its name, and its best traditions.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I hope the House will agree with me when I say that on a Supplementary Estimate it really is not desirable that we should go over the whole policy of the relations between this country and the various native tribes, rights, and customs which the hon. Gentleman has gone into.

\*MR. JOHN BURNS said he should not have said a word on the subject but for the noble Lord telling them that this expedition was going to be carried through until the Mullah was destroyed, and that was not a policy which ought to be introduced upon a Supplementary Estimate.

MR. A.J. BALFOUR: In any case, I think the next item in this Vote presents an even more attractive opportunity of attacking the Government, and I would suggest that hon. Members opposite should allow this Vote to pass and turn their attention to pursuing higher game.

MR. DALY said that one of the pleas put forward by the noble Lord opposite was that trade would be spoiled unless this Mullah was put down. That was practically an admission that such wars were carried on for the purpose of extending trade, and while Great Britain might be improved by these expeditions not one penny of improvement would come to the country which he represented. For that reason he felt that it was the duty of his hon. friends on that

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.

Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r

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

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Chapman, Edward

Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-



Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel  
Churchill, Winston Spencer  
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon  
Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.  
Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.  
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim  
Anson, Sir William Reynell  
Compton, Lord Alwyne  
Goulding, Edward Alfred  
Archdale, Edward Mervyn  
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas  
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)  
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.  
Corbett, A. C. (Glasgow)  
Greene, Sir E W (BrySEdm'nds  
Aahmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.  
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Grenfell, William Henry  
Austin, Sir John  
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)  
Gretton, John  
Bailey, James (Walworth)  
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)  
Greville, Hon. Ronald  
Bain, Colonel James Robert  
Cubitt, Hon. Henry  
Groves, James Grimble  
Baird, John George Alex.  
Cust, Henry John C.  
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton  
Balcarres, Lord  
Dalkeith, Earl of  
Guthrie, Walter Murray  
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r  
Dalrymple, Sir Charles  
Hain, Edward  
Banbury, Frederick George  
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chath'm  
Hall, Edward Marshall  
Hartley, George G. T.  
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan  
Hambro, Charles Eric  
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin

Dewar, T R. (T'rH'ml'ts, S.Geo.  
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Mid'x  
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol  
Dickson, Charles Scott  
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'donderry  
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.  
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.  
Banbury, Rt. Hon. Robt. W.  
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.  
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield  
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd)  
Bignold, Arthur  
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cock field  
Hare, Thomas Leigh  
Bill, Charles  
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph  
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'uth  
Blundell, Colonel Henry  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.  
Bond, Edward  
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edw.  
Hay, Hon. Claude George  
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-  
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart  
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)  
Bowles, Capt. H. V. (Middlesex)  
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton  
Heath, Jas. (Staffords., N.'W.)  
Brassey, Albert  
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir. J (Manc'r  
Helder, Augustus  
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John  
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst  
Hogg, Lindsay  
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu  
Finch, George H.  
Hope, J. F. (Shef'ld, Brightside  
Burdett-Coutts, W.  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Hoult, Joseph  
Butcher, John George  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Howard, Capt J (Kent, Faversh.  
Cautley, Henry Strother  
Fitzroy, Hon. Edw. Algernon

Button, John (Yorks, N.R.)  
Cavendish, R.F. (N. Lancs.)  
Fletcher, Sir Henry  
Jackson, Rt. Hon. W. Lawies  
Cavendish, V.C W (Derbyshire)  
Garfit, William  
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Gibbs, Hn A.G.H. (City of Lond.  
Johnston, William (Belfast)  
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)  
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)  
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir J. H.  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.  
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.  
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh

side of the House to protest against the large sums of money called for by the Government in the way of Supplementary Votes. It was a very remarkable thing that the Government, possessing so much brains and ability, had not been able to foresee more accurately their requirements and the amount of money they would require to carry them through. On this ground they fully deserved every opposition to the passing of those Votes. Any commercial establishment which went so far astray as the Government had done this year in estimating its requirements would soon find itself in the Bankruptcy Court.

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

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

The Committee divided: Ayes, 230; Noes, 117. (Division List No. 75.)

Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.  
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)  
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)  
King, Sir Henry Seymour  
Mount, William Arthur  
Skewes Cox, Thomas  
Lambton, Hon. Frederick W.  
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.  
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)  
Smith, H.C. (N'h'mb., Tyneside)  
Lawrence, William F.  
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)  
Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks.)  
Lawson, John (Grant  
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)  
Spear, John Ward

Lee, Capt. A H (Hants. Fareham  
Newdigate, Francis Alexander  
Stanley, Lord (Lanes.)  
Legge, Col. Hon. Hencage  
Nicholson, William Graham  
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk  
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart  
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.  
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens  
Stock, James Henry  
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.  
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay  
Stone, Sir Benjamin  
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.  
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)  
Stroyan, John  
Lowe, Francis William  
Pemberton, John S. G.  
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley  
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)  
Pierpoint, Robert  
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)  
Pretymann, Ernest George  
Talbot, Rt. Hon. JG (Oxford Univ  
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)  
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward  
Thornton, Percy M.  
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred  
Purvis, Robert  
Tollemache, Henry James  
Macartney, Rt. Hon. W. G. E.  
Randles, John S.  
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray  
Macdonald, John Dimming  
Rankin, Sir James  
Valentia, Viscount  
Maconochie, A. W.  
Rasch, Maj. Frederic Carne  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinb., W.)

Reid, James (Greenock)  
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.  
M'Killop, Jas. (Stirlingshire)  
Remnant, James Farquharson  
Warr, Augustus Frederick  
Majendie, James A. H.  
Rentoul, James Alexander  
Webb, Col. William George  
Malcolm, Ian  
Renwick, George  
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. CE(Taunton  
Manners, Lord Cecil  
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge)  
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne)  
Martin, Richard Biddulph  
Ridley, S. F. (Bethnal Green)  
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)  
Maxwell, WJH (Dumfriesshire  
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson  
Willox, Sir John Archibald  
Melville, Beresford Valentine  
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)  
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)  
Mildmay, Francis Bingham  
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.  
Wilson, John (Falkirk)  
Milward, Col. Victor  
Royds, Clement Molyneux  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander  
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H.(Yorks.)  
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy  
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)  
Wolff, Gustay Wilhelm  
More, R. Jasper (Shropshire)  
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert  
Wrightson, Sir Thomas  
Morgan, David J (Walthamst.)  
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. E.J.  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Morgan, Hon. F. (Monm'thsh.  
Seely, Charles Hilton(Lincoln)

Morrell, George Herbert  
Sharpe, William Edward T.  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew  
Morrison, James Archibald  
Simeon, Sir Harrington  
NOES.  
Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)  
Emmott, Alfred  
Lundon, W.  
Abraham, William (Rhondda)  
Farrell, James Patrick  
M'Crae, George  
Allen, C. P. (Glouc, Stroud)  
Fenwick, Charles  
M'Dermott, Patrick  
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)  
Ffrench, Peter  
M'Kenna, Reginald  
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)  
Field, William  
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)  
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.  
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)  
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin  
Boland, John  
Fuller, J. M. F.  
Mansfield, Horace Rendall  
Boyle, James  
Gilhooly, James  
Mooney, John J.  
Brigg, John  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
Morton, Edw. J.C. (Devonport)  
Broadhurst, Henry  
Hammond, John  
Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.  
Brown, Geo. M. (Edinburgh)  
Harmsworth, R. Leicester  
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid)  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Hayden, John Patrick  
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W  
Burns, John  
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-

O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)  
Burt, Thomas  
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.  
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Holland, William  
O'Dowd, John  
Causton, Richard Knight  
Jameson, Major J. Eustace  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Cawley, Frederick  
Joicey, Sir James  
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.)  
Clancy, John Joseph  
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)  
O'Malley, William  
Colville, John  
Jordan, Jeremiah  
O'Mara, James  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Joyce, Michael  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Craig, Robert Hunter  
Kearley, Hudson E.  
O'Shee, James John  
Crean, Eugene  
Kennedy, Patrick James  
Palmer, George W. (Reading)  
Daly, James  
Kitson, Sir James  
Partington, Oswald  
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)  
Lambert, George  
Reddy, M.  
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)  
Langley, Batty  
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)  
Doogan, P. C.  
Leamy, Edmund  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Duffy, William J.  
Leigh, Sir Joseph  
Rigg, Richard  
Duncan, James H.  
Levy, Maurice  
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)

Dunn, Sir William  
Lewis, John Herbert  
Robson, William Snowdon  
Elibank, Master of  
Lloyd-George, David  
Roche, John  
Ellis, John Edward  
Lough, Thomas  
Roe, Sir Thomas  
Schwann, Charles E.  
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan Gower  
White, Luke (York, E. R.)  
Sinclair, Capt John (Forfarshire  
Thompson, E. C. (Mouaghan, N.  
Wilson, F.W. (Norfolk, Mid.)  
Soames, Arthur Wellesley  
Tomkinson, James  
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)  
Soares, Ernest J.  
Trevelyan, Charles Philips  
Wodehouse, Hn. Armine (Essex  
Sullivan, Donal  
Tully, Jasper  
Woodhouse, Sir J T (HuddTsh'd  
Taylor, Theodore Cooke  
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)  
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)  
Tennant, Harold John  
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.  
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.  
Weir, James Galloway  
Thomas, F. Freeman (Hastings  
White, George (Norfolk)  
Question put accordingly. "That the Item, Class 5, Vote 2, be reduced by  
£10,000, in respect of Somaliland (Grant-in Aid)."  
AYES.  
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)  
Harmsworth, R. Leicester  
O'Malley, William  
Abraham, William (Rhondda)  
Hayden, John Patrick  
O'Mara, James  
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)  
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.



