

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 19th June, 1901.

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

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

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

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

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

GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY BILL.

MERSEY DOCKS AND HARBOUR BOARD BILL [Lords].

MILFORD DOCKS BILL [Lords].

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

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

NITRATE RAILWAYS COMPANY BILL [Lords].

Not amended; considered; to be read the third time.

SHREWSBURY GAS BILL [Lords].

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

SWANSEA HARBOUR BILL.

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

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

INCLOSURE (SUTTON) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 8) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDER (No. 3) BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDER (No. 1) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 5) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDER (HOUSING OF WORKING CLASSES) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDER (HOUSING OF WORKING CLASSES) (No. 2) BILL.

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 4) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 10) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 12) BILL.

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

PETITIONS.

AGRICULTURAL RATES ACT, 1896.

Two petitions from Northwich, in favour of re-enactment; to lie upon the Table.

GROCERS' LICENCES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

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

LIQUOR TRAFFIC LOCAL VETO (SCOTLAND) BILL.

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

POLICE SUPERANNUATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

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

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL

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

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

Petitions in favour; from Pokes-down; Deer; Chelsea; Hertford (four); Bengoe; Kenilworth; Colchester; Kentish Town; Stockport; Worksop; Halifax; Nantyglo; Pontardulas; Tottenham; Cheltenham; Seghill; Liverpool; Highbury New Park (two); and Sleaford; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) BILL.

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

SOVEREIGN'S OATH ON ACCESSION BILL.

Petition from Buxton, against; to lie upon the Table:

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

UNION OF BENEFICES ACT (ST. MARY-AT-HILL WITH SAINT ANDREW HUBBARD, AND ST. GEORGE, BOTOLPH LANE, WITH ST. BOTOLPH, BILLINGSGATE).

Return [presented 6th June] to be printed. [No. 215.]

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Return [presented 18th June] to be printed. [No. 216.]

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Twenty-eighth Annual Report by the Accountant for Scotland to the Scotch Education Department [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC LIBRARIES BILL [Lords].

Copy ordered, "of Memorandum relating to the Public Libraries Bill."; (Lord Balcarres.)

Copy presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [Bill 203.]

BISHOPRIC OF SOUTHWARK BILL [Lords].

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday, 27th June, and to be printed. [Bill 220.]

EDUCATION (YOUNG CHILDREN SCHOOL ATTENDANCE) (SCOTLAND) BILL (CHANGED TO "EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL").

[THIRD READING].

Order for Third Reading read.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): Even at the risk of detaining the House for a few minutes, I wish to intervene in order to show that the promoters of this Bill are not wanting in gratitude for the great assistance which the Government have given to the measure. Their thanks are sincerely tendered to the Lord Advocate for what he has done. I do not conceal the fact that we rather rejoice that the Bill now before the House is a very different one to that which was brought up for Second Reading; it is a much more beneficent measure; it is more wide reaching, and it will do much more good to the country than the original Bill could have done. It would have been almost presumptuous for any private Member to have thought he had a chance of passing such a Bill without the aid of the Government. When it first came before the House it was merely a Bill to prohibit casual employment in Scotland under the age of eleven years, and factory employment under the age of twelve. The Bill as it now stands assimilates both classes of employment and prohibits any employment of children in Scotland under, the age of twelve. Then as regards the methods of exemption; the original

Bill proposed an educational standard, whereas I am happy to say the Bill now proposes to give the power of exemption to the school boards of Scotland; to, in other words, the people of Scotland, under certain conditions. These are very far and wide reaching changes, and I think the House will agree that they are changes for the better. It was with the knowledge of the great changes that have come over the Bill that the promoters took special care in no way to hurry the passage of the Bill through the House. The intervals which have elapsed between the different stages have been long ones, and in fact the principles embodied in the Bill have been before the country since last session. The Second Reading of this Bill took place on the 1st May, and since the 10th of that month the Bill has been in print in its present form before the country. It is a striking fact that in spite of the change that has come over the Bill there is practical unanimity in favour of it not only in this House, but throughout Scotland. After all, the Bill is merely the fulfilment in the United Kingdom of the pledges entered into by Great Britain at the Berlin Conference of 1890, and it is a matter for reflection, upon which I will not dwell now, whether it is politic to have allowed nearly twelve years to pass before the pledge was given effect to. But the difficulties of legislation are such that perhaps it has been impossible to act sooner. Neither one political party nor the other can claim immunity from blame for this delay, and I would therefore urge on Scottish opinion to make up for the years that have been lost in the struggle of educational competition in which every nation during the past twelve years has made such great strides. We have a good deal to make up and I trust that Scottish public opinion will not fall behind in the battle. I have said that the thanks of the promoters are due to the Government. Perhaps they deserve some slight apology from me for having exposed them to the gentle badinage of the Lord Advocate on account of some ambiguous representation I made. The promoters have also to tender their thanks to two hon. Members of the House who have been specially instrumental in furthering the passage of the Bill through the House and in framing it as it now stands. I allude to the hon. Baronet the Member for the College Division of Glasgow and to the hon. Member for North Ayrshire, whose interest in educational matters the promoters gratefully recognise. I trust that the House to-day will, without undue delay; although perhaps there may be occasion found for delay not directly connected with the Bill itself; despatch this measure on its last journey to another place. I would fain hope, too, that one result of this Bill will be to induce England to follow the example set in it, so that instead of our occupying a second place, as we have done during the last two or three years, in educational matters, the United Kingdom will be in the forefront. I would further hope that we in Scotland may thoroughly realise the increased responsibilities, which this measure throws upon us. These increased opportunities, coupled with the unprecedented gift of Mr. Carnegie,* which has electrified the world, will make this year stand out as a remarkable one in the history of education in the United

* Mr. Andrew Carnegie, a Scottish-American manufacturer, devoted the sum of ten million dollars to "improving and extending the opportunities for scientific study and research in the universities of Scotland, his native country, and for

rendering attendance at the universities more available to the deserving youth of that country." Particulars are given in The Times of 8th June, 1901, page 16. Kingdom, and it behoves the people of Scotland to take full advantage of them, and to show that the good a nation can exercise is not influenced merely by numbers or by wealth, but consists more than ever in maintaining a friendly, brotherly rivalry with other nations, and in doing all that in them lies to improve the moral welfare of mankind. I beg to move.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."; (Mr. Pirie.)

MR. GALLOWAY (Manchester, S.W.): In bringing forward the Amendment I am about to move I desire to say that I am not animated by any spirit of deeply-rooted objection to the principle of the Bill as it originally passed its Second Reading in this House. I am sure that none of us on this side of the House desire to do anything to impede the progress of education in any part of the United Kingdom, and still less would we do anything which would prevent the speedy carrying out of the great benefits which the hon. Member suggests as likely to accrue from the passing of this measure. But, if I needed any justification for the motion I am about to make, I should find it in the remarks of the hon. Member himself, when he candidly admitted that this was not the Bill which was read a second time and when he added that the thanks of the promoters and himself were due to the Government for having taken the matter in hand. He said the Lord Advocate was responsible for the alterations which had been made, and, in short, he put the proposition before the House that the measure we are now asked to read a third time under the auspices of the Lord Advocate is altogether different from the private Member's Bill which we read a second time. Now, that is a somewhat extraordinary position, on which I shall have some remarks to make. I wish, however, first to refer to another observation which fell from the hon. Member. He said that this Bill had been before the public in its present form for quite a long time. I at first thought that there must have been two Bills, but when he informed us that this long period of time dated from the extraordinary date; the 10th May this year; or six weeks ago;

MR. PIRIE: I said that the propositions embodied in the Bill were before us last session.

MR. GALLOWAY: The hon. Member said that this Bill was printed on 10th May. I would ask the House to remember another point in connection with this Bill. It was referred to the Grand Committee on Law, and as far as I have been able to gather from the debates which took place when Mr. Gladstone proposed to set up Grand Committees, his idea was that more or less non-contentious measures should be referred to such Committees, with a view to the consideration of legal points and to the making of any alterations of a technical character which might be necessary in order to carry out the law, and that, thereby, some relief should be afforded to the congestion of business in the House itself. I venture to think it was never contemplated by Mr. Gladstone or by the House that a Bill should be sent to a Grand Committee containing one set of principles, and returned to this House embodying another and entirely different set of principles. I propose to describe the various stages through which this Bill has

passed, and then to move, "That this House refuses to accept a Bill which effects extensive and ill-considered alterations in the law, not contained in the Bill as presented for Second Reading." I hope, as I said in my opening remarks, that these words will not be taken as indicative, in any sense, of a wish to retard the course of education in Scotland, but as conveying an expression of opinion from this House that this is not the way in which it was intended or desired by the House that legislative changes should be carried into effect.

The Bill, as it was presented for Second Reading, was a very short one. It was contained in about half a page, and on the back of it there was a memorandum explaining its object. That memorandum stated that the proposal of the Bill was to raise the standard of partial exemption from school attendance from the third to the fourth, and the total exemption from the fifth to the sixth standard, provided that no child might be employed in any casual employment under the age of eleven instead of ten as at present, and that no child might be employed in any factory or workshop under the age of twelve, instead of as at present. It was proposed to carry that out by certain alterations in the existing law. Now I hope it is quite clear to the House that the original intention of the framers of the Bill was that, according to the standard named in that Bill, partial exemption should be granted from school attendance. There were no other means suggested. I think it would have been in order, on the motion for the Second Reading, had one so desired, to move an Amendment, the effect of which would have been that the House refused to sanction a Bill which granted partial exemption from school attendance according to standard, and which did not give the right of partial exemption to the school board. That would have been a question of principle and differentiation between the school board and the standard. I venture to draw the conclusion From that, that the main feature carrying out the principle of the Bill has been entirely and extensively altered by the Grand Committee, and that the Bill, as it has been returned to us, instead of consisting only of half a page of printed matter, contains two and a half pages and provides for a number of repeals of the present law, while it transfers or rather gives authority for partial exemption from the schools to the school board. It does away in this respect with the control of the Government inspectors. I should like first to point out the inconvenience of this kind of legislation. It may be necessary from time to time to repeal sections of Acts of Parliament in order to properly carry out the law, but surely there can be no possible reason why, in a small Bill of this kind, we should start repealing well-considered Acts of Parliament passed a number of years ago; Acts of Parliament against which it has never been alleged that anything has cropped up in the working of them to render desirable their repeal. There is no suggestion that these Acts have not been effectual for the purposes for which they were intended. Now what is it that it is proposed to repeal?; 35 and 36 Vict.,

chap. 62, Education (Scotland) Act 1872, Sees. 69 and 73. I would ask the House to mark this, for it seems to me to be a very serious matter. Section 69 of the Act of 1872 provides that a parent must provide elementary education for his

children between the ages of five and thirteen, and that if he be unable to pay for it, he must apply to the parochial board of the parish to pay the fees, which they must do if satisfied as to the parent's inability. But it goes further, and provides that no payment shall be made or refused on condition of the child attending any school in receipt of the parliamentary grant other than such as may be selected by the parent. That is Section 69. But when we turn to the Bill as amended by the Grand Committee, what do we find? The first clause of the Bill says it shall be the duty of every parent to provide efficient elementary education in reading, writing, and arithmetic for his children between the ages of five and fourteen years. Thus Section, 69 is repealed, and the children of unfortunate parents who are unable to pay are brought under an entirely new state of affairs. This proposal, in fact, entirely alters the law. I have no doubt that my right hon. and learned friend may be able to show some very excellent reasons why this has been done, but, so far at any rate, we have had no explanation, and I think the House is entitled to ask for one. Further, I would like to ask the Lord Advocate why he has not repealed Section 22 of the Act of 1878, which provides for the class of children whose parents are unable to pay the school fees. The effect of the repeal of Section 73 will be to abolish the necessity for obtaining the Government inspector's certificate as a condition of exemption. I suppose the right hon. and learned Gentleman will say that the reason for that is that the right of exemption is to be transferred to the school boards of Scotland. I do not understand why, although it may be necessary thus to transfer that power, it should also be necessary to take the power away from the Government inspector. It may be undesirable that there should be two authorities, but I should have thought the Government inspector was, at all events, a man in whom confidence can be placed. So far as I can see, therefore, there is no reason why this power should be curtailed, even if at the same time it is given to the school boards of Scotland.

Now I come to the proposal to repeal 41 and 42 Viet., chap. 78. The right hon. Gentleman proposes to repeal Sections 5 and 6. By Section 5 the age limit is fixed at ten years, and it is provided that between the ages of ten and fourteen no child shall be employed who has not obtained a certificate under Section 73 of the Act of 1872 that he is attending school under the provisions of any Act relating to the education of children employed in labour or under a minute of the Scottish Education Department. Section 6 deals with casual employment and the age limit, and there is the same provision as to obtaining a certificate as under Section 73 of the Act of 1872. Now all these powers are to be placed in the hands of the school boards. There is to be no question of a standard raised, and I do not myself understand why this difference has been made. Why should the standard be abolished? Why should not the school board have been given power to fix a standard? There are four other sections of the Act of 1883 which it is proposed to repeal. When Section 4 was passed it amended Section 69 of the Act of 1872, and it limited the parent's obligation to cases where no certificate had been obtained under the 73rd section. It raised, too, the age limit to fourteen, and that it is now proposed to repeal. Again I would ask the Lord

Advocate why in a Bill of this kind, dealing as it did with exemption by standard, he repeals sections of the Act of 1883 against the working of which, so far as I know, no complaint has been made. Section 6, which it is also proposed to repeal, is the section which, under the present Bill as originally drawn, the hon. Member proposed to amend. It amended Section 5 of the Act of 1878 by introducing as an additional case in which partial exemption from school might be granted the case where a child had passed the third standard, and was attending a public elementary school in accordance with the provisions of Section 21 of the Factory and Workshops Act, 1878. Again I will ask the right hon. and learned Gentleman why it is proposed to repeal this section, and why it could not have been left in existence, even although power was at the same time to be given collaterally to school boards. The other two sections are not, I think, very material. What I want to point out to the House is that whether the Lord Advocate can or cannot justify these repeals; and I have no doubt he can; there are two points to be remembered in connection with them. The first is that the repeals were not proposed in the Bill as originally drawn. It is problematical if the Bill would even have passed had it been originally presented in the form in which it now stands. I will not venture to give an opinion on that subject, but this I am entitled to say, that the Bill was not read a second time with these repeals in it; and if we are going to allow Bills to come down from the Grand Committee making material alterations in the law, and if in this connection I use the words "ill-considered," I do so in the sense that they have not been fully considered, and that the House has had no opportunity afforded it of considering them on the motion for the Second Reading; I do not wish for one moment to suggest that the right hon. Gentleman himself has not fully considered them; I can only say I think it is very unfortunate that a new precedent should thus be established in respect of private Members' Bills. I have thought it desirable that the House should have clearly and fully before it the proposals now contained in this Bill as to which no explanation was given by the hon. Member in moving the Third Reading.

The new proposals are that a parent shall be compelled to provide education for his child between the ages of five and fourteen years. That, at all events, is a new principle. There were in previous Acts certain conditions under which a parent might be relieved. Those conditions are now to be repealed, and what the right hon. Gentleman proposes to do in the cases of parents who are not pecuniarily able to provide education for their children I do not know. At all events, we are entitled to ask for an explanation. Then I have another question. Section 3 of the new Bill provides that no person shall take into employment a child under twelve years of age, or in other cases between twelve and fourteen years of age, unless he shall have obtained a certificate of exemption from the school board of the district, and also that no child under twelve, or between twelve and fourteen, who has not been so exempted, shall be employed in any casual employment as defined by Section 6 of the Act of 1878. That is to say, instead of amending, as was originally proposed, Section 6 of the Act of 1883, the Bill introduces a

procedure which was not contained in it when brought on for Second Reading. It proposes to do away with the certificate of the Government inspector; it does away with the section of the Factory and Workshops Act, 1878, which formerly applied, and with regard to the third standard it does away with all limit of the Scotch Education Department fixing the number of attendances to be made. Section 3 lays down the lines on which the school board is to grant exemptions, and the control which it is to be subject to. I do not say that this is not quite right and proper to be put in the Bill, but at all events this much we are entitled to ask from the Lord Advocate, namely, a full explanation of the new provisions introduced in the Grand Committee. I want also to ask the right hon. and learned Gentleman, with regard to the operation of Section 18 of the Factory and Workshops Act, which prohibits the employment of children under twelve, whereas under the Act of 1891 the age limit is eleven, why he has not proposed to amend that Act. Is the letter of the statute to over-ride the form? That is a legal question I cannot answer. The hon. Member for North Aberdeen admitted in his speech that the Lord Advocate had taken this Bill under his wing. That is the real reason for my Amendment. We are asked to-day to affirm the principle that a private Member's Bill may be referred to a Standing Committee, which may absolutely revolutionise and alter its contents. This seems to me to be a very important matter. Only on the 11th of this month the Leader of the House told us; when making his motion giving the Government all the time of the House; how far-reaching would be the effect of such proceedings as these which we are now asked to sanction. He first pointed out how short often was the discussion on Private Bills on Wednesday afternoons, even when such Bills might have for their object the carrying out of far-reaching constitutional revolutions. He referred to the fact that several Bills of wide importance had been discussed and divided upon after a debate lasting only from 12.15 to 5.30, and he pointed out that Government measures of comparatively minor importance sometimes occupied two or three days of Parliamentary time. He showed conclusively in that speech what would be the result of adopting proceedings such as were proposed in regard to the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill and the Pure Beer Bill. In taking the action I have, I have no desire to delay the course of education in Scotland or in Great Britain, but I do wish the House to have an opportunity of expressing once and for all its disapproval of such proceedings as have taken place in regard to this Bill, and of affirming that a private Member shall be responsible for his own Bill, and that the Government shall not take it under its wing, either in Grand Committee or when it is down for Third Reading. I beg to move the Amendment standing in my name.

LIEUT.-COLONEL PILKINGTON (Lancashire, Newton) seconded the motion. When the Bill was last before the House he entered a protest against it, and he still objected to children being treated differently in England and in Scotland in regard to the age at which they might accept employment. Legislation on this subject should go side by side for the two countries, and he might remind the House that he objected strongly to Mr. Robson's Bill, chiefly on the ground that it dealt entirely with children who were in the employment of employers by whom

the law was being strictly kept, and that violations of the law were confined to casual labour. Clause 2 of this Bill sanctioned casual labour, and that was one of his chief objections to it. He held that the Government ought to see that the law affecting children was the same in Scotland as it was in England and Ireland. The conditions obtaining in the two countries should be exactly the same, both as regarded inspection and in respect of casual labour.

Amendment proposed;

"To leave out from the word 'That' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'this House refuses to accept a Bill which effects extensive and ill-considered alterations in the law not contained in the Bill as presented on Second Reading.'";(Mr. Galloway.)

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

*MR. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith Burghs): It is impossible that any measure should have received fuller consideration than the Bill which is now before the House; with the exception of the hon. Member for Mid Lanark and the hon. Member for Ross and Cromarty, the whole of the Scotch Members are strongly in favour of it. I know of very few who have any antipathy to the principles of this measure; there was a great rush of Scotch Members to go on the Committee of Law, not all of whom were able to get there, but whether they got there or not they followed the Bill very closely and desire it to succeed. I think it is a matter for congratulation that a Bill promoted by independent Members should have been allowed to reach its present stage. Co-operation upon Scottish education has been no uncommon incident in our past history, and I think it augurs well for the future that we should have made such rapid progress with the measure before the House, and so repudiated, at any rate, our responsibility for any defect in the educational equipment of Scotland. The responsibility for measures such as this has shifted more completely upon the shoulders of private Members of late years. With regard to legislation direct from the Scottish Office, the prospects of their having sufficient time to promote legislation are not hopeful, which is much to be deplored; but this Bill is a step towards the organisation of secondary education. This has been a fruitful year, and we know the question of the organisation of secondary education is before the Scottish Education Department, and I certainly hope that another session will not be allowed to pass without, the same co-operation in educational matters, and I am sure the passing of this Bill without difficulty will afford a sense of general security that there will be general progress.

LORD HUGH CECIL (Greenwich) said there was one clause in this Bill which he read with great surprise, and which he thought was of considerable legislative importance. The first clause was;

"It shall be the duty of every parent to provide efficient elementary education in reading, writing, and arithmetic for his children who are between five and fourteen years of age."

The marginal note to this clause was;

"Parents to provide efficient elementary education for their children."

The House was passing this Bill through its Third Reading, and they would, if

the other House passed it, give legislative sanction to the principle which he believed had been violently contested in this House, that "elementary education" should be defined as "reading, writing, and arithmetic." He suggested that this restricted definition in the Bill, if passed into law, might be quoted hereafter in English courts of law as expressing the latest mind of Parliament on the subject. He commended to the notice of the promoters of the Bill that elementary education would be treated as having been defined afresh by this Bill.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE (Wiltshire, Cricklade) said he only rose because of the comments which had been made on the Standing Committee on Law, otherwise he would not be guilty as an Englishman of the rash conduct of attempting to interfere with the details of Scotch education. He did not intend to discuss the contention of the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich further than to say that the interpretation which he suggested would not be accepted by any English lawyer. If any complaint was made of the way in which this Bill was passed by the Standing Committee he was most to blame. As chairman of that Committee he considered very carefully whether the Amendments which had been placed upon the Paper by the Lord Advocate should be put into the Bill, and came to the conclusion that they should. All the alterations which were made in the Bill were quite in accordance with the procedure of a Committee either of the House or upstairs, and nothing was done which could be described as making a new Bill. The wording was largely altered from first to last; there were alterations in details and machinery; but nobody could contend that a new Bill had been made. The Lord Advocate placed a large number of Amendments on the Paper, which no doubt reconstituted the Bill and made in certain details important alterations, but there was nothing in the Bill which was not in it before. When Mr. Gladstone commented upon the Standing Committee he said it was for the purpose of improving the law; this Bill as it had come down from the Committee was a very great improvement in the law, because from first to last it told its own story, and anybody who read it could understand it. There was not that mass of references to other Acts which was becoming every day the increasing curse of our legislation. When he admitted all these Amendments he felt he was acting in the spirit of the remarks of that great statesman, for he was improving the Bill in form, and in that way was acting in the direction of the principle laid down by Mr. Gladstone.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) said, as he was considerably interested; in this subject, the House would perhaps pardon him for making a few observations. He felt in some difficulty, inasmuch as he felt bound to dissent from his two colleagues the hon. Members for Lancashire in the criticisms which they had passed upon the Bill. From first to last there had been a separate series of statutes, one affecting England and another affecting Scotland; separate codes, passed year by year; and separate Education Departments existed; it seemed, therefore, rather late in the day to say we ought to have one and the same system. Such a method of legislation would be injurious to Scotland and mischievous to England, because in matters of education Scotland was setting England a bright example; an example he should wish to see followed less slowly and less reluctantly. There was no ground for complaint or any surprise. The

Committee was well attended, and he was impressed with, their interest; their enthusiasm; in respect to work which they had done. A week previously the Bill stood for Report stage; it had first place on the Paper, and those opposed to it had had every opportunity, if they so desired, of criticising it. The new print had been issued for very nearly a month and surely any hon. Member who was deeply interested in education could in the course of four weeks have formulated their objections, and have brought them before the House. He thought it was an unhappy circumstance that on the Third Reading of the Bill a motion of this kind should be made to pass a resolution which, if passed, would have the effect of staying the Bill, and would make it impossible to pass it this session.

MR. GALLOWAY reminded the hon. Baronet the Member for Wigan that he had already stated that he had no wish to stop the progress of the Bill, but he thought it a Bill which should have been taken up by the Government.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL said he considered that the subject submitted to the Standing Committee was one with which it was eminently fitted to deal. It was a matter rather of administration than policy, and therefore eminently fitted for discussion before the Standing Committee on Law. The noble Lord the Member for Greenwich had made a remark with regard to elementary education, but that remark was made rather late in the day, seeing that by the Act of 1872, Section 69, it was provided that every parent should provide elementary education in reading, writing, and arithmetic for children between five and thirteen years of age.

That had been the law in Scotland since 1872, and no lawyer had yet endeavoured to put a limited construction on those words. The Bill had not been taken over by the Government. He wished it had been. It was in the hands of private Members, and step by step it had met every difficulty which Bills of private Members met when their desire was an improvement in the law.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid) said for the second time he found himself in disagreement with other Scotch Members. He was not in any way interested in any Bill which might

follow this on the Paper, and he merely spoke on account of the importance of this question in the case of Scotland. It had been asked why the Bill was not opposed at the Report stage; if that had been done the Paper would have been studded with Amendments, and he would not have been able to deal with the measure in a comprehensive manner, as one should do on Second Reading and the Report stage. The Bill was a simple one, raising two points; it raised the age and it raised the standard of exemption from Standard V. to Standard VI. That was a Bill which he would have cordially supported, but what happened to the Bill was this. The Government took advantage of the innocence of the hon. Member for North Aberdeen and cut out everything that was in it, everything but the standards. Hon. Members did not appreciate the effect such an alteration produced. According to the Bill, no child in Scotland would be able to be employed in any employment whatever under the age of twelve. Under the present law in Scotland children over eight could be employed during the harvest and the fisheries season, but under this Bill the school boards would have no power to give exemption to a boy eleven years and eleven months old. A boy under twelve could not deliver a can of milk or a newspaper in the morning. Scotland was

often thought to be superior in its system of education to England, but the number of scholars on the roll of the elementary schools was 17·29 per cent. of the population, whereas in England it was 17·81; while the average attendance was 14·60 in England, and only 14·47 in Scotland. There had been progress in England in the matter of secondary and elementary education, and a retrogression in Scotland, with the result that Scotland had lost its old place in advance of England. Legislation of this kind would not bring children into the schools. He supposed there would soon be a proposal that no child should be compelled to get out of bed before eight o'clock in the morning. He was prepared to say that in 1872 Scotland was ahead of England in this matter, but she was behind now, and if hon. Members looked into the matter they would find Scotland was going back. He ventured to say that if this Bill had been brought in by the Government it would have been rejected by the Scottish Members, and the Government would not have been able to carry it, and the only reason it was to be passed through now was because the Lord Advocate had taken advantage of the hon. Member for North Aberdeen. According to the policy of 1872, every parent was compelled to send his child to school, and certain standards of examination were laid down which every child should be made to pass. The policy of the law was to take care that the child was educated, and it was the first duty of schools and school boards to see that they were being educated. The result was that by individual examination they were able to test whether a child was being educated or not, but under this Bill individual examination was done away with altogether. He ventured to say that if this Bill passed into law the condition of things would be worse than before. Education would go back, and the position of the children would be that they would be idling their time.

*MR. WYLIE (Dumbartonshire): As one who did not speak either on the Second Reading or the Report stage of this Bill, perhaps I may be permitted to say a few words in support of the Third Reading. I confess I was surprised to find that, in the first instance, the promoters of this Bill, with a knowledge of past events, did not aim at the greater advantages which are secured to the children of Scotland by the Amendments which have been introduced in Committee. I am in sympathy also with the clause which gives the school boards the power to grant exemptions to children between the ages of twelve and fourteen. I believe that some of the Scottish school boards are in favour of doing away with exemptions altogether. But I hope that they will continue to exercise this prerogative, especially in connection with the children of widows and infirm fathers. The Bill, as it now stands, is really only a part, but certainly an important part of the much more comprehensive scheme for education in Scotland which was approved by the Scottish Education Department and embodied their policy, and which came to us from the House of Lords on the 28th of May, 1900. If that Bill had been passed, as it ought to have been, it would have come into operation in April of this year, but it was shelved, chiefly on the principle; which is I am afraid becoming rather a stereotyped principle in this House; that when occasion arises all Scotch business should be deferred to Irish or English business for the Government are

very well aware that the Scottish Members are of a patient and long-suffering disposition, and that they will not clamour for their rights. There was probably another reason why the more comprehensive Scottish measure was not passed, namely, the complacent but delusive belief entertained by many Scottish Members, and also by some English Members, that Scotland occupies such a superior position in regard to education that it can very well afford to wait. The fact of the case is that the progress of elementary education in Scotland has relatively been very much inferior of late years to the progress in England. I cannot, however, concur in the statement that elementary education in Scotland is actually inferior, because, judging by the percentages of those who cannot read or write, Scotland still maintains a leading place, but there is no doubt that compared with some of the Continental countries, notably Germany and Switzerland, Scotland has been steadily drifting into a back place as regards both elementary and secondary education. The Bill now before the House will completely remove the stigma which attaches to us of not having fulfilled the engagement entered into at the International Conference at Berlin that the minimum statutory age in this country should be twelve years. Even with the advance which this Bill will secure we are still very much behind those two Continental countries, because there the limit of age is thirteen years. This is not a satisfactory position for us to occupy. No country in the world has taken so much advantage of the aid of machinery and other labour-saving appliances as this country has done, so much so that some years ago it was calculated that we had 220 horse-power per thousand of the population as against only one-half of that amount in the country which came next to us. So great was our manufacturing supremacy in many points that it was calculated that six British workmen could do the work of twenty-four Germans or Frenchmen, thirty-two Austrians, or fifty Spaniards. Our accumulated wealth per inhabitant also was nearly one-half greater than that of Germany or Switzerland, and I think it has been highly discreditable to this country that it should have allowed itself to lag so far behind these comparatively poorer Countries in regard to both elementary and secondary education. When the Bill similar to this for England was passing through the House I put an Amendment on the Paper to the effect that the standard should be raised to thirteen years, but at the request of the hon. Member for South Shields, and of other English educationists, who considered that such an Amendment might imperil the passing of the Bill, I withdrew it. I have found myself in a somewhat similar position in regard to the Scottish Bill. In 1878, when the first enactment was made for limiting the age of children, the standard was fixed at eight years. How unnatural was the state of affairs that existed at that time may be inferred from the fact that children under eight years of age required to be protected by law from being sent to work. There has been steady progress since then. In 1879 the age was raised to nine years; in 1880 it was raised to ten years, at which point it has continued and will continue until this Bill comes into operation, and even then we shall still be a year behind two of the leading Continental countries. The main object of this legislation is to improve the condition of the children physically and educationally, but from a purely economical point of view also it

is very sound policy to give our children a thorough education, which can only be obtained by enabling them to remain long enough at school. The competition among the principal manufacturing and commercial nations of the world is fortunately now one not so much of physical drudgery as of mental ability, and I am glad to think that we are progressing in the matter of giving our children an opportunity of being able to cope with Continental countries in this respect. This Bill has had the cordial support of my right hon. friend the Lord Advocate, and I would congratulate my hon. and gallant friend the Member for North Aberdeen upon the success of his efforts in this matter. I am glad that he has acknowledged the support he has received from the Lord Advocate, and I think we owe a great debt of gratitude to the right hon. Gentleman for the zealous manner in which he has taken up this Bill and for the able and almost indispensable services he has rendered in introducing Amendments and in giving the Bill the position in the business of the House which it now occupies. I am glad to learn that the Government intend to bring in an English Bill this session, and I hope that the very first Bill which they bring in in the following session will be a more comprehensive measure in regard to Scottish education. In this connection all Scottish Members are able gratefully to acknowledge that a wealthy and generous Scotsman, recognising the deficiencies of education in his own country, has come forward, with unprecedented liberality, to help to restore Scotland to the old leading position which it occupied for so many centuries. In conclusion, let me say that material wealth should be applied to the development of the intellectual, physical, and moral life of the people, and this Bill will have great effect in that direction. It will do something, but not all, to remove from us the discredit which attaches to us of allowing very much poorer countries to excel us in regard to both elementary and secondary education; it will help to increase our material prosperity by giving a broader basis for the secondary and scientific education which we are now finding absolutely necessary to enable us to maintain our commercial and manufacturing supremacy throughout the world; and it will help somewhat to increase the number of healthy, happy, and educated children throughout the country, to secure which should be one of the first aims of all good Government. I cordially support the Third Reading of the Bill.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromartie): called attention to a possible danger involved in the Bill so far as Highland crofting counties were concerned. The matter was explained by the following letter which he had received from the school board of Urquhart (Ross), dated 14th June, 1901; EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL, 1901.