Beaumont, Went worth C. B.  
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.  
O'Shee, James John  
Boland, John  
Holland, William Henry  
Palmer, George Wm. (Reading)  
Boyle, James  
Jameson, Major J. Eustace  
Reddy, M.  
Brigg, John  
Joicey, Sir James  
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)  
Broadhurst, Henry  
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Jordan, Jeremiah  
Rigg, Richard  
Burns, John  
Joyce, Michael  
Roberts, John H. (Denbighsh.)  
Burt, Thomas  
Kearley, Hudson E.  
Robson, William Snowdon  
Buxton, Sydney Charles  
Kennedy, Patrick James  
Roche, John  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Kitson, Sir James  
Roe, Sir Thomas  
Cawley, Frederick  
Lambert, George  
Schwann, Charles E.  
Claney, John Joseph  
Langley, Batty  
Soares, Ernest J.  
Colville, John  
Leamy, Edmund  
Spencer, Rt. Hn. CH (Northants  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Leigh, Sir Joseph  
Sullivan, Donal  
Craig, Robert Hunter  
Levy, Maurice  
Taylor, Theodore Cooke  
Crean, Eugene

Lewis, John Herbert  
Tennant, Harold John  
Daly, James  
Lloyd-George, David  
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.  
Dalziel, James Henry  
Lough, Thomas  
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings  
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)  
Lundon, W.  
Thomas, J A(Glamorgan,Gower  
Davies,MVaughan-(Cardigan)  
M'Crae, George  
Tomkinson, James  
Dewar, J. A. (Inverness-sh.)  
M'Dermott, Patrick  
Tully, Jasper  
Donelan, Captain A.  
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)  
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)  
Doogan, P. C.  
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin  
Warner, Thos. Courtenay T.  
Duffy, William J.  
Mansfield, Horace Kendall  
Weir, James Calloway  
Duncan, James H.  
Mooney, John J.  
White, George (Norfolk)  
Ellis, John Edward  
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)  
White, Luke (York, E. R.)  
Farrell, James Patrick  
Murphy, J.  
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.  
Fenwick, Charles  
Nolan, Col. John P.(Galway,N.  
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)  
Ffrench, Peter  
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)  
Wodehouse, Hn. Armine (Essex  
Field, William  
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)  
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd  
Foster, Sir W. (Derby Co.)  
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.

Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)  
 Fuller, J. M. F.  
 O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)  
 Gilhooly, James  
 O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)  
 TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir Brampton Gurdon and Mr. Thomas Bayley.  
 Goddard, Daniel Ford  
 O'Dowd, John  
 Hammond, John  
 O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
 Hardie, J. Keir (MerthyrTydvil  
 O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N  
 NOES.  
 Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex.F.  
 Arcbdale, Edward Mervyn  
 Bain. Colonel James Robert  
 Agg-Gardner, James Tynte  
 Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.  
 Baird, John George Alexander  
 Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel  
 Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis  
 Balcarres, Lord  
 Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc, Stroud  
 Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John  
 Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r  
 Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.  
 Austin, Sir John  
 Banbury, Frederick George  
 Anson, Sir William Reynell  
 Bailey, James (Walworth)  
 Bartley, George C. T.  
 The Committee divided;: Ayes. 112; Noes, 235. (Division List No.76.)  
 Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin  
 Guthrie, Walter Murray 1  
 Orr Ewing, Charles Lindsay  
 Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol  
 Hain, Edward  
 Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)  
 Bentinck, Lord Henry C.  
 Hall, Edward Marshall  
 Partington, Oswald  
 Bhownaggee, Sir M.' M.  
 Hambro, Charles Eric  
 Pemberton, John S. G.  
 Bignold, Arthur  
 Hamilton, RtHn. LordG(M 'd'x

Pierpoint, Robert  
Bill, Charles  
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nd'rry  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Blundell, Colonel Henry  
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robt. W.  
Pretymann, Ernest George  
Bond, Edward  
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd)  
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward  
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-  
Hare, Thomas Leigh  
Purvis, Robert  
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)  
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th  
Randles, John S.  
Brassey, Albert  
Haslam, Sir Alfreds.'  
Rankin, Sir James  
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John  
Hay, Hon. Claude George  
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne  
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu  
Heath, A. Howard (Hanley)  
Reid, James (Greenock)  
Brown, George M.J.(Edinburgh)  
Heath, Jas. (Staffords., N. W.  
Remnant, James Farquharson  
Burdett-Gontts, W.  
Helder, Augustus  
Rentoul, James Alexander  
Butcher, John George  
Hogg, Lindsay  
Renwick, George  
Cautley, Henry Strother  
Hope, J. F. (Shef'ld, Brightside  
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge)  
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)  
Hoult, Joseph  
Ridley, S. Forde (BethnalGreen  
Cavendish, V. C.W. (Derbysh)  
Howard, Capt J (Kent, Faversh.  
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas Thomson  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Jackson, Rt. Hon. Wm. L.  
Robertson, Herbert(Hackney)

Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)  
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick  
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.)  
Johnston, William (Belfast)  
Royds, Clement Molyneux  
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r)  
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
Chapman, Edward  
Kenyon, Hon. G. T. (Denbigh)  
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander  
Churchill, Winston Spencer  
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)  
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)  
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.  
King, Sir Henry Seymour  
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert  
Compton, Lord Alwyne  
Lambton, Hon. Frederick W.  
Saunderson, Rt. Hn Col. Edw. J.  
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Seeley, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)  
Corbett, A. Cameron(Glasgow)  
Lawrence, William F.  
Sharpe, William Edward T.  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Lawson, John Grant  
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Lee, Capt A. H. (Hants, Fareh'm)  
Simeon, Sir Barrington  
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)  
Cross, H. Shepherd (Bolton)  
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie  
Skewes-Cox, Thomas  
Cubitt, Hon. Henry  
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.  
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)  
Cust, Henry John C.  
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.  
Smith, HC (North'mbTyneside)  
Dalkeith, Earl of

Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S  
Smith, James Parker(Lanarks)  
Dalrymple, Sir Charles  
Lowe, Francis William  
Spear, John Ward  
Davies, Sir Horatio D(Chatham  
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)  
Stanley, Hn. Arthur(Ormskirk  
Dewar, T.R.(T'rH'ml'ts,S.Geo  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Dickson, Charles Scott  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft  
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart  
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.  
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth  
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.  
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-  
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred  
Stock, James Henry  
Dimsdale, Sir J. Cockfield  
Macartney, Rt. Hn W. G. Ellison  
Stone, Sir Benjamin  
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph  
Macdona, John Cumming  
Stroyan, John  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Maconochie, A. W.  
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley  
Dunn, Sir William  
M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.  
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier  
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin  
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire  
Talbot, Lord E.(Chichester)  
Dyke Rt. Hn.Sir William Hart  
Majendie, James A. H.  
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'dUniv.  
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton  
Malcolm, Ian  
Thornton, Percy M.  
Elibank, Master of  
Manners, Lord Cecil  
Tollemache, Henry James  
Emmott, Alfred  
Martin, Richard Biddulph

Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray  
Fergusson, Rt Hn Sir J (Manchr)  
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.  
Valentia, Viscount  
Fielden, Edw. Brocklehurst  
Melville, Beresford Valentine  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Finch, George H.  
Mildmay, Francis Bingham  
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.  
Finlay, Sir Rbt. Bannatyne  
Milward, Colonel Victor  
Warr, Augustus Frederick  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney  
Fitzroy, Hon. Edw. Algernon  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Webb, Col. William George  
Fletcher, Sir Henry  
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy  
Welby, Lt. -Col. A. C. E. (T'nton  
Garfit, William  
More, R. Jasper (Shropshire)  
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-under-L.  
Gibbs, Hn A.G.H. (CityofLond.  
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)  
William's, Col. R. (Dorset)  
Gibbs, Hn. Vicary (St. Albans)  
Morgan, Hon. F. (Monm'thsh.  
Willox, Sir John Archibald  
Godson, Sir Augustus Fred.  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.  
Gordon, Hn. J.E. (Elgin&Nairn  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
Wilson, John (Falkirk)  
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-  
Morrison, James Archibald  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.  
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)  
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.  
Goschen, Hon. George J.  
Mount, William Arthur  
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm

Goulding, Edward Alfred  
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.  
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-  
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)  
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute  
Wrightson, Sir Thomas  
Greene, Sir E W (B'ryS. Edm'ds  
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.  
Murray, Col, Wyndham (Bath)  
Grenfell, William Henry  
Newdigate, Francis Alexander  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
Gretton, John  
Nicholson, William Graham  
Greville, Hon. Ronald  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Groves, James Grimble  
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens  
Original Question again proposed.

#### SOUTH AFRICAN WAR; HOSPITAL COMMISSION'S REPORT.

MR. BURDETT-COUTTS (West-minster): I regret that the consideration of the Report of the South African Hospitals Commission, which deals with a subject which has moved the nation for a considerable time, should come on at an hour when it will be impossible, without overtaxing the patience of the Committee, to deal with it adequately, and therefore I will make an appeal before going on to the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House. It is this. Whether, considering that we have practically had no opportunity of debating this subject since the Report of the Commission was issued, considering the great interest which, I think, is felt on this subject, and considering also the opinions of the Commission, he would not consent to give a day or half a day for the discussion of the Report at any time he may find it convenient to do so. I should be content with this being given after Easter. I think I am able to say that if he could offer us a fair opportunity of discussing this very important subject the opposition to the Vote, which cannot possibly be successful, would not be persevered in.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman is not content with the opportunity he has now; but it is not very late, it is still early (1 2.5 a.m.). But if, in spite of that reflection, he still thinks that he would like some other opportunity. I think it would be in order on the Vote for the War Office, but this Vote must go on I should be quite glad to put down the Vote we have been discussing, or rather the whole body of Supply, as the first item on Monday for Report, and if the House consented to pass over the Votes which have been relatively fully discussed to-night, then the hon. Gentleman and those who desire to see the medical question raised will, of course, have ample opportunity of discussing it. If the opportunity of debate which I offer him on Monday does not fit in



with his desire, then there will be a later opportunity of discussing the question on the Estimates.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire. Ilkeston): I wish to understand this matter clearly. I quite coincide with the appeal that has been made to the First Lord of the Treasury with the view of getting a fuller discussion of the subject.

Does the right hon. Gentleman propose that the Report stage should be taken early on Monday as the first Order, so that this question may be discussed?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Of course, the first Order would be the Order for the whole body of Supply. It could only be so by the rules of the House; but if the House were content to pass lightly and rapidly over the Votes we have discussed, so as to come quickly to the questions which we have not hitherto discussed, then, of course, full opportunity of debate would be given to the hon. Gentleman. I am in the hands of the House in the matter. I shall be glad to put that down first on Monday, immediately after Questions.