"Sir,;I am directed to draw your attention to this Bill, and to point out that unless school boards in the Highland counties have power to remove from the attendance registers the names of such scholars who may be granted exemption from the obligation to attend school, that the special grant to Highland counties will be in great danger of being lost to them. [See Scotch Code, Article 19 (B) 6, Highland grants.]

"To give you a case in point, Mrs. A. B. is a young widow, left with a croft, etc., and three children, eldest girl thirteen years of age, the other two nine

and eight. To enable the widow to carry on the croft and maintain herself and family without relief from the parish, she is forced to keep the eldest child at home to herd the cow, etc., and she strives to keep the two younger children at school. The school board cannot see their way to prosecute this poor woman for the non-attendance at school of her eldest child, yet they are bound to keep the name of this child on the attendance register of the school, which so reduces the percentage of the average number of scholars enrolled who are in average attendance that a shilling per head of the Highland grant is lost to that school unless the average exceeds 80 per cent. of the number enrolled.

"I am to suggest that after the words 'twelve years of age,' in Section 3, there should be inserted 'and to remove the names of such individual children from the attendance register.'

"This question affects the grants for Highland crofting counties only.

"I am, etc.,

"(Signed) ALEXANDER MACDONALD.

"School Board Clerk."

This was a serious matter for the schools in crofting counties where this special grant was given under Clause 3. There was a provision that the Department should have power, when it saw fit, to call upon school boards for a return of the children to whom exemption had been granted, and under certain circumstances to call upon school boards to recall such exemption or to take steps to improve the attendance. The last part of the clause was;

"If the said school board fail to do so within a reasonable time, it shall be lawful for the Department to withhold or refuse the Parliamentary grant made to the said school board under Section 67 of the Education (Scotland) Act, 1872."

In Article 19 B (6) of the Code of 1901 these grants were given according to the average attendance of children whose names were entered on the school register, and such cases as those mentioned in the letter he had read would reduce the average. It was a pity that neither the Scottish Education Department nor the Lord Advocate had noticed this fact; and, while he had no intention of opposing the Third Reading of the Bill, he hoped the Lord Advocate would give an assurance that these grants would not be injuriously affected in the manner he had explained.

MR. RENSRAW (Renfrewshire, W.): I should like to ask the Lord Advocate to consider whether, in view of the fact that the English Act which passed a few years ago limits the age for casual employment to eleven years, it would not be possible in another place to amend the present Bill, so as to allow casual employment in the case of children between the ages of eleven and fourteen years, as that seems to be the only point to which serious exception has been taken. Another appeal I desire to make is in consequence of the remarks of the hon. Member for Mid Lanark. The hon. Member pointed out that the words of the Bill as they now stand in Clause 4 might be capable of leading to difficulties in regard to the authority of the school board under section 7 of the Education (Scotland) Act, 1878. By that section power was given to the school board to deal with children who were to be employed in temporary occupation. The words at the end of Section 4 in this Bill are to this effect;

"The Acts specified in the schedule to this Act are hereby repealed to the extent mentioned in the third column thereof and as from the commencement of this Act, and so much of any Act as is inconsistent with this Act is hereby repealed."

I do think there is a possibility of a difficulty arising in connection with that, and I will ask whether those words might not be altogether omitted, or, if they cannot, in the opinion of the right hon. Gentleman, be so omitted, whether they might not be modified, or some reference to the Act of 1878 introduced, to show that the provisions of this Bill are to be read along with the first part of the Act of 1878. If that was done, I think it would clear up this difficulty; which is a real difficulty, and one which it must be in the interest of the

school board authority to avoid. The other points in which I am specially interested I had an opportunity of placing before the House when the Bill was considered on Report. I still regret that the educational test in regard to exemption has been entirely got rid of, and I also feel that difficulties may arise in the case of some of the voluntary schools which would have been avoided if the powers which I have suggested of granting exemption had been given to the voluntary schools on the same conditions as to the school boards. Even in its changed form, I welcome the Bill as a businesslike and useful measure, and one which will be a great benefit to the progress of education in Scotland, and I would appeal to the hon Member for South-west Manchester to withdraw his Amendment, and allow the Bill to be read a third time without a division.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): I generally agree with my hon. friend the Member for Mid Lanark, who always speaks with information, and often discovers points which have been overlooked, but I cannot concur in his observations to-day. The hon. Member complained of the alterations which have been made in the Bill since it was introduced. There are alterations and alterations, but I decidedly think that the alterations made in this Bill have been valuable improvements. The raising the age limit from eleven to twelve is very important, and it only gives effect in Scotland, after the lapse of several years, to that to which the Government committed themselves at the conference at Berlin. I hope the Lord Advocate will stand by this Amendment. The hon. Member also objects to the substitution of the age limit for examinations, but it is really only a simpler and more direct mode of attaining the same end as was proposed in the original Bill. The object is to be assured that before children leave school they shall have had a certain reasonable degree of instruction. We hear much about continuation schools. I have always regarded the fact that there is a necessity for continuation schools as a reproach to our elementary system. If our elementary and secondary systems of education were as strong as they ought to be, there would be far less need for continuation schools than there now is. At present, children leave school after attaining a certain smattering of education; they go a certain length; but we find that, after the lapse of three or four years, they have forgotten almost all that they learnt at school, and they go back to the continuation schools, where they have to receive again a certain amount of elementary education. Therefore I think the

raising of the age limit is most desirable. I have not the same regard for examinations as my hon. friend apparently has. I always thank God that I was born before the age of examinations. Examinations necessitate a great amount of cram. Examinations and cram go together, and, while quick witted children can often pass through fairly well, examinations are too commonly not a satisfactory test either of attainments or of ability. The Bill as it now stands;

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

SIR JOHN LENG (continuing): With regard to the alterations in the exemptions clause, I am glad to see them in the Bill. The Lord Advocate is no doubt aware that under the regulations as they now stand in many cases the labour certificate, which may be obtained on the assertion by the parent that it is a necessity, has been very much abused. I know of cases in which several hundreds of children have obtained these certificates, and it has been ascertained that, so far from the parents being in necessitous circumstances, they were in receipt of good wages, and the family income was such that there was not the least occasion for them to exploit the labour of their young children, or to obtain the few shillings of wages which they would earn by taking advantage of the labour certificate. The provision that such boards should keep a record of the circumstances under which these exemptions are granted is, I think, an excellent one, and I only hope the Department will keep a careful watch over the granting of the certificates, in order to see that they are not given to parents whose circumstances are such that they are quite unnecessary. I therefore give a general support to the Bill as it has been amended under the guidance of the Lord Advocate, but I think it is worthy of his consideration whether he should not follow the suggestion of the hon. Member for Renfrewshire and allow a certain elasticity with regard to the casual employment of children in certain localities and under certain circumstances in work of a limited and healthy nature. I have known instances of boys being employed between the hours of six and eight in the morning in a perfectly healthy employment, which, while enabling them to bring in a few shillings for their parents, has not disabled them from giving due attention to their lessons when at school, and these boys have benefited very much from that employment, and have risen from comparatively humble positions to be good citizens and prosperous men. With that single suggestion, I have much pleasure in giving my cordial support to the Bill in its amended form, hoping that the right hon. and learned Gentleman will stand by the Bill in its main principles, simply giving effect in another place to such reasonable suggestions as have been made.

MR. BANBURY (Camberwell, Peckham): I should not have intervened in this debate but for the remarks of hon. Members who seemed to be under the impression that English Members ought not to express any opinion upon matters which have to do with Scotland. That seems to me to be an extraordinary opinion to hold. I have always understood that the function of Members of this House was to express their views, not only upon questions affecting the particular constituencies with which they are connected or the portion of the country which they represent, but also upon questions affecting the country as a whole. There can

be no doubt that education interests English Members just as much as it does Scotch Members. The hon. Member for the Leith Burghs said that this Bill had received as full consideration as it was possible for any Bill to do, but I do not think he quite grasped the point of the objection of my hon. friend the Member for South-west

Manchester. I believe that my hon. friend had no particular objection to the Bill as it stood; his objection is based entirely upon the manner in which it has been dealt with in its passage through the House. No doubt the Bill was considered on Report, but it had no consideration on the Second Reading stage. The Bill is absolutely different from when it was read a second time. Not only is it absolutely different, but there is nothing left except the title. In this particular Bill there is nothing in the title, whereas we had had recent instances in which everything was in the title. Therefore, as a matter of fact, this discussion is a Second Reading, and not a Third Reading discussion at all. After the remarks of the hon. Member for Leith Burghs, I was much surprised to hear one of the most distinguished and certainly one of the most painstaking Scotch Members; the hon. Member for Mid Lanark; in an extremely able and forcible speech, criticise nearly every clause in the Bill. I understand that the Scotch Members were unanimous on this matter; and surely, if that is not the case, the hon. Member for South-west Manchester was discharging a patriotic duty in moving his Amendment to-day. The hon. Member told us that under this Bill if a boy is just under the age of twelve years he will be unable to take part in any casual employment, even though that employment in no way interferes with the time he has to pass at school or with his making sufficient progress in those studies which are a necessity to every citizen, whether English, Scotch, or Irish. I was extremely astonished to learn that educational statistics in Scotland are now not as good as those in England. I have always understood that if there was one thing more than another in which the Scotch excelled it was in the fact that their education was so very much superior to the English. Whether the Scotch people are quicker and sharper, and are able to learn more with less attendance, than the English people, I do not know, but I have always been told, especially by Scotch Members, that Scotland was far in advance of England in this matter. I do not object in any way to the Third Reading of this Bill, and, as I say, I should not have intervened

in the debate but for the introduction of the extremely dangerous principle to which I have referred. I only hope the Government will remember the pertinent remarks made by the First Lord of the Treasury a fortnight or three weeks ago. When discussing whether or not it was right to take the time of private Members, he pointed out the great dangers and difficulties which might arise if what has now taken place was to occur frequently; that is to say, the taking up by the Government of a private Member's Bill, altering the whole of the measure, leaving nothing but the title, and then passing the Bill under the guise of its being a private Member's measure.

MR. PARKER SMITH (Lanarkshire, Partick): I am sure that all Scotch Members will welcome the interest taken by English Members in Scotch questions, as this is an Imperial Parliament, and we do not wish to have the benches empty but for the

Members directly concerned, as is usually the case when Scotch matters are discussed. The hon. Member for Dundee asked for greater elasticity with regard to casual employment. That is not my criticism of the Bill at all. I do not think the Bill goes far enough in the way of regulating casual employment; it does not prevent the casual employment of any child of any age whatever except during certain hours. That is not enough. But opinion is waking up in Scotland. School boards and other bodies have been considering the matter; various reports have recently been made; a striking report has recently been circulated by the Women's Labour Association; and I believe that Scotland will presently be ready to go a good deal further than this Bill goes in the way of regulating the casual employment of children both in the early hours of the morning and when they are of a tender age. I disagree altogether with the hon. Member for Renfrewshire in hoping that the age will be lowered from twelve to eleven years. The age as it stands has been before the country for some time; it was the age that was in the Government Bill of last year; it has been considered by the public as well as by the school boards, and, as far as I know, there has been hardly any objection taken to it. The difficulties which the big school boards have raised

have been in quite another direction. Their criticism has been directed against the amount of discretion which is put into their hands, but which I think was rightly and properly left to them. The Government may take it that Scotch opinion is sufficiently advanced to accept the Bill as it stands. My hon. friend opposite is to be congratulated upon the success of the Bill; upon his luck, in the first place, and, in the second place, upon the readiness with which he has adapted himself to the suggestions of the Government. The Bill is not quite the same as when introduced, but the question raised was a very important one, and one which it was the desire of all of us should be dealt with in the most satisfactory manner, and I think the hon. Member is to be congratulated upon having as the result of his initiative a Bill which will be a satisfactory and important addition to the educational legislation of the country.

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): I think the time has now come when I should reply to the criticisms which have been made, and, of course, I am bound to give the first place to the Amendment actually before the House. My hon. friend the Member for South-west Manchester characterises the changes which have been made as extensive and ill-considered alterations. So far as their being extensive is concerned, it is quite true that taking the words in the Bill the criticism is well-founded. In fact, mention has been made that the title alone is unchanged, but the hon. Member apparently was not aware that even that had been amended by the hon. Baronet the Member for Wigan. The question really is whether the Bill deals properly with the subject to deal with which it was originally introduced. I have nothing to do with the question of order. If these Amendments had been out of order they would no doubt have been objected to by the noble Lord who presided over the deliberations of the Committee. I am, of course, perfectly satisfied with the decisions to which he came. As regards the scope of the Bill, the idea of the Bill was to regulate the attendance of young children at school in Scotland. In my speech on the Second Reading of the

measure I stated, on behalf of the Government, that we were in sympathy with the object of the Bill, but that we thought it ought to be achieved in a rather different way to that proposed. All that has been done by the Amendments introduced in Committee has been to make good the various objections which, on the particulars at my disposal, I urged in my speech on the Second Reading. The hon. Member for South-west Manchester asked me a good many pertinent questions. In his dissertation on the Bill he seems to have become particularly entangled in the schedule, and he was very anxious with regard to the different repeals. He first fixed his attention on the 69th section of the Act of 1872. He saw that that had been repealed, but that the second part of it we did not touch. He particularly asked why, as we repealed Section 69, we did not repeal Section 22 of the Act of 1878. I believe my answer will be perfectly satisfactory to the hon. Member. That section has already been repealed by Section 88 of the Local Government Act, 1889. I might take his other questions in the same spirit, and the same answer would really apply to many of them. I ask him to consider the matter from the point of view of drafting. What was the state of affairs when he had to face the Bill introduced by the hon. Member for North Aberdeen? There are two questions which have been dealt with by this Bill; first, that of the duty of the parent to provide education for his children, with possible exemptions, and the duty of prosecution which lies upon the school board in case of default on the part of the parent; and, secondly, the question of total or partial casual employment. So far as these two matters rested, the state of affairs was this. Dealing in the first place with the question of providing education, there was, first of all, Section 69 of the Act of 1872; one half of that had been amended by Section 4 of the Act of 1883, and the other half had been repealed by a section of the Local Government Act of 1889. Then as regards casual employment, first of all, there was Section 72 of the Act of 1872; that had been repealed and other words substituted by Section 5 of the Act of 1878; Sub-section 2 of that Section 5 had been amended by Section 6 of the Act of 1883; and the Bill of my hon. friend opposite proposed to re-enact that Section 6 of the Act of 1883 which had amended Sub-section 2 of Section 5 of the Act of 1878, which had superseded Section 72 of the Act of 1872. There is no subject that I have heard descanted on in this House more often than the inadvisability of legislation by reference, and we thought it much simpler to make this Bill complete in itself, and to sweep away these various subsidiary sub-sections amended and re-amended, and to reintroduce in Section 1 of the Bill the provision casting upon the parent the duty of providing elementary education between certain years. I think that explanation will justify the particular form of the Bill as it now stands. As I am on the subject of the first section, I may say a word as to the interposition of the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich. He is afraid that this might have a curious effect upon the reading of the statutes affecting other parts of the kingdom. It has been already pointed out that the expression "elementary education" is no new term. It appeared as far back as in the Act of 1872. But I want merely to administer a little comfort to the noble Lord, and to say that I do not think he need be discouraged by what the hon. Baronet said. As

to the suggestion that this Bill, if passed into law, might be quoted as defining elementary education as meaning only reading, writing and arithmetic, the matter really does not stand there in that way. This section deals only with the duty of parents, and not at all with the subjects which the school boards may teach. When the subjects which the school boards may teach are dealt with the words "elementary education" are not used at all.

LORD HUGH CECIL was understood to explain that the meaning of his argument was that the words where specially used appeared to define "elementary education" as a legislative expression.

MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: As a legislative expression, possibly, as to the duty on the parent. But you have there a perfectly different set of considerations from the question of the sort of education a school board may provide out of the rates. In other words, I am not at all afraid of a Cockerton Judgment being raised in Scotland under our Education Acts.

I will pass now, Sir, to the speech of the hon. Member for Mid Lanark. What is it the hon. Member objects to in the Bill? He says we have taken advantage of the hon. Member who introduced the Bill. I do not quite understand that phrase. We have certainly not taken advantage of the hon. Member without his being fully aware of what we were doing and giving his active support. The hon. Member for Mid Lanark also complains that there was no Second Reading speech on the Bill. So far as I am concerned, if the hon. Member did me the honour to listen to the speech I delivered on that occasion he will remember that it was upon the exact lines of the Amendments which have been introduced. There was no Amendment introduced into the Bill that I did not deal with in my Second Reading speech. The hon. Member further complains of the abolition of tests by standards, The hon. Member is, of course, perfectly entitled to his opinion, but in this matter it is certainly against not only the view of the Scotch Members, but also the general educational ideas of Scotland as expressed in the conference of large school boards, to which reference was made in the last debate on this Bill. The truth is that, education ally considered, we have thought it a great benefit to get rid of the labour certificate and to have no competition with the merit certificate. The hon. Member referred to the fewness of the merit certificates. There are not a great many as compared with the total number of children, but the number is steadily increasing, and it is our object that it should increase. Undoubtedly the competition of the labour certificate, as far as it went, was detrimental to the merit certificate. Then the hon. Gentleman says that under this Bill we shall not have uniformity of treatment. We consider that to be a very great advantage. In the question of employment you have always two considerations to bear in mind, both perfectly legitimate and reasonable in their way. You have to consider the interests of the education of the child, and also the legitimate interest of the family so far as its support is contributed to by the earnings of the child. Therefore, so far from looking upon the consideration of the individual circumstances of the particular child and its family at a disadvantage, we regard it as one of the great advantages of the Bill. I will not follow the hon. Member into the statistics which he gave with regard to attendances. All I can say is that his view that

Scotland is "behind England," whatever that may mean, is not generally shared either by hon. Members for Scotland or, from what I hear on these benches, by the English Members. I would also point out that this idea of prohibiting at a tender age the employment of children is not brought forward solely with the view of increasing the number of school attendances; it is brought forward with the view of having the child in a condition to profit by what it is taught in the school. That is a very different thing.

The hon. Member for Ross and Cromarty asked me a question dealing with Highland schools. It seems to me that the question he raised is one in connection with the Code rather than with this Bill. But I shall be very glad to receive from him the representation made to him by the school board, and, at all events, have inquiries made in the proper quarters. The hon. Member for Renfrewshire made an appeal to me upon two subjects. First of all, he wants the age below which casual employment is prohibited altered from twelve to eleven years. The hon. Member for the Partick Division has already made one answer to that appeal when he pointed out that casual employment as a whole is not prohibited, but only casual employment during certain hours. Upon this matter of the age I do not want the measure to be too stiff, but at the same time I should not be inclined to change the age unless it was shown that there was a real body of opinion the other way. The other point brought forward by the hon. Member was with regard to the application of Section 7 of the Act of 1878. I feel that it perhaps ought to be made more clear. The idea certainly is that Section 7 should apply, but it is not one of those sections which have been repealed, and I should take care that in another place the vague words "and so much of any Act as is inconsistent with this Act is hereby repealed" shall be taken out. I think if we do that and put in at the end of the citation clause a provision that this Act should be read along with the several Education Acts, we should sufficiently secure the object the hon. Member has in view. I think I have dealt with every matter which has been raised, and I hope the Bill may now be read a third time without a division.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

OUTDOOR RELIEF (FRIENDLY SOCIETIES) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. WINGFIELD-DIGBY (Dorsetshire, N.), in moving that the Bill be read the third time, said that it had passed through its various stages up to the present time almost without opposition. It was only a two-clause Bill; Amendments were carried on behalf of the Local Government Board at the Committee stage, and the text of the Bill as it now stood contained provision in the second sub-section that;

"In granting outdoor relief to a member of any friendly society the board of guardians shall not take into consideration any sum up to five shillings a week received from such friendly society in sick pay."

He believed that on both sides of the House a strong opinion existed that any effort by the working classes, or any of their poorer brethren, in the direction of thrift should rather meet with encouragement than the reverse. By not

allowing them outdoor relief simply because they were receiving relief from a friendly society they were not giving that encouragement. This was a very small measure, and not in any way connected with, although it might be in the direction of, old-age pensions, which they were told the other day at Birmingham the friendly societies were to be the parties to carry out.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time.";(Mr. Wingfield-Digby.)

LORD HUGH CECIL said that though this was not a very large Bill it contained a great deal that was interesting and important. It was a Bill which, like some others, was not fully apprehended by those who merely looked at it in the form in which it was printed. This was a case of legislation by reference to other enactments, although not a bad case of the kind. When he first saw it he had difficulty in finding the full scope of the Bill, and it took some trouble and research through previous Acts to find the interpretation, The Bill began by saying;

"The discretion given by section one of the Outdoor Relief Friendly Societies Act, 1894, to the boards of guardians to take or not to take into consideration the amount received by a member of a friendly society as sick pay when granting outdoor relief shall be limited as hereinafter provided."

The natural course was to refer to the section in the Act of 1894, and there he found it was enacted;

"Notwithstanding any orders or regulations of the Poor Law Commissioners or the Local Government Board under and by virtue of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, or of any Act amending the said Act, it shall be lawful for any board of guardians, if they think fit, to grant relief out of the poor rates to any person otherwise entitled to such relief, notwithstanding that the said person shall, by reason of his membership of a friendly society, be in receipt of any sum, and that in estimating the amount of the relief that shall be granted to such person being a member of a friendly society as aforesaid, it shall be at the discretion of the board of guardians whether they will or will not take into consideration the amount which may be received by him from such friendly society."

Following this up, if one wished to understand the Bill now before the House it was necessary to go to the Act of 1834. There he found himself confronted with very considerable difficulty. It was a very elaborate Act, and he had to spend considerable time in hunting through it before he found the section to which they were now referred. It seemed to be Section 52, which said;

"It shall be lawful for the said Commissioners by such rules, orders, or regulations as they may think fit, to declare to what extent and for what period the relief to be given.…may be administered out of the workhouse," and so on.

It was obvious that even here there was certain obscurity, because there was a reference to regulations to be made under the Act. He had not seen these regulations, although he might have found them perhaps if he had taken further trouble in the matter. This was an illustration of the way legislation was conducted. The discretion referred to in the present Bill was that conferred

on the guardians by the first sub-section of Section 1 of the 1894 Act, which he had already read. That discretion was now to be taken away by this Bill up to a certain point. The amount received from friendly societies which was not to be taken into consideration by the guardians in granting outdoor relief was fixed at 5s. by the second sub-section.

MR. BANBURY (Camberwell, Peckham) said the sub-section was not amended so as to appear in the print now before the House in the form in which it was passed by Committee.

An HON. MEMBER asked whether they were able to discuss a Bill which was not printed in accordance with the Amendments which had been made upon it.

*MR. SPEAKER: It is quite in order. There were only two drafting Amendments made in Committee. The words "up to 5s. a week" were struck out at the end of Sub-section 2 of Clause 1, and the words inserted were, "except in so far as such sum shall exceed 5s. a week." The House, as is usual in such a case, did not order the Bill to be reprinted.

LORD HUGH CECIL said it was still a case where the limit was 5s. The proposal in this Bill was the negation of the Act of 1834. The idea of that Act was that support should only be given, whether by outdoor or indoor relief, after every other source of subsistence was exhausted. The present Bill had for its underlying principle the idea that people had a right to a certain amount of support, not to save them from starvation, but as a reasonable provision, and that the fact that a person was receiving certain benefits as the result of an investment in a friendly society Was no reason why he should not receive the same consideration in the matter of poor relief as a thoroughly thriftless person. That was a revolution in the way in which we had hitherto looked at poor relief. It approached the question from a socialistic point of view. It laid down

the principle that a man had a right to assistance as against the State.

Personally he had no objection to such a Bill, but to think that the matter would rest there was to deceive themselves. It would advance further stages in the same direction, until old-age pensions were reached.

MR. STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.) said the noble Lord had referred to the Bill of 1894. He would remind the House that alterations were made upon it in another place by the present Prime Minister, and that was the reason why it was so complicated. When the Bill came back to the House of Commons he did not make any objection to the alterations, because he was only too glad that the principle of the Bill was accepted. He believed they were generally agreed as to the proposal in the present Bill to give assistance in the case of those who had made a certain amount of provision for helping themselves by becoming members of friendly societies. He had introduced the Bill at the instance of the National Conference of Friendly Societies, and he desired to thank the President of the Local Government Board for assisting its progress through the House. He also thanked the hon. member for Peckham for not persisting in his opposition which he had intended to give to the Bill.

MR. BANBURY said that as all the stages of this Bill had been taken after twelve o'clock, it had been impossible for him to explain his attitude towards it, and

he should like now to say a few words in regard to the motives that actuated him. He had never had the slightest objection to the Bill as a Bill. Hitherto he had said that no man should receive outdoor relief unless he was in such a state that he could not subsist without it. He did not object to the Bill because it was proposed to give assistance to those who had become members of friendly societies. They owed to friendly societies very great obligations, and they ought to be encouraged in every possible manner. His only objection to the Bill was that it encouraged but one form of thrift. He thought that a man who invested a small amount of money in the Savings Bank or bought a small cottage was just as much entitled to the assistance provided by the Bill as a man who joined a friendly society. He thought it would have been advisable before passing the Bill to see whether some means could not be devised whereby others who had been thrifty would benefit in the same manner.

MR. BOND (Nottingham, E.) said it was only by a happy accident that they were in a position to pay any attention to the far-reaching principle which underlay the apparently insignificant and unimportant Bill now before the House. They were told that the Bill was introduced at the instigation, or, at all events, with the sanction, of a large number of the friendly societies of this country. That predisposed many hon. Members to accept the Bill. He himself yielded to no man in his admiration for friendly societies. They represented a movement which had, notwithstanding great difficulties, developed one of the most important features in our social system. The principle on which friendly societies were based was that of co-operative independence. The founders and promoters of those societies wished to be beholden to no man for assistance; but the friendly societies were forgetting the precepts of their founders when they desired to come in contact with the poor law system, from which it was originally desired to rescue themselves. He thought therefore that a good deal of weight which would naturally attach to their opinion in this matter was taken away. When the friendly societies were found in conflict with the principle so long established in the poor law that relief should be given only in cases of destitution, the House should pause and consider carefully how far measures of this kind were likely to lead. He understood from what Mr. Speaker had said that an Amendment had been introduced into the Bill; he knew not when or how; which extended the operation of the measure not merely to allowances from friendly societies in time of sickness, but to all cases where members of friendly societies were in receipt of allowances not exceeding 5s. per week. He did not know whether it was intended, but it was evident that they had there introduced in an insidious and unobtrusive way the principle of old-age pensions; a question which had not received the consideration of the House. The provision prohibited guardians from taking such allowances into account. It was pretty evident that they had gone a long way in the direction of old-age pensions without proper legislative sanction being given to the proceeding. That seemed to him a rather serious state of things. He hardly thought it proper that they should pass this measure after such scanty discussion on the Third Reading. It was a measure which might have far-reaching consequences, and he ventured to think that it contained much potential mischief for the friendly societies

themselves with regard to the administration of the poor law up and down the country. It was a curious thing that the introduction and conduct of this Bill had fallen into the hands of two Members who represented West Country rural constituencies. Anybody who was acquainted with the way the poor law was administered up and down England knew that the objection to having recourse to the poor law did not prevail in anything like the same intensity in the West Country as in other parts. It had become almost a matter of course in the rural parts of Somerset for an old labourer to receive out-door relief from the guardians. The labourer did not think there was any disgrace in having accepted that form of relief. He could well understand how Members representing districts where that feeling prevailed should think they were doing the district a good turn in promoting such legislation as was now under consideration. But the House should recollect that there were other districts where high-minded and independent men were unwilling to avail themselves of an appeal to the poor law. This would be the first time since the Act of 1834 was passed that the House would put its seal to a proposal which would break down the principle that relief should be given for destitution only. The Bill either went too far or not far enough. If they were going to set their seal to the principle that there was to be encouragement of thrift, they ought to make it encouragement of thrift of every kind.