MR. BURDETT-COUTTS: The Mom day promise appears to be contingent on circumstances which it is impossible to foresee. Therefore, if I have not exhausted my right of speaking, I think it would not be respectful to the House of Commons or to the Committee if, after having passed some stringent criticisms on the action of this Commission in another form, I were not willing to support those criticisms on the occasion of this Vote, or not ready to meet any answer that may be made to them. I hope I am the last person to put things in the papers on public subjects which I am unwilling to back up in my place in Parliament.

I believe that the Secretary of State for War, whose attitude on this question I venture to express my great appreciation of, intends to deal out reforms with no niggard hand. There is only one question with regard to which I am not absolutely clear, that is, how far he proposes to rest upon the results of this inquiry, for which we are now voting a large sum of public money, and how far he proposes to confine himself to its suggestions in framing his scheme of reform.

I believe that if he does so his reforms will be a total failure, because I think the inquiry has been partial and imperfect, the conclusions lame and impotent, and the main suggestions of reform are framed on the wrong lines. I consider it a very grave matter that at this moment, when the Army is a subject of great national interest and great national anxiety, one of its chief Departments should have been investigated in a manner which has resulted in casting over its defects a cloak which has not only concealed the real nature and extent of the defects themselves, but has concealed their causes and the responsibility for them. We condemn a general for inaction in the field, but when we come to a more peaceful Department of the Army, but one in which inaction and mismanagement have far more deadly results, we are content to be silent as to cause and effect, and silent as to responsibility.

What was this Commission? Was it a tribunal appointed with a due regard to the peculiar circumstances by which the inquiry would be surrounded, setting forth equipped with ample powers to meet those circumstances, and to pierce the wall of official defence that was certain to be set up? No, Sir. It had none of those powers which were essential to its work, and the consequence is that weakness,

inconclusiveness, and partiality run through every page of its Report. Sir, it is not my object to discuss the Report so much as the inquiry which has been held; and the imperfections of this inquiry I prefer to attribute to the absence of compulsory powers. Why those powers were not given in the first instance I could never understand. But I am not going back on that subject, because once the Government had determined to send the Commission out without powers, the Government is freed to a large extent from its responsibility by having left it to the Commission to ask for the powers if necessary. From this point the blame rests on the Commission. But wherever the blame lies, the result is the same. What has been the result of the absence of powers? I take it from the Report itself;

"We have also Had to recognise that our private soldiers are very slow in making complaints."

Why did not the Commission ask for compulsory powers?

"Witnesses would only state the facts which they thought assisted their own views. and by keeping back other information would tend to give a false impression as to the true state of things."

They could not get their questions answered. Compulsory powers, which would have included taking evidence on oath and compelling the answering of questions, would have made this vain and futile examination impossible. At any moment the Commission might have obtained those powers. That is the declaration of the Commission; that the soldiers would not give evidence, that witnesses would not answer questions. May I be pardoned if I remind the Committee that when I stated this here last summer I was told that my evidence on that account was to be discredited, and that I was insulting the whole British Army. When the Commission state it they are rewarded with a medical baronetcy and a legal Grand Cross of the Bath. I do not want to interfere with gentlemen getting these distinctions if they like them; but I wish they had been ear-marked as rewards for undertaking a laborious task rather than as implying approval of the manner in which the inquiry had been conducted.

Now, Sir, I want to say two things about this remarkable declaration or confession of the Commission about the difficulties of getting evidence. If the Commission had placed it at the head of their Report instead of wrapping it up in an obscure paragraph, we should have known how to estimate the nature of the inquiry, and how to appreciate the value of the Report. The second thing I have to say is, When did the Commission find this out? Was it at Netley, when they were first appointed? Was it at Cape Town, a little later? Where was it? In any case why did they not apply to Lord

Roberts for compulsory powers? He could have given them under martial law by a stroke of his pen. as he gave them to the Concessions Commission presided over by my hon. friend the Member for Warwick and Leamington. But the Commission chose to go on without them. I have drawn attention elsewhere to what I bare called a "sinister corollary to the absence of powers, and that was the presence of an overwhelming organisation supervising the inquiry, choosing the witnesses, producing the greater part of the evidence, acting as amicus curi throughout the investigation; whereas there was not the slightest attempt at

organisation, there was not a single guiding voice or assisting hand to help the other side. Sir. I do not want to inquire who was to blame for this state of things. All I say is that it is not within the widest stretch of imagination that an inquiry so circumstanced could arrive at the truth.

The Commission discard the suggestion that there was any possibility of their getting evidence as to what had taken place in April and May by a personal inspection of the hospitals at the time of their visit to South Africa: the "magic transformation scene" which took place within a week of the disclosures in the press and in this House, and which to my mind is the very strongest possible proof establishing previous official neglect, had cleared away most of its traces.

But there was no concealment about the getting up of the case. Two officers of the Royal Army Medical Corps were appointed to go round the hospitals, select the evidence, and prepare the way for the Commission. One of these returning home stated in public, while the Commission was still sitting;

"Everything was as perfect as possible. Everything that mortal knowledge and foresight could supply was at hand. Many of the hospitals generated their own electric light and manufactured their own soda water."

This was the picture presented to the Commission which was appointed to inquire into the bell-tents at Bloemfontein in the months of April and May; I seem to hear the echo of the speeches at the Reform Club banquet on April 29th: "Everything that provision could suggest or money supply was present on the spot."

Now it may be stated, in fact I think I have seen it stated in a high quarter, that these two officers were appointed to collect the whole evidence, that is, as much against as for the authorities. Very well. I want to call the attention of the Committee to something more about those two gentlemen who were appointed to get up the case. It is contained in a letter from the Chaplain to the Forces at Norval's Font.

The proceedings are thus described in a letter to the President of the Commission printed in the evidence, which runs as follows;

"To the Right Hon. Lord Justice Homer, Chairman of the Royal South African Hospitals Commission.; About 2nd August two majors of the R.A.M.C. came to Norval's Pont, saying that Lord Roberts had sent them to visit all the military hospitals in South Africa, and ascertain where there was evidence for the Hospital Commission, and then to meet the Commissioners in Cape Town, and act as guides to them. To one of those gentlemen I told some of the distressing things that had come to my notice here; for example, how during May enteric and dysenteric patients had to walk 400 yards to a latrine; how, during June, there were, first, no bedpans, disinfectants, or nurses, although the war had passed away north in the middle of March, and the railways from Cape Town and Port Elizabeth were clear, and the neighbouring civil hospital, the Edinburgh, had all it needed; how so-called convalescents arrived here actually suffering with enteric, and were sent on again somewhere else a few days later; and how I had seen them crouching or lying by the railway line for hours before a train was due. Mention was also made in our conversations of the fact that a Board of Inquiry into hospital officers' mess expenses had sat, as a result of which,

while these two gentlemen were still here, the Senior Medical Officer was suspended; and also of the fact that letters home of a civil surgeon here, commenting severely on the treatment of the sick and wounded, had got into a local newspaper, and so into The Times. Yet this officer, giving evidence before your Commission in Cape Town, said ' There was no cause for complaint of any kind at Norval's Pont.' ";Cape Times report, 22nd August.

This was one of the officers who got up the case for the Commission, and that is my answer if it is contended that they were ordered to do their work impartially.

Sir. I repeat that the absence of powers on the one hand, and the presence of such an organisation on the other, should have made the Commission ten times more careful with regard to its proceedings. I have complained of the inadequate number of patients examined. Who could so well tell of the treatment of the sick and wounded as the man who was treated? The refusal to hear, or want of care in hearing, patients' evidence was a grave infringement of the Reference to the Commission as amended by the words of the First Lord of the Treasury;"a Commission to inquire into the care and treatment of every sick and wounded man in South Africa. "I do not want to press that amended Reference too literally, but I say that the peculiar circumstances of the case demanded the fullest and most careful examination of soldier-patients.

Now as to the method in which patients were examined. There was not only the state visit to Netley, when they examined on a single afternoon, in the wards of the hospital, seventy out of the 154 soldier-patients examined during the whole inquiry; but nearly all the other patients were examined in batches in hospitals, their comrades and officers knowing perfectly well the sort of evidence they were going to give and had given. Is it not incredible that this method of examination should have been adopted, when the Commissioners themselves say, "especially while the men are in hospital, they may be deterred from complaining by fear of consequences." The Commission condemns itself out of its own mouth. To hear these soldiers who have been the real sufferers, and have seen their comrades suffer and die; to hear them, not on formal visits to hospitals, surrounded by official supervision and many other deterrent conditions, but individually and apart, and by careful examination to get out their whole story; finally, to hear them in the largest possible number, especially with regard to the times and places which led to the inquiry;these methods were more essential to a just conclusion than volumes of evidence from official and Army medical authorities, placed on their defence, and practically monopolising the witness-box.

Up to this point I have complained (1)of the absence of compulsory powers;(2)of the presence of a watchful and omnipotent organisation on one side of the case, with nothing of the sort on the other, and of the getting up of the case by two officers of the Department which was on its trial; (3) of the inadequate number of private soldiers examined; (4) of the fatally deterrent conditions under which they were heard. I will now ask the Committee to listen to a few further facts which I desire to lay before it.

1. At the time the Commission were appointed there must have been in this country some 3,000 or 4,000 soldiers who had been patients in the hospitals, and at the times of which I complain. The record of every patient who had been in hospital, what hospital he had been in, when he had been there, how long he had stayed, was in the hands of the Department. Was any real effort made to search out these men or to take their evidence? There was the afternoon visit to Netley; the patients there were taken haphazard. That was all.

2. The Committee will remember that one of the main points to which his attention was directed last summer, one of the main things that led to the appointment of the Commission, was a description I gave of a certain field hospital at Bloemfontein. The Commission recognised the importance of the case. They devoted two whole pages to it, and they came to a feeble and most inconclusive verdict. Now, Sir, before the appointment of the Commission at least 1,000 soldiers must have passed through that hospital as patients. As far as I can see, and I have examined the evidence very closely, not a single man who was in that hospital as a patient was examined before the Commission.

3. Take another case, the case of the eight patients on the platform at the Bloemfontein railway station. I have pointed out how the Commission, in spite of my personal evidence, who was there; in spite of the evidence of the hon. Member for Bow and Bromley, who was also there; in spite of the evidence of the civilian medical officer who received the patients at the Irish hospital; the Commission accept the story of the Principal Medical Officer, who was really responsible for the scandal, and recite it as their own verdict upon this painful affair. But, Sir, what I want to ask is this. Why did they not call at least one of the seven surviving men of that incident? Not one was called.

4. One of the strongest complaints I have made against the medical arrangements was the bad feeding of convoys of sick and wounded sent by train, mostly in open trucks. How does the Commission pursue its inquiry into this matter? Out of 154 patients who were examined only seven were asked questions about their feeding on trains. Four of these stated they only got bully beef and biscuits. That is how the Commission inquired into the important question of the feeding of these convoys, and that is the basis of their verdict.

From Bloemfontein: "We think that sufficient and proper food and medical comforts were provided for them." From Kroonstad: "As a rule, we think that proper food and comforts were provided for the men on the journey." General conclusions; "Before the men started on any journey they were, as a rule, well supplied with such comforts, as well as with proper food."

The Committee will notice that my last four points have been: (1) That no real effort was made to obtain patients' evidence with regard to the places and times of which I complained; (2) that no patient in the crowded field hospital was examined; (3) that not one of the sick men on the platform was examined; (4) that practically no evidence with regard to the feeding of convoys in trains was taken.

I will now deal with two individual but important instances of the methods of the Commission with regard to evidence. I take first a letter from the

Archbishop of Cape Town, who writes as follows;

"The Hospitals Commission is returning this week. Whether the result will justify their mission is, I think, very doubtful. There can be no doubt but that while the defence was thoroughly and completely organised, the fact that it was no one's real business to make the attack made the case against the authorities very difficult to establish";

"I had said all I knew, or the most important part of it, on paper and forwarded it to the secretary. But in spite of this they so strongly urged me to meet them that, though it involved much inconvenience to myself and to others, and caused me an additional journey of 600 miles, I came to Cape Town; to be asked two or three questions, which [ I had already answered on paper, and to be dismissed after about five minutes. When I wished to hand

in some evidence afterwards about the serious deficiency in hospital equipment even at the hospitals near Cape Town, I was somewhat curtly informed that the Commissioners desired no further information on that point";

"For one thing one may be thankful. I have heard it said far and wide that from the moment the controversy was raised in England and here, the comforts of the patients were much better attended to."

Now, Sir, what is the point here? I put aside the peculiar treatment meted out to a high dignitary of the Church busily engaged performing the functions of his office and dragged 600 miles up to Cape Town to have two or three questions put to him. The real point is that he tendered new evidence with regard to the base hospitals, and that that evidence was peremptorily declined.

Now let us look at the verdict of the Commission about the base hospitals. They quote the opinion of the staff' commander at the base, who was really in a military sense responsible for the condition of the hospitals;

"They were all housed, and all had good mattresses to lie on, and were well looked after; much better than I have ever seen on service elsewhere."

I wonder if he has ever seen a campaign where the base was at a great town and a great port provided with every comfort that the world could supply. But that is not my point. The Commission made up their mind with regard to the base hospitals and they did not want any more evidence. Now, Sir, I am not a lawyer, but I put it to any lawyer here present; Did he ever hear of a judge or a jury refusing new evidence and then making up their mind in favour of the side against whom that evidence would tell? That is exactly what the Commission did in this case.

There is another case which I mentioned in one of my letters and which is so similar to that I have just related that I will remind the Committee of it here.

It is connected with what is known as the "Intombi Scandal." With regard to that matter the Committee print the evidence of two Army medical officers, and the evidence of an Army Service Corps officer who was appointed by Sir George White to inquire into the matter. The latter officer gave evidence against the medical arrangements. The Commission give their usual verdict;

"But we think, after making all just allowances, that no complaint can reasonably be made with regard to the steps taken by the authorities or the way in which the patients were looked after."

I may say that the main complaint against Intombi was the stealing of the patient's food and comforts by the orderlies and non-commissioned officers. But that is not the point I want to make. There was another Court of Inquiry into Intombi, which is actually referred to in the evidence, composed of three officers, and one of these officers wrote to the Commission stating that the evidence taken before that Court would be of great value, suggesting that they should call for it, and offering himself to appear as a witness before the Commission. He was not called, and he never had any answer to his letter. And yet the Commission say there was no just cause of complaint as to the way in which the patients were looked after. This officer who wrote to the Commission is a well-known member of the Natal Legislature, and served throughout the war with considerable distinction as an officer of the Natal Volunteers. He naturally feels somewhat strongly on the subject, and writes; "If the hospitals were a scandal it seems that the work of the Commission is going to be a greater scandal."

Now, Sir, I put this opinion of a leading colonist side by side with that of the Archbishop of Cape Town; and if time served me I could give other equally strong and authoritative opinions from the Colony; and I want to ask the Committee, Is this the lesson we want our colonies to learn of our methods in such a matter? Remember, far and wide over there they have seen and known what happened. Their own sons and brothers and husbands and fathers have suffered from our mismanagement of this great Department of the campaign. And we tell them that this is the sort of inquiry into those thing with which England is content, and we ask these young administrations to accept this model, stamped with the mother country's high authority and honour, of how we conduct our public business and how we guard the interests of truth and justice, in a matter of life and death. Ho you think this will increase the love and honour of the colonies for the mother country? Do you think this will strengthen the tie which at best depends on the moral force of a high example, upon that purer conception of public life and that more just and honest regard for public truth, which the colonies look for from the sovereign government and the Mother of Parliaments?

I have spoken much of the evidence the Commission did not take. I now desire to say a few words about how they treated certain evidence they did take. At Pretoria, when the Commission had but half completed its inquiry, Lord Roberts gave evidence. As is well known, Lord Roberts's evidence was highly favourable to the medical arrangements in the war. I am not going to discuss the opinion of Lord Roberts on this subject. I am only dealing with the action of the Commission. Lord Roberts's evidence was published the next day throughout South Africa. Sir, the publication of that evidence from that moment closed the mouth of every officer in the British Army. What is the custom in courts-martial and councils of war? Is it not that the junior officer gives his opinion first and so on upwards in the successive ranks, the opinion of the senior officer being taken last, in order that it should not affect the free expression of opinion by his subordinates? The case is infinitely stronger here. All the witnesses had to come forward voluntarily. Who was Lord Roberts? He was the most popular

commander of modern times. He was Commander-in-Chief of the Forces in South Africa. He was the future Commander-in-Chief of the British Army. Talk about insulting the Army &#x0021; Did not the real insult lie in placing officers in a position where they must either condemn the views of their Commander-in-Chief or be silent as to evils from which they knew their men had suffered? What did we hear the other night from the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Colonies? That when Lord Roberts had given his decision, it was not permissible even for the House of Commons to discuss the merits of the case or to have any opinion. A fortiori, how could you expect officers of the Army to come forward, not under compulsion, but spontaneously and of their own free will, to contradict the authoritative opinion and traverse the published decision of their Commander-in-Chief? Mr. Lowther, the publication of Lord Roberts's evidence by the Commission before they closed their sittings was the greatest barrier that was ever placed against the truth coming out in an inquiry like this.

Sir, I will make but a brief reference to what I frankly own I think the greatest blot in the history of the Commission, and that is the refusal to hear the witnesses I offered to send before them. I had spent four months collecting this evidence; it came from the most capable and intelligent set of eye-witnesses I have ever met. brave men who scorned to complain of hardships in the field, but whose practical common-sense had been offended by seeing men suffer and die from defects in hospitals which they knew were easily remediable and had nothing to do with military exigencies. The Commission had been all along in the hands of the Department. They had practically promised to take the evidence in England on their return; they refused to do so. I leave this matter, and the only inference that can be drawn from it, to the Committee and the public. All I say is that, had they heard those witnesses, it would have been impossible for them to have presented such a weak and vacillating Report.

I will now refer to a very grave omission in the Report. We have heard something about the bad feeding of patients in trains. Does the Committee really know how the results of that neglect were averted? Throughout the whole campaign, for a year and a half, these trains have been slowly dragging down to the base with their convoys of sick and wounded, and throughout the whole campaign their feeding and refreshment on the way has been largely done, not by the military or medical authorities whose duty it was, but by the voluntary aid and great kindness of the civilian population all along the line, most of which ran through a sparsely inhabited area. Many of these people are poor and hard-worked.

They have given their time, their savings, their labour to this humane and loyal service; little stationmasters' wives and daughters, even porters' and platelayers' womenfolk; they have waited up all night keeping a fire lighted to make beef-tea or warm milk, or other nourishment suitable for the painful complaints of the patients. It was a most important part of the medical arrangements, into which this Commission was to inquire. Was there no place for an adequate reference to it in the Report, if not by way of tribute, at least in recognition of its importance in the medical arrangements? No, none; because it



was not done by officials or by a Department. So in this Report, which I suppose will be the authoritative and historic record of the medical arrangements in the war, this continuous chain of generosity and self-sacrifice, reaching over 700 miles of that railway, displayed by the humble and loyal colonists to the vast armies which have poured into that country, goes entirely unacknowledged. I deeply regret it.

Sir, the complexion which colours the Report throughout is shown to be fatal when we come to the Commission's suggestions of reform. Whatever is firm; and it is very little; is partial to the Department; whatever is not partial to the Department is feeble to a degree. I can only very briefly touch on some of their proposals.

They recommend first; first, mark you; the increase of the Royal Army Medical Corps. It is quite true that lower down they admit that the scientific status of the corps ought to be improved; but they treat the subject in a very half-hearted way. They miss altogether another instance where surely a tribute was due, but none has been paid, and which also touches closely the question of reform. The Committee has heard of the New South Wales Medical Contingent, with its fine field hospital and gallant bearer company. It was the only colonial medical service in the war. It was a sort of militia service, but its medical officers were mostly distinguished medical men in the colonies, who left their practices and gave their services. Their staff, non-coms., and orderlies were splendidly disciplined and efficient. There was no stealing patients' money and property in the New South Wales Field Hospital. Wherever there was firing the New South Wales Bearer Company was sure to be close at hand at the right moment. Yet, with the exception of a brief and colourless mention, there is no tribute of any kind to this splendid colonial service in that department of the campaign which the Commission was sent out to inquire into. No; it did not belong to the Department. But surely the lesson is an important one in these days, when the extension of the auxiliary forces plays such a large part in this Army scheme. It is absolutely lost on the Commission. They do not inquire into, they make no comment on, its bearing on the question of enlargement of the Medical Service.