MR. GOULDING (Wiltshire, Devizes) said that allusion had been made to the manner in which the Amendments had been introduced, but he would point out that the Amendments appeared on the

Order Paper for a couple of days, and that they were passed in Committee of the whole House. He could not imagine any more public way of amending the Bill. He congratulated his hon. friends on their success in carrying the Bill to its Third Reading. The hon. Member for East Nottingham had said that he was a supporter of friendly societies and desired in every way to encourage them in their good work, but he added that the Bill was brought forward by hon. Members representing West Country and rural constituencies, and that it had not the support of other Members. As a matter of fact, however, the Members whose names appeared on the back of the Bill came from all quarters of the United Kingdom, and the Bill was universally supported by all who believed in the good work of the friendly societies for the thrift they had inculcated in the minds of the people. He was thankful that the Bill had reached its present position, and he was certain that when it became law it would have a good effect, especially in rural constituencies, in inducing non-members of friendly societies to reconsider their position. He desired very cordially to support the Third Reading of the Bill.

MR. THOMAS BAYLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield) said he wished to congratulate the hon. Member for South Somerset on having brought the Bill into its present successful position. He also congratulated the Government on their changed attitude from a year ago, and he thought that the General Election had educated them more than anything else. The hon. Member for East Nottingham objected to the Bill because he said it would affect the independence of friendly societies, but he did not advance a single argument in support of that contention. The

societies would be quite as independent as they were before, and he thought the Bill would help them by encouraging people to join. Poor law guardians were mostly in favour of the Bill, and from the ratepayer's point of view, it was undoubtedly a very important question. If the hon. Member for East Nottingham represented a constituency where friendly societies were strong, his view on the Bill would be very different from that which he expressed. The hon. Member said that the Bill was the beginning of a great social reform, but he was not even prepared to take the first step in it. The country, however, was not only prepared to take the first step, but to take further steps in the same direction. The hon. Member for Peckham said he did not know how to define what a friendly society was, but there was a public official known as the Registrar of Friendly Societies, and if the hon. Member applied to him he thought he would get a very excellent definition.

MR. BANBURY said there was no definition in the Act of 1896, to which he presumed the hon. Member was alluding, and he was further informed that the Act of 1896 could not be read in conjunction with the Act of 1894.

MR. THOMAS BAYLEY said that the best definition would undoubtedly be obtained from the Registrar of Friendly Societies. He, for one, would be quite willing to include more societies, but at any rate the Bill was an excellent Bill, and the friendly societies would be perfectly satisfied with it.

MR. COHEN (Islington, E.) said he congratulated the hon. Gentleman opposite on having piloted through the rather troubled waters through which a private Member's Bill had to pass in the House of Commons a measure which he thought would be very useful, but which no one would deny was extremely important, as it introduced a valuable principle into the present outdoor relief system. He thought the Bill would be the forerunner of further measures of the same character. He did not, however, really know why an exception should be made in favour of friendly societies, and why persons who had deposited money in friendly societies should be entitled to relief, whereas persons who had put money into the Government savings bank should not have a similar advantage. That was a new principle, and would necessitate further legislation. He recognised entirely that the friendly societies had done most valuable and beneficent work for the poorer classes, but they were not the only means of encouraging thrift. He hoped the measure would become an Act of Parliament, and he believed that it would be the forerunner of other measures of a similar character.

*COLONEL BLUNDELL (Lancashire, Ince) said he thought the Bill ought to include other classes. There were, for instance, pensioners whose pensions were insufficient to support them, and he thought the measure ought to comprehend such persons and others similarly situated.

MR. JACKSON (Leeds, N.) said he was really in a difficulty with regard to the Bill, because, as had been pointed out, it was not known that the Bill had been amended in Committee. He now understood that the words "sick pay" had been struck out, but surely that entirely altered the character of the Bill, and with all respect to the hon. Member opposite, who took to task the hon. Member for Peckham for asking for a definition of friendly societies, he had been honestly striving to find a definition which would apply to friendly societies as

mentioned in the Bill, and so far as he knew there was no such definition. The hon. Member who moved the Third Reading of the Bill appealed to the House to encourage thrift. He entirely agreed, as he thought it was extremely desirable that thrift should be encouraged; but the becoming a member of a friendly society was not the only method of encouraging thrift, and so long as the words "sick pay" remained in the Bill;

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): May I point out to the hon. Gentleman that in the last clause of the Bill the words "sick pay" are retained?

MR. JACKSON said that if that was so it made a great difference as regards the definition of the Bill, and he apologised for having misunderstood it in that particular. The fact that the words "sick pay" were retained made it much more easy to determine or define to what persons the Bill would apply. But he would point out that there were only certain societies which gave sick pay. Would an accident society, or one of the societies connected with the great railway companies which made good the wages of a railway servant for a number of weeks up to his full pay and for a certain number of other weeks up to his half pay? That was how it worked out and he would like to know whether a man who had contributed his own money to a society, in the expectation of getting a certain amount of benefit

from so doing, was to be shut out from the benefits of this legislation because his society was not to be termed a friendly society under the terms of this Bill. Perhaps he had not made his point clear. But supposing a railway servant receiving 5s. a week from his benefit society was, under some unfortunate circumstances, obliged to appeal to the parish for relief, would he be permitted to retain that five shillings and yet have the benefit of parish relief? If the author of the Bill did not make that plain he would leave grave doubts in the minds of the House. There were other societies besides so-called friendly societies which promoted thrift. He himself had had the honour of taking an active part in the amendment of the law relating to building societies. In his own constituency they had some of the most important and he believed some of the largest building societies, and he believed they were the most solvent in the kingdom, and what he wanted to know was, whether a man who had set aside in these societies money to provide against the future was to be excluded from the benefits of the Act. It was obvious that the man who contributed to a building society was doing just as much to make provision for the evil day as the man who contributed to a friendly society, and yet they had his hon. friend the Member for East Nottingham saying that the new form of legislation which was going to alter the general law apparently applied to one class only. He thought the Bill ought to benefit all classes who had attempted to provide for themselves. He thought the Bill was a defective Bill, and he agreed with his hon. friend the Member for East Nottingham that it had either stopped short or had gone too far; if the Bill was for the purpose of benefiting those who exercised thrift, it ought to extend to all alike and not only to members of friendly societies. He was not opposed to friendly societies, and had always done what he could to promote and encourage them, and therefore he could not be open to the suspicion of having any objection to friendly societies; but they ought to be fair and

equitable and extend an equal advantage to all who have practised the same virtue and made the same struggles to provide for their old age.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping) said that as a Member for an agricultural constituency he took a great interest in the Bill, and he would appeal to his hon. friends to look at the good portions of the Bill and endeavour to pass it.

The right hon. Gentleman the Member for North Leeds had undoubtedly pointed out defects in the Bill, and the hon. Member for East Nottingham, with great honesty of purpose, and speaking on a subject with which he was well acquainted, also pointed out defects, but he would ask his hon. friends to look upon the Bill as an instalment. Friendly societies generally had had a very great struggle in agricultural districts, but they were now beginning to make their way among the agricultural labourers, who were fighting shy of the so-called "slate clubs," held in public houses, which were no use to them in their old age, and they were discovering the necessity of joining friendly societies. He knew of no Bill that the friendly societies were more anxious to have. That there were omissions in it he was prepared to acknowledge. His hon. and gallant friend had pointed out one, namely, Army pensioners, and he hoped that that class would receive some consideration, and that railway and other societies should be eventually added, but he would appeal to hon. Members not to throw the Bill out at the present moment. He believed the intention was a good one, and that though the measure might infringe some part of the sacred Poor Laws, which were looked upon with such respect by some hon. Members, he believed it would do incalculable good to friendly societies and to agricultural labourers generally.

SIR JOSEPH PEASE (Durham, Barnard Castle) said he also desired to congratulate the hon. Member. He agreed that the Bill did not go far enough, and that all persons in receipt of an allowance from any society to which he directly or indirectly contributed should be included. The principle on which outdoor relief should be given was that the amount should be sufficient, in addition to what the recipient was receiving from any other source, to fit him to return to work as soon as possible. All the friendly societies in his constituency had urged him to support the Bill, and he trusted the House would give it a Third Reading.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) said that he too wished that the Bill had gone a great deal further, and had included Army pensioners, and men belonging to railway societies who were in receipt of grants. But the friendly societies had encouraged thrift more than any others, especially that kind of thrift which saved the rates, and for that reason he thought that the principle of the Bill should be established. They were all indebted to the friendly societies for the good they did, and he would have been glad if the Bill had gone even further in their favour. If the Bill were carried into law it would not only be a good thing for the friendly societies, but it would effect a saving of the rates, by encouraging men to join the societies. He hoped the discussion would soon be brought to an end, as many hon. Members appeared to be inclined to continue the debate, with the object of preventing another Bill being discussed.

MR. HEYWOOD JOHNSTONE (Sussex, Horsham) said he had the greatest respect for friendly societies, and considered that they had an additional claim on the

sympathy of Parliament because they seldom came forward to ask for legislation, and he was prepared, therefore, to look on the Bill with the most favourable eye. But he would like to know what this Bill was going to do. The Bill of 1894 was an enabling Bill. It enabled boards of guardians to grant or withhold relief entirely at their discretion to or from members of friendly societies, and to grant relief to any person notwithstanding whether he was or was not in receipt of a grant from a friendly society. Had that discretion been abused? If so, he had never heard of it. Looking at the Bill as it stood, did it mean that the guardians ought to take into consideration what a man received from a friendly society? Did it mean that if a friendly society gave a man 16s. a week the guardians ought to deduct 5s. a week, and treat him as if he had only 11s. a week? It seemed to him that the Bill would not place boards of guardians in a very different position to what they were under the present legislation. The boards of guardians who had been niggardly and grudging under the Act of 1894 would not change their nature and increase their relief under the Act of 1901. MR. LLEWELLYN (Somersetshire, N.) said he supported the Bill most heartily. One especial reason why the House should pass the Bill at once was that it would legalise what was done every day of the week. On the whole, whether it was legal or illegal, boards of guardians had always been glad to grant where necessary outdoor relief to members of friendly societies, and the Bill would legalise a practice which has been in operation for many years.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time and passed.

CREMATION BILL [Lords].

As amended by the Standing Committee, considered.

MR. RENSHAW said the clause which he desired to propose defined certain expressions in the application of the Bill to Scotland. He could not understand why Scotland had been treated exceptionally in respect of cremation. It could not be that Scotland was not favourable to cremation, because in the report issued by the Scottish Cremation Society it was stated that the number of cremations was steadily increasing every year, and that every satisfaction had been expressed at the arrangement at the crematorium. In a pamphlet which had been issued he observed that the system which had been adopted in Glasgow in respect of cremation was as effective as any system established in England, and the apparatus was one of the best. He hoped the House would, therefore, gather that Scotland was not behindhand in matters associated with cremation. The hon. Member for West Aberdeenshire was one of the presidents of the first cremation societies in Scotland, and he hoped the hon. Member would inform the House as to the desirability of giving local authorities in Scotland the same opportunities as regards cremation as were given in England.

LORD HUGH CECIL asked, on a point of order, whether the clause ought not to be postponed until the House had considered Clause 10, which stated that the Bill should not apply to either Scotland or Ireland.

*MR. SPEAKER: The practice of the House compels new clauses to be taken first on the Report stage. It occasionally leads to inconvenience and difficulty, but it cannot be departed from now.

MR. RENSRAW said he was quite willing to take a division as to whether the Bill should or should not extend to Scotland.

A Clause, (Definitions, Scotland), brought up, and read the first time.;(Mr. Renshaw.)

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

SIR WALTER FOSTER said that if the Lord Advocate had no objection to offer on behalf of the Scotch Office, the Amendment might be accepted.

MR. LEES KNOWLES (Salford, W.) said he thought it was very desirable that the House should have an expression of opinion from the Front Bench with regard to the views of the Government on the subject, and he hoped the Lord Advocate would give the House some guidance. It did seem very curious that if they added the new clause proposed by his hon. friend, embodying certain definitions with regard to Scotland, they would later on come to Clause 10, which specifically stated that the Act should not apply to Scotland or Ireland. His hon. friend had said that he was perfectly willing to take a division on the question whether the Act should or should not apply to Scotland, and the hon. Gentleman opposite appeared to take the same view. He had looked through the Report of the Grand Committee, and must say that it was very meagre. It did not give the House much information. He had been informed that the subject of the application of this Bill to Scotland had not been brought before the Grand Committee for discussion at all. It seemed to him that, if this Bill was to be extended to Scotland and to Ireland, it should be remitted back to the Grand Committee on Law, that they might consider the proposed extension of the Bill to Scotland and to Ireland, and that the House might receive some assistance from the Grand Committee. He did not see many representatives from Ireland present. Possibly they had not taken into consideration that an Amendment extending the Bill to Ireland would be brought forward. He believed that the Irish members were particularly averse to this new mode of dealing with dead bodies by cremation, and if they had thought the Amendment would be brought forward they would have had something to say on the matter. Personally, if the Bill was carried through this House, with the insertion of the proposed new clause extending it to Scotland, he could see no objection to its extension to Ireland. What was sauce for the goose was sauce for the gander. He hoped the Lord Advocate would give the House some advice on the matter.

MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY said that, so far as he could see, there was no objection to the extension of the Bill to Scotland; but, while that was his personal opinion, he had had no opportunity of consulting the Local Government Board of Scotland. There were some expressions in the clause proposed by the hon. Member for Renfrewshire which would require to be altered. If the clause was read a second time, he would, therefore, move some verbal amendments upon it.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.) said, speaking as one of its vice-presidents, that the Cremation Society of Scotland was very strongly in favour of the proposed extension to Scotland. He hoped the Secretary for Scotland would take into very serious consideration the responsibility placed upon him under Clause 4 of making regulations for cremation.

*MR. TOMLINSON (Preston) said he had been a member of the Standing Committee,

and he thought it was unfortunate, in the position in which the Bill now stood, that there really had been no adequate time between the nomination of the Committee and its sitting to give that close examination of the Bill which was desirable. He took it that that was the reason for the Amendments now on the Paper. He questioned whether the clause as framed would not carry the construction and use of crematoria to a much larger extent in Scotland than would be the case in England. Whenever the Bill was put into force it would involve a considerable amount of expense to the burial boards; therefore he thought the House ought carefully to consider the amount of the pecuniary resources of the local authorities in imposing a burden of this kind upon them.

DR. FARQUHARSON said there was a very large and well-equipped crematorium in Glasgow working very successfully.

*MR. TOMLINSON said that was not his point. What he would like to ask was, what was included under the term "parish council" in Scotland, and whether a parish council or a town council was in all cases a proper body to set up a crematorium. He should hesitate very long before entrusting such a duty to parish councils in England, so many of which were very small bodies.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.) said that the Irish members were opposed to the application of the Bill to Ireland, and he did not know whether it was seriously intended to move an Amendment to that effect.

*MR. SPEAKER said that the clause under discussion related only to the application of the Bill to Scotland.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE said that if the Bill was not to be extended to Ireland the Irish representatives would offer no opposition to it.

SIR WALTER FOSTER pointed out that it was expressly provided in the Bill that it should not apply to Ireland.

MR. BANBURY said he was very glad that the Bill was going to apply to Scotland, because if the Bill was a good Bill it ought to apply to Scotland. They in England ought not to keep all the good things to themselves. His hon. friend the Member for Salford said he could not understand what would happen if this clause were passed when Clause 10 specifically declared that the Bill should not apply to Ireland or Scotland; but he had Amendments to Clause 10 to make the Bill apply to Scotland and Ireland. He fully intended to move these Amendments.

LORD HUGH CECIL ventured to suggest to his hon. friend who had moved this clause that he would be well advised

in withdrawing it at this stage, and it could be discussed on a re-committal of the Bill at the Third Reading. They could not deal under this clause with the national circumstances of each country. It seemed to him a very strange thing that a parish council, if it were anything like an English parish council, should be allowed to make a crematorium. From that point of view it was most desirable that the matter should be considered in a regular way in Committee, and that, therefore, this Bill should be re-committed.

MR. JORDAN (Fermanagh, S.), as one of the members of the Grand Committee, said that the question of applying the Bill to Scotland or Ireland had never been raised in Committee, and it was an unreasonable thing to introduce it now. On

those benches they were not at all disposed to obstruct the Bill as applied to England, nor even to extending it to Scotland; but if the hon. Member for Peckham persisted with his Amendment in applying the Bill to Ireland, the Irish Members must protect themselves and oppose the whole Bill.

MR. BANBURY said he should certainly move his Amendment applying the Bill to Ireland.

MR. JORDAN said it appeared to him that the hon. Gentleman's intention was to block the whole Bill.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL (Sir EDWARD CARSON, Dublin University) said he represented mainly the views of the Government, which he must say, as far as the Bill was concerned, looked upon its application, at present restricted, as an extremely useful measure. The question of its application to Ireland or Scotland was never before the Committee, and he should be sorry if the Bill were amended so as to endanger its passing. He would remind hon. Members that, as to the applicability of the Bill, it was not a Bill to authorise cremation, which was perfectly legal at the present time, but to place cremation under proper rules and regulations laid down by the Home Office. Having regard to the fact that cremation was being carried on to a very large and increasing extent in England without any Government rules, as there were in the case of burials, he thought it would be wise if the House allowed the Bill to pass without being hampered by the introduction of Scotland or Ireland. There might be no objection to its application to Scotland, but certainly as regarded Ireland there was no pressing case for applying it to that country. It would be most inconvenient if they entered into practically a new discussion, on new lines, on a matter which might imperil the whole Bill.

MR. RENSRAW said that, having regard to the speeches of some hon. Members, he desired to point out that the parish or town councils would be the only authorities which could be affected by the application of the Bill to Scotland. He must remind the noble Lord that parish councils in Scotland were not the small affairs he seemed to suppose. For instance, the parish of the city of Glasgow had a population of over 700,000 people.

*MR. TOMLINSON said he did not say that a parish council being the burial authority was necessarily unfit to be entrusted with the carrying out of the Bill. What he asked was whether there were not some parish councils whose pecuniary resources were not large enough to make it light for them to construct crematoria.

MR. MACARTNEY (Antrim, S.) said the speech of the Solicitor General was an illustration of some mistakes that were made. He intended to support the clause of his hon. friend for the extension of the Bill to Scotland, and afterwards to submit a motion for its extension to Ireland. He was very glad that the House reserved to itself the right to full consideration of the Bill after being sent down by the Grand Committee. If there was anything in the Bill that was good for England, he could not for the life of him see why it should not be extended to the United Kingdom. Taking all things into consideration, the hon. Member for Renfrewshire, in the interests of his own proposal, should withdraw his clause at this stage, for the purpose of moving it afterwards when the Bill was

recommitted. It would also be necessary to have definition clauses in respect to Ireland as well as to Scotland.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) said that this was a measure in which he took a very great interest, and he rose for the purpose of saying that if it was proceeded with, as sent down by the Grand Committee, it would meet with no opposition from the Irish Members. It was perfectly clear, however, that the object of the hon. Member for Peckham was not to extend the Bill to Scotland and Ireland, but to prevent the Bill being extended to England. So far as the hon. Gentleman's action went, it was refreshing to think that he had taken a new line, because, as a rule, he took steps to prevent any Bill being passed for any country whatever. If the representatives of England desired this Bill they were entitled to have it; but they from Ireland were certainly entitled to object to its application to Ireland. As to the application to Scotland, the extraordinary thing was that if there was a great desire on the part of the Scotch people that it should be extended to Scotland, that should have been voiced on this occasion, not by the representatives of Scotland, but by the representative of Peckham, which, after

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.

Coghill, Douglas Harry

Goulding, Edward Alfred

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Cohen, Benjamin Louis

Graham, Henry Robert

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready

Gretton, John

Aird, Sir John

Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)

Grey, Sir Edward (Berwick)

Anstruther, H. T.

Cripps, Charles Alfred

Griffith, Ellis J.

Archdale, Edward Mervyn

Crombie, John William

Groves, James Grimble

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)

Hain, Edward

Arrol, Sir William

Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)

Hall, Edward Marshall

Atherley-Jones, L.

Cubitt, Hon. Henry

Haslam, Sir Alfred S.

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Cust, Henry John C.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Dalkeith, Earl of
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Baird, John George Alexander
Dalziel, James Henry
Helder, Augustus
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Henderson, Alexander
Banbury, Frederick George
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Hoare, E. Brodie (Hampstead
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset E.
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Hogg, Lindsay
Beckett, Ernest William
Doughty, George
Hornby, Sir Wm. Henry
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Douglas, Chas. M. (Lanark)
Houldsworth, Sir W. Henry
Black, Alexander William
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Hoult, Joseph
Blake, Edward
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Howard, J. (Mid, Tottenham)
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidst'ne
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan
Jackson, Rt. Hn. Wm. Lawies
Burns, John
Fenwick, Charles
Jacoby, James Alfred
Burt, Thomas
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)

Jebb, Sir Richard Claver house
Butcher, John George
Fisher, William Hayes
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Cameron, Robert
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Flynn, James Christopher
Joicey, Sir James
Causton, Richard Knight
Foster, Sir W. (Derby County)
Jones, David Brynm'r (Swansea)
Cavendish, V. C W (Derbyshire)
Galloway, William Johnson
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Garfit, William
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Gibbs, Hn A. G. H. (City of Lond
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Channing, Francis Allston
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Kitson, Sir James
Chapman, Edward
Gordon, Hn. J. E (Elgin & Nairn)
Law, Andrew Bonar
Coddington, Sir William
Gorst, Rt. Hon, Sir John Eldon
Layland-Barratt, Francis

all, whatever else might be said about it, could not claim to have the advantage of being in Scotland. It showed, at any rate, that the Scotch people were not very keen upon the subject.

MR. HEYWOOD JOHNSTONE thought it was very desirable that the Bill should be extended to Scotland, but he would suggest that a considerable part of the clause moved by the hon. Member for Renfrewshire was not necessary. It defined what a "Burial Authority" in Scotland was; but he contended that Clause 2 of the Bill, as it stood, contained a definition of a burial authority quite wide enough to include parish councils or town councils in Scotland if they performed the duties of a burial board in England. He suggested to his hon. friend that he would be well-advised to leave out that part of the clause. The other portions defining the Local Government Board of Scotland and the Secretary for Scotland

were necessary.

Question put.

The House divided:;Ayes, 199; Noes, 87. (Division List No. 262.)

Leigh, Sir Joseph

Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard

Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr

Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie

Plummer Walter R.

Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings

Leng, Sir John

Price, Robert John

Thornton, Percy M.

Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S

Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward

Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray

Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.

Randles, John S.

Wallace, Robert

Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine

Rankin, Sir James

Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir Wm. H.

Lough, Thomas

Rea, Russell

Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.

Loyd, Archie Kirkman

Rentoul, James Alexander

Warner, Thos. Courtenay, T.

Lucas, Col. F. (Lowestoft)

Renwick, George

Warr, Augustus Frederick

Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. E.

Rickett, J. Compton

Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan

M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)

Ridley, Hn M. W. (Stalybridge)

White, Luke (York, E. R.)

M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)

Ridley, S. F. (Bethnal Green)

Whiteley, Geo. (York. W. R.)

Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F

Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)

Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)

Morgan, Hn Fred. (Monm'thsh.

Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)

Whittaker, Thomas Palmer

Morrell, George Herbert

Roe, Sir Thomas
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Wilson, Fred W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Mount, William Arthur
Round, James
Wilson, Henry J. (York W. R.
Murray, Rt. Hn A Graham (Bute
Russell, T. W.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Myers, William Henry
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh, N.)
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Nicholson, William Graham
Smith, H C (North'mb, Tynes'e
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Norman, Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Soares, Ernest J.
Wylie, Alexander
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Spear, John Ward
Yoxall, James Henry
Palmer, Sir Chas. M. (Durham
Stevenson, Francis S.
Palmer, George W. (Reading)
Strachey, Edward
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Mr. Renshaw and Dr. Farquharson.
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Thomas, Able (Carmarthen E.
Peel, Hn. Wm Robert Wellesley

Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.
NOES.
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)
Gilhooly, James
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Ambrose, Robert
Gunter, Sir Robert
O'Dowd, John
Austin, Sir John
Hammond, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Hay, Hon. Claude George
O'Kelly, J. (Roscommon, N.)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Malley, William
Beach, Rt. Hn. W. W. B. (Hants
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
O'Mara, James
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)
O'Shee, James John
Boland, John
Jordan, Jeremiah
Pease, Sir Joseph W. (Durham)
Bull, William James
Kennedy, Patrick James
Power, Patrick Joseph
Caldwell, James
Leamy, Edmund
Rasch, Major Frederic Came
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J A (Glasgow
Lecky, Rt. Hon. Wm. Edw. H.
Reddy, M.
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Lundon, W.
Redmond, William (Clare)
Cogan, Denis J.
Maconochie, A. W.

Seely, Chas. Hilton (Lincoln)
Colville, John
M'Dermott, Patrick
Seton-Karr, Henry
Condon, Thomas Joseph
M'Govern, T.
Shaw, Charles E. (Stafford)
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Crean, Eugene
Malcolm, Ian
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset
Cullinan, J.
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Delany, William
Mooney, John J.
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Donelan, Captain A.
Morris, Hn. Martin Henry F.
Stroyan, John
Doogan, P. C.
Murnaghan, George
Sullivan, Donal
Duffy, William J.
Murphy, J.
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Ffrench, Peter
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Lord Hugh Cecil and Mr. Knowles.
Field, William
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
Clause added.

It being after half-past Five of the clock, further proceeding on consideration, as amended (by the Standing Committee), stood adjourned.

Bill, as amended (by the Standing Committee), to be further considered upon Wednesday next.

PRESTATYN WATER BILL [Lords].

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

Adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Six of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 20th June, 1901.

TOOK THE OATH.

One other Member took and subscribed the Oath.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

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

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

Elland Gas Bill [Lords].

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

BRIGHTON CORPORATION BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

YORKSHIRE ELECTRIC POWER BILL.

Read the third time, and passed. [New Title.]

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 1) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 5) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (HOUSING OF WORKING CLASSES)

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDER (HOUSING OF WORKING CLASSES) (N) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 4) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 10) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 12) BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

MILITARY LANDS PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL.

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

Bill to be read the third time tomorrow.

EDUCATION BOARD PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION (ACTON) BILL [Lords].

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

Bill to be read the third time tomorrow.

SHIPLEY IMPROVEMENT BILL.

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

BIDEFORD AND CLOVELLY RAILWAY (ABANDONMENT) BILL [Lords].

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

KING'S NORTON AND NORTHFIELD URBAN DISTRICT TRAMWAYS BILL [Lords].
POULTON-LE-FYLDE GAS BILL [Lords].

Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed
PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP K).

Mr. HEYWOOD JOHNSTONE reported from the Committee on Group K of Private Bills,
That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Friday
the 28th day of June at Twelve of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to; Metropolitan Common Scheme (Ham) Provisional Order
Bill; Neath Harbour Bill; Thames Deep Water Dock Bill, without amendment.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION BILL.

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

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

Petitions against; from Pendleton and West Wiltshire; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour; from Kettering (two); Stepney, and Seaton; to lie upon the
Table.

SOVEREIGN'S OATH ON ACCESSION BILL.

Petition of the Scottish Women's Protestant Union, against; to lie upon the
Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).

Copy presented, of Colonial Report, No. 323 (St. Helena, Annual Report for 1900)
[by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA (LOANS RAISED IN INDIA).

Copy presented, of Return of all Loans raised in India, chargeable on the
Revenues of India, outstanding at the commencement of the half-year ended on the
31st March, 1901, &c. [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.
[No. 217.]

PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS (CONDITIONAL LICENCE).

Copy presented, of Licence granted to Jane Horner, a Convict under detention in
Aylesbury Prison, permitting her to be at large on condition that she enter the
Elizabeth Fry Refuge, Hackney [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF MIDDLESEX).

Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of the County of Middlesex,
dividing the parish of Harrow-on-the-Hill into convenient Polling Districts [by
Act]; to lie upon the Table.

COUNTY OFFICERS AND COURTS (IRELAND) ACT, 1877.

Account presented, of the Receipts and Payments under the Act during the year
ender the 31st March, 1901 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.
[No. 218.]

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 2432 [by
Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, No. 555 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (INTELLIGENCE DIVISION).

Copy presented, of Annual Report of Proceedings under the Sale of Food and Drugs Acts, 1875 to 1899, the Merchandise Marks Acts, 1887 to 1894, and other Acts for the year 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

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

1. Private Bill Legislation.;Return relative thereto [ordered 18th April; The Chairman of Ways and Means]: to be printed. [No. 219.]

2. Loan Societies.;Abstract of Accounts of Loan Societies in England and Wales to 31st December, 1899, furnished to the Central Office for the Registry of Friendly Societies [by Act].