But in their treatment of the question of civilian aid you see how the spirit of the Department, grasping at complete control, has permeated the Commission, and set them on the wrong track in this matter. They recommend the mixing up of the Royal Army Medical Corps officers with civilian doctors in medical work; the private hospitals which did such splendid work in the campaign, such as the Yeomanry, the Irish, Scotch, Welsh, and many others. These hospitals, with complete civilian staffs and only one Royal Army Medical Corps officer to form a link with other departments, afford an irrefutable proof of the value of self-organised, self-controlled, independent civilian medical aid, and of the facility with which it can be applied for the period it is required.

Sir, that is my case; or, rather, a small part of my case; against the inquiry that has been held. The inquiry has failed to give any true picture of the extent of the evils, has failed to point out any of the causes, and has failed to push home any of the responsibilities; and by the manner of conducting its

proceedings, by the refusal of evidence and the failure to take the right evidence, and by allowing itself to fall into the hands of an organisation on one side of the case, it has reflected grave discredit on English public life. For these reasons I have appealed, and I appeal again, to the right hon.

Gentleman the Secretary of State for War to

go outside of the Report which has resulted from such an inquiry, and to take larger and more practical views in framing his reforms than are to be found in that document.

And, Sir, I venture to make another appeal to the Government, an appeal which perhaps it would not be in order, in connection with this Vote in Supply, for me to make in any larger or more specific terms than by stating this. If we have entered on an era when the demands of our position call not so much for new legislation as that we should put our house in order, and if that can only be done in every department by a full, searching, and relentless investigation of its defects, then the worst model we can adopt for that process, and the weakest and rottenest basis of reform, will be this farce of an inquiry for which we are now voting this large sum of public money.

MR. DALZIEL said he was sure he was expressing the opinion of many hon Members on both sides of the House that the hon. Gentleman had no need to make any apology for the very important and valuable speech to which they had just listened. He thought they ought to all associate themselves in the protest that a question of this magnitude and far-reaching importance should be discussed at one o'clock in the morning. He did not say anything about who was responsible; but he called it a public scandal that the only opportunity they had of discussing a matter in which the lives of thousands of our countrymen were involved should be at that hour in the morning. He wished to draw the attention of the Secretary for War to one or two statements on which he thought they were entitled to some explanation. He agreed with the hon. Gentleman that a Commission without powers to take evidence on oath could not present a Report which would be satisfactory. Take the case of the Belfast Riots Commission, where only a few lives were concerned. That

Commission reported that it would be useless to take evidence unless on oath.

Not only had the South African Commission no power to take evidence on oath, but they had no power to protect witnesses, and anyone giving evidence was liable to official criticism and censure. He would point out that the Report itself stated that the Royal Army Medical Corps was totally insufficient, and was so constituted that it could not be materially enlarged or have its deficiencies made good, and that these deficiencies were felt throughout the whole of the South African campaign. It then went on to state that for a considerable time before the outbreak of the war the necessity for increasing the staff of the Royal Army Medical Corps was urged upon the military authorities, but for the most part without avail. That was a direct charge that, the corps being insufficient, recommendations had been made that it ought to be increased, and that those recommendations had not been acted upon. The Committee was entitled to know who were responsible for that inaction and neglect. Why was it that when responsible people at the head of the Royal Army Medical Corps recommended that

the corps should be increased no attention whatever was paid to their recommendations? That was a very serious charge against the Government, meriting some notice from the right hon. Gentleman in his reply.

There was one other point. At the out break of the war the hon. Member for the Ilkeston Division pointed out the inevitable results of typhoid in South Africa, and suggested that a special Commission should go out to assist the Army doctors with their experience. That Suggestion was rejected by the authorities on the ground that there was not the same need of special assistance with regard to sanitary matters as with surgical operations. But recently the right hon.

Gentleman the Secretary of State had gone entirely back on that position. and had practically censured the Government by saying that he thought the experience of the war had shown that a Committee of that character would have done good service. It certainly seemed that that refusal required some? explanation.

The points he put to the right hon. Gentleman were: Why was it that we went to war with the Royal Army Medical Corps not even up to peace strength and altogether unfit to deal with the conflict in which we were engaged; and, secondly, what justification was there for the Government in not adopting the suggestion with regard to taking proper sanitary precautions? The Committee had every confidence that the right hon. Gentleman would take advantage of the Report and act upon it, but that was not the whole question. We had to do with a state of things in the past which it was no good hushing up or attempting to discuss at one o'clock in the morning. In that Report there were sufficient charges to demand an explanation from the Government, because upon them, after all, rested the responsibility for the neglect.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derby, Ilkeston), having taken an interest in this matter from the beginning, felt bound to say that he was startled and pained by the very grave position in which they found themselves. The hon. Member for Westminster had levelled against the Commission some of the most serious charges ever made against any public inquiry, and which really deserved the grave consideration of the Government. It had been shown that the Commission started without proper powers and never took the trouble to arm itself with those powers; that it refused evidence over and over again; and that citizens of high standing were invited to attend and then the evidence they were prepared to give was practically refused. In the Report the Commissioners themselves virtually admitted the whole case brought forward in the House before the Commission was constituted, for on page 39 they stated;

"We think that the deficiencies of the staff at Bloemfontein were not thoroughly realised as soon as they might have been, and that more doctors might have been obtained and sent up so as to supply these deficiencies earlier. We cannot think that the deficiencies of transport, which we are fully aware of, could have prevented doctors being obtained and sent into the town."

The same remarks applied to the lack of nurses. That was an admission of the whole case with regard to the unfortunate men who died at Bloemfontein, and the Report, from beginning to end, if read between the lines, admitted most of the charges which were made in the House.

There were many things which struck one in analysing the Report. In any thorough

inquiries, even without professional experience, if animated by a desire to get at the bottom of the matter, one of the first things would be to state the death rate from typhoid fever. But there was nothing of that sort in this document. One gathered from Lord Roberts's telegram that the death rate at that date was about twenty-one per cent. It was as low as twelve and a half in some hospitals and under eight per cent. in others, but there was nothing whatever in the Report to show why our men had died at the rate of twenty-one, or in some places twenty-three per cent. With regard to the supply of beds, it was laid down by authorities on all hands that the minimum supply should be equal to ten per cent. of the force. That question the Commission did not attempt to grapple with, and in the Report it was almost impossible to find the number of beds at any time available for the Army. On the information he had from time to time received it seemed that at no period was the minimum of ten per cent. provided. At the beginning of the active advance there were about 116,000 soldiers in South Africa, and, on the widest computation, only 9,000 instead of 11,600 beds. When the number of men had reached 184,000, the beds numbered only about 12,000, instead of 18,400, so that apparently as the Army increased, the medical appliances and the provisions for the comfort of the troops became less. Even in the middle of last year, after all the debates in the House and the efforts of the War Office to supply the deficiencies, the proper proportion of beds had not been supplied. Taking the Report as it stood, and analysing the figures given as to beds, it presented a very grave condemnation of the medical arrangements in connection with the war. The most amusing thing; if anything concerning this matter could be amusing; was that the only conclusion the Commission, after holding its inquiry in South Africa, could come to, was that another Committee should be appointed to do the work they did not do. The Leader of the House had stated that the object of the Commission was to inquire into the treatment of every wounded and sick soldier in South Africa; but that was the very thing the Commission had not done. They had gone altogether on the wrong track, and the responsibility, no matter on whom it rested, was a very grave one. Instead of carrying out the object with which they were sent, the Commission inquired into the efficiency of the Royal Army Medical Corps, with the view, apparently, of preparing a defence. The Royal Army Medical Corps was not attacked in the House. Mistakes doubtless were made by the corps; there were some bad officers among them, but bad officers I had been discovered in almost every branch of the Army in the course of the campaign, and the Royal Army Medical Corps was no worse than other departments. Some men did not do their duty, but, taken man for man, he believed that the Royal Army Medical Corps in this campaign had deserved as well of the country as any other branch of the military service. But the great complaint was that the corps was undermanned from the beginning, and, with all the additions the right hon. Gentleman had been able to make, it was still about 100 less than it was forty years ago. That in itself was a scandal.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr. STUART WORTLEY, Sheffield, Hallam) reminded the hon. Member that the Vote under discussion was for the Commission of Inquiry, and that it would be out of order to discuss thereon the policy of the War Office

with regard to the organisation of the Royal Army Medical Corps.

SIR WALTER FOSTER did not wish to go into the question of the re-organisation of the Army Medical Corps. The Report of the Commission assigned its defects to the undermanning of that department, and the result was that we had had to fall back upon civil surgeons. He wished to ask the right hon.

Gentleman how he proposed to follow out the recommendations contained in the Report with reference to the Army Medical Corps Corps.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is impossible for an answer to be given to such a question upon this Vote.

SIR WALTER FOSTER said that apparently those recommendations did not come within the purview of the Vote, but he would be able to ask his question, no doubt, on the Army Medical Vote. That would be no inconvenience to him, and perhaps it would be better to discuss it then. The Army Medical Department, in endeavouring to meet the deficiencies, had had to rely upon sending out a large number of civil surgeons. He thought we were bound to recognise that those civil surgeons had rendered a vast amount of service, but they had not received the same amount of consideration that they might have done in view of the large number sent out and the good work they had done. Over 300 of them had been sent out. We had about 468 members of the Royal Army Medical Corps, and no less than 385 civil surgeons had been doing similar work. That additional staff which was obtained during the difficulties in South Africa, was a measure of what we should require in order to meet similar difficulties in the future. He wished to get out of this debate and out of this Report such a consideration of the whole question, as would lessen the sufferings of the soldier on his campaigns in the future by preventing, where-ever possible, the spread of preventable diseases. The Army Medical Department must be kept in such a state of efficiency that what had been called scandals might not occur in the future. It was true that this Report said that there was no such thing as a hospital scandal, but he thought that statement went a little

too far. Those who had read the Appendix of the Report must admit that there was a want of proper organisation on the part of the Army medical officers, and a want of supply of those ordinary creature comforts which were absolutely necessary in sickness. The absence of those led not only to an enormous amount of needless suffering, but also to the sacrifice of hundreds of lives. He knew that the right hon. Gentleman was in no way responsible for this, but he hoped that under his regime steps would be taken to prevent a repetition of what he thought was one of the most painful features of this campaign, by which many lives had been lost which might, under more favourable conditions, have been saved.

\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): I do not think that the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy was quite fair when he said that this was a very inconvenient occasion, and, at the same time, the only occasion upon which this subject could be discussed. The hon. Member will remember that we had some discussion on the subject, including a speech from the hon. Member for Westminster, on the King's Speech. Possibly some hours debate has been devoted to less important subjects which might have been devoted to this question. The

position at this moment is that we are invited to consider how this Commission performed its duty. My hon. friend the Member for Westminster has made a most vehement attack upon the character of this inquiry and the principles which have guided them. In the few words I propose to say I would like to ask, as a matter of common sense, on what grounds are these motives imputed to this Commission? What can possibly be the grounds upon which my hon. friend thinks he has discovered in the whole action of this Commission the sinister motives of a determination to shield the Army Medical Corps, to burke the inquiry, and to report something that will be favour-

able to the military authorities? What can be the motive of these independent gentlemen; not one of whom, so far as I know, has anything to gain in the matter from the Government; doing this? They are all independent men with nothing to gain by such action; they are men of the highest character, and what can be the motive which would induce them to act in the way the hon. Member for Westminster says they have acted? I am at a loss to understand what their motive could be. MR. BURDETT-COUTTS: I would remind the right hon. Gentleman that I did not give my opinions, but I confined myself to giving the facts with regard to the inquiry. I had to give a précis of my speech, and I devoted the whole of my remarks to facts and incidents.

\*MR. BRODRICK: I hold no brief for the Hospitals Commission, but I know that they are a body of thoroughly high-minded gentlemen who gave an immense amount of time and hard work to this subject, who travelled a great many thousand miles, and who took up this inquiry for a public purpose, and reported on matters as they found them. If their Report is not altogether satisfactory to my hon. friend and to some other hon. Members of this House, I can only say that so far as I am concerned I do not feel that I am bound by the four corners of this Report as to what requires to be done in the Army. In the nature of things it cannot be an exhaustive Report. Looking at this matter quite impartially, I think the hon. Member cast a very unmerited slur upon the Commission when he said that these gentlemen concluded their labours by appointing a Committee to do the very work which they had been appointed to do. That was not an accurate statement of the facts. This Commission was appointed to consider and report upon the care and treatment of the sick and wounded during the South African campaign. They may or may not have carried out that instruction to the satisfaction of some hon. Members of this House, but I think they were fully justified in recommending the appointment of a Committee to inquire into and report on the steps needed to attract in the future a sufficient supply of medical officers and nurses. This Committee which is suggested deals with the future and not with the past. I think hon. Gentlemen who have spoken have pushed these matters against the Commission a great deal too far. I am not going to weary the Committee by dealing in detail with the points raised in the very vigorous indictment which my hon. friend has made, but I wish to refer to a statement which he made with regard to Lord Roberts. The hon. Member said, with a great appearance of force, that Lord Roberts having been called as a witness at Pretoria, it was obvious that no private soldier who afterwards gave evidence would be anxious to give a different opinion. That statement no doubt impressed

many hon. Members with the idea that nothing like fair evidence would be obtained. To prove this I think the hon. Member ought to have shown that, whereas the evidence given before Lord Roberts was of one character, the evidence given by officers afterwards was of a totally different character.

MR. BURDETT-COUTTS: I am sorry that the late hour at which I spoke obliged me to leave out some very important parts of my speech. I had intended to close with the sentence that if you had any doubt upon this point, it was only necessary to examine the evidence which followed Lord Roberts's evidence, and it would be found that not a single officer in the Army afterwards gave an opinion opposite to that expressed by Lord Roberts.

MR. BRODRICK: I confess that I can produce one or two pieces of evidence which will hardly bear out that statement. I do not wish to widen the gulf between myself and those hon. Members who look upon this Report as being unsatisfactory, and I hope we shall all look at it as the commencement of the reform of the Army Medical Service. The hon. Member for Kirkcaldy asked why the Army Medical Corps were not fully equipped at the time we entered on the war. I can only remind the House that the blame for this shortage lies as much at the door of this House as at any other point. We have had the Army Medical Corps organised on the principle that three army corps only were necessary, and if that principle had been adhered to I believe that the arrangements organised in regard to the Army Medical Corps would have been sufficient. But instead of three army corps, provision had to be immediately made for six army corps. I well recollect how some remarks I made a fortnight ago, in regard to the necessity of preparing to send out 120,000 men abroad, were received. If this House only allows us to organise the Army Medical Corps to supply 120,000 men, how can you expect the same medical staff to supply the medical requirements of 220,000 men? I may tell the hon. Member that I think the experience of the war will show that a Committee such as that suggested by the Commission would be an extremely valuable one.

Looking at this matter impartially, I think it is regrettable to pass this unmerited slur on men who have, at any rate, tried to do their duty properly according to their lights. I do not think it ought to be supposed for a moment that a Commission appointed to inquire into the care of the sick and wounded during the campaign could cover the whole ground, nor would its Report be the only guide for the future in regard to the reform of the Army Medical Corps. For the re-organisation of the Department I will not look to the Report alone. I am perfectly aware that in the past the condition of the Army Medical Corps has not been satisfactory in several respects. First of all, we have had far too small a choice of men to bring into the corps, and until we remedy that defect we shall not have an efficient Service. We have not had sufficient elasticity in connection with the Service. I approach this question with an absolutely open mind. I do not feel that we can build altogether on the existing foundation. We shall not limit ourselves to official sources for inspiration. I am not in the least without hope, that before very long the steps about to be taken will enable us to bring before the House a scheme which will give us a really effective Army Medical Service.

MR. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.) said the right hon. Gentleman had stated that it was an independent and impartial Commission, but was that really so? He had complained of the hon. Member for Westminster attributing sinister motives to the Commission, which was composed of independent gentlemen. It should be remembered what was the position of the Government at the time the Commission was appointed. At that time it was most important for the Government that the Commission they were appointing should bring in a Report in favour of the action of the Government with reference to the provision made for the Army Medical Service in South Africa. It would have been a serious thing for the Government if, as the result of their inquiries, the Commission had found that the Government had failed in their duty to the soldiers in South Africa. The Commission had at its head Lord Justice Romer, who was the legal grade, if he might say so, of the Commission. It had been conclusively proved that in his method of conducting the inquiry he had departed altogether from legal traditions, customs, and forms. What happened? Before the Commission left England the evidence of certain witnesses was tendered, and it was refused by the Commission. The hon. Member thought he was correct in stating that Lord Justice Romer promised that the evidence of those witnesses would be received on the return of the Commission from South Africa. On their return Lord Justice Romer and the other members of the Commission absolutely declined to receive the evidence that was tendered. In an ordinary case in any of the courts of this country such a proceeding in the way of refusing to receive evidence would be rightly regarded as a disgrace to the judicial bench. The case for the accusers of the Government in connection with the provision made for the Army Medical Corps in South Africa was not heard by the Commission, and all the evidence taken was evidence for the defence. On reading the Report they found that it was not the judgment in any sense of an impartial or an independent tribunal. It was a special plea from beginning to end for the defence and against the accusers. It was a most amusing thing to go through the Report. All through the Report such expressions were to be found as "on the whole," "generally speaking," and "as a rule." The Principal Medical Officer and head medical staff were strongly animadverted upon, and then the Report said; "But taking their work as a whole, and considering the difficulties they have had to contend with, we think that the Principal Medical Officer and his head staff have done excellent work."

There were pages devoted to criticising the Principal Medical Officer and his staff and showing how they had failed to do their duty in very important details. The Commission accused the orderlies of general thievery, but their Report also said;

"Complaints against orderlies in this war have been somewhat numerous, though, on the other hand, the way in which the orderlies as a body discharged their duties has deservedly been the subject of high praise from many witnesses of experience."

With respect to the condition of the Field Hospital of the 12th Brigade at Bloemfontein the Report says;

"This hospital was in many respects unsatisfactory, but the results on the



patients were not so bad as might have been anticipated."

The whole Report showed a lack of organisation and want of attention to detail. Even the headings of the various portions of the Report confirmed this; as, for instance, "Delay in bringing up hospitals," "Delay in bringing up medical staff," "Delay in moving patients from railway stations," and so on. The Report from beginning to end was a special plea on behalf of the defendants in the dock for their treatment of the soldiers of the Queen in South Africa. It appeared to him, in reading the Report, that Lord Justice Romer probably had most to do with the drafting of it, but that on the one hand he had the angel of truth compelling him to put in these reservations and exceptions, while on the other hand stood the angel of whitewash, because the Report proved that the Commission was a whitewashing Commission and nothing else. His Lordship therefore had a very difficult part to play in framing the Report, and under all the circumstances; he did his task extremely well.

As an Irish Member he had no sympathy with Irishmen who joined the King's Army, and he had done his best to persuade them not to do so. But when unfortunate Irishmen, through poverty, had been driven to enter the Army he was entitled to intervene in the debate in order to criticise the action of the Government and the Royal Army Medical Corps in not properly providing for the comfort of the men who were fighting the battles of the country. He moved to reduce the Vote by £;1,000.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Item. Class 7, Vote 1, be reduced by £;1,000.";(Mr. O'Shee.)

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick's) drew the attention of the Committee to the case of a Unionist friend of his who, joining the Army, was sent to South Africa. While there he fell sick and was put into one of the bell-tents. For five days he was lying on the ground without a blanket and without any sanitary accommodation whatever. He was half-starved, and it was only his strong Irish constitution which kept him alive. The doctor never went near him, he had no medicine or treatment of any kind, and apparently nobody cared whether the wounded and sick lived or died. In contrast to that, another friend of his, who went out with the Irish Yeomanry, was taken prisoner by the Boers, and the man said that the Boers treated him as a prisoner a great deal better than our own men were treated in our own hospitals. He fully agreed that the Report was a whitewashing Report. The gentlemen who went outwore no doubt impelled by the highest motive, but that highest motive was to get the Government out of a difficulty. There was not the slightest doubt that this eminent judge was put at the head of the Commission in order that no damaging admissions should appear, and the result was that the Government had got a Report according to order, and the Committee were expected to swallow everything contained therein. The War Office and the officials responsible ought undoubtedly to be brought to justice at the bar of public opinion. This was nothing else but a public scandal in regard to the way the wounded were treated, and he promised his friend that he would make the case public. He was prepared to give the gentleman's name, only he told him that he did not want to pose as a martyr. He hoped the right hon.

Gentleman would take these facts into consideration.