INCOME TAX ASSESSMENTS, 1896–1900.

Return ordered, "of the number of Assessments to the Income Tax for the year ending 5th April, 1896 (in the same classes and in the same amounts as stated in, and in continuation of, Parliamentary Paper No. 216, of Session 1895."

"And similar Returns for the years 1897, 1898, 1899, and 1900.";(Mr. Bartley.)

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL. ORDERS (No. 6) BILL.

Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals, contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill.";(Mr. Gerald Balfour.)

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL, ORDERS (No. 10) BILL.

Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill.";(Mr. Gerald Balfour.)

PROSECUTIONS (FISHERY LAWS) (IRELAND).

Return ordered, "for years 1890 to 1900, inclusive, ending the 31st day of Date of alleged offence.

Name; etc., of person charged.

Name, letters, and number of beam or otter trawl vessel.

Where alleged offence committed.

Statute of bye law contravened.

Place and date of trial.

Result of trial.

By whom detected.

Summary.

Names, &c., of persons charged more than once during the foregoing period of ten years.

Number of times such persons were charged.

Total amount of fines.

Total length of imprisonment undergone.

;(Mr. O'Mara.)

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR;CONCENTRATION CAMPS.

MR. C. P. SCOTT (Lancashire, Leigh): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will cause Returns to be published weekly showing the number and the

rate of mortality of the white men, women, and children respectively, in each of the concentration camps in South Africa; and, so far as practicable, similar Returns for the native camps.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): I will ask Lord Kitchener to give such information as he can. It will probably be more convenient to give the figures monthly.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is yet in a position to state how many deaths of men, women, and children December, of Prosecutions undertaken in Ireland of Masters of beam or otter trawl vessels for alleged infringement of the bye-laws of the Fishery Board or the provisions of the Acts prohibiting beam or otter trawling within certain waters round the coasts of Ireland, in the following form, with Summary:; respectively occurred in the concentration camps in Natal, Orange River Colony, and Cape Colony respectively during the months of April and May respectively; what change, if any, has been made in the dietary; and what improvement, if any, has been made in the sanitary arrangements and medical provision for the sick.

MR. BRODRICK: I cannot give the figures separately for April, but I have already given the House the total deaths to the end of April. Those for May are as follows:;Orange River Colony, including Kimberley and Aliwal North, 20 men, 57 women, and 123 children, out of a total of over 25,000 souls. Cape Colony Camp at Port Elizabeth, nil, out of 386 souls. Natal, 3 men, 1 woman, 8 children, out of a total of over 2,500 souls. I have already given information as to the dietary, sanitary arrangements, and medical provision to the House, and all proper attention is being given to these matters.

MR. FLYNN: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether there is any intention to improve the dietary and medical arrangements?

MR. BRODRICK: NO, Sir; the dietary as given up to now has been pronounced sufficient by those in authority in South Africa, including the medical authorities, and it is not proposed to increase it.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs): Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the desirability of a special diet for the very young children?

MR. BRODRICK: As far as possible a special diet is given to young children, but where great numbers are massed together it is not, and will not, always be possible to give fresh milk.

BOERS IN THE FIELD.

MR. BLACK (Banffshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether any recent despatch has been received from Lord Kitchener estimating the number of Boers still in the field; if so, will he lay it upon the Table; if not, upon what data are they estimated by the Government to consist of 17,000 men.

MR. BRODRICK: The information is based on the Field Intelligence Reports, which are never published.

TREATMENT OF INVALID SOLDIERS.

SIR ELLIOTT LEES (Birkenhead): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that officers and men invalided home by medical boards at Johannesburg and Pretoria have to pass additional boards at Bloemfontein and Cape Town; and if invalided home from the front in order to undergo operations

in England are occasionally detained for weeks at Wynberg Hospital, near Cape Town; whether, in the interest of the patient and the taxpayers, orders could be given that all patients about to undergo operations in England should be sent home with as little delay as possible; and whether, in all cases, the number of medical boards before which invalided officers and men have to pass prior to being sent home can be reduced.

MR. BRODRICK: I am not aware that persons invalided home are examined by more than one board, except in cases where the patient on his way to the coast develops further illness, and has to undergo examination with a view to the extension of his sick-leave. The information at my disposal tends to show that patients are not detained unnecessarily at Wynberg. I will, however, draw the attention of the Commander-in-Chief in South Africa to the points raised by the question with a view to his taking such action as may be deemed necessary.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): Did Lord Milner have to pass an examination by this board before he came home on leave?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

REVISION OF COURT-MARTIAL SENTENCES.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether any progress has been made with the revision of sentences pronounced by courts of inquiry in South Africa on soldiers charged with misconduct in the face of the enemy, and who are now undergoing their sentences in convict and other prisons in this country; whether a case has been brought under his notice in which the prisoner and members of his family fought bravely in Egypt as well as in South Africa; and whether he will see that no time is lost in deciding upon this and similar cases.

MR. BRODRICK: The Commander-in-Chief is carefully going through the sentences by courts-martial in South Africa. The case which the hon. Member brought to notice will be considered, but the facts are not entirely in accord with those which he forwarded to me.

BOER PRISONERS; INTERNMENT IN INDIA.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State or India whether his attention has been called to the latest Report of the Army Medical Department, which stated of Ahmednagar that the general health was bad during the greater part of the year, that plague was epidemic from July to December, and enteric fever was most prevalent in May, June, and July; and, seeing that the principal medical adviser stated that the sanitary conditions were bad, the barrack accommodation and the conservancy establishment insufficient, and the water supply unsatisfactory, whether he will recommend the removal of the Boer prisoners to a more healthy locality.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): I have already stated in the House that there is no intention of removing the Boer prisoners. The Report quoted by the hon. Member for East Clare mainly refers to the cantonment where British troops were located during the year 1899, which was exceptionally unhealthy owing to causes which have now ceased to exist; and the defects mentioned by the principal medical officer have been remedied. As I have

said before, the station is considered to be one of the healthiest and most agreeable in India. The prisoners' camp was recently visited by the Governor of Bombay, who reported that the prisoners appeared "to be thoroughly contented and well cared for."

MAILS FOR TROOPS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

MR. EVELYN CECIL (Aston Manor): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether his attention has been called to the numerous complaints which have recently been made with reference to the non-delivery of letters to the troops in South Africa; and whether the difficulties of communication could be so far overcome as to ensure greater regularity in the postal service.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): Has there not been an exceptional amount of postal matter to be dealt with?

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): The Postmaster General is aware that cases still arise in which letters addressed to the troops in South Africa do not reach the persons for whom they are meant; but

the number of complaints of such cases is decreasing. The authorities in South Africa appear to appreciate fully the unsatisfactory conditions under which the postal service for the troops is carried on in a state of war, but they are understood to be making every possible effort to improve the conditions. In reply to the hon. Member for North Aberdeen, I may say that the amount of postal matter to be dealt with has been enormous.

RESERVISTS AT ALDERSHOT.

SIR JOHN LENG: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can explain why Reservists who returned to this country from South Africa last July are still kept at Aldershot, thus throwing on their employers the responsibility of continuing to support their wives and families in fulfilment of promises made when the Reserves were called out.

MR. BRODRICK: The men who are retained at Aldershot are those whose services cannot be spared. With the large number of young soldiers at home, it is absolutely necessary to keep a proportion of older men with the regiments and at the depots. The local military authorities have been given discretionary power to allow any men whose services can be dispensed with to return to their homes.

ARMY REFORM SCHEME.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, before the War Office Vote is put down to be taken in Committee of Supply, he will furnish a Return showing the number and estimated cost of the staff proposed as the establishment for the United Kingdom under the scheme of Army reform, as compared with the number and cost of that establishment on 31st March last, distinguishing the number and cost of the headquarter staff at the War Office from that of Army corps areas.

MR. BRODRICK: It is not proposed to make appointments to any of the Army corps before October 1st, and until all the arrangements are completed, including those for various measures of decentralisation which I intend to propose, I cannot give the Return desired.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB: May I ask whether, before the War Office Vote is taken, the House will be told to what extent the staff is to be increased, in view of the statement on the Estimates that the extent of the increase had not been settled.

MR. BRODRICK: It is not proposed to increase the strength of the staff of the War Office. As to the remainder, I may say that our labours are extremely heavy, and I may not be able to bring all these matters to a settlement before the War Office Vote.

AUTOMATIC RIFLES.

MR. NORMAN (Wolverhampton, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether an automatic rifle has been issued for experimental purposes; if so, will he state the name of this rifle, and how many have been issued, and will he afford Members of Parliament an opportunity of inspecting the new arm.

MR. BRODRICK: The reply to the question is in the negative.

SOLDIERS' LIABILITY FOR PARENTS' MAINTENANCE.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that an application on behalf of Catherine Guilfoile, a widow aged seventy years, came before the Mountmellick Board of Guardians at their meeting on the 1st instant, and that this woman has two sons who hitherto maintained her, and are at present in the service of the King, one in South Africa and the other in Dover; and, seeing that the application was supported by the chairman of the county council, who is also guardian of the division in which Catherine Guilfoile resides, and who recommended that she be granted 2s. 6d. per week, whether he can take any steps by which this woman may be prevented from becoming chargeable to local rates.

MR. BRODRICK: The Secretary of State for War has no power to compel the sons to give any portion of their pay

to their mother. An application by the local authorities to the officers commanding the regiments concerned to take measures to induce the sons to contribute to their mother's support would doubtless receive attention.

RECRUITING IN IRELAND.

MR. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will state the numbers of enlistments in Ireland in the Regular Army and the Militia respectively during the first four months of each of the years 1896, 1897, and 1898.

MR. BRODRICK: The figures are as follows:;1896: Army, 1,037; Militia, 3,145. 1897: Army, 1,184; Militia, 3,228. 1898: Army, 1,276; Militia, 3,035.

VOLUNTEER EQUIPMENT.

MR. OSMOND WILLIAMS (Merionethshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that K company of the 3rd Volunteer Battalion Royal Welsh Fusiliers, which was formed at Dolgelly nearly a year ago, has not yet been supplied with arms; whether his attention has been called to the fact that this company, which is a cyclist one, took part in the recent Easter manoeuvres, and had to borrow rifles, bayonets, and slings from the Portmadoc company of the same battalion, and that some of the overcoats and leggings of this battalion bear the condemned for service mark, dating back as far as 1872; and can he state who is responsible for this state of affairs, and whether steps will be

taken to supply the required equipment without delay.

MR. BRODRICK: I know nothing of the matter alluded to in the question. The question is entirely one for the general officer commanding the district, who is responsible that the unit is properly armed, clothed, and equipped. The overcoat and leggings are provided by the unit out of the capitation grant, and the War Office has nothing to do with the supply.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): Is there no appeal to the War Office in matters of this kind?

MR. BRODRICK: Under the principle of decentralisation urged upon the Government it was felt that these questions should be left in the hands of the general officer commanding. His attention shall be called to this case.

ARMY MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the fact that there is at the head of the Army Medical Department at the present time only an Acting Director General shortly about to retire from the service, he will say when a new Director General will be appointed.

MR. BRODRICK: No, Sir; I can make no statement on this subject. Various measures for the reorganisation of the Medical Department are in progress.

WRENCH v. LANGWORTHY BROS.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the remarks of the Lord Chief Justice in the case of Wrench v. Lang worthy Bros. and Co., and if he proposes to take any steps in the matter.

MR. BRODRICK: My attention has been called to this case, and I am considering it.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the advisability of laying on the Table a full report of the evidence and of the Lord Chief Justice's remarks?

MR. BRODRICK: I do not see any reason for that. The case was very fully reported.

H.M.S. "SYBILLE."

*SIR JOHN COLOMB: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is yet in a position to state the composition of the force of fifty men which, with the captain and two lieutenants, were absent on duty on shore from H.M.S. "Sybille," and the composition of the complement remaining on board when that ship was wrecked; and, if so, can he state the figures for each branch afloat and ashore belonging to the ship when the occurrence took place.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): The composition of the force on shore was as follows:;Captain, 2 lieutenants, 33 petty officers and men of executive and navigating branch, 5 engineer branch, 2 miscellaneous ratings, 1 sergeant and 10 men of the Royal Marines, total 54. The complement remaining on board was composed of 13 remaining officers of the ship, 85 executive and navigating branch, 87 engineer branch, 13 artificers, 16 miscellaneous ratings, 15 Royal Marines, 18 Kroomen, total 247.

RELIGIOUS MINISTRATIONS FOR DYING SEAMEN.

MR. GILHOOLY (Cork County, W.) I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that a few months ago a Roman Catholic seaman who was serving aboard the "Diadem," then stationed at Castletown Berehaven, fell from aloft at 4 p.m., and expired at 6.30 p.m. on the same day, from injuries sustained by the fall, and whether he can explain why, although the "Diadem" was within five minutes row of the house of the Roman Catholic chaplain, he was not sent for to administer the sacraments to the dying man.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: A priest was not sent for in this case because it was not anticipated that the accident to the seaman in question would terminate fatally. The medical officer of the ship was of opinion that he would recover. In the ordinary course the man would have been sent into Queenstown Hospital on the following day, and the collapse of the patient was sudden and unforeseen. I may add that the case has already received full and careful consideration by the Admiralty, and that commanding officers are instructed, in all cases where it is possible, to make every effort to secure the services of a priest or minister of the denomination of an injured man whenever a case of danger to life arises. It is to be regretted that in this instance no such ministrations were provided, but it is quite clear that the absence of a priest was not due to either neglect or indifference on the part of the officers of the ship.

MR. GILHOOLY: Will the hon. Gentleman allow me to inform him that the evidence given at the inquest concerning this man;

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

MR. GILHOOLY: Then, is the hon. Gentleman aware that the naval officer stated at the inquest that;

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

MR. GILHOOLY remained standing and tried to complete the question.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. Member persists in disregarding the authority of the Chair, I shall have to take the step of naming him to the House.

FOREIGN MEAT SUPPLIES TO THE NAVY.

MR. GILHOOLY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that the present contractor to the Channel Squadron at Castletown Berehaven supplies foreign beef, whether the terms of his contract require that the beef should be freshly killed, and, if so, will the Admiralty enforce the terms of the contract, and compel the contractor to supply Irish beef.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The contract for the supply of meat at Berehaven provides that the meat shall be good, fat, well-fed, freshly-killed ox or maiden heifer beef; that it shall be approved by the commanding officer of the vessel, supplied as in all respects fit for His Majesty's service, and that no refrigerated or frozen beef is to be supplied. There is no reason to believe that the conditions of the contract have been departed from. The officers commanding the ships are informed of the conditions, and no complaint has been received from any of them to the effect that the meat is not of good quality, or that the conditions have not been complied with. It is not proposed to vary the terms of the contract.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): Are navy contractors in Ireland permitted to supply foreign beef?

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

ISLAND OF ARRAN SIGNAL STATION.

MR. MORRIS (Galway): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the Board of Admiralty have come to any decision as to the need for the Naval manoeuvres on the west coast of Ireland, and for other purposes, of a signal station on the north island of Arran at the entrance to Galway Bay.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The question of the establishment of a signal-station on the island of Arran is at present under the consideration of the Admiralty, but no decision has yet been arrived at.

H.M.S. "REPULSE"; LOUGH SWILLY FATALITY.

MR. NORMAN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can say in what manner the chain of a boat of H.M.S. "Repulse," the breaking of an officially-stamped link of which resulted in the death of a seaman in Lough Swilly on 13th May, was tested at Chatham, and what steps have been taken to give effect to the recommendation of the coroner's jury that better supervision should be exercised at Chatham in issuing fittings.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I will ask the hon. Member to postpone this question, as I have not yet been able to obtain all the required information.

BISHOP OF CALCUTTA.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS: On behalf of the hon. Member for the Camborne Division of Cornwall, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if it is intended to confer on the Bishop of Calcutta the style and precedence of Archbishop; and, if so, can this step be taken without the sanction of this House being obtained by legislation or otherwise, and will the change be carried out without adding to the expenditure of the Indian Empire.

LORD G. HAMILTON: I cannot make any statement at present on the subject to which the hon. Member's question refers. As I said a few days ago, in reply to the hon. Member for Shrewsbury,* there are many important considerations involved in this proposal; but I believe I may state at once that, if the change of title were made, no extra charge would thereby be thrown upon the revenues of India.

CHINESE INDEMNITY.

MR. DILLON: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any agreement has yet been arrived at by the Allied Powers as to the amount of the indemnity which China is to be compelled to pay and as to the machinery by which the payment of the instalments of indemnity is to be secured.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRANBORNE, Rochester): In a Note addressed by the representatives of the Powers at Peking to the Chinese Plenipotentiaries, the total indemnity payable by China has been fixed at 450 million taels, but the other matters referred to in the question are still under discussion.

MR. DILLON: Was the Note signed by the representatives of all the Powers?

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: Yes, I think so.

COST OF DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICES OF FOREIGN STATES.

MR. NORMAN: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he will cause to be procured from His Majesty's representatives abroad figures snowing the annual cost of the diplomatic services and the consular services respectively of the United States, Germany, and France.

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: The following are the total figures taken in the

* See page 271.

case of France and Germany from the Estimates for the year 1901–02, and in the case of the United States for the year 1900–01, but I am not able to distinguish with any accuracy between the diplomatic and consular expenditure, and no doubt the charges do not correspond exactly to their English equivalents, so that the figures may be misleading. France, 9,435,500 francs; Germany, 8,507,700 marks; United States, 1,897,638.76 dollars.

GIBRALTAR WORKS.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether His Majesty's Government propose to lay upon the Table of the House, as the First Report of the Gibraltar Committee, the unanimous replies on 30th March of all its members to the six questions constituting the reference to it; or do they propose to lay, as that Report, the personal letter addressed privately and confidentially by Admiral Rawson on that date to the First Lord of the Admiralty, which letter described itself as an Interim Report; whether His Majesty's Government propose to lay upon the Table both documents, and, if they present only Admiral Rawson's Report, do they propose to lay the whole or only portions thereof.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): In answer to my hon. friend I have to say that I know of no personal letter addressed by Admiral Rawson to the First Lord of the Admiralty. We propose to lay on the Table of the House both Reports, with their enclosures, except only those portions which, on public grounds, ought, in our opinion, to be treated as confidential. The enclosure in the first Report contains the answers, not to the six questions to which my hon. friend refers, but to five out of the six questions which were asked. One of the questions to which my hon. friend refers was not answered.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Is my right hon. friend aware that Admiral Rawson himself described this as a personal letter, and that, on that ground, no copy was given to the other members of the Committee?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir. My hon. friend's memory strangely misleads him, for, in the very first paragraph of the document to which he refers, Admiral Rawson says he has the honour to present this "Interim Report." And he not only signs it himself, but all the other members of the Committee including my hon. friend, signed it with this subscription:,"We agree to the foregoing Report, (Signed) Thomas Gibson Bowles," and the other members of the Committee.

COAL DUTY;EFFECT ON ITALIAN CONTRACTS.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his attention has been drawn to the Report for the year 1900 on the Trade and Commerce of Italy, which states that owing to the increasing expense of British

coal, of which four and a half million tons were imported in 1900, it has been proposed to utilise the waterfalls and electricity for generating power in order to substitute electricity for steam for traffic and industrial purposes, thereby reducing the imports of British coal; and whether, under these circumstances, the Government will reconsider their decision to impose a duty on coal exported from the United Kingdom, thereby increasing the cost of British coal in Italy.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): I have not seen the Report; but, assuming the statement in the question to be accurate, I see no reason for reconsidering the imposition of a coal duty. I am told that large contracts have been made for supplying coal to Italy since the imposition of the duty, the purchaser paying the duty.

COAL DUTY; REMISSIONS.

MR. CHARLES M'ARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer where coals are exported, in pursuance of contracts made before 19th April, 1901, to persons resident in a foreign country, from whom the export duty cannot be recovered, will the Treasury be entitled, under Clause 3 (2) of the Finance Bill, to remit

the duty; and, if so, will the production of the contracts and proof of shipment of the coal in pursuance thereof be deemed sufficient evidence upon which the Treasury may exercise their power of remission.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I think my hon. friend is asking me a general question with reference to some particular case. I can only say that remission would depend not merely on production of the contracts and proof of shipment under them, but also on their nature and character.

NATIONAL COAL RESOURCES-INQUIRY.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydfil): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he has addressed a communication to the various coal trade associations asking those bodies if they are prepared to support a request for a complete investigation into the whole subject of the country's coal resources, the probable term for which the coalfields are likely to last for home consumers, the possibility of adopting a more economical method of working, the competitive power of our coal with the coal of other countries, and the probable effect of the new export duty; and, if so, whether such an inquiry will be by a Royal Commission, a Select Committee of the House, or a Departmental Committee; whether, in view of the time that must elapse before the result of such an extended inquiry can be made public, he will provide that an Interim Report shall be issued as to the effect of the new coal duty before it will be necessary to formulate the Budget proposals of the next financial year; and if, having regard to the nature of the inquiry and the current estimate of the value of the Report of the Coal Commission of 1866 as to the probable duration of the supplies of cheap coal, he will see that the commercial element is adequately represented upon the Commission or Committee.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The Parliamentary Committee of the Mining Association of Great Britain asked me whether I could advise an inquiry into the advisability of the coal export duty, its incidence, and its probable effects on the coal trade; and explained that they did not suggest the withdrawal of the

duty, but desired an inquiry before it was imposed for another year. I pointed out to them that such an inquiry would be, in my opinion, too limited to lead to any satisfactory conclusion, and asked whether they would support suggestions which had already been made for a much more extended investigation, including the first four points specified in the question. I have not yet received a reply, and therefore have not brought the subject before my colleagues. I can, therefore, only say, in reply to the other questions of the hon. Member, that at present I do not see how an Interim Report could be of value unless it was based on a consideration of the whole subject.

FORTIFYING WINE IN BOND.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether there is any rule as to the quality and age of spirits that may be used to fortify wine in bond, and whether foreign spirit may be used for the purpose.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: There is no rule as to the age or quality of the spirit used for the purpose of fortifying wine in bond. The spirit used for the purpose may be (a) British plain spirits, (b) foreign spirits unsweetened, (c) spirits of wine.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: May German spirit be used then?

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: Any unsweetened foreign spirit.

CUSTOMS; EXAMINATION OF PASSENGERS' LUGGAGE.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether it is the custom for the police or other Government officials to ask the names or examine the luggage of passengers arriving at Southampton or Liverpool

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): The baggage of all passengers arriving from foreign ports at Liverpool, Southampton, or any other port in the United Kingdom is by law liable to examination by the officers of customs. The police have nothing to do with the matter, and I am informed that it is not the practice of the customs officers at the ports named to ask the names of passengers on arrival. Information is obtained from lists supplied by the shipping companies.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: Will the Chief Secretary see that the same course is adopted at Queenstown and other Irish piers?

MR. WYNDHAM: I replied to a question on this subject the other day, and I have nothing to add to my answer.

YOUTHFUL OFFENDERS.

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can state when he intends to bring in the Bill dealing with youthful offenders.

*MR. RITCHIE: To-day; at the commencement of public business.

METROPOLITAN POLICE STATIONS.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will consider the advisability of connecting the police stations throughout the metropolis with the telephone system, seeing that this has been carried out with satisfactory results in the City of London as well as other

towns throughout the United Kingdom.

*MR. RITCHIE: This question has been considered already, and it appeared that the existing efficient system of telegraphic communication between all the police stations, which is entirely under police control, meets all police requirements.

MERCANTILE MARINE TONNAGE CALCULATIONS.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade; See page 66.

Trade, having regard to the fact that cross-channel and coasting steamers have been recently constructed with fractional or negative tonnage, so as to escape the payment of tonnage dues, whether he will cause inquiries to be made with the view of suggesting a remedy to provide a fair revenue to port and dock boards.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): I fear I can only repeat what I have already stated in reply to the hon. Member's previous questions. So far as reasonable uniformity can be obtained by Board of Trade regulation, I shall endeavour to secure it, and it is of course open to harbour authorities, by means of local Acts, to endeavour to obtain powers to levy dues based on the gross instead of on the net tonnage of vessels.

SCOTTISH SHERIFFS' SALARIES.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether a decision has now been arrived at in regard to the question of increasing the salaries of sheriffs in Scotland; and, if not, can he state when a decision is likely to be announced.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The decision has been deferred pending the receipt of information for which the Secretary for Scotland has asked from certain of the sheriffs. I am in hopes that a decision will shortly be arrived at.

CANDIDATES FOR CIVIL SERVICE APPOINTMENTS; MEDICAL INSPECTION.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL (Armagh, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can state what are the various fees for medical inspection which have to be paid by successful candidates at Civil Service examinations; and whether he can arrange that in future such inspections shall be gratuitous as in the case of recruits for His Majesty's forces.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The fees vary from half a guinea to a guinea. They do not do more than meet the payments to the medical men by whom the examinations are made. It is not proposed to make any change

CANADIAN MAIL CONTRACTS.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether, seeing that the vessels of the Elder and Dempster Company (Beaver Line), of Liverpool, carry His Majesty's and the Canadian mails, he can state what steps, if any, he has taken to see that the Pair Wages Resolution of the House of Commons of 1891 will be carried out so far as the firemen employed on the Beaver Line of Royal Mail steamers from Liverpool are concerned; and having regard to the fact that the current rate of wages on steamships sailing out of Liverpool which carry the mails to the United States of America is £5 per month for firemen can he state what is the present rate of wages which is paid to firemen employed on board the

vessels of the Beaver The employed in carrying the mails.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The mails for Canada are conveyed under contract with the Canadian Post Office, not with the Postmaster General; and the present contractors are not Messrs. Elder, Dempster and Company, but Messrs. Allan. The Postmaster General has no knowledge of the present rate of wages paid to firemen of the Beaver line.

CLERKS TO SURVEYORS OF TAXES.

MR. M'GOVERN (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can state by whom clerks to the Surveyors of Taxes are appointed who pays these clerks their salaries, and out of what source or fund; whether a surveyor is changed from one survey to another, are the clerks in the office changed also, and can a surveyor of taxes dismiss a clerk in his office without the sanction of the Board of Inland Revenue; and will he explain why the clerks in the offices of Surveyors of Taxes are held to be merely clerks of the surveyors, and to have no connection or claim to be recognised as members of the staff of the department or in its employment.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: (1) Clerks to Surveyors of Taxes are appointed by the surveyors, and (2) are paid by the surveyors out of an allowance provided for that purpose in the Inland Revenue Vote. (3) The clerks are not changed from one survey to another without the surveyor. (4) A surveyor may dismiss a clerk without the Board's sanction; but he must inform the board that he has done so. The clerks are held to be merely clerks of the surveyors, because that is in fact their position. They are not appointed by the Board of Inland Revenue, they do not hold Civil Service certificates, and they are not part of the permanent staff of the Department.

EDUCATION;WELSH COUNTY SCHOOLS.

MR. MOSS (Denbighshire, E.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education, in view of the proposal contained in Section 6, Sub-section (2), of the recently introduced Education Bill as applicable to the county schools in Wales, and, seeing that most of the schools receive annual grants under the various schemes, whether he will introduce a clause exempting Wales from the provisions mentioned.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): The Government will consider the suggestion of the hon. Member before the Education Bill leaves the House of Commons.

LLANELLY AND THE EDUCATION QUESTION.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education if he has received a resolution passed at a public meeting at Llanelly, suggesting that the Government should pass a short Bill enabling school boards to carry on the work they are doing at present till a comprehensive measure can be passed, entrusting all work connected with public education (elementary, secondary, and technical) to an authority solely elected for this purpose; and whether he can fall in with their desire.

SIR J. GORST: Yes; I have received the resolution. There is no intention of introducing such a Bill at present.

TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION IN WALES.

MR. GEORGE KENYON (Denbigh): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether, in view of the proposal in the Education Bill to repeal the whole of the Technical Instruction Acts of 1889 and 1891, he will insert a special clause to keep alive certain Technical, Instruction Committees in Wales, and whether the penny rate which it is proposed to empower urban district councils to levy (Section C, Sub-section (1) will be in addition to the twopenny rate contemplated under Section 3.

SIR J. GORST: No such clause is proposed by the Government, but they will consider any which the hon. Member may suggest. The answer to the second paragraph is in the affirmative.

SCHOOL EXEMPTION IN WALSALL.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether he is aware that the Walsall School Board has within the past three months exempted over one hundred children from school attendance, some of whom failed to pass the fourth standard at the recent examination; will he state whether the Board are empowered to make such exemption, and does the Education Department propose to take any steps to prevent members of this school board from breaking its own bye-laws.

SIR J. GORST: The answer to the first paragraph is in the negative. Under the Walsall bye-laws children are entitled to partial exemption after twelve, either on passing Standard IV. or on making three hundred attendances annually for five years.

LEEDS SCHOOL BOARD AND THE COCKERTON JUDGMENT.

MR. JACKSON (Leeds, N.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether his attention has been called to a letter and pamphlet circulated by the Leeds School Board in which it is stated that about 13,000 students in Leeds (the number enrolled last session) will be deprived of the further opportunity of self-improvement or training for commercial and industrial pursuits, the work shown in the accompanying prospectus of last year's classes will be at a standstill, this result being attributed to the judgment in *Rex v. Cockerton* and the absence of official guidance or instruction from the Board of Education; and whether he will give an assurance that the provision in the Education Bill dealing with this subject will be proceeded with.

SIR J. GORST: The difficulty in which the Leeds School Board find themselves is caused by their having established schools which they have no legal power to maintain. No official guidance or instruction could enable them to use the school fund for purposes not sanctioned by the Elementary Education Acts. Under the existing law, the local authority, under the Technical Instruction Acts, can use the funds provided by those Acts for the maintenance of such schools, and further facilities are provided in the Bill now before Parliament. There is nothing to prevent the Leeds School Board from now arranging with the local authority for the continuance of such schools, either under the existing law or in anticipation of legislation on the subject.

REX v. COCKERTON; SURCHARGES BY AUDITORS.

MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if it is the intention of the Board to enforce surcharges upon members of school boards leviable under what is known as the Cockerton Judgment.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): If any member of any school board feels himself aggrieved by any surcharge by the auditor he has a right of appeal to the Local Government Board, and I shall be prepared to consider on any such appeals reasons for which a remission may be made.

BUCKLAND FISHERY COLLECTION.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to a proposal of the Grimsby Town Council to ask the Government to transfer to Grimsby the collection of fishery specimens which the late Mr. Frank Buckland left to the nation; and will he say if this collection is still at South Kensington, and when and where it will be open to inspection by the public.

SIR J. GORST: Perhaps I may be allowed to answer this question. The Board of Education have never heard of the Grimsby proposal; the fish are at the Victoria and Albert Museum at South Kensington, and can be seen there at all times when the museum is open.

HOUSE OF LORDS AND PRIVY COUNCIL APPEALS.

MR. BLAKE (Longford, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General whether he can state the number of days on which the House of Lords and the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council respectively sat for the discharge of judicial business in each of the years 1899 and 1900.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): The House of Lords sat for judicial business in 1899 on seventy-one days, and in 1900 on eighty-six days. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council sat for judicial business in 1899 on ninety days, and in 1900 on seventy-four days.

SCOTTISH MEDICAL OFFICERS OF HEALTH.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, as representing the Secretary for Scotland, if he will state the number of medical officers of health appointed in Scotland to districts other than burghs since the 1st January, 1898, and will he say how many of these medical officers hold a public health diploma.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): Five medical officers of health holding a public health diploma have been appointed in Scotland to districts other than burghs since the 1st January, 1898. In addition seventeen appointments have been made by district local authorities, but as the medical men

did not possess the statutory qualifications, the appointments were not in terms of the Public Health Acts and were not recognised by the Local Government Board.

CONGESTION IN ROSS AND CROMARTY.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, as representing the Secretary for Scotland, seeing that up to the 9th May last the Congested Districts Board had purchased land in Sutherlandshire and also in Inverness-shire for the settlement of the people, will he explain why the Board have not acquired land in Ross and Cromarty, especially in view of the congestion in some parts of the county,

notably in Island of Lewis, and of the repeated applications for land which have been made both by the people and the representative bodies acting on their behalf.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The Board have not been able to acquire any land in the counties of Ross and Cromarty which is suitable for the formation of crofters' holdings. Acting on the suggestion of the Board, the proprietor of Lewis offered the Board to feu a field of seven acres near Stornoway, on which it was proposed to create holdings for fishermen, giving them about a quarter of an acre each for a garden. The Board offered to pay for the cost of enclosures, roads, drains, etc., and to give advances to enable the cottars to erect dwellings. The field was most suitable for the purpose, and the Board was led to believe that there was a large demand for fishermen's holdings of this sort, but when applications were invited only one was received.

MR. WEIR was understood to ask if £5 per acre was not being charged for land which was absolutely useless to the people.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I am not aware of it.

MR. WEIR: Well, it is a fact.

IRISH MACKEREL FISHING INDUSTRY.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the import duty on mackerel into Russia is higher than that on herrings, and whether efforts have been made to get this inequality reduced with a view to opening a new market for the Irish mackerel fishing industry; whether the Congested Districts Board has endeavoured to open fresh markets in Asia Minor for smoked and salted fish, and will he state what efforts are now being made by the Department or by the Congested Districts Board to open fresh markets for the Irish mackerel fishing industry, the success of which is of such importance to the western and south-western districts of Ireland.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The reply to both queries in the first paragraph is in the affirmative. The Congested Districts Board will inquire into the possibility of opening fresh markets in Asia Minor. The Board endeavoured last year to open a market in Irish inland towns, but without success. The Department of Agriculture is making inquiries with the object of developing the foreign markets for picked mackerel. Owing to the large and steady supply of fresh fish, there does not appear to be any prospect of developing a trade in home markets.

CO. MAYO POLICE FORCE,

DR. AMBROSE (Mayo, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the number of police stationed in county Mayo in each year from 1895 to 1900, inclusive; how many extra police have been employed during that period, and at what cost, and how many extra police are employed in county Mayo at present.

MR. WYNDHAM: 486, 500, 473, 470, 468, and 487, respectively. An extra force of fifty men was employed in the county from March, 1898, to May, 1900, at a cost to the rates of £3,739 10s. 4d. There have been no extra police in the county since May, 1900.

DR. AMBROSE: What has become of the extra police who were employed there?

AN HON. MEMBER: They are in Belfast.

[MR. WYNDHAM made no reply.]

DR. AMBROSE: I will put the question down for to-morrow.

MR. WYNDHAM: They have gone back to their duties elsewhere.

DR. AMBROSE: Does it not follow, then, that some place is over-policed?

[No answer was given.]

IRISH UNION AMALGAMATION.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state what steps the Local Government Board are taking to promote amalgamation of unions, and to remove any legal difficulties that may stand in the way; what action has been taken on the Local Government Board's Sanitary Order of the 4th of May, 1900, with respect to the appointment of a responsible sanitary officer in each group of unions, and will he say whether parties holding offices in county infirmaries are eligible as deriving their salaries from the poor rate for the office of poor law guardian.

MR. WYNDHAM: The general question of the amalgamation of unions is engaging the attention of the Local Government Board; investigations in the matter are now in progress. The provision in the Order of May, 1900, with respect to the appointment of a medical superintendent officer of health has not been acted upon in any case. The opportunity to act upon it will only arise as vacancies occur in the office of consulting officer. I am unable to reply to the second paragraph; the point is one for determination in a court of law.

EVICCTIONS IN IRELAND.

DR. AMBROSE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the number of families that have been evicted in Ireland between the years 1886 and 1900 inclusive, also the number of persons in each family.

MR. WYNDHAM: The total number of families evicted in the period of fifteen years mentioned was 20,352. There are no records of the number of persons included in the evicted families. The number of families remaining out of their holdings is not, of course, correctly represented by these statistics, since a very large proportion of them have been restored to their farms.

SLIGO MAGISTRACY.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that magistrates holding His Majesty's commission of the peace for the county of Sligo, especially those appointed between the years 1892 and 1896, are prohibited by a rule of the Lord Chancellor from adjudicating outside certain prescribed districts; and whether, in view of the fact that quite recently two paid resident magistrates appeared at the ordinary petty sessions court at Tubbercurry, in that county, when the principal business was the hearing of trivial charges preferred against two respectable persons, he will abolish that rule, or else modify it, so that the area of adjudication for county magistrates be extended.

MR. WYNDHAM: The practice is that magistrates, when about to be appointed, should state what petty sessions courts they purpose to attend. It was adopted long before the year 1892, and has been found to be necessary, in order to make

proper provision for the manning of the petty sessions bench and the due administration of justice. The practice has no application to resident magistrates. It is not proposed to modify it.

LISBURN DISTURBANCES;MR. TREWS SPEECHES.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in a case of being disorderly in the street brought against a man named M'Grogan, in the Lisburn town court on Thursday last, Sergeant Fullerton, who prosecuted, swore that a man named Trew had used strong language against Roman Catholics in the Market Square on the previous Saturday night when preaching, which incited M'Grogan to disorder, and which he considered

provocative; is he aware that the chairman of the court, Dr. McKenzie, said that Trew should be summoned, condemned his language as hurtful to Roman Catholic feeling, and discharged M'Grogan; and can he say if Trew is the same person who is alleged to have incited to the riots in Belfast on the 9th instant and subsequent dates; if so, has the suggestion of the Lisburn magistrates, that Trew should be summoned, been acted on, or is it the intention of the Crown to prosecute him for his language in Lisburn?

MR. WYNDHAM: Trew is the person charged with inciting to riot in Belfast; for this a prosecution has already been directed against him, in which it is possible that this speech, made in Lisburn, may be given in evidence. I must, therefore, decline to enter more fully into the matter, as it is involved in a pending prosecution.

UNITED IRISH LEAGUE PLACARDS.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state by what authority and under whose direction Constable Hallisey acted in tearing down a poster convening a meeting of the United Irish League at Shanballymore on Sunday last, the 16th instant; and, seeing that the poster did not contain anything of an illegal or intimidatory nature, will the police be instructed to abstain in future from interference with meetings of the United Irish League at Shanballymore.

MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member has not been correctly informed. The placard referred to was not torn down by the police. No instructions of the nature mentioned in the second paragraph are necessary.

IRISH INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION BOARD;PREPARATORY GRADE PRIZES.

MR. MURNAGHAN (Tyrone, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been drawn to the new rule of the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland whereby the custom of awarding prizes and exhibitions in the preparatory grade is to be discontinued after the present year, and having regard to the effect that this change will have on poor pupils since rewards are reserved for students of fifteen years of age, and with the view of preventing the loss of benefits of secondary education to the children of those in humble circumstances, whether he will ask the Commissioners to reconsider their decision in this matter.

MR. WYNDHAM: In discontinuing the custom of giving prizes and exhibitions

directly to the students in the preparatory grade, the Board of Intermediate Education was strongly influenced by the weight of evidence given before the recent Commission on Intermediate Education as to the danger of educational over-pressure at an early age. The Board, however, have taken power in Rule No. 42 of the new rules to assign to managers of schools a sum of money, not exceeding £;1 for each student who shall have passed in the preparatory grade, as a prize fund to the school, to be applied according to a scheme to be approved by the Board.

CORK COUNTY POOR RATE COLLECTORS.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork, Mid) I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state in what manner the lodgments are made by the collectors of poor rate in Cork County, and whether the sums collected by them are lodged to the credit of the county council at the close of the half-year or as they are received from the ratepayers, and, if the latter course is adopted, can he say by what method the interest which accrues on these lodgments is allocated amongst the different unions, and how many collectors have lodged their collections in banks different from the accredited treasurers of the county council, and whether this proceeding is sanctioned by the Local Government Board.

MR. WYNDHAM: The secretary to the county council states that the collectors are required to lodge their collections to the credit of the council fortnightly, or oftener when the sums collected amount to £;100. The county at large is credited with the interest on

the lodgments, and it would not be practicable to allocate the interest to particular districts. The collectors of one union, instead of lodging the moneys to the credit of the council, lodged them to their own credit with a branch treasurer. This irregularity was corrected by the county council, who did not, however, bring it under the notice of the Local Government Board.

PROTECTION OF IRISH DAIRY INDUSTRY.

MR. O'SHEE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been drawn to recent prosecutions in England indicating that foreign products, such as bacon, butter, and eggs, are sold as Irish products; whether the Department of Agriculture in Ireland has made any representations to the English Board of Agriculture as to the necessity for a more energetic and stringent enforcement of the law in this matter; and whether, if this cannot be otherwise secured, the Department of Agriculture in Ireland has power to devote a portion of its income to the payment of special inspectors for the detection of such frauds in the chief centres of population in England and Scotland; if so, whether it will consider the advisability of doing so.

MR. WYNDHAM: The answer to the first paragraph is in the affirmative. The Department has been in correspondence with the English Board of Agriculture in regard to butter frauds. The Irish Department has recently increased its staff of transit inspectors, who are required to protect the interests of Irish produce both in transit and on sale, in Great Britain as well as in Ireland.

WEST AND SOUTH CLARE RAILWAY TAXES.

MR. DUFFY (Galway, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant

of Ireland whether he is aware that the electoral divisions of Dromane, Inniscaltra North, and Mount Shannon, in the Scariff rural district, have been called upon to pay taxes in connection with the working of the West and South Clare Railways, although the divisions named are comprised in the South Galway Parliamentary Division,

and therefore not included in the list of guaranteeing baronies; and, seeing that the Local Government Board informed the Clare County Council on 27th April last that the said divisions could not be legally taxed in connection with the working of these railways, and that they have already paid a portion of the baronial taxes, whether he will cause directions to be issued to the proper authority, informing them that, in striking the next rate for these particular divisions, a remission should be made, amounting to the sum already illegally levied from them.

MR. WYNDHAM: The facts are as stated in the question. The Board informed the Council that, in its opinion, the electoral divisions referred to are not legally liable for any portion of the guarantees in respect of the South Clare or West Clare Railway. The Board will suggest to the Council the desirability of remitting the rate already assessed upon these divisions.

CONGESTION IN THE BAWNBOY RURAL DISTRICT.

MR. M'GOVERN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to a resolution of the Bawnboy Rural District Council asking the Local Government Board to have several electoral districts in the Bawnboy rural district scheduled under the Congested Districts Act, and what steps, if any, have been taken to comply with the resolution.

MR. WYNDHAM: Legislation would be necessary to enlarge the area of districts at present scheduled as congested.

IRISH FISHERY COMMISSION;MR. LANE'S APPOINTMENT.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether Mr. Lane, the temporary Fishery Commissioner recently appointed in Ireland, was required to pass any examination to test his fitness for the office; and, if not, will he be required to pass an examination before he is permanently appointed; and whether he can say what qualifications or practical experience in fishing industry this gentleman has had, or in what industrial pursuit he has been engaged during his life.

The following question was also on the Paper.;

*MR. SHEEHAN (Cork, Mid): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state now long it is intended to continue Mr. Lane in the position of temporary inspector of fisheries in Ireland; and, seeing that, in addition to his qualifications on account of having assisted Mr. Green in a survey of the deep sea fisheries, the development of the Irish fisheries requires the care and attention of inspectors possessing expert knowledge, whether he will take steps to secure that a gentleman of practical experience and proper training shall be elected to fill the vacancy caused by the retirement of Mr. Cecil Roche.

MR. WYNDHAM: I will at the same time reply to the question of the hon. Member for Mid Cork. Examinations are not held for the post of Fishery Inspector. Mr.

Lane was not, therefore, examined. The question of making a permanent appointment has not arisen. I have already stated that Mr. Lane has special knowledge of deep sea and inland fisheries. He was not appointed as an expert in fisheries, but mainly because of his business training and experience, and with a view to assist the Department in the development of the fisheries on their commercial and industrial side. The fisheries branch of the Department is already sufficiently strong in expert officers.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: The right hon. Gentleman has not said in what industrial pursuit this gentleman has been engaged during his life.

MR. WYNDHAM: I believe he has been in business as a brewer.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: Is it intended that he shall pass any test examination before he is permanently appointed?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! That has nothing to do with the question.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: With all respect, Sir, it is part of the question on the Paper.

MR. WYNDHAM: The question of a permanent appointment does not arise. I decline to commit the Government to make the appointment permanent.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: Is it not a fact that civil service clerks have to pass an examination before appointment?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member is now arguing the question.

INTIMIDATION IN COUNTY SLIGO.

COLONEL M'CALMONT (Antrim, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received letters from Mr. Charles Phibbs, of the County Sligo, stating that, as a consequence of taking a grazing farm from Lord Harlech, he was at once deserted by all his farm hands; that, with one exception, they refused the offer of higher wages, saying that if they remained they might be murdered; that the local blacksmith refused to do any work for him; that the only man remaining in his employment has been threatened; and that a draper in Bally-mote has given his assistants instructions not to supply his family with any goods; whether he is aware that since these letters were written Mr. Phibbs has been boycotted; and whether under these circumstances the Government will take steps to protect Mr. Phibbs.

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes, Sir; the letters referred to have been received by me, but I had full cognisance of the facts apart from communications. Mr. Phibbs will be provided with ample protection.

COLONEL M'CALMONT: Has not Mr. Phibbs been denounced by what is known as the Irish National League; and, if so, is he to be compelled in the future to live under the rule of that body, or will Government protect him?

MR. O'DOWD: Was not Mr. Phibbs ostracised by his own party some years ago?

MR. CONOR O'KELLY (Mayo, N.): Is it not the fact that almost every concession wrung from Irish landlords of late years has;

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

CAPTAIN DONELAN: May I ask;

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! If any further questions are to be asked notice must be given in the ordinary way.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: But;

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

CAPTAIN DONELAN: It is only very short, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member must accept my decision, whether he thinks it right or wrong.

IRISH COUNCILS AND DIRECT LABOUR.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the county and district councils may forthwith formulate schemes for the employment of direct labour, in anticipation of the Provisional Order which will come into operation in 1st April, 1902; and, if so, whether he will direct the Local Government Board to so advise the several councils.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Provisional Order cannot be acted upon till it is confirmed by Parliament. The Board will circulate the Order as soon as it becomes law, and will advise the councils as to the preliminary steps which may be taken for the purpose of putting the Order in force on the appointed day.

MR. CULLINAN: Cannot the councils take the preliminary steps before the 1st April?

MR. WYNDHAM: They must wait until Parliament has confirmed the Provisional Order, which I hope will be not many days hence.

*MR. SHEEHAN: Will the Right hon. Gentleman direct or request the Local Government Board for Ireland, when the Provisional Order is confirmed, to intimate to the County and District Councils that they may proceed to formulate schemes for the employment of direct labour.

MR. WYNDHAM: As soon as the Order is confirmed the Local Government Board will take action on it.

INFRINGEMENTS OF IRISH FISHERY LAWS.

MR. O'MARA: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will grant a Return for the years 1890 to 1900 inclusive of prosecutions undertaken in Ireland of infringement of the fishery laws by masters of beam or otter trawl vessels round the coast of Ireland.

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes, Sir; the Return will be granted.

MAIDEN QUARTER SESSIONS IN IRELAND.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland if the sheriff of a county is bound to attend at quarter sessions in Ireland for the purpose of presenting white gloves to the presiding judge when absolute crimelessness prevails in a district; and, if so, what is the explanation of the absence of the sheriff of Kerry from the quarter sessions at present being held at Killarney, and the last quarter sessions held three months ago, at both of which there was no criminal business to be disposed of.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): The sheriff is not under any obligation such as is suggested. The explanation of his absence on the occasions referred to is stated in the question, namely, that there were not any prisoners or traverses for trial.

FITZGERALD ESTATE, CO. WESTMEATH.

MR. DILLON: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether he will state why the receiver on the Fitzgerald estate, in the county Westmeath, has been

ordered to sue for the hanging gale, and whether he has sanctioned this proceeding.

MR. ATKINSON: This estate is under the jurisdiction of the Land Court. No proceedings have been taken by the receiver, and will not be taken unless by the direction of the land judge. The executive Government has no control in the matter.

DUBLIN POLICE COURT PINES.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether he can state how much of the £;5,760 16s. 5d. levied as fines and costs in the Dublin police courts in the year 1899 was distributed amongst local bodies, and if he can name the local bodies to whom the money was paid.

MR. ATKINSON: The allocation of the sums paid to local bodies out of the amount mentioned in the question was as follows:;To the Dublin Corporation, £;479 17s. 3d.; to the Pembroke Urban District Council, £;30 19s. 2d.; to the Rathmines Urban District Council, £;10 3s. 5d.; and to the Drumcondra Urban District Council, £;4 2s. 0d.

AUDIT OF IRISH PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can see his way to have the present arrangements altered so that in future the accounts of the Irish public departments may be audited permanently in Dublin.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: In the case of certain accounts where access is required to books and documents which cannot conveniently be transmitted to the Audit Office a local test is already made. So far as is known, no inconvenience arises from the transmission of accounts from Ireland and their audit in London. If the examination of the Irish accounts were conducted locally by officers under the direction of the Comptroller and Auditor General, great practical inconvenience would result from the necessity of referring questions to London before bringing them to the notice of the Dublin accounting officers, while the opportunity at present available to the Comptroller and Auditor General of personal conference with his officers would be wanting.

CLONES POSTAL STAFF;FREE MEDICAL ATTENDANCE.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that, although established sorting and telegraph clerks are entitled to free medical attendance, the sorting and telegraph clerks at Clones do not enjoy this privilege; and whether, seeing that a number of post offices in England which do not possess a more numerous: postal staff, have a post office doctor, the same right may be extended to the officials in Clones.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Free medical attendance is supplied only at offices at which the Department has appointed a medical officer, and Clones is not one of those offices. The question of appointing a medical officer at Clones is now under consideration.

IRISH LIGHTS.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that about two years ago the Irish Lights Commission agreed to remodel the Maiden Lights by erecting a new and improved light on the rock

adjacent to the course of the mail steamers, which are now larger and faster; also to place a large buoy at Hunter's Rock and Highlandman's Rock, and to put a fog signal on the main land; and, seeing that many accidents have occurred, and that the Larne and Belfast Harbour Commissioners made repeated applications to have these improvements carried out, whether he will take measures to have them completed before the coming winter.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The Trinity House on the 15th instant notified to the Board of Trade their approval of a proposal by the Commissioners of Irish Lights to improve the light at the East Maidens, and the scheme is now being considered by the Board of Trade. But the cost of the work is not included in the Estimates for the current year. I am informed that a buoy will be placed at Highland Rock in a few weeks time, while the description of buoy to be placed at Hunter's Rock is under consideration. The Lighthouse authorities are of opinion that it would not be desirable to put a fog-signal near the Maidens, and the nautical adviser to the Board of Trade concurs in this view.

IRISH UNIVERSITY COMMISSION.

MR. MORRIS: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is yet in a position to state the terms of reference to the Royal Commission on University Education in Ireland, and the names of the gentlemen who are to serve on the same.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Within the last hour or two I have been placed in a position to answer my hon. friend's question, and I am very sorry, for reasons which will suggest themselves to all interested in this matter, that I have not been able at an earlier date to give any information to the House on this subject. The reference to the Commission is in the following terms;

"To inquire into the present condition of the higher general and technical education available in Ireland outside Trinity College, Dublin, and to report as to what reforms, if any, are desirable in order to render that education adequate to the needs of the Irish people."

The members of the Commission are twelve. The Chairman is Lord Robertson, formerly a well-known Member of this House as Lord Advocate, late Lord Justice General, and now one of the Lords of Appeal in Ordinary. I will read the other names in alphabetical order; Professor Butcher, late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, Fellow of University College, Oxford, and Professor of Greek in Edinburgh University; the Roman Catholic Bishop of Clonfert, Senator of the Royal University of Ireland; Professor Ewing, Professor of Mechanism and applied Mechanics, Cambridge University; Sir Richard Jebb, a Member of this House, Regius Professor of Greek in Cambridge University; Mr. Justice Madden, well-known to Members of this House; Lord Ridley, Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford; Professor Rhys, Professor of Celtic in Oxford University, and Principal of Jesus College Oxford; Professor Rucker, Fellow and late secretary of the Royal Society, Professor of Physics at the Royal College of Science, London, and one of our most distinguished physicists; Professor J. Lorrain Smith, Professor of Pathology and Bacteriology in Queen's College, Belfast; Mr. Starkie, Resident Commissioner of National Education in Ireland, and formerly President of Queen's College, Galway; and Mr. Wilfrid Ward, late Examiner in Mental and Moral Science

at the Royal University of Ireland. Of these twelve, four are Irishmen and resident in Ireland, the rest are resident in Great Britain. Three are Roman Catholics, and the other nine are Protestants.

OLD AGE PENSIONS.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he has received a unanimous resolution passed at the annual meeting of the delegates of the Hearts of Oak Benefit Society, recommending that the State should provide a scheme of old age pensions, commencing at the age of sixty-five, of not less than 5s. per week, to persons who have been members of a thrift society for at least twenty years; and whether he can fall in with their desire.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have received the document to which the hon. Gentleman refers. He can hardly expect me to make any announcement on the subject of old age pensions at the present moment.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES: Does the right hon. Gentleman wish me to convey that answer to a quarter of a million electors?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have conveyed it by giving the answer myself.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACTS AMENDMENT (EXPENSES).

Committee to consider of authorising the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of any expenses incurred by the Secretary of State under any Act of the present session to amend the Factory and Workshops Acts (King's Recommendation signified), to-morrow.;(Mr. Secretary Ritchie.)

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend the law relating to County Courts in Ireland." County Courts (Ireland) Bill [Lords]

NEW BILL.

YOUTHFUL OFFENDERS.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): I have to ask leave to introduce a Bill to amend the law relating to youthful offenders and for other purposes connected therewith. The object of the Bill is, as far as possible, to protect young people from being contaminated by the influences of prisons and workhouses. The House will remember that a similar Bill came down from the House of Lords last session, but, while the provisions of the Bill as a whole were generally acceptable, there was one provision, that relating to the whipping of young prisoners, which met with a considerable amount of opposition, and the Bill in consequence did not proceed any further. I do not desire that the other extremely useful provisions of a measure of that kind should be shipwrecked upon that rock again, and therefore I have from the present Bill omitted that clause, but retain in the Bill all those provisions which would have a very considerable indirect influence in preventing young persons going to prison. I need not detain the House at any length by describing the provisions of the present Bill. There is a provision that children and young persons who are on remand, or waiting trial, instead of being sent to prison or to the workhouse, should be committed to the charge of some reliable person, who will be responsible for the production of the individual whenever necessary. The children will be committed to houses set apart for that purpose, and I believe that already in various parts of the Metropolis houses are available for

carrying out this provision. According to last year's Bill, if a parent or guardian had conducted to the child's offence by neglect he was made liable to a fine of £5. In the present Bill the parent or guardian is made individually responsible for the whole of the fine and costs which may be inflicted on the child if he is shown to have contributed to the offence by neglect. We also amend the machinery for the recovery of parental contributions towards the maintenance of a child or young person who has been sent to a reformatory or industrial school. At present the law is found in practice to be very inefficient, and it is very hard in a great number of cases to recover these contributions completely or even at all. The indirect effect of this and the former provision will be to induce parents and guardians to make every effort to prevent children from coming within the meshes of the law. There is another provision in the Bill which has been asked for many times by the representatives of Ireland. It deals with the unsatisfactory state of the law in Ireland with regard to the committal of young persons to reformatories. The law is not clear, but it seems to have been held that young persons in Ireland cannot be committed to reformatories unless they have previously been sent to prison. By altering this the Bill will assimilate the law in Ireland to the law in England in this respect. I hope and believe that these provisions will receive the general assent of the House, and that with the assistance of the House we shall be enabled to pass the Bill into law in the present session.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.): This is a subject in which I have always taken a great deal of interest, and I would ask the right hon. Gentleman whether this Bill will deal with the most serious part of the matter. In the case of a trifling offence, where a small fine of 1s. or 2s. 6d. is imposed, costs of £1, and sometimes of £2 or £3, follow upon the certificate of the magistrate, and only too frequently the parent, who is ready to pay the fine, may be utterly unable to pay the costs. I hope the right hon. Gentleman in his Bill will deal with that. The costs cannot be imposed under Lord Cross's Act unless there is a certificate given by the magistrate, but my observation leads me to believe that, unfortunately, the certificate is given almost as a matter of course.

Bill to amend the Law relating to Youthful Offenders, and for other purposes connected therewith, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Secretary Ritchie, Mr. Solicitor General, and Mr. Jesse Collings.

YOUTHFUL OFFENDERS BILL.

"To amend the Law relating to Youthful Offenders, and for other purposes connected therewith," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 221.]

FINANCE BILL.

Considered in Committee;
(In the Committee.)

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

Clause 2::

MR. FLOWER (Bradford, W.) moved an Amendment having for its object the exclusion of "His Majesty's colonies and possessions" from the proposed tax. He said the

proposal he would make later on, if the Committee accepted this Amendment, to give the colonies preferential terms by admitting their imports of sugar at a reduction of 33 per cent., might be approached from two points of view. In the first place it might be looked upon from the point of view of giving help to the colonial sugar industry. Practically he suggested that colonial sugar should pay 2d. where foreign sugar paid 3d. The market for colonial sugar in this country, under the operation of European bounties, had gradually fallen away almost to nothing. By the adoption of his proposal the market for colonial sugar would gradually revive, and cane sugar would take the place of foreign beet sugar in this country, a result which he was sure the House, without distinction of party, would welcome. Our West Indian colonies, which had been reduced from prosperity almost to the verge of bankruptcy, would become once more self-supporting and prosperous parts of the Empire. Time and again the condition of the West Indies had been brought before the House. It was an old and a very sad story. In answer to a question put to him on 29th April last the Colonial Secretary stated that, including the sum in this year's Estimates, the financial assistance which had been given to the West Indies amounted to about £320,000 in five years in carrying out recommendations. That was in addition to £82,000 given in relief of distress caused by the hurricane in 1898. He certainly thought the West Indies should receive from this country better consideration in view of the fact that in the course of the next few years the American market would show the outlook to be even more dreary than it was at present. He could not help thinking that if by some means of adjustment of our fiscal relations we could do something to avoid on one hand the continual giving of doles to the West Indies and at the same time assist them to revive what was their natural and profitable industry, the growth of sugar, we should be devoting ourselves to a cause at once practical, profitable, and patriotic. The loss of revenue from the proposal which he made would not amount to more than £60,000 if the imports were on the scale of last year, and the ultimate increase in importation would be gradual. One objection that was raised by the Chancellor of the Exchequer was the danger of fraudulent imports of foreign sugar being brought into this country as colonial. There was no commodity whose origin was more easy to trace than sugar. Did the Chancellor of the Exchequer seriously maintain that Germany could send huge quantities of sugar to Queensland or Jamaica and then be able to re-ship it as colonial sugar? Could that be done without the colonies knowing all about it? Would the colonies connive at it, or would it even pay Germany to do so? Was it seriously contended that sugar importers would arrange to forge bills of lading so that a cargo coming from France would appear in the ship's papers as hailing from Barbados? He submitted that such a contention could not seriously be entertained. There was a third objection which could be raised, and that was that the granting of this preference to colonial sugar would be an infringement of free trade. But was it not the acme of Cobdenite pedantry to object to freer trade in sugar between the colonies and the mother country? His Amendment did not propose to put an import duty on sugar, it only provided that certain import duties should be lower in the case of sugar coming from

British colonies than on that coming from foreign countries. British disciples of free trade had objected to countervailing duties against bounty-fed sugar because they would not have any import duty imposed on commodities; but when there was an import duty, surely they ought not to object to any reduction of it.