\*MR. TULLY thought very grave and serious charges had been made by the hon. Member for Westminster, and he had proved his case up to the hilt, and they were entitled to have a clear and sufficient answer to that ease from the Government. He thought this Hospitals Commission was simply an electioneering Commission sent out for the purposes of the General Election. The right hon. Gentleman had stated that the members of this Commission were impartial and disinterested, but he did not say that two of them had got titles which they never would otherwise have got. When the Government appointed Commissions to inquire into the riots at Belfast and the Broadhead outrages at Sheffield they were given power to protect witnesses who gave evidence; but in the case of this Commission, which dealt with the lives of thousands of soldiers, that power was refused. That being the case, how could they expect any other result than the very limited Report which was presented to the House? The hon. Member for Westminster had told them plainly how the wounded

were treated. He knew a private in the Irish Yeomanry who fought at Lindley, and he received a slight injury which ought to have healed in a week or two with proper treatment, but in consequence of being dealt with by an incompetent doctor at the front that soldier was now limping about Dublin with one leg. That would not have happened if they had not tried to run the Army on society lines, with society generals and society doctors. There were numbers of men in Ireland who had lost their limbs through merely trivial wounds, and this could have been prevented if their injuries had been attended to at the time by competent doctors. The Report presented was simply a whitewashing Report, and the £8,000 spent on this Commission was simply for official whitewash. He hoped his hon. friend would press his motion to a division.

DR. THOMPSON (Monaghan, N.) said he could not sit silently and hear the Army Medical Department abused. It was not the officers, but the system under which they worked that was to blame. He knew a large number of medical officers engaged in this war, and they told him in communications that they knew where to get the supplies, but the system was such that, although, they went and begged for these things for the sick and wounded, they could not get them. After the letters of the hon. Member for Westminster appeared in The Times then all these difficulties were removed. There could not be the smallest doubt that not only this House, but the country and every British soldier, owed to the hon. Member for Westminster a debt of gratitude for what he had done. He did not hesitate to say that the action of the hon. Member for Westminster had been instrumental in saving the lives of thousands of men in South Africa. He did not blame the Government so much, because they had sent out large quantities of every sort of supplies; but the system of distribution was such that it destroyed the vitality of the service. He knew a case where a soldier had his hand blown off, and when the medical officer came to amputate the limb there was no antiseptic for him to use. They were not allowed to keep such things in small establishments, and they could not be supplied within ten days. He knew another case where there was an outbreak of diphtheria, and the medical officer had to buy diphtheric anti-toxine because the Government had not provided any. Those were

absolute facts, and he felt sure that the right hon. Gentleman, the Secretary of State for War, who had shown such a great interest in reforms in the Army, and had proposed such an elaborate scheme, would do all that was possible to remedy the state of things which existed in the Army Medical Service at present. As regarded the Army Medical men themselves, amid great dangers, wherever their services were required they were always there. They never spared themselves in the Crimea, and they had not spared themselves in South Africa.

MR. CREAN (Cork, S.E.) contended that the system under which the Army Medical Corps worked was bad and defective, and it was not right to try and throw the blame for what had occurred during this campaign on the doctors. These men did not wish to pose as martyrs. In fact, some of them, were rather doubtful of the results that would accrue to themselves for the sacrifices they had made for the honour of Great Britain. It was clear that the evidence of the men who had suffered most had not been accepted. This was proof positive that the Commission was appointed not to find facts or to bring home any defects in the system, but to make it appear to the public that the statements made by the hon. Gentleman, who was not an opponent but a supporter of the Government, were exaggerated. The Commission was a fraudulent Commission from the beginning, and was sent out to South Africa to cover up the defects of the system, and to bring a plausible Report before the country, to exonerate the

AYES

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Archdale, Edward Mervyn

Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Bagot, Capt. Joceline FitzRoy

Gentlemen on the Front Bench who were responsible for the muddle in South Africa. It was not a Commission that did any practical good, and it was never intended to do anything else than purely and solely to whitewash the Government.

The Report was not worth £8,000; in fact, it was not worth the cost of the paper on which it was printed. His contention was not that the doctors had neglected their duty in the field, or that they were inefficient as individuals, but that the system as a whole was inefficient, and that the staff were not numerous enough to cope with the difficulties with which they were surrounded.

The war was entered into without sufficient food, supplies, clothing, or medicines. The Commission did no earthly good. If any good was done it was by the hon. Member for Westminster; who, however, had been closed when he wanted to bring forward evidence to prove every charge that had been made. It was a clover move on the part of the Commission to ask the head of the Army to give his evidence first. That was done intentionally to prevent any underling, or non-commissioned officer, or private giving true evidence. He himself had seen men driven mad by their sufferings and neglect. He had taken a man to the police

quarters who had been driven out of barracks by his colleagues.

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

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

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 154; Noes, 72. (Division List No. 77.)

Bain, Colonel James Robert

Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashfd

Platt-Higgins, Frederick

Balcarres, Lord

Harris, Fleverton (Tynemouth

Pretymann, Ernest George

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

Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley

Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward

Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin

Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.)

Purvis, Robert

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

Hope, J. F. (Sheff'ld, Brightside

Randles, John S.

Bentinck, Lord Henry C.

Howard, Capt J (Kent, Faversham)

Reid, James (Greenock)

Bignold, Arthur

Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton

Rentoul, James Alexander

Bill, Charles

Johnston, William (Belfast)

Renwick, George

Blundell, Colonel Henry

Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh

Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge

Bond, Edward

Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green

Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-

Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)

Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson

Brassey, Albert

Law, Andrew Bonar

Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John

Lawrence, William F.

Royds, Clement Molyneux

Cautley, Henry Strother

Lawson, John Grant

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

Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.  
Leigh- Bennett, Henry Carrie  
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S  
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albeit  
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)  
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.  
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J.(Birm.  
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S  
Sharpe, William Edward T.  
Chamberlain, J. A. (Worc'r  
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)  
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)  
Chapman, Edward  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)  
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)  
Skewes-Cox, Thomas  
Corbett, A. Cameron(Glasgow)  
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth  
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)  
Smith, HC (North'mb Tyneside  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Macartney, Rt.Hn. W G Ellison  
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.  
Cubitt, Hon. Henry  
Macdona, John Cumming  
Spear, John Ward  
Dalkeith, Earl of  
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)  
Stauley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk  
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)  
Majendie, James A. H.  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Dewar, T. R (T'rH'mlets, S.Geo.  
Malcolm, Tan  
Stock, James Henry  
Dickson, Charles Scott  
Manners, Lord Cecil  
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley  
Dickson-Poynder, Sir J. P.

Maxwell, WJ H (Dumfriesshire  
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napie  
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph C.  
Melville. Beresford Valentine  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph  
Milward, Colonel Victor  
Thornton, Percy M.  
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray  
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy  
Valentia, Viscount  
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton  
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire  
Walker, Col. William Hall.  
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst  
Morgan, Day, J. (Walthamstow  
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.  
Finch, George H.  
Morgan, Hn. Fred(Monm'thsh.  
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Welby, Lt.-Col. ACE(Taunton)  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
Whiteley, H. (Ashton under L.  
Morrison, James Archibald  
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)  
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.  
Morton, Arthur HA(Deptford)  
Wilcox, Sir John Archibald  
Cordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin&Nairn  
Mount, William Arthur  
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)  
Goschen, Hn. George Joachim  
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Greene, Sir EW (BryS. Edm'nds  
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry  
Greene, W. Raymond(Cambs.)  
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-  
Grenfell, William Henry

Newdigate, Francis Alexander  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Groves, James Grimble  
Nicholson, William Graham  
Guthrie, Walter Murray  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
Hambro, Charles Erie  
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens  
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Mid'x  
Pemberton, John S. G.  
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.  
Penn, John  
NOES.  
Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)  
Dalziel, James Henry  
Joicey, Sir James  
Abraham, William (Rhondda)  
Doogan, P. C.  
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)  
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc, Stroud)  
Dully, William J.  
Jordan, Jeremiah  
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)  
Elibank, Master of  
Joyce, Michael  
Boland, John  
Farrell, James Patrick  
Kennedy, Patrick James  
Boyle, James  
Fenwick, Charles  
Leamy, Edmund  
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)  
Field, William  
Leigh, Sir Joseph  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)  
Levy, Maurice  
Burns, John  
Fuller, J. M. F.  
Lundon, W.  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Gilhooly, James  
M'Crae, George  
Clancy, John Joseph  
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John

M'Dermott, Patrick  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Hammond, John  
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)  
Crean, Eugene  
Hardie, J Keir (Merthyr Tydvil  
Mooney, John J.  
Cullinan, J.  
Hayden, John Patrick  
Murphy, J.  
Daly, James  
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-  
Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N  
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid)  
Reddy, M.  
Thomas, J. A. (Glam.,Gower)  
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)  
Redmond, J. E. (Waterford)  
Thompson, E. C. (Monaghan, N.  
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Tully, Jasper  
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)  
Roche, John  
Warner, Thomas CourtenayT.  
O'Dowd, John  
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)  
Weir, James Galloway  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Soares, Ernest J.  
White, Luke (York, E. R.)  
O'Kelly, Jas (Roscommon, N.)  
Sullivan, Donal  
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)  
O'Malley, William  
Tennant, Harold John  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.  
O'Mara, James  
Thomas, A. (Glamorgan, E.)  
O'Shee, James John  
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings  
Question put accordingly, "That the Item, Class 7, Vote 1, be reduced by  
£;1,000."  
AYES.  
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)  
Gladstone Rt. Hn. Herbert J.