There was a question connected with this matter of sugar which it was almost impossible to avoid touching upon, he meant the question of bounties. He did not want to enter at length upon that question that day, partly because he quite understood it was a matter of the utmost difficulty and delicacy, as any one would realise who had read the French papers of the previous day; and partly because anything that might be said in the House of Commons might hamper the course of His Majesty's Government during the next few months; a course which he hoped they would enter upon with a strong desire and an earnest sympathy to do all that they possibly could for colonial sugar production. He would only say on this matter that he really did not see why they should not have preferential duties and the abolition of the bounties as well. The colonies needed badly all the help they could get, while he believed the bounty-giving States, particularly Germany, the most powerful of all, were heartily sick of the increasing drain on their treasuries involved in the bounty policy, and he fancied they were willing enough to withdraw the bounties whenever they could. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Montrose, in a speech of power, eloquence, and ability which everyone of them admired, spoke about some inevitable consequences of the increasing expenditure of the country and amongst them the right hon. Gentleman said that it would be inevitable for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to widen his net. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had widened his net in the present case, and had re-introduced the tax upon sugar. The one great object that he had in moving his Amendment was to urge the Chancellor of the Exchequer to seriously consider whether in the imposition of fresh customs duties, he would look at the advisability of minimising the operation of these duties on goods which came to us from His Majesty's colonies and possessions. The case of Canada had been mentioned by his hon. friend the Member for Sheffield. Canada had carried out a proposal which had extorted enthusiasm from us all; but, after all, he did not suppose we really built up an empire entirely by enthusiasm. He did not imagine that we consolidated our position merely by expressions of goodwill. Something more solid and practical than that was required; and he submitted to the Chancellor of the Exchequer that, in view not only of what Canada had done, but of what Australia was capable of doing, that he should make a serious attempt to consider the question of an inter-Empire preferential tariff. The question as regarded sugar was of the first importance in this matter, because Queensland and the other Australian colonies were exceedingly anxious to develop an English market, and such a proposal as he had made would be a great encouragement to them. If our colonies, as exemplified in the case of Canada, and as illustrated by the hesitating and waiting attitude of Australia, were prepared to meet us, ought we not to be prepared to meet them? He did not ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer to plunge into the fiscal war; he should be sorry indeed to urge him on

that course; but, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer had to spread his net further and further in search of additional revenue, he should see whether it would not be advisable to give preferential terms to our colonies. This was a question which would grow more and more acute in this country. He knew that a deep interest was taken in this question by the working classes of the West Riding of Yorkshire, and he was convinced that they felt, when the colonies were coming to us in a spirit of such loyal co-operation in our military difficulties in South Africa, and also in a spirit of willing and loyal co-operation in Imperial affairs generally, and for commercial federation, that the time was ripe for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to respond to their proposal in a sympathetic spirit, and to encourage the gradual formation of inter-Empire trade, which, he believed, would be the surest basis for the future consolidation of the Empire.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 2, line 3, after the word 'Ireland,' to insert the words, 'save from His Majesty's colonies or possessions.'"; (Mr. Flower.)

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

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): My hon. friend who has brought this very important subject before the attention of the Committee commenced his remarks with an observation with which all of us will sympathise. He regretted the present position of our West Indian colonies, and recommended his Amendment to the Committee mainly on the ground that its adoption would afford substantial relief and a prospect of improvement to those colonies which, in his judgment, nothing else would afford. I hope that my hon. friend will not for a moment suppose that I fail to sympathise with such a desire. I think that I have given practical proof of that desire in the large grants, amounting to £320,000, for the purposes of relief which have been presented to Parliament during the last five years for the benefit of the West Indian colonies. My hon. friend proposes that this sugar duty, imposed solely with the object of raising revenue which is sorely needed, and which will be paid by the consumer here and not by the producer, should be levied in such a way as to extract one-third less from sugar coming from the colonies than from sugar coming from foreign countries. There I must join issue with my hon. friend. I cannot believe it would benefit this country or benefit the West Indies to adopt that policy. It is the policy of forty years ago, and it was abandoned after long trial as benefiting neither this country nor our colonial possessions. Let me address myself to the arguments which my hon. friend adduces. In the first place, he said this would deprive the Exchequer of very little revenue, and that is quite true so far as the present is concerned; but, in passing, I ask my hon. friend to consider what the effect of adopting his proposal would be. It would not only deprive the Exchequer of a third of the revenue on sugar coming from British possessions; it would also impose that third upon the consumers of sugar in this country, for it is obviously clear that consumers here would pay just as much for colonial sugar paying two-thirds duty as for foreign sugar paying the full duty. Therefore, while depriving the Exchequer of a certain

amount of duty it would also take that amount out of the pocket of the home consumer for the benefit of the colonial producer. That is my hon. friend's object. But he would not have proposed this Amendment if he desired that the financial effect should continue to be a small one. His desire is to encourage the production of sugar in our colonies, and to replace foreign sugar in this country by sugar produced in our colonial possessions. Therefore, he would be glad to see the day when a third of the whole revenue from sugar would be lost to the Exchequer to pass into the pockets of colonial producers. But I do not believe that anything of the kind would happen, and I will tell my hon. friend why. He ridicules the idea of any possible fraud in connection with these preferential duties. He asked how was it possible that sugar could be sent from Germany or France to Jamaica in order to be re-exported to this country as colonial sugar. I agree with him. Sugar is too bulky and freight too dear for that operation. But Cuba is almost within sight of Jamaica, other West India Islands belonging to foreign countries are very near our own possessions, and French Guiana and Dutch Guiana are very near British Guiana. If we establish this preferential duty, in view of what I have said, we should have to safeguard that system by certificates of origin, and other precautions against fraud, which were absolutely intolerable when they existed in past years, and which would be infinitely worse for the commerce of our colonies than the duty of which my hon. friend complains. Certainly I am not disposed to embark on such a policy as that, with the idea that it would benefit our colonies, because I believe it would be injurious to our colonial trade. My hon. friend in one part of his speech showed the true meaning of his proposal. It is not merely a proposal to aid the West Indies. My hon. friend admitted it to be the commencement of a new fiscal policy for this country. If we adopt it with regard to sugar we should have to follow it out with regard to tea, with regard to spirits, and with regard to every other colonial product to be found on the tariff.

MR. FLOWER said he only suggested the Amendment to apply to newly imposed duties.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I do not see how it would be possible to make distinctions in the treatment of colonial products. If one colony producing a certain article is relieved of a third of the duty, then other colonies producing other articles would also claim to be similarly relieved. If my hon. friend's proposal were to succeed there would be a very material reduction in the yield of our customs revenue. That would have to be made up by the imposition of new customs duties, in which the same principles must be followed. Suppose we put a duty on corn, flour, timber, wool, or meat, Canada would ask us to levy it on all corn and flour not produced in Canada which we import, and similarly with Canadian timber, Australian wool, meat from New Zealand, and so on to every article which we import into this country and to which we should have to give this preference for colonial produce. And what would be the effect of such duties on the cost of living, and therefore on the cost of production here? Would it not seriously injure our manufacturers in their competition, already hard enough, with foreign countries? But that is not all. When we have done all that, foreign countries

would come to us and say they were prepared to make the same tariff concessions to us as our colonies if they were treated on equal terms. What would be the answer of my hon. friend. Would he say to foreign countries, "Oh, yes, we will do for you what we have done for our colonies if you will give us the same advantages." Then this fiscal policy within the Empire would at once disappear and we would be caught in the meshes of the "most favoured nation" clause, which would put an end to the whole thing. But if on the other hand my hon. friend said to foreign countries, No, you are not our colonies, we cannot give you the same treatment. What then? Our export trade to foreign countries is more than double what it is to our colonies, and are we prepared to risk the loss of that trade by declining to give foreign countries in return for the same concessions the treatment we give to our colonies? I would warn the Committee that I am aware that even while I am speaking there is a strong feeling in Germany on this subject, and that if Parliament were so ill advised as to adopt the policy of my hon. friend we should run the serious risk of losing the "most favoured nation" treatment for our commerce with Germany which we now enjoy. Having regard to what I have said, I trust the Committee will refrain from imposing on future Chancellors of the Exchequer such difficult conditions as suggested by my hon. friend. I believe that they would be injurious both to the mother country and to the colonies. I say that not from any antiquated notions of free trade to which my hon. friend has alluded, but for the reasons that I have endeavoured shortly to place before the Committee. I will not detain the Committee further, except to say that I trust that the desire to assist the West Indies will not lead them into a path which would, to my mind, lead to as great a fiscal mistake as we could make. It would be the reversal of a policy which has been successful in promoting our trade and commerce with our colonies and with foreign countries for the last forty years.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central) said he regretted the speech which had just been made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. It was most unfortunate that the Secretary of State for the Colonies was unavoidably absent. The right hon. Gentleman had made many speeches upon the commerce of the Empire, and through them all there ran the thought that the real foundation of the unity of the Empire lay in the development of its commercial policy. He would quote one extract from the Secretary of State for the Colonies;

"Experience has taught us that this closer union could be more hopefully approached in the first instance on its commercial side."

When the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his Budget speech announced his intention to impose an import duty on sugar, he professed anxiety to do something practical to restore the refineries in this country and to revive the sugar industry in our colonies. The right hon. Gentleman stated to-night the enormous loss which the foreign bounty system had imposed on the Empire, and he also referred to the £400,000 granted to the West Indies during the last five years. That was entirely on account of the depression caused by foreign bounties. Here was the opportunity to save the taxpayers from these repeated grants, because everyone who had the slightest knowledge of the West Indies must know that that £400,000 had been paid by the taxpayers of this country to

relieve the West Indies, and although there might have been some advantage in the cheapness of sugar, they paid away with one hand what they saved with the other. No one believed that the grants which had been made to the West Indies for the past five years would not have to be renewed from time to time if the policy of the Chancellor of the Exchequer of doing nothing to develop the trade of the Empire were to be pursued. He wished to call the attention of the Committee to two extracts from the report of the Strong Commission which went out to the West Indies to investigate the causes of the serious depression existing there. That Commission consisted of three very distinguished gentlemen; Sir Henry Norman, chairman; Sir David Barbour, a distinguished financial authority; and the late Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, who threw so much light on any subject with which he grappled. The Commissioners unanimously stated that they could not close their Report without expressing strong sympathy with the many persons engaged in or dependent upon the sugar industry; not only the labourers but the higher social class which had been impoverished by the depression. Sugar was very cheap, and although he thought the colonies were exceedingly grateful for the sympathy expressed with them, it would have been much more to the point if the Government of the mother country had done something practical to remove the causes of that depression, and revive an industry which had suffered so severely. The chairman of the Committee, in a separate Report, differed from his colleagues as to the policy of imposing countervailing duties on bounty supported sugar, and he urged that a duty should be levied on such sugar to an amount equal to the bounty paid upon it by any foreign Government. That was a practical remedy. Now that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was proposing a duty upon all sugar coming into the country he had an opportunity given him of which he might take advantage without violently reversing what he called the policy of this country for the past forty years, and which he would tell his right hon. friend, whether he liked it or not, was going to be reversed in the very near future. It was being reversed to-day by the action of trade unions and large bodies of working-men acting within the law who viewed with disfavour the advantages foreigners at present enjoyed in our markets. He begged his right hon. friend not to delude himself with the idea that he, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, or any other right hon. Gentleman was going to retain the system of free markets in this country without reciprocity.

His right hon. friend had an opportunity now of giving an advantage to colonial-grown sugar, but did not avail of it. Why? First of all, he said that the consumer would not get any advantage and that the price of sugar would not be lower. But that was a matter for the consumer to consider, and if any serious evil were wrought by it his right hon. friend would be able to remedy it. His hon. friend, himself, and many other hon. Gentlemen representing populous constituencies, and representing, just as much as his right hon. friend did, merchants and manufacturers, asked, with the full knowledge and authority of their constituents, that that concession should be made in favour of trade with our colonies. It was not an argument against it that the consumer would get no advantage. His right hon. friend in the course of his reply evidently thought

that the proposal, if adopted, would develop colonial trade to an enormous extent, because he contemplated a great ensuing loss to the public revenue if the policy of the Amendment were adopted in the near future. But if that were the result, his right hon. friend and his successors would be quite capable of finding new sources of revenue. His right hon. friend had had to obtain increased public revenue, and he found no difficulty whatever in doing it. He did so with the approval of the great majority of the country, and if he also adopted a policy which would develop trade with our colonies, and if the public revenue were affected thereby, he would, with the power of the people, be able to propose new duties to counterbalance the loss incurred. Then his right hon. friend said that it would be no advantage to the colonies. Would he stand up now and say that the preference granted by Canada was of no advantage to British trade?

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I do not think the hon. Member will find that any material part of the improvement in the trade between Great Britain and Canada is due to that preference, for the simple reason that the preference still leaves a protective duty as against the British manufacturer in favour of the Canadian manufacturer, and the result is that, although our trade with Canada has largely increased, the trade of the United States, which has not a similar preference, with Canada has increased almost as much as ours.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT said he supposed that trade with the United States had also largely increased. His right hon. friend would not admit that our trade with Canada increased because of the institution of a preference in favour of British goods. Was his right hon. friend acquainted with the causes which led to that increase? The facts and figures published by the Canadian Government and the statistics of the Board of Trade showed that since that preference was granted British trade with Canada had increased. He deeply regretted to hear his right hon. friend's statement. What effect would that have on the Government and people of Canada? They owed an enormous debt to Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the boldness with which he came to England and advocated the denunciation of treaties, and also upon his firm attitude during the General Election last year. Why, the Cobden Club absolutely presented their gold medal to Sir Wilfrid Laurier mainly

because of his attitude in that particular. They did not hold a dinner because, he believed, there were no funds available, but they held a meeting at which Lord Farrer and the few other gentlemen who constitute the Cobden Club were present, and they voted Sir Wilfrid Laurier their gold medal. Therefore his right hon. friend had no reason to be so much afraid as he was of the Cobden Club. Then his right hon. friend held up the bogey of Germany. It was astonishing that his right hon. friend, connected with an Imperial Government for such a long series of years, should be so frightened of foreign Governments, or of what France or Germany might say or do. He wished his right hon. friend would try to think more about his own people, about the needs of his own countrymen, the development of their own trade and of trade within the Empire. Germany could take good care of herself. She knew very well the advantages to be derived from their system. France knew it very well. Debates in the French

Chamber and articles in the French press lately showed the reason why France should not quarrel with Great Britain, and that was because she was her best customer. Great Britain bought four times more from France than France did from Great Britain. How did Germany, France, Russia, and other countries show their gratitude for the policy of free imports into this country which was maintained by his right hon. friend? By increasing their duties almost every year, and by putting greater difficulties in the way of our trade. That was the way they showed their gratitude for the policy adopted by his right hon. friend who, in the British House of Commons, said that he could not adopt the policy advocated by his hon. friend the Member for Bradford, and voiced by working men throughout the country, for fear of what Germany might say or do. Lord Salisbury had pointed out the impossibility of negotiating with foreign Governments at the present time. They could not negotiate as long as their policy was that of statesmen, he would not use any adjective, like the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who in the British House of Commons trembled at the mention of the word "Germany." They had no power to

negotiate with foreign Governments. If they wanted to negotiate with the United States the British Minister would visit the Secretary of State at Washington, with a view perhaps to having a harassing impost removed from a British import, but the Secretary of State would say that if the United States gave England the concession she asked for. England had nothing to give in return. They had lost their bargaining power. It was not a question of goodwill, but of bargaining power, and a statement like that delivered by his right hon. friend; to which he listened with the greatest grief and pain; would do infinite harm. He feared there was no hope of turning his right hon. friend aside.

His hon. friend called the attention of the Committee to the small amount of revenue involved. The amount was small, because although various parts of the Empire were admirably adapted for the cultivation of sugar, the industry was entirely ruined by the policy adopted by foreign countries. The figures were most astounding. Last year they imported from foreign countries nearly twelve million hundredweight of unrefined sugar, while they imported from British possessions only 1,377,000 hundredweight. And the right hon. Gentleman could not give this little advantage to the colonies because of his fear of upsetting the fiscal system! As regards the West Indies the matter was most serious. A large sum, £400,000, had been given to them by the taxpayers of this country during the last five years; the right hon. Gentleman had been generous in this matter, it was true; but how much better it would be to give them a chance of being prosperous as they were before, and living by their own industry, than to compel them to live on doles given to them by the English people. The statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer would have a most serious effect in the West Indies, where there was already a strong movement to have done with a country which did so little for their commercial policy and ally themselves with a great continent which made commercial policy the first point of its programme. He urged the right hon. Gentleman to consider the effect which would be produced in the West Indies by the

observations he had just made, and to which the Committee had listened with so

much regret. The right hon. Gentleman had spoken of his fear of fraud, but means could always be taken to prevent it; he was afraid of fraud owing to the proximity of the Danish, Dutch, and American Islands, but precautions could always be taken against it. The answer the Committee had received this afternoon would not only have a serious effect in the West Indies and in Canada, but also in Australia, where the question of tariffs was now being considered, Mauritius, Queensland, and other places. He greatly regretted that the right hon. Gentleman would not give the little advantage for which the hon. Member for Bradford asked, first because of his fear of Germany; secondly, because he feared it might reduce the revenue; thirdly, because he thought the consumer would not get the 2d. in the cwt.; and, fourthly, because he feared the Government would not be strong enough to prevent fraud. He could only express his intense regret that the right hon. Gentleman could not see his way to give this slight advantage to British import trade.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.): I really rise to express my sympathy with the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who has brought such a pitiless storm about his head as that which has just come from the hon. and gallant Member for Central Sheffield. The hon. and gallant Member was so choked with emotion and indignation at the conduct of the Chancellor of the Exchequer that he was almost unable to express his views, and I really trembled for the right hon. Gentleman, because I thought the hon. and gallant Member was on the point of calling him perhaps a pro-Boer! But speeches of the kind to which we have just listened really explain the true character of this motion. We know very well the opinions of the hon. and gallant Member, and we know the sincerity and have seen the fervour with which he has spoken. He talked about the feelings of the working classes on this subject. Now, I imagine the working classes know, or at all events will soon discover, that they are the persons who will have to pay the whole of this in-

creased expenditure. It is said that this enormous increased expenditure, both normal and for the war, is for the advantage of the Empire, but it is not the Empire that pays for it; it is that contemptible, miserable corner of the Empire called the United Kingdom that pays; it is the working man of the United Kingdom that pays the whole of this additional taxation. And what is the proposal with regard to those parts of the Empire that do not contribute? We all recognise the zeal and valour with which the Colonies across the seas have sent their forces to aid in this war; but the taxation for the war will not fall upon them, but upon the petty population of 40,000,000 who occupy little England. And the proposal is that the working men, on whom this taxation falls, are to have an additional burden put upon them in order to give relief to those who do not pay the taxes. ["No."] Members say "No," but it is the fact. Who is to get the advantage of this proposal? The sons of the Empire across the seas, who do not pay the interest on £150,000,000 of debt, the additional income-tax, the additional tea duty, and the additional sugar duty. We are to pay it all, and we are to make a gift to them, not only of this particular money, but the whole policy which it represents now. The working men of this country are not such fools as not to understand that perfectly well. The hon. and gallant Member

spoke about receiving reciprocity. Unhappily, I regret to say, the West Indies are not in a position to grant any reciprocity at all, and therefore this would be a gift, so far as they are concerned, without reciprocity, and when the hon. and gallant Gentleman speaks of Australia, the Bill, at all events in regard to this clause, grants no reciprocity upon their part. The views of the hon. and gallant Gentleman as to reciprocity in this matter are entire delusion. On the part of the taxpayers of this country I protest against the claim which is made in the Amendment, and the much larger policy which it portends.

Now, I will say no more upon that. The burden on the British taxpayer is heavy enough now, but it is more than likely to be a great deal heavier in the future, and therefore we cannot afford to give away revenue. If revenue is given away it must be found in some other quarter. So we may put that matter aside. The right hon. Gentleman referred to what he called the great dangers to this country. We have difficulties enough with our foreign trade already. We know that the foreign trade of this country as compared with that to British possessions is about as three to one, and we are to put to risk the whole of that trade by proposals of this kind. We must not suppose that there will not be retaliation the moment we alter the status in quo. It is all very well for the hon. and gallant Member for Central Sheffield to talk of not being afraid of Germany. The hon. gentleman is strong enough and brave enough to meet the whole German army in his own person, but when we come to business we cannot rely on his eloquence to overcome the views on trade which are entertained in the German Empire. And we may depend upon it that, not only in the German Empire, but in France and in other countries as well, this trade of ours, which is more or less in a critical position, and at this moment, is not so flourishing as we could desire, will be greatly endangered by what they might regard as a policy entirely disturbing existing relations. On these grounds I regard a motion of this character as of the most perilous description, and therefore I shall vote against it.

*MR. LAWRENCE (Liverpool, Abercromby) said he had often thought that they showed rather too much consideration as to what other nations would do or think upon the question of our taxation, and he was not prepared to follow the right hon. Gentleman as to the danger to our trade with foreign nations. Speaking with some knowledge of the West Indian colonies which were concerned with this tax, he wished first of all to thank the hon. Member who had referred to these colonies for doing so, because, with the exception of his late lamented friend Colonel Mil ward, he was the only hon. Member who had referred the subject during the time this tax upon sugar had been on the tapis. The West Indies had been suffering from a tax on sugar very patiently for many years, in the matter of the bounties, and they would continue to suffer in patience, believing that every lane had an ending, and confident that His Majesty's Government were waking up to the seriousness of their needs and the duty of the mother country towards them. The West Indies were not asking for any preference for their industry. It was true that when His Majesty's Government came forward and put another burden upon them by the tax it caused the greatest disappointment amongst them, and they were at first inclined

to resent it as thoughtless. To those hon. Gentlemen who did not understand the difficulties of the diplomatic situation it might appear inconsiderate on the part of the Government to spring this tax upon the staple industry of the West Indies; and while he sympathised with the hon. Member for Bradford, and thanked him for the sympathetic terms in which he had spoken of the condition of these colonies, he thought they were prepared to postpone to a more convenient season the great question which had been raised. They were satisfied with the opinion of His Majesty's Government, expressed in many public documents, to the effect that they believed that the bounty system was an injustice and ought to be abolished, and they looked anxiously forward to the time when the Government would do their best to negotiate with foreign Governments for the removal of those bounties. They were convinced that the industry to which those bounties were attached was perfectly able to hold its own in the markets of the world if it was fairly treated. The Chancellor of the Exchequer alluded to the fact that this country had expended within the last five years £;400,000 for the benefit of these colonies, but the amount of money we had expended in the West Indies had not been at all commensurate with the charges we had levied upon them: Those debts would never have been incurred if their industry had had legitimate treatment at the hands of the mother country. When the tax of 4d. per gallon was imposed upon rum, a very heavy impost was placed upon another important product of the West Indies, and as long as that tax remained they might consider themselves very liberally treated by contributing only £;300,000 or £;400,000 within the last five years. When gentlemen in the position of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Northumberland, and colleagues of his like Sir David Barbour were prepared to endorse that view it showed that the West Indies were justified in asking that after justice had been done them by the removal of the bounties at the hands of foreign nations the mother country should consider whether something could not be done in the direction of removing the impost upon rum. He would not detain the House any further, but he looked forward with confidence to the Government doing something in the direction he had indicated. Hope deferred had made the heart of the West Indies rather sick, and it was now time that justice should be done to them.

MR. BLAKE (Longford, S.) said he was glad that the hon. Gentlemen who had proposed and supported this motion had put their views before the Committee very clearly. It was well that this should be so, as much mischief had been done, in his opinion, by coquetting with this question. Much mischief had been done at the meetings of the Conservative organisations by opinions expressed upon this subject which had received the approval of the chiefs of the party, and which had given hope and encouragement in that quarter which could never be realised in their time. His own view was not quite that of the Chancellor of the Exchequer with reference to the advantage which a colony might receive from the adoption of the principle of preferential tariffs. He believed some considerable advantage might be derived by a colony under these conditions. But that was not the question. The question was the price at which that advantage to the colony would be obtained. The great advantage of this country, whose trade was, they were told, in a somewhat critical condition, was the soundness of its position

in reference to the question of duties. That was the great advantage of the position in which this country stood as a trading, manufacturing and carrying country. Great Britain was not dependent upon devices which rendered trade less free and interfered with its liberty

to obtain in the cheapest market whatever it wanted. They had much to fear in the future if they did not put their shoulder to the wheel. The advance made by foreign countries in technical education and the sacrifices they had made to improve their trade had produced a state of things which was not likely to render this country altogether happy. In the situation in which they were placed, to suggest that this country, instead of keeping fast by that which was good, holding to the solid element, and adding to its strength by diminishing its expenditure and duties all round, thus increasing its power as a manufacturing, trading, and carrying nation, should enter into this quixotic enterprise, which would produce disadvantages, far outweighing any possible advantages, seemed to his mind perfectly absurd. He trusted it would come to be understood that that was the definite policy of the leaders of opinion on both sides of the House. It was all very well for the hon. Member for Sheffield to say what was coming in the future. In the position in which this country stood; a state of things in which the concrete and the abstract ran together; no large departure could be made from the present system without increasing the price of raw materials. To suggest to the people of this country that a policy of this kind would have to be adopted was a sure omen for overwhelming defeat and disaster to those who brought forward such views as serious propositions for the welfare of the people.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury) said that if the Chancellor of the Exchequer could see his way to agree to the Amendment the greatest enthusiasm would be felt. He was somewhat astonished at the views expressed by his hon. friend who had last spoken, because Canada had expressed the strongest opinion that any expression of views by the House of Commons such as had now been moved would create a kindly feeling in Canada towards England; and the rejection of such a motion, after the sacrifices which Canada had made in order to show her affection for the mother country, would cause the greatest disappointment to that part of the Empire.

Before this debate ended he trusted that his right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer would make matters clear upon this point, otherwise it might be thought that they did not care about the colonies when questions of taxation arose. He hoped that his hon. friend would go to a division.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I feel strongly the kindness and goodwill shown by the action of Canada. But I think that the action itself is of far more importance on that account than on account of the actual effect it will have upon our industry.

*MR. CHARLES WILSON (Hull, W.) said that, having sat in this House for many years, he knew the opinions of the hon. and gallant Member for Central Sheffield. When the hon. and gallant Member said that "we" had heard with regret the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer he hoped the "we" represented a very limited number in the House. Personally he also represented a populous

place, and he agreed with every word the Chancellor of the Exchequer had expressed upon this matter. He looked upon this as an all-important matter. It was not a question of the West Indies only, but of the entire commercial position of this country; and if we deviated in any way from the free trade principles which had made this country great, we would make the greatest mistake; that could possibly be made. He did not wish to say a single word offensive to the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Central Sheffield. He hoped the hon. and gallant Member had received a medal last week for his services from the King. He should also be decorated with a medal by the German Emperor for his action in promoting the Merchandise Marks-Act and the cry of "Made in Germany," which had made the commerce of Germany. When a Committee of this House sat on the Merchandise Marks Act two or three hon. Members opposite supported the action Mr. Wilson took, but unfortunately they were outvoted by other members of the Tory party. If they had considered the result of that action, perhaps they would act more wisely in future. We heard every day of the increase of German shipping, and as one connected with shipping he knew that for the growth of that shipping the hon. and gallant Member for Central Sheffield was to a great extent responsible.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT said he was in no sense responsible for the Merchandise Marks Act. On the contrary, he brought in a Bill in several successive sessions to improve that Act by doing away with "Made in Germany" and substituting "Foreign made."

*MR. CHARLES WILSON said he would leave that point on one side. He could not think that the views of the hon. and gallant Gentleman could be believed in by the great mass of Members in this House who had had to rely for their condition in life upon their own commercial enterprise. He sincerely hoped that the views of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, so wise and so ably expressed, would not be in any way influenced by the speech of the hon. and gallant Member.

*MR. DAVID MACIVER (Liverpool, Kirkdale) said no one could be more widely opposed to the views just expressed than he was. He, too, represented a very large commercial constituency, composed in a great measure of working men, and he knew their views on this particular question, and kindred questions, and certainly, whatever their politics might be, their views were those of the hon. and gallant Member for Central Sheffield. He was not one of those who saw any objection to the taxation of foreign imports, whether of sugar or anything else, but he objected to the taxation of the industries of our own people at home or in the colonies. He was altogether in sympathy with the Amendment of his hon. friend the Member for Bradford, and yet he could not help feeling that, if the Committee were asked to divide upon it, they would have a somewhat misleading division, and he should regret that any division should give the appearance; for it would not be the fact; that a majority of the Committee did not sympathise with their West Indian and their sugar-refining friends. He did hope that, if the colonies must, as foreign nations, have their sugar tax, it might be merely a temporary tax, and that the day was not far distant when we should see our way to give some kind of preferential treatment to our own people. Now that the Government were in close negotiation

with regard to the question of bounties, with a result, as they hoped, that might remove this iniquitous system which had done so much mischief, it would be a great mistake if a division should be taken which would in any sense weaken their hands. Many thousands of people in this country had lost their employment through the closing of sugar refineries on account of the bounty system in foreign countries. Some of them came from his constituency, and it was only right that he should express himself in favour of the views of his hon. friend the Member for Bradford.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): I think, whether we divide or not, this debate will have done some good; it will clear the air. As has been said, there have been a great many hopes held out and a great many projects suggested which those who have looked into the matter and know the state of the case in the colonies know to be altogether groundless. Anyone who has studied the history of the colonies knows that nothing in the world will be more difficult than to introduce a system of inter colonial tariffs between the colonies and ourselves, and I think it is very fortunate that this bubble has been so effectively pricked by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. If this was a question of having one authority for the whole Empire, imposing one system of duties, for every part of the Empire, there might be a great deal to be said for a project of that kind. It would be one of the greatest things that could be done to consolidate the Empire and propagate free-trade principles. But we all know the conditions of our colonies. We know the difficulties they have in raising revenue. They have different conditions and different difficulties which make a proposal of that kind at present impossible, although we may hope that at some distant date it may pass from the present stage to a case of probability. I think we should be grateful to the hon. Member for Bradford for putting his case so broadly. What would be the results of this proposal? The first would be that this sugar tax would have to become

permanent, because if we are going to confer this benefit on the West Indian colonies, holding out inducements to the planters to cultivate their estates and provide machinery, it would certainly be considered a great hardship and very unfair to them if we suddenly withdrew that advantage given to them and abolished the sugar tax altogether, and we should do a bad thing in the way of tying our own hands, if we were to give any such preference.

MR. FLOWER dissented.

MR. BRYCE: That would be one result of adopting the proposal. What would be the second result? This is only intended for sugar coming from the West Indies, Queensland, and the Mauritius. I was struck with the observation of the hon. Member for Canterbury, who said the proposal would be received with enthusiasm in the colonies. I understood the hon. Member for South Longford to say that it would be received with enthusiasm in Canada.

MR. BLAKE: I did not express any opinion.

MR. BRYCE: My hon. friend the Member for South Longford is very cautious. The hon. Member for Canterbury speaks for Australia, where he said the proposal would be favourably received. Why? Because they would immediately expect preference for some of their articles. They would expect preference for wine and

brandy, and possibly some other products, but above all for wool. We should at once have to reduce all our tariffs on wine and brandy, and we should have to impose a duty on wool. But we could not stop there. Suppose we gave benefits to Australia by reducing the duties on wine and brandy, we should next have to deal with Canada. At present none of the large staple products of Canada are taxed, and if we gave benefits to the West Indies, to the Mauritius, to the Cape, and to Australia, we must do the same for Canada and put a tax on timber. Would that be regarded as good policy by the working men? Do you think we should have the working men of Yorkshire and Lancashire eager for a policy which imposed taxes on wood and wool? No doubt we should also have to consider the case of New Zealand, so that we should be embarked upon a policy which would revolutionise our fiscal system, which would affect in the greatest way the food of the people and the raw material of our manufactures. We should have to embark in an endless set of bargains with the colonies the constant shifting of the tariff up and down, which would be not only the despair of the Chancellor of the Exchequer but which would make it impossible to conduct our fiscal policy on a sound and permanent principle. Further, we would be imposing the greatest possible difficulty on foreign Powers, and that at a time when our trade is threatened in other ways, requiring a policy of wisdom I think that the more this proposal is examined the more its impracticability is demonstrated, but it will be of great benefit if the debate and the firm stand which has been taken by the Chancellor of the Exchequer prevents these proposals from being put forward in the future.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: It will not prevent that.

*MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland) said he trusted that the suggestion of the hon. Member for Liverpool would be accepted, and that the mover and seconder would be satisfied with the discussion and withdraw the Amendment. It had been well said that we should not swop horses in crossing the stream. We had a very difficult stream to cross just now. No one shared more strongly than he did the views of the hon. and gallant Member for Sheffield, but it was impossible to get a fair expression of opinion in that House at the present moment. There were Members who told them that free trade had made this country great. Was not this country great before forty years ago? Was it not great in the days of Queen Elizabeth and Oliver Cromwell? He did not think that the country was ever in a more critical position than it was at the present moment. [Nationalist cheers.] With regard to that cheer, and in spite of it, he believed that hon. Members below the gangway were in their hearts as bitterly opposed to free trade as he was himself. This was not an opportune time to bring this Amendment forward, but he hoped it would be introduced again when the country was in a more settled state. As regarded the position of the West Indies, if something was not done for them they would gravitate naturally to the United States of America, and we would lose them just as we had already lost the Hawaiian Islands. The first necessity was to live. What had the policy of free trade done for this country during the last forty years? Had it not increased their difficulties? Had not the land gone out of cultivation day by day?

*THE CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. Member is going a long way from the Amendment before the Committee.

*MR. CATHCART WASON said he did not for a moment dispute the ruling. This was a great question, and raised, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer had frankly admitted, not merely the relief of the West Indies, but the whole question of protection. That was one of the greatest subjects which this country had to consider. The colonies had been taunted with the fact that, although their energies were admired, they were not going to contribute to the cost of the war. To his own knowledge colonists had paid large sums of money in connection with the war, and he could tell the right hon. Member for West Monmouthshire and those sitting near him that it was possible to form a syndicate of colonists to-morrow who would take the whole of our responsibilities in South Africa off our hands for 150 millions, and think it dirt cheap at the price.

*MR. HOLLAND (Yorkshire, W.R., Rotherham) said he should like as a business man to express his gratitude, in common with that expressed by several of the previous speakers, to the Chancellor of the Exchequer for the very great stand he had made in the interest of Free Trade. Yet, of course, it was only the stand one would have expected him to make in view of his public utterances on this question. He remembered a short time ago hearing the Chancellor of the Exchequer address an important meeting in the city of Liverpool on that matter, and on that occasion he referred to the question of an Imperial Zollverein. He thought he was accurately quoting the sense of the remarks when he said that he declared that he would only favour the idea of an Imperial Zollverein on the basis of free trade. He fancied that would hardly suit the desire of his hon. friends on the other side of the House. He remembered, also, that this question of an Imperial Zollverein had been brought before the chambers of commerce of the Empire on several occasions. There was an Imperial Congress of the chambers of commerce held about five years ago. On that occasion the subject was thoroughly debated, but it was found by practical business men who took part in that discussion that there were insuperable difficulties in the way of carrying out any scheme which could be laid before that congress, and for that reason the idea was abandoned, or, if not abandoned altogether, the original resolution was withdrawn, and an innocuous one substituted. It was seen, for instance, that we should have difficulties with our own colonies at once. There would be claims on the part of the Indian cotton-grower as against the American cotton-grower; and what would happen if we were to discriminate against the American cotton-grower? And he did not think that would suit the Lancashire mill-owner who used American cotton. The same difficulty would arise in regard to the great staple of wool if we attempted to discriminate in favour of Australia and against the Argentine and Turkey. It would be seen at once that insuperable difficulties would be placed in the way of the successful conduct of the wool spinning and weaving industries of the country. When these points were laid before the Imperial Congress it was seen at once that the scheme could not be proceeded with. He must say that he had a great deal of sympathy with the hon. and gallant Member for Central Sheffield when he referred to the preference which Canada had given to this country. He appreciated the spirit which had animated Canada in making a preferential arrangement in our favour; but he would like to point out to the Committee that that preference conceded by Canada was not limited to this

country alone, or to the

Empire alone, but was to be conceded to any part of the world which conceded similar treatment.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: No.

*MR. HOLLAND: In the first instance it was. He thought it was under the influence of that feeling, and also with the knowledge that Sir Wilfrid Laurier, whose name had been so often quoted with sentiments of admiration and respect, was a Free Trader at heart, that the Cobden Club a few years ago voted him its gold medal. That gold medal was not to be interpreted as an approval of the whole of the fiscal policy of Canada, but merely as an acknowledgment of his splendid services and the stand he had made, surrounded as he was by Protectionists, in Canada. There had recently been a general election in Canada, and he believed with the hon. Member for Central Sheffield that this question of preferential trade was more prominently discussed than any other subject before the constituencies. He would like to ask whether those who were most strongly in favour of this country abandoning its system of free trade emanated from the polls with a satisfactory majority. They knew, as a matter of fact, that they came out very much worse than before, and therefore they found Sir Wilfrid Laurier again returned as the leader of the Canadian Parliament. It was true that British traders appreciated the action of Canada in making this preference in favour of British goods. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had expressed a doubt as to whether British trade had derived any benefit from it. As a trader himself, he must confess that he had derived considerable benefits which would not have been possible under previous conditions. What was proposed to be done by such an Amendment as was now under consideration was not to make any attempt at reparation to Canada for its treatment of the mother country. The Amendment proposed to confer benefits not on Canada, but on the West Indies. Now, although the condition of the sugar industry in the West Indies had been lamentable lately, many competent judges considered that that was owing to the antiquated methods pursued there of producing sugar. He could quote authorities in support of that statement to which even the hon. and gallant Member for Central Sheffield would attach importance. The commissioner of The Times newspaper declared that by better methods the cost of production of sugar in the West Indies might be reduced by 50 per cent.; and the commissioner of another London newspaper said that no well equipped and managed sugar estate in the West Indies failed to pay as well as any other well-managed industry at home. Therefore, before asking us to depart from our free-trade position, it would be well that there should be some attempt to modernise their methods in the West Indies; and if these failed, there might be some excuse for the question being raised again in the House. He could not share in the feeling of regret which the hon. Member for Central Sheffield had expressed that the price of sugar had been so low in this country during the last few years. He knew that the lowness of the price had been artificial, and that it had been caused by the bounties given by various states on the Continent. But he thought that the House ought not to lose sight of one particular effect of the bounties. It was that the low prices created by these bounties had enabled the Chancellor of the Exchequer to fasten

on this cheap commodity, and put a duty upon it. If the price of sugar had been higher the right hon. Gentleman would have hesitated before putting on this tax. He believed that another convention was about to be held in Brussels in regard to sugar bounties, and he would not be sorry if the Continental nations which were giving these bounties decided to abandon them. We did not want gifts thrown at our heads as if we could not afford to pay a fair price for what we consumed. But the disadvantage had not been with us who had been receiving this bounty-fed sugar; it had been with the foreign nations which had been penalising themselves by giving the bounties. When goods were sold below cost price it was for the seller who was losing by that transaction to stop rather than the buyer who was gaining by it. I saw by the papers this morning that French Ministers were protesting against

the continuance of the bounties being given to the French sugar refiners, because they found that it was an expensive policy, and that by it France was impoverishing herself, and that it was to the interest of France to do away with these bounties.

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS (Glasgow, Camlachie) said this question was not one, after all, of bounties. The Committee was face to face with a direct proposal; namely, that we should give an advantage of 4s. 2d. per cwt. to sugar coming from British colonies and possessions.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT said he proposed 33½ per cent.; how was that 4s. 2d. per cwt.?

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS said very well; but he wanted to know on what sugar that 33½ per cent. advantage was to be allowed? How did his hon. and gallant friend the Member for Central Sheffield know that sugar that came from Barbados had been produced there? Could they ear-mark sugar?

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Yes.

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS: His hon. and gallant friend said "Yes." He had a little knowledge on the subject, and he declared that sugar could not be earmarked. They would have a most extensive system of fraudulent trading at the other end. If an advantage of thirty-three and a half per cent. was given to colonial sugars, they would have all the sugar from Cuba going out to Australia and then being reshipped here as Australian sugar; and the hon. Gentleman could not prevent it. He maintained that those who wished to help the colonies were bound to go to a division. He asked the hon. Gentleman who they were going to help. He did not think that the hon. Gentleman and his friends knew themselves, or that they realised that it was impossible to help the producers of sugar in any part of the world as against the producers of sugar in another part of the world, for the articles were identical and could not be distinguished. He had heard with great regret hon. Members from great constituencies like Liverpool had been giving a halting expression of opinion on this subject; and therefore he spoke for one of the great constituencies which had prospered under the beneficent effects of free trade, because they had always been able to buy their materials freely in every part of the world. They were told that they must help the West Indian colonies in their staple product, but if so they must deal in the same fashion with all British colonies and

possessions, and thus they would be face to face with protection, which would lead to confusion with all foreign nations in the scramble for trade. If one industry were protected, all must be protected; and the first to demand it would be the wheat-growing industry. They ought to have a clear exposition of what a tax on wheat meant. It meant dearer bread. The farmer might benefit at first by such a tax, but before many years the main advantage would be reaped by the owners of wheat land. Not all of his hon. friends who supported this proposal were landowners, but they would all fight with each other as to how they could get most protection for the particular industry in which they were engaged, and the end would be that they would raise not only the rent of the land in this country which produced wheat, but the price of bread, and of every commodity which we manufactured.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport) said the only satisfactory speech which they had heard from the other side of the House, except that of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, had been that from the hon. Member for Camlachie, who had denounced in strong and well-deserved terms the proposal of the hon. Members for Bradford and Central Sheffield. It was most desirable that those who had the courage of their conviction on this question should not shirk a division. This was a most opportune occasion; the issue was definite and specific; and good care would be taken that this Amendment was not withdrawn. We should be able then to see who were the protectionists on the other side of the House, and who came there to preach principles which they had not the courage to vote for. These speeches raised false hopes, that were impossible of realisation, and for that reason, if for no other, it was

as well that the motion should receive its quietus that night. During last Parliament, on the suggestion of the Colonial Secretary, £500,000 had been given to the West Indies under the pretext that it would revive their industry; and the first shot had been fired that night in this new Parliament in behalf of a similar campaign. If they did not resist this motion strongly and firmly, there would be a repetition of these gifts by the Colonial Secretary to the West Indies. If the House would bear with him, he would undertake to prove conclusively that the West Indian sugar planters had no case whatever. On the contrary, they were highly prosperous. [Cries of "Oh."] He meant those who conducted their business on proper lines. The groans and complaints came from a body of men who had got deep down in bad financial circumstances owing to the fact that when their trade flourished they charged their estates with all sorts of family settlements, and neglected to supply their businesses with modern machinery and to apply the best methods in growing the cane and manufacturing the sugar. We were being misled in this country as to the real facts of the case in the West Indies. He should prove that the West Indian sugar industry was highly prosperous and likely to continue so.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: That will be very interesting.

MR. KEARLEY (continuing) said that those who talked about the depressed West Indian colonies always pointed to the producer of beet sugar as having brought about their distress. But what had the producer of beet sugar done? He had conducted his business on scientific lines, had built large central factories,

and increased the extraction of sugar from beet double in fifty years. What was the state of the West Indies? Most of the planters had obsolete machinery, and although nature favoured them with soil and climate the extraction of sugar from the sugar cane had been much less than that from beet, unless on those plantations which had adopted the most modern machinery and the best methods. These were making stupendous profits. A large West Indian planter admitted himself in a memoran-

dum submitted to the Colonial Secretary in 1897 that he could produce cane sugar at £;8 16s. 8d. per ton. We had it beyond dispute that no German beet factory could produce sugar under £;10 per ton, but he was paid a bounty of 25s., so that the cost price for German beet sugar was £;8 15s. per ton, as against. £;8 16s. 8d. in the West Indies. Now, what was the relative market value of the two sugars? The bulk of West Indian sugar did not come to this country, but went elsewhere, but it invariably commanded in the market from £;1 to £;2 per ton more than the beet sugar. How, then, could an industry of that sort be in. a bad way? The truth was that the large West Indian companies were making at least 20 per cent. on their undertakings, and he hoped that the Committee would not listen for a single moment to the demand now made on it. It was said that prices were now lower than they were three or four years ago, but when the prices were higher the grumblers complained as much as they did now, and this was merely an attempt by those who were not sufficiently enlightened to conduct their business on proper and modern lines to extract a subsidy from the British taxpayer. MR. FLOWER asked how many West Indian companies produced their sugar at a cost of £;8 16s. 8d. per ton.

MR. KEARLEY said he referred the hon. Gentleman to the memorandum given to the Colonial Secretary in 1897. The principal market for West Indian sugar was the United States, where there was both an import duty and a countervailing duty. Now, if we gave a differential duty to West Indian sugar the result would be that the West Indies would lose the American, which was their best, market. If anyone doubted what America would do he would refer them to the notification that had appeared in the Press as to the course the United States Government was adopting towards Russia. Russia was supposed to give her sugar exports a certain premium, but the United States Government got to know that Russia was giving these exports indirectly something more than was declared. The result had been that there was something like a tariff war at

present between the United States and Russia, which was very likely to spread into a very serious affair. The American Secretary to the Treasury said: "When we find export bounties are given we must impose a countervailing duty." The French Government had adopted in recent years a policy of giving their colonial cane-sugar producers precisely the same bounty as to their beet-sugar producers. In 1885 the production of beet sugar in France was 140,000 tons, and the importation of French colonial cane sugar was 140,000 tons; but in 1900 the production of beet sugar had increased to one million tons, while the production of cane sugar in the French colonies, though it was granted the same bounty as beet sugar, had fallen to 80,000 tons. That proved conclusively that these bounties would not put an industry on its legs where there is not a power to

compete with the rest of the world. That was the secret of failures in the West Indies. They had made money formerly very easily, and hoped that the good times would last for ever, and they had not been businesslike in their methods. He was perfectly certain that in years to come they would prove themselves as capable of making a profit on cane sugar as the best companies had been, and that they would continue to make that profit.

MR. HOULT (Cheshire, Wirrall) said the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down undertook to prove to the Committee that the West Indian colonies were at the present time successful. He was very much interested when he heard that statement, and he thought he was going to be enlightened, but the hon. Gentleman had utterly failed to prove to the Committee that the West Indian colonies were in any way successful. Most of them were at the present time in a state of utter ruin. In Antigua sugar production had gone out; in St. Kitts it was the same; in Barbados it was almost entirely gone, too; and Trinidad was not much better. In Demerara it was true that sugar was still produced. It was a very curious fact that the distress in the West Indies commenced at the time when bounties on sugar were given by European countries. At that time he ran a line of steamers to the West Indies. These steamers conveyed from this country all sorts of things required by the islands, and they brought back sugar. He had to give up that line of steamers because the trade no longer existed. He always had been a free trader, and he was a free trader still. He strongly believed in free trade, and he also believed in fairness in trade. He believed the sugar planters in the West Indies had not been treated fairly. They had to struggle under the bounties which were given by foreign Governments, and those bounties proved too much for them. The land went out of cultivation, and the planters lost the whole of the money they had invested. That was a matter which should have been dealt with by the Government at the time. He did not think it could be dealt with now. It seemed to him utterly impossible to do anything at the present time, but he trusted that somebody with energy and capital would go to the West Indies and make use of the productive land which was there, and the climatic conditions, which should bring about successful result in some way or the other.

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.) said he thought perhaps the discussion had been carried on by many hon. Members who had no practical acquaintance with the sugar industry. Now he owned a sugar plantation in Trinidad, and though he had not been able to make the profits which had been described by his hon. friend, at the same time he had not the slightest intention of voting for the Amendment, because the moment they made a preference in favour of colonial sugar they would open the flood gates on every other raw material. He thought it would be perfectly absurd to depart from their old and safe free trade principles. The hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Central Sheffield and other hon. Gentlemen spoke for large centres of industry. He did not know whether employers in Sheffield were wanting in that ingenuity which was necessary at the present time. He knew they were fairly reactionary, and not very much in favour of education, and it was very possible, perhaps, that they were not keeping themselves in the van. But he objected to the House of Commons being asked to legislate for every declining industry. He believed in

industry and commerce being allowed to take care of themselves. If they invested their money in the Argentine or some other country and found it was not successful, they had no right to come whining to the House of Commons to alter the laws or turn them in their own favour. He was exceedingly glad that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had disclaimed any tendency to protection, because he was bound to say that the tax on sugar and coal seemed as if he were following in the direction which was urged by The Times. A year ago The Times newspaper fell foul of the right hon. Gentleman because he would not broaden his basis of taxation, and recommended sugar and wheat as points to which he should direct his attention. He had no faith in The Times, either as to its policy at home or its policy abroad, and he was glad the right hon. Gentleman had turned his back on that great and potent element for evil that existed in London. He trusted that the right hon. Gentleman would not listen to the counsels of the hon. and gallant Gentleman behind him, whose chief energies during his life had been turned in a different direction from that of industry and commerce.

*MR. TAYLOR (Lancashire, Radcliffe) said that two very old and dangerous fallacies had been trotted out in the course of the debate. One was that it was the business of the Government to make the community at large pay extra in order to relieve industries which were not remunerative in themselves. The other fallacy was that they allowed raw materials to be imported into this country without duty for the benefit of foreign nations. The hon. and gallant Member for Central Sheffield asked what recompense did countries like Russia and Germany give this country for receiving their exports free. But this country received their exports free not for their benefit but for its own, and they knew it well. He hoped they had heard the last of these two fallacies for some time to come. He was not, however, surprised that hon. Gentlemen like the hon. and gallant Member for Central Sheffield and the hon. Member for Bradford should expect something in the direction of protection from a Chancellor of the Exchequer who had put a duty on an article of food. Those who had egged the right hon. Gentleman on to that duty might egg him on to put a duty even on bread. He came from the woollen district of Yorkshire, and had lived for fifty years within nine miles of Bradford, and he wondered what the working-men constituents of the hon. Member opposite would think when they read in the newspapers to-morrow that the hon. Member had proposed a policy which would mean putting a duty on wool, which was the staple of the Bradford industry. That would be a necessary consequence of the establishment of preferential duties. As a manufacturer, he himself had to compete under very difficult circumstances with German manufacturers of cloth in the markets of this country, and he had been often sorely tempted to throw in his lot with those who wished to make cloth dearer for the benefit of the manufacturer, but he resisted that temptation, and would continue to resist it, because, manufacturer though he was, he was an Englishman first. He did not believe that by making the cost of production dearer they would be in a better position than heretofore to compete with other manufacturing nations. What was the cost of manufactured goods? There were two elements. In the first place material and in the second labour. If a duty were put on their raw material it would not enable

them to get a farthing more for their goods in competition with other nations. If their raw material cost more, the result would be that there would be less to pay in wages, and the working man would not only have his food taxed but his wages would be lowered. That was a working man's question as well as a manufacturer's, and he hoped that hon. Members who thought that the hon. and gallant Member for Central Sheffield was right would have the courage of their convictions, and vote with him in the division lobby, so that they might be able to see what backing the Colonial Secretary really had in the policy enunciated in his recent speech.

MR. MITCHELL (Burnley) discussed

the question whether this country had enjoyed free trade or not in the past and was deriving as much advantage from our fiscal system as in times past. He contrasted the present condition of England and America, and said that he had heard some of Mr. Bright's speeches in which he predicted the failure of America through the adoption of protection. Could any commercial man deny that America to-day enjoyed absolute free trade with eighty millions of people, and that she commanded a free selling power to the markets of England?; a distinct and decided advantage which we ought not to forget or minimise. He could only say from his own experience that many of the advantages that we were supposed in times past to possess had vanished, and we now had to compete against heavy duties. What he desired to know was, could the free traders of this country influence foreign

Governments to readjust those

AYES.

Archdale, Edward Mervyn

Llewellyn, Evan Henry

Willoughby de Eresby, Lord

Brookfield, Colonel Montagu

Malcolm, Ian

Younger, William

Delany, William

Montagu. Hon. J. Scott (Hants.

Halsey, Thomas Frederick

Mooney, John J.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Mr. Kearley and Mr. Lough.

Hudson, George Bickersteth

Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.

Hutton, John (Yorks, N. B.)

Reid, James (Greenock)

Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareh'm

Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)

Bell, Richard

Cawley, Frederick

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Bentinck, Lord Henry C.

Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Bignold, Arthur
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Bigwood, James
Chamberlain, J. A. (Worc'r)
Allan, William (Gateshead)
Black, Alexander William
Channing, Francis Allston
Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.
Blake, Edward
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Allsopp, Hon. George
Boland, John
Cogan, Denis J.
Ambrose, Robert
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Colomb, Sir John Charles R.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn)
Colville, John
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Brigg, John
Condon, Thomas J.
Arrol, Sir William
Broadhurst, Henry
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Atherley-Jones, L.
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Cox, Irwin Edward B.
Austin, Sir John
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Craig, Robert Hunter
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Cranborne, Viscount
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bullard, Sir Harry
Crean, Eugene

Bain, Colonel James Robert
Burns, John
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Baird, John George Alexander
Burt, Thomas
Crombie, John William
Baldwin, Alfred
Butcher, John George
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Caine, William Sproston
Crossley, Sir Savile
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Caldwell, James
Cullinan, J.
Balfour, Maj K R (Christchurch
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Cust, Henry John C.
Banbury, Frederick George
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Carew, James Laurence
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Dalziel, James Henry
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Causton, Richard Knight
Davenport, William Bromley
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H (Bristol)
Cautley, Henry Strother
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Beach, Rt. Hon. W. W. B (Hants
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Davies, M Vaughan (Cardigan)
Beckett, Ernest William
Cavendish, V. C. W. Derbysh.
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.

duties in the way they had a right to expect? The duties were increasing, and the only trade which showed an increase was the colonial trade and the trade under the flag. England should, as far as she could, respect that which Canada had done, which was so much to the benefit of England. In conclusion, he asked

the hon. Member for Central Sheffield whether it would not be a grave mistake to go to a division. He thought it would, because the result would not represent a correct decision so far as free trade or protection was concerned, and its import might be misconstrued. Under these circumstances he thought the decision might be postponed until the direct issue was in question, and therefore he appealed to the hon. Member to withdraw his Amendment.

Question put.

The Committee divided:;Ayes 16; Noes 366. (Division List No. 263.)

Dickinson, Robert Edmond

Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampst'd

Newnes, Sir George

Dickson, Charles Scott

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

Nicol, Donald Ninian

Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-

Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.

Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)

Dillon, John

Holland, William Henry

Norman, Henry

Dimsdale, Sir Joseph C.

Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry

Nussey, Thomas Willans

Donelan, Captain A.

Hoult, Joseph

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

Doogan, P. C.

Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)

O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)

Doughty, George

Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)

O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-

Jacoby, James Alfred

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

Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)

Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse

O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.

Doxford, Sir William Theodore

Johnston, William (Belfast)

O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)

Duffy, William J.

Jones, David Brynm'r (Swansea

O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)

Duncan, J. Hastings

Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)

O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Dowd, John
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Elibank, Master of
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Kelly, J. (Roscommon, N.)
Elliott, Hon. A. Ralph D.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
O'Malley, William
Emmott, Alfred
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)
O'Mara, James
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Keswick, William
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Fardell, Sir T. George
King, Sir Henry Seymour
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Palmer, Sir C. M. (Durham)
Fenwick, Charles
Knowles, Lees
Palmer, Geo. Wm. (Reading)
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Parkes, Ebenezer
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Law, Andrew Bonar
Partington, Oswald
Ffrench, Peter
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Pease, Alfred E. (Cleveland)
Field, William
Lawson, John Grant
Peel, Hon. Wm. Robert W.
Fielden, Edward Procklehurst
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Penn, John

Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Leamy, Edmund
Pierpoint, Robert
Fisher, William Hayes
Lecky, Rt. Hn. William Edw. H.
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose-
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Pirie, Duncan V.
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Leveson-Gower, Fredk. N.S.
Plummer, Walter R.
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Lewis, John Herbert
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Flower, Ernest
Lock wood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Pretymann, Ernest George
Foster, Sir Michael (Lond. Univ
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Pym, C. Guy
Fuller, J. M. F.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Randles, John S.
Galloway, William Johnson
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Garfit, William
Lundon, W.
Rea, Russell
Gibbs, Hn. A G. H. (Cy. of Lond.
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Reddy, M.
Gilhooly, James
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. E.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert J.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Redmond, William (Clare)
Goddard, Daniel Ford
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Reed, Sir E. James (Cardiff)
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.

Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin&Nairn
Maconochie, A. W.
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Gore, Hn G R C. Ormsby-(Salop.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool
Rentoul, James Alexander
Gore, Hn. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall
Renwick, George
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
M'Dermott, Patrick
Rickett, J. Compton
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
M'Govern, T.
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (St'lybr'dge
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.
Rigg, Richard
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Greene, Sir E W (B'ryS Edm'nds
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Majendie, James A. H.
Roberts, John H. (Debigths.)
Groves, James Grimble
Manners, Lord Cecil
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Robson, William Snowdon
Haldane, Richard Burdon
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Roe, Sir Thomas
Hamilton, Rt Hn Ld. G. (Midd'x
Mitchell, William
Ropner, Col. Robert
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nd'rry
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Round, James
Hammond, John
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)

Russell, T. W.
Hanbury, Rt Hon. Robert W.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Rutherford, John
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd
Morgan, Hn. Fred. (M'nm'thsh.
Schwann, Charles E.
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Morgan, J. L. (Carmarthen)
Seely, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Harwood, George
Morley, Rt. Hon. J. (Montrose
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Morrell, George Herbert
Shaw, Charles E. (Stafford)
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Hayden, John Patrick
Moulton, John Fletcher
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Mount, William Arthur
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Helder, Augustus
Murnaghan, George
Smith, H C (N'rth'mb. Tyneside
Helme, Norval Watson
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Henderson, Alexander
Myers, William Henry
Spear, John Ward

Hermon-Hodge, Robert T.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R. (N'th'nts
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir J. M.
Wallace, Robert
Wills, Sir Frederick
Stock, James Henry
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Strachey, Edward
Wason, Eugene (Clackmarnian)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Strutt, Hon. Chas. Hedley
Wason, John C. (Orkney)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Sullivan, Donal
Webb, Col. Wm. George
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Weir, James Galloway
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersfd.
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Welby, Lt-Col. A C E (Taunton)
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
White, George (Norfolk)
Wylie, Alexander
Thomas, J A (Gl'morgan, Gower
White, Luke (Yorks, E. R.)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Thornton, Percy M.
White, Patrick (Meath, North
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
Tomkinson, James
Whiteley, George (Yorks, W. R.
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)

Tritton, Charles Ernest
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Tufnell, Lt.-Col. Edward
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Valentia, Viscount
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(Birm

MR. KEARLEY, in moving an Amendment to reduce the duty on sugar which indicates a polarisation exceeding 98 degrees from 4s. 2d. to 2s., said the Amendment he had the honour to move was one which affected the whole question. He was moving to reduce the duty by half. It was dear that the money would have to be raised somehow, and therefore he did not move the rejection of the duty altogether, but he thought it would be more convenient for the people if this duty was reduced to one farthing on the pound. He objected to the tax altogether because it increased the price of this food by 35 per cent.; it was contemptible in its character and most reactionary. Sufficient had been heard in the previous debate as to the tendency of taxation, and the taxing of bread-stuffs was only a question of time. So long as this great expenditure; the normal expenditure; went on increasing in this way there could be very little doubt that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, sooner or later, would be forced to come down to the House and propose a tax upon breadstuffs. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer would not admit it for a moment, because he rather prided himself upon the patriotism of the working man, who, he said, was proud of the amount he contributed to taxation. The President of the Board of Agriculture had taken the same line, and said that the working men of the country would regard it as an insult if they were not allowed to contribute. One hon. Gentleman opposite had also said he rejoiced in the tax because it would restrict the use of sugar. As regards the popularity of this tax, one of the last public proofs with regard to that was given at Saffron Walden.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order! The hon. Member is now attacking the whole tax. He is himself proposing a 2s. tax, and, therefore, all he is entitled to do is to discuss the merits of his proposal as compared with that before the Committee.

MR. KEARLEY said he would endeavour to keep himself within the ruling of the Chair, and perhaps he might be permitted to refer to what had been said by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The Leader of the Opposition, speaking in the country, had said that the cost of this tax to the working man would be about 4s. 6d. per week per family, and the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer had described that statement as being grossly exaggerated. He had, however, made an inquiry into this matter, and he found that the cost to a workman's family of six persons would be 5d. per week, or 21s. 8d. per year. That amount would probably be exceeded, because, although the Chancellor of the Exchequer only expected £5,000,000 from this tax, the consumers would have to pay £7,000,000. That was the direct effect of indirect taxation. The right hon. Gentleman had expressed the opinion that in the past the incidence of taxation had fallen unequally, and consequently unfairly, on the direct and indirect taxpayer, and had taken credit to himself that in his Budget he had succeeded in

equalising matters. But that was a most fallacious line of reasoning, because the only test of the burden of taxation was the taxable capacity of the individual. The amount paid was no test whatever. The man with £50,000 a year who paid 2s. in the £ income tax had still £45,000 to spend, and therefore would not feel the burden as it would be felt by a man whose income was very small. The point of equalisation was not arrived at by taking the direct and indirect taxation, but by taking the circumstances of each individual tax, and that was a point which was not recognised in this Budget in any way. The right hon. Gentleman had piled tax upon tax on the working man. Last year it was the tea, tobacco, beer, and spirit duties; this year there was to be a sugar duty, and the object of his Amendment was to induce the right hon. Gentleman to admit that, although he was obliged to get new revenue, he had put too heavy a burden upon the people by the imposition of this sugar duty, and that it was not equitable to place such a burden upon them. He admitted that the working classes should be made to feel the cost of the war, but they were feeling it with a vengeance, for half the national revenue was derived from taxes they paid; in fact, the working classes were being taxed to death. A tax upon the food of the population was hurtful to them directly and indirectly; they would have to pay a good deal out on the one hand, and they would suffer on the other because they would not be able to indulge to the same extent as they had done in the article taxed. Indirect taxation was tremendously costly for the consumer, and he objected to this tax for that reason. He objected to it also because it imposed a burden on the most important article of food after meat and corn, and it imposed a tax upon a raw material out of which industries had sprung all over the country. All of those industries;

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order! The hon. Gentleman is now using an argument just as applicable against his own proposal as against the Bill. All he can now do is to show good reason why his proposal of 2s. is better than the proposal of 4s. 2d.

MR. KEARLEY contended that if the duty was 2s. it would be reduced by half the amount, and only half the harm would be done. He moved the reduction because, he submitted, the working classes were too heavily taxed; because a tax upon food was a retrograde movement, the extension of which no one could foresee; and, finally, because indirect taxation was so costly to the consumer.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 2, line 8, to leave out '4s. 2d.,' and insert '2s. 0d.,' instead thereof." (Mr. Kearley.)

Question proposed, "That '4s. 2d.' stand part of the clause."

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The hon. Gentleman was good enough to say that the working classes are being taxed to death. That is one of the most absurd statements that has ever been heard in this House. I do not deny for a moment that the sugar duty of 4s. 2d. per cwt. is a tax which must fall upon the working classes; I have held that all along. I never said it was a popular tax, but I do say that, having regard to the circumstances of the time, the working classes are prepared to bear it. The hon. Gentleman says that for some reason a tax of 2s. would only be half as hurtful as a tax of 4s. 2d. With regard to the manufacturers, he

knows as well as I do that the manufacturers who use sugar for export trade will have the duty back, whether it be 2s. or 4s. 2d.

MR. KEARLEY: May I ask whether the right hon. Gentleman intends to give a drawback on exported goods?

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The hon. Member has stated that the working classes will pay two millions more than the duty yields to the Exchequer. Why? Because of the illegitimate profit of the dealers and grocers, a body of men of whom the hon. Member knows a great deal, and on behalf of whom he has often addressed the House. The result of reducing the duty to 2s. would be to put more money into the pockets of these gentlemen and less into the Exchequer. The retail price of sugar to the consumer is always varied by a halfpenny in the pound, and for that reason I carefully considered the matter, and am convinced that if I imposed a duty of 2s. 1d. instead

of 4s. 2d. per cwt. the price of sugar to the small consumer would be raised by a halfpenny in the pound just the same, and the balance would go to the dealer and the grocer, a thing which I desire to avoid.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) regretted that he was not able to agree with the Amendment. He objected to the tax entirely. As regards the merits of the tax itself, he was at one with the hon. Gentleman. His chief objection to the Budget was that, while the Government were incurring a war expenditure of £150,000,000, they were only imposing on the country additional taxation to the amount of £27,000,000, so that he for one should like to see the sugar duty increased rather than reduced; therefore he could not agree with the hon.

Gentleman. He could not help feeling that there was a great deal of weight in what fell from the Chancellor of the Exchequer in reply to the hon. Member.

Another objection to this Amendment was that the same inconvenience to the consumer and the manufacturer would be caused by a 2s. duty as by a 4s. 2d. duty, and the revenue would receive only half the amount. If the Amendment had been a proposal to increase the tax he should have been more inclined to support it. The principle of late years had been that when a tax was either reduced or increased it should be by a substantial amount, so that the amount actually paid by the consumer should be practically the same as that which went into the Exchequer. When the alteration in duty was a slight one the difference usually went into the pocket of the middleman, as was recently the case with regard to the tobacco duty. If the increase was a large one the Exchequer would receive almost as much as the consumer paid; and if trade was to be harassed and disturbed, as it would be by this tax, it was better that it should be for a large rather than a small amount. Holding this view, he could not support any Amendment which proposed to reduce the tax.

MR. BROADHURST (Leicester) said the objection of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to a reduction of this tax on the ground that it would add to the profits of the middleman was derived

from his experience with regard to the tobacco duty. When a portion of that duty was remitted he (the hon. Member) warned the Chancellor of the Exchequer that the consumer would not obtain the slightest advantage, either in quality or in price. The right hon. Gentleman doubted that theory, but in the following year

admitted its correctness.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH dissented.

MR. BROADHURST: By reimposing the tax.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I wanted more money.

MR. BROADHURST contended that the experience of the right hon. Gentleman had taught him that that theory was a correct one. If, however, this tax was reduced from 4s. 2d. to 2s., he believed the middleman would not get all the advantage. During the last twenty years the cheapness of sugar had largely revolutionised the condition of poor homes as regarded the luxuries they were able to obtain. Cubes and sweet-stuff which, twenty years ago, it was impossible for the poorer classes to obtain, were now common articles of consumption in the homes of moderately-paid working people. If the tax was reduced from 4s. 2d. to 2s. these cubes and sweet biscuits and so on would be obtainable at practically the same prices as had recently been paid; because the extra cost of the sugar, in the quantities bought by the manufacturers, would be so small. In that case the reduction of the tax by one-half would be a distinct advantage to the working classes. The hon. Member for Devonport, an admitted authority on the subject, had stated that, after inquiries at 200 different industrial centres, the extra cost per family of six persons involved in this sugar tax was calculated to be 5d. per week. That was really equivalent to a reduction of wages. To a mechanic earning 40s. a week it was not an extraordinary, though still a great consideration, but to the casual labourer in towns whose average earnings were perhaps 16s. per week, and the agricultural labourer in the country, with his 12s. per week, it was a most serious matter. Agricultural labourers were notorious for large families, and to deduct 5d. per week from their wages would frequently just make it impossible for them to maintain their sick club or benefit society contribution. While he was not averse to reminding those who had shouted for the war that they must pay for it, he thought this new sugar duty was levying an unfair proportion of the burden upon the part of the community who could least know for what they were shouting. It was a grave and serious injustice to impose this additional indirect taxation upon the classes who were already unduly burdened. Speaking from memory, he believed that wines, the drink of the rich, brought in only about £1,500,000 a year, while beer, the drink of the poor, benefited the Exchequer by about £14,000,000 per year. From that example, it could be seen how unfairly the burden of taxation fell upon the different classes of taxpayers, and on that ground he felt he was justified in supporting this proposed reduction. He was entirely opposed to any tax on sugar. Why had not the Chancellor of the Exchequer increased the duty on spirits, or doubled the duty on wines?

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is now discussing the Budget as a whole: the time for that has passed.

MR. BROADHURST fully recognised the correctness of the Chairman's ruling, but this was a very tempting subject. If the tax per family could be reduced from 5d. to 2s. per week, it would be a consideration of enormous importance to a large portion of the community. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer could not agree to the reduction, would he assure the Committee that, if the tax was

found to fall as heavily as it was feared it would do on the poorest classes, he would consider its readjustment next year?

MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) pointed out that in the Bill as it at present stood the amount contributed by indirect taxation was about £7,000,000, while the amount contributed by direct taxation was only about £4,000,000. He asked whether this was an intentional departure from the principle of, roughly speaking, making direct and indirect taxation equal. If it could be shown that on other grounds that general principle had been maintained, he for one should not be prepared to support the present Amendment, but if no explanation was given he should certainly vote for the proposed reduction, because its effect would be to put the direct and indirect contributions under the Finance Bill on practically the same footing.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH said he would not be in order in going into the point raised by the hon. Member, but, as he stated in his Budget speech, the effect of the proposals of the Bill, together with the existing taxation of the country, would practically equalise the amounts derived from direct and indirect taxation. The coal tax was of course left out of the calculation.

*MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.) cordially supported the Amendment, because he could not agree with the principle that they should be content with merely balancing the products of direct and indirect taxation. The question should rather be considered from the point of view of the sacrifices involved in the proposals in proportion to the individual incomes of the classes who had to contribute to the revenue. According to a statement made in 1885 by the present Colonial Secretary, the taxes on articles of consumption amounted then to about 8 per cent. upon the average wages of working men. Since that date the percentage had largely increased, until it now stood at about 10 or 12 per cent. By the present proposals there was added what amounted to about 3 or 3½ per cent. of taxation if they took the average wages of agricultural labourers. Considering what these increases meant to men whose incomes were from 12s. to £1 per week, he thought the hon. Member was amply justified in moving to reduce this tax by one-half. In 1874 the then Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Stafford Northcote, took the greatest pride and satisfaction in sweeping away the sugar tax, his argument being that its abolition would mean the removal of a great hardship from the poorer classes and the removal of a serious interference with trade, and

Sir Stafford's forecast had been more than fulfilled by an immense development of important industries since then. The whole of these arguments applied therefore with even greater force at the present time, and therefore he should support the Amendment.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.) said he should vote for the Amendment, because the tax would fall very heavily upon the working population of Ireland. Tea was a necessity of life in Ireland, and therefore sugar was also a necessary, because tea could not be taken without sugar. However hardly the tax might fall on the agricultural labourers and artisans in England, it would fall with much greater force on the corresponding classes in Ireland, because Ireland was a poorer country. It was therefore only right that some Irish Member should

associate himself with the mover of this reduction, and he should have pleasure in supporting the Amendment.

MR. JORDAN (Fermanagh, S.) expressed his intention of supporting the reduction of the tax on the principle that half an evil was better than a whole evil. He should do this in the interests of trade as well as of the people generally. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer believed that in the event of the tax being reduced to 2s. the balance of 2s. 4d. would go into the pocket of the middleman, he had very little knowledge either of the middleman or the small trader, or of their customers. He was not ashamed to say that he was a

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Beckett, Ernest William

Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Bignold, Arthur

Cranborne, Viscount

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Bigwood, James

Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)

Allhusen, Augustus Hy. E.

Blundell, Col. Henry

Cross, Herb. S. (Bolton)

Allsopp, Hon. George

Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-

Crossley, Sir Savile

Archdale, Edward Mervyn

Bousfield, William Robert

Dickinson, Robert Edmond

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John

Dickson, Charles Scott

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Brookfield, Col. Montagu

Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-

Arrol, Sir William

Bullard, Sir Harry

Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir E. H.

Doughty, George

Austin, Sir John

Cautley, Henry Strother

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-

Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy

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

Doxford, Sir William Theodore

Bailey, James (Walworth)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Bain, Col. James Robert
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Baird, John George Alexander
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
Fardell, Sir T. George
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
Balfour, Maj K R (Christch'rch)
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Bathurst, Hon. Allen B.
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Beach, Rt Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Firbank, Joseph Thomas

middleman himself, and he could assure the right hon. Gentleman that the consumers were too keen on getting their goods at the lowest possible price to permit this difference to go to the benefit of the small trader. If the small farmers and labourers found that by buying half a stone or a stone of sugar they could get it ¼d. or ½d. per lb. cheaper, they would buy the larger quantity instead of purchasing a single pound. The assumption of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was therefore altogether erroneous. The saving effected would go into the pockets of the consumers, where it ought to go. He repudiated entirely the position taken up by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in regard to middlemen, for he was a middleman himself. From what the right hon. Gentleman had said, they would be inclined to think that middlemen were Jews, who were always ready to grasp by force everything they could; but even in Ireland they had some sense of business morality, and the consumers were keen enough to prevent them doing what the right hon. Gentleman had insinuated. He repelled the accusation made by the right hon. Gentleman, because the middlemen could not get the advantage, and they would not do so if they could. When he heard it insinuated that middlemen were prepared to gobble up everything he felt that he must protest against such an accusation.

Question put.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 177; Noes, 109. (Division List No. 264.)

Fisher, William Hayes
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage

Richards, Henry Charles
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Leveson-Gower, Fred. N. S.
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (St'Iybridge
Foster, Sir Michael (Lond. Univ
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Garfit, William
Long, Rt Hn Walter (Bristol, S.)
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Godson, Sir Augustus Fred.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Ropner, Col. Robert
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin&Nairn
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Round, James
Gore, Hn. G. R C Ormsby-(Salop
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsm'th)
Rutherford, John
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Maclver, David (Liverpool)
Seton-Karr, Henry
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Maconochie, A. W.
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ryS Edm'nds
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edin., W.)
Smith, H C (North'mb Tyneside
Greville, Hon. Ronald
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Spear, John Ward
Groves, James Grimble
Maiendie, James A. H.
Stanley, Lord (Lanes.)
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Malcolm, Ian
Stock, James Henry
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd.)
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Hamilton. Marq. of (L'nd'nd'rry
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Stroyan, John

Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert W.
Morgan, Hn. F. (Monm'thsh.)
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Morrell, George Herbert
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Morton, Arthur H. A (Deptford)
Thornton, Percy M.
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Mount, William Arthur
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Heaton, John Henniker
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute)
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Helder, Augustus
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Valentia, Viscount
Hermon-Hodge, Robert T.
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Hobhouse, Hy. (Somerset, E.)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell (Birm)
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Peel, Hon. Wm. Robert W.
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Hutton, John (Yorks., N. R.)
Penn, John
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Pierpoint, Robert
Wills, Sir Frederick
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir J. H.

Plummer, Walter R.
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Kenyon, Jas. (Lanes., Bury)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Pretymann, Ernest George
Wodehouse, Rt. Hon. E. R. (Bath
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Pym, C. Guy
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Knowles, Lees
Randles, John S.
Wylie, Alexander
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Law, Andrew Bonar
Renshaw, Charles Bine
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Rentoul, James Alexander
Lawson, John Grant
Renwick, George
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.
Fenwick, Charles
Newnes, Sir George
Allan, William (Gateshead)
Ffrench, Peter
Nolan, Col John P. (Galway, N.)
Ambrose, Robert
Field, William
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Atherley-Jones, L.
Flynn, James Christopher
Norman, Henry
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Gilhooly, James
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Goddard, Daniel Ford
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'ry Mid
Black, Alexander William
Hammond, John
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)

Blake, Edward
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Boland, John
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir A. D.
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Helme, Norval Watson
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Brigg, John
Holland, William Henry
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Jacoby, James Alfred
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Burt, Thomas
Joicey, Sir James
O'Dowd, John
Caldwell, James
Jones, David B. (Swansea)
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
Cawley, Frederick
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Malley, William
Channing, Francis Allston
Kinloch, Sir John George S.
O'Mara, James
Cogan, Denis J.
Layland-Barratt, Francis
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Colville, John
Leamy, Edmund
Partington, Oswald
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Lough, Thomas
Power, Patrick Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Lundon, W.
Rea, Russell
Cullinan, J.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Reddy, M.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)

Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
M'Dermott, Patrick
Redmond, William (Clare)
Delany, William
M'Govern, T.
Rickett, J. Compton
Dillon, John
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
Rigg, Richard
Donelan, Captain A.
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Doogan, P. C.
Mooney, John J.
Roe, Sir Thomas
Duffy, William J.
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Murnaghan, George
Shaw, Chas. Edw. (Stafford)
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh.)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Yoxall, James Henry
Spencer, Rt Hn C R. (Norchants)
Whiteley, George (York, W R.)
Sullivan, Donal
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;Mr. Kearley and Mr. Broadhurst.
Taylor, Theodore Cook
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Thomas, David Alfred (Merth'r
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Weir, James Galloway
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'ld
*MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said he had four Amendments on the Paper, but they
all referred to one subject. It was the only legitimate Amendment, if he might
say so apart from party purposes, that ought to be moved in regard to the

proposals of the Chancellor of the Exchequer except the Amendment to oppose the clause altogether. They had in the clause a very ingeniously devised system of graduation of the sugar duty, and the object he had in view was to substitute for that a simple system which he would describe to the Committee. He moved to insert after "sugar," in line nine of Clause 2, the words "of a polarisation of ninety-eight degrees or less, the cwt., 2s." He had adopted the figure 2s. because it was the lowest proposed in the Chancellor's scale. The simple system he proposed would involve only two duties, one of 4s. 2d., if they liked, on refined sugar, and 3s. 6d. on raw sugar.

*MR. DOOGAN (Tyrone, E.) called attention to the fact that there were not forty Members present.

*THE CHAIRMAN: A division has quite recently been taken, showing that there are more than forty Members in the precincts.

MR. LOUGH said any Member of the Committee who had given the matter his attention would agree that the graduation of the duty was by far the most important consideration embodied in the sugar clause. His first reason for the proposal he made was that the history of the sugar duties favoured the adoption of a simple duty of this kind rather than a graduated system. During the last ten years of the graduated duty on sugar opinion in the House of Commons tended steadily towards a simple duty such as he now proposed. In the Budget of 1864 Mr. Gladstone made his great argument in favour of a graduated system of sugar duties, reducing at the same time the duties to half the amount at which they stood before. It might appear to the Committee from the admission he had made that Mr. Gladstone was in favour of a graduated system of duties. He must go a little further back than that. A Committee of the House of Commons examined the matter in 1862, and reported in favour of the system of graduation to a certain extent. The sugar duties of this country had always been graduated, and the Committee reported that they should still be graduated, and Mr. Gladstone said it would be a ridiculous thing to abolish the graduation, but, with all that, he reduced the graduation to smaller proportions than ever before. The Chancellor of the Exchequer now proposed that the lowest duty should be 2s., and the highest 4s. 2d. That meant that the highest was more than 100 per cent. over the lowest. Mr. Gladstone's proposal was that the highest should only be a little more than 50 per cent. over the lowest duty. He would ask the Committee not to pay so much attention to Mr. Gladstone's arguments as to what happened during the last ten years the sugar duty was in force. He would point out what was the effect of the graduation proposed in 1864, because he was going to argue that the same effect would follow the worse kind of graduation which the Chancellor of the Exchequer proposed now. Within two years after the Budget of 1864 the importation of the highest quality of sugar fell from 85,000 tons to 1,000 tons, and, on the other hand, the importation of a low grade, then admitted for the first time, rose to 53 per cent. of the sugar imported into this country. The evils arising from the 1864 scheme of graduation became so great that it had to be altered in 1867, again in 1870, again in 1873, and, finally, in 1874 the sugar duties were abolished. The graduation was reduced at every alteration, until in the scale of

1873 there was only a difference of 1s. between the highest and the lowest sugar duty, being a much smaller difference than was established by the present proposal. He would suggest that a difference of about 6d. between raw and refined sugar would be sufficient.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: There were five rates of duty then.

*MR. LOUGH: Quite so. He was glad the Chancellor of the Exchequer had interrupted him. The right hon. Gentleman was now proposing twenty-four duties at which sugar was to be admitted to the country. There never had been so much graduation as the present Chancellor was giving. In the Budget of 1873 the Chancellor of the Exchequer alluded to the evils which arose from graduation. He would ask the attention of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to the admission made by the Government in 1873, through the mouth of the Chancellor of the Exchequer of that time, with regard to the question of graduation. The Chancellor said:; "As we reduced the tax we reduced the range The effect has been considerable and very beneficial.

He also gave this other reason;

"Refining gives rise to innumerable practices which I will not call by any harsh names."

When he said he would not use any harsh name he meant adulteration. It was desirable to get rid of this practice, and they got rid of it by reducing graduation. The next point, which was the most important of all, was alluded to in the Budget of 1873, and it was one which the right hon. Gentleman would not be able to push entirely aside. The Chancellor of the Exchequer then alluded to the fact that, owing to the graduation of the sugar duties, the revenue of the country was subject to continual losses. These arose through the drawbacks which were given on sugar exported, being at a higher rate than had been received by the Exchequer when the sugar was imported. Dressing and other practices were adopted to improve the appearance of the sugar and make it pass as quality of a higher grade, so that the Revenue was greatly injured. Similar frauds would commence the moment a graduated scale was re-introduced. In 1873 the Chancellor of the Exchequer said this would

cease because "The scales will be so near that it will not probably be worth the while of anyone to take much trouble." so that the safety against fraud was that the graduation was slight. But here we had a worse graduation introduced. He had shown that the experience of the House of Commons was that these graduated duties tended to give an opportunity of defrauding the Exchequer, and opinion was against the repetition of them. His second objection was that the Chancellor of the Exchequer's proposed scheme had come from a bad quarter. He did not know whether any hon. Members were aware from where the Chancellor of the Exchequer had got his scheme. But he would tell the Committee that this was the American sugar tariff imported into this country. He would like to make that good. In the United States the sugar tariff began at a little less than a halfpenny and went up to a penny. The Budget proposal was that we should begin at a farthing and go up to a halfpenny; exactly the same scheme of graduation as in America. There was scarcely a doubt that if the Committee admitted the proposal of the Chancellor of the Exchequer this year of a graduation from a farthing to a halfpenny, a

year or two hence we would get the full tariff of the United States. The Chancellor of the Exchequer might say what better origin could a proposal of this kind have? In the United States they had got smart business men, with very go-a-head notions. But he would remind the Committee that the United States was a protectionist country, and it was openly avowed that they had got a protectionist tariff. We were a free trade country, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer said that he was going to stick to free trade in all his proposals in his Budget; but if he was going to stick to free trade he would find some difficulty in defending his scheme of graduation. The United States scale had done every possible harm. Under it the American Sugar Trust had been founded, and of all the monopolies in the United States that was the worst. It controlled the production, importation, and distribution of all the sugar in the country. Nine-tenths of all the sugar distributed in the United States were touched by that Trust, and it avowedly prevented anything but the commonest classes of sugar being imported into the United States. The origin of the Chancellor of the Exchequer's scheme of graduation ought to satisfy the Committee that it should hesitate before adopting it. His third argument was that sugar refining was an industry which could not be expected to flourish in the United Kingdom. It might be asked what had that to do with the graduation of the duties? The only reason we had yet had given for adopting this extraordinary scale was that the Chancellor of the Exchequer wanted to give "fair play" to the sugar refiners; but why not "fair play" to the public, the consumers of sugar? It was quite contrary to our system in this country for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to give "fair play" or protection to any manufacturing industry. It was said that the scheme was to do something to restore the sugar-refining industry in this country; but he maintained that nothing could set it up again. The proportion of refined sugar imported into and consumed in this country in 1860 was only 2 per cent., but last year it was 59 or 60 per cent., so that there had been a steady tendency to get a large proportion of refined sugar from abroad. But the Chancellor of the Exchequer was putting the highest duty, 4s. 2d. per cwt., on refined sugar and only 2s. per cwt. on raw sugar. Mr. Gladstone, in 1864, laid down a principle which the Chancellor of the Exchequer ought to adhere to on the present occasion. He said; "The form of our duty should be such as to least interfere with the natural course of trade."

And again it was said that the House;

"would have been left open to the charge of offering to the producer or manufacturer an opportunity of doing something different from that which he would do if there was no duty at all."

There never was a better principle laid down, but Mr. Gladstone had not lived up to it. He had no experience of a period in which there was no sugar duty at all in this country. During that period the refining was done abroad. If the tendency of a graduated scale was to develop in this country an industry of this kind, which had failed once, and which would be contrary to the best interests of the country, then they ought not to adopt the scale. But graduated sugar duties were not at all necessary to

give fair play to sugar refining. In the period of free trade in sugar the largest and most productive sugar refinery in the country had sprung up in Liverpool and London; that of the Messrs. Tate, and it was never so successful and prosperous as it was to-day. Therefore none of these protective duties or "fair play" were necessary to build up the sugar-refining industry. But he asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer to think of the British public. The consumption of sugar had increased immensely in this country during the last forty years. In 1801 the consumption of sugar was 15 lb. per head of the population; in 1840 it was 16 lb.; practically no difference. In 1860 it was 30 lb. per head, and in 1900 90 lb.; that was, the consumption had trebled under free trade. He believed that the graduated scale would cause an immense interference with trade in this country. When there were five grades, five millions of samples had to be taken. How many millions would be necessary when there were twenty-three or twenty-four gradations? A maximum of interference with trade and inconvenience at the customs would be caused. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said he had got a correct instrument for testing the quality of sugar. He questioned whether the polariscope was a correct instrument. The operation of a graduated scale would depend upon the uniformity of the eyesight on the part of the Custom House officers, and he doubted whether that could be attained, and there would be a great deal of uncertainty about the exact amount of duty that would have to be paid on any parcel of sugar. He thought, even if it were a little unfair, it would be better if there were a fixed scale; so much on raw and so much on refined sugar. He had wanted to see a polariscope, but could not find one. He went into a shop and asked to see one, but the shopmen looked upon him as a person not quite right in his mind. The shopman called the proprietor, who asked what it was he wanted. He replied a polariscope. The shopkeeper asked him if he knew what a polariscope was, and he answered that it was an instrument which the Chancellor of the

Exchequer was going to test sugar with, whereupon the old man said that if he had had any idea of the mischief caused by Chancellors of the Exchequer he would not have come into the shop and asked for a polariscope. Then the shopkeeper, who had not even a picture of a polariscope, told him that if he really wanted one he would send to Paris for it, and that it would cost £20. He maintained that it was a pity to base customs duties in this country on such a complicated instrument as that. In conclusion he thought the main objection to the proposed new system was that if the graduated scale were adopted there would be a great loss to the revenue in the matter of drawbacks. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer took a simple scale of 3s. for refined and 2s. 6d. for raw sugar he would get as much money as by this complicated graduated scale, and would, moreover, save all the worry and inconvenience to the trade.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 2, line 9, to leave out from the word 'polarisation' to the end of line 15, and insert the words 'of ninety-eight degrees or less, the cwt. 2s.'; (Mr. Lough.)

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

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The hon. Gentleman ended his speech by saying that if a duty of 3s. was placed on refined sugar and 2s. on raw the result would be more agreeable to the trade and more beneficial to the revenue. I need not say that I have had many communications from the trade, but I have never heard from any quarter the objections which the hon. Member said the trade entertained to my proposal. The hon. Member denounces me for putting a protectionist tariff on sugar, and is apparently imbued with the idea that I have framed this scale in order to protect the refiners of this country. I have done nothing of the kind; I have simply framed a scale which, according to the words he quoted from Mr. Gladstone, will not interfere with the ordinary course of trade and will leave the refiners of this country and the trade generally, as far as possible, in precisely the relative position they were in before the duties were introduced.

The hon. Member seemed to ignore the extraordinary difference of quality