O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Abraham, William (Rhondda)  
Hammond, John  
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N  
Allen, C. P. (Gloucester, Stroud)  
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil  
O'Malley, William  
Barry, E. (Cork. S.)  
Hayden, John Patrick  
O'Mara, James  
Boland, John  
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-  
O'Shee, James John  
Boyle, James  
Joicey, Sir James  
Roddy, M.  
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)  
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire)  
Redmond, John E. (Waterford  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Jordan, Jeremiah  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Burns, John  
Joyce, Michael  
Roche, John  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Kennedy, Patrick James  
Samuel S M (Whitechapel)  
Clancy, John Joseph  
Leamy, Edmund  
Soares, Ernest J.  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Leigh, Sir Joseph  
Sullivan, Donal  
Crean, Eugene  
Levy, Maurice  
Tennant, Harold John  
Cullinan, J.  
Lundon, W.  
Thomas Alfred (Glamorgan, E  
Daly, James  
M'Crae, George  
Thomas, F. Freeman (Hastings  
Dalziel, James Henry  
M'Dermott, Patrick  
Thomas, J. A. (Glam., Gower)

Doogan, P. C.  
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)  
Thompson, E.C. (Monaghan, N  
Duffy, William J.  
Mooney, John J.  
Tally, Jasper  
Elibank, Master of  
Murphy, J.  
Warner, Thos. Courtenay T.  
Farrell, James Patrick  
Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.)  
Weir, James Galloway  
Fenwick, Charles  
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid)  
White, Luke (York, E.R.)  
Field, William  
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)  
Wilson, Jhn. (Durham, Mid.)  
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)  
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.  
Fuller, J. M. F.  
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)  
Gilhooly, James  
O'Dowd, John  
NOES.  
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. E.  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim  
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte  
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)  
Greene, Sir E W (B'rySEdm'nds  
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)  
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs)  
Archdale, Edward Mervyn  
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Wore.  
Grenfell, William Henry  
Arkwright, John Stanhope  
Chapman, Edward  
Groves, James Grimble  
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.  
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.  
Hambro, Charles Eric  
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis  
Corbett, A. C. (Glasgow)

Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G (Mid'x  
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Rbt. Wm.  
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy  
Cubitt, Hon. Henry  
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashfrd  
Bain, Colonel James Robert  
Dalkeith, Earl of  
Harris, Fleverton (Tynemouth  
Balcarres, Lord  
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)  
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley  
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r  
Dewar, T. R. (T'rH'mlts,S.Geo.  
Heath, J. (Staffords, N. W.)  
Bathurst, Hon, Allen Benjamin  
Dickson, Charles Scott  
Hope, J. E (Sheffield, Brightside  
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol  
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.  
Howard, Capt. J (Kent,Faversh  
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.  
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield  
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton  
Bignold, Arthur  
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph  
Johnston, William (Belfast)  
Bill, Charles  
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin  
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh  
Blundell, Colonel Henry  
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. H.  
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W (Salop.  
Bond, Edward  
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-  
Lawrence, William F.  
Brassey, Albert  
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst  
Lawson, John Grant  
Brodrick, Rt, Hon. St. John  
Finch, George H.  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne

Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie  
Cautley, Henry Strother  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.  
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)  
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.  
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.  
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)  
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin&Nairn  
Long, Rt Hn Walter (Bristol,S.)  
The Committee divided:;Ayes, 72; Noes, 153. (Division List No. 78.)  
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale  
Nicholson, William Graham  
Smith, HC. (North'mb. Tynes'e  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Nichol, Donald Ninian  
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)  
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens  
Spear, John Ward  
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth  
Pemberton, John S. G.  
Stanley, Hn. Arthur(Ormskirk  
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison  
Penn. John  
Stanley, Lord (Lanes.)  
Macdona, John Cumming  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Stock, James Henry  
M'Killop, Jas. (Stirlingshire)  
Pretymann, Ernest George  
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley  
Majendie, James A. H.  
Pryce-Jones, Lt-Col. Edward  
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier  
Malcolm, Ian  
Purvis, Robert  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
Manners, Lord Cecil  
Randles, John S.  
Thornton, Percy M.  
Maxwell, WJH (Dumfriesshir)  
Reid, James (Greenock)  
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray  
Melville, Beresford Valentine  
Rentoul, James Alexander

Valentia, Viscount  
 Milward, Colonel Victor  
 Renwick, George  
 Walker, Col. William Hall  
 Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
 Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge)  
 Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.  
 Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
 Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)  
 Wason, John C. (Orkney)  
 Moon, Edward Robert Pacy  
 Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson  
 Welby, Lt-Col A.C.E (Taunton)  
 More, R. Jasper (Shropshire)  
 Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)  
 Whiteley, H Ashton und. Lyne  
 Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)  
 Royds, Clement Molyneux  
 Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)  
 Morgan, Hn. F. (Monm'thsh.)  
 Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
 Willox, Sir John Archibald  
 Morrell, George Herbert  
 Sadler, Col Samuel Alexander  
 Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.  
 Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
 Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert  
 Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
 Morrison, James Archibald  
 Seely, Chas. Hilton (Lincoln)  
 Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B. Stuart-  
 Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford  
 Sharpe, William Edward T.  
 Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
 Mount, William Arthur  
 Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew  
 Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham(Bute  
 Sinclair, Louis (Romford)  
 TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
 Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)  
 Skewes-Cox, Thomas  
 Newdigate, Francis Alexander-  
 Smith, Abel H.(Hertford, East  
 MR. A. J. BALFOUR claimed, "That the Original Question be now put."  
 \*THE CHAIRMAN accepted the motion, and proceeded to put the question.  
 MR. FIELD (remaining seated and speaking with his hat on) asked if this would

preclude them from discussing two very important Votes relating to salmon fisheries and the Port of London.

\*THE CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the House having claimed that the main question be now put, and I having accepted that motion. I am afraid the hon. Member will be precluded from further discussion.

ME. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): May I ask, Mr. Lowther, on a point of order, what is the main question? Is the question you are putting the total sum of £893,000?

\*THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.

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

Burdett-Coutts, W.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Bathurst, Hon. A. Benjamin

Cautley, Henry Strother

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol

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

Archdale, Edward Mervyn

Bentinck, Lord Henry C.

Cavendish, V. C.W (Derbyshire

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Bignold, Arthur

Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Bill, Charles

Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)

Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis

Blundell, Colonel Henry

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Bond, Edward

Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r

Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy

Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-

Chapman, Edward

Bain, Colonel James Robert

Brassey, Albert

Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.

Balcarres, Lord

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John

Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Oh &#x0021; Nobody heard the question put.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil) asked if it would be in order to exempt the Vote dealing with the funeral of Her late Majesty, because this would be the

only opportunity afforded to the House of discussing that Vote.

\*THE CHAIRMAN: There is no means of exempting that item.

Original Question put accordingly, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £;893,316, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for Civil Services and Revenue Departments."

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 159; Noes, 64. (Division List No. 79.)

Cranborne, Viscount

Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie

Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge

Cubitt, Hon. Henry

Leveson-Gower, Fredk. N. S.

Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green

Dalkeith, Earl of

Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.

Ritchie, Rt. Hn. C. Thomson

Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham

Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S

Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)

Dewar, T. R (T'rH'ml'ts,S. Geo.

Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)

Royds, Clement Molyneux

Dickson, Charles Scott

Loyd, Archie Kirkman

Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-

Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.

Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)

Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander

Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield

Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsm'th)

Seely, Charles Hilton(Lincoln)

Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph

Macartney, RtHn W. G. Ellison

Sharpe, William Edward T.

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-

Macdona, John Cumming

Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)

Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin

M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire

Sinclair, Louis (Romford)

Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton

Majendie, James A. H.

Skewes Cox, Thomas

Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst

Malcolm, Ian

Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)

Finch, George H.  
Manners, Lord Cecil  
Smith, HC (North'mb.Tynesie  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Maxwell, W. J. H (Dumfriessh.)  
Smith, James Parker(Lanarks)  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Melville, Beresford Valentine  
Spear, John Ward  
Fuller, J. M. F.  
Milward, Colonel Victor  
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk  
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. H. John  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs  
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Stock, James Henry  
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin&Nairn  
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy  
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hadley  
Goschen, Hn. George Joachim  
More, Robt. Jas. (Shropshire)  
Sturt, Hon. Humphrey Napier  
Greene,SirE. W. (BySEdm'nds  
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)  
Morgan, Hn. Fred. (Monm'thsh  
Thomas, Alfred(Glamorgen, E.  
Grenfell, William Henry  
Morreli, George Herbert  
Thomas, J. A. (Glam.,Gower  
Groves, James Grimble  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
Thornton, Percy M.  
Guthrie, Walter Murray  
Morrison, James Archibald  
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray  
Hambro, Charles Eric  
Morton, Artbur H A. (Deptford)  
Valentia, Viscount  
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G.(Mid'x  
Mount, William Arthur  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Rbt. Wm.



Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute  
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.  
Hardy-Laurence, (Kent, Ashfd  
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry  
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney  
Harris, Fleverton (Tynemouth  
Newdigate, Francis Alex.  
Welby, Lt.-Col. ACE (Taunton  
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley  
Nicholson, William Graham  
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne  
Heath, James (Staffords, N.W.  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Williams, Col. B. (Dorset  
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield Brightside  
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens  
Willox, Sir John Archiba.  
Howard, Capt. J. (Kent Faversh  
Pemberton, John S. G.  
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.  
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton  
Penn, John  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Johnston, William (Belfast)  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Wortley, Rt, Hn. C. B.Stuart-  
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)  
Pretymann, Ernest George  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Kenyon, Hn. G. T. (Denbigh)  
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward  
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop  
Purvis, Robert  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Handles, John S.  
Lawrence, William F.  
Reid, James (Greenock)  
Lawson, John Grant  
Rentoul, James Alexander  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Renwick, George  
NOES.  
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.  
Hammond, John  
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon N

Abraham, William (Rhondda)  
Hardie, J Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)  
O'Malley, William  
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud)  
Hayden, John Patrick  
O'Mara, James  
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)  
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-  
O'Shee, James John  
Boyland, John  
Jordan, Jeremiah  
Reddy, M.  
Boyle, James  
Joyce, Michael  
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)  
Brown, Geo. M. (Edinburgh)  
Kennedy, Patrick James  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Leamy, Edmund  
Roche, John  
Burns, John  
Leigh, Sir Joseph  
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Levy, Maurice  
Soares, Ernest J.  
Clancy, John Joseph  
Lundon, W.  
Sullivan, Donal  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
M'Crae, George  
Tennant, Harold John  
Crean, Eugene  
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)  
Thomas, F Freeman-(Hastings)  
Cullinan, J.  
Mooney, John J.  
Thompson, EC. (Monaghan, N.  
Daly, James  
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)  
Tully, Jasper  
Dalziel, James Henry  
Murphy, J.  
Weir, James Galloway  
Doogan, P. C.

Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.  
White, Luke (York, E.IR.)  
Duffy, William J.  
O'Brien, Kendal(Tipper'ryMid  
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)  
Elibank, Master of  
O'Connor, T. P. Liverpool)  
Farrell, James Patrick  
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.  
Fenwick, Charles  
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)  
Field, William  
O'Dowd, John  
Gilhooly, James  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Resolutions to be reported To-morrow; Committee to sit again To-morrow.  
Adjourned at Three of the clock a.m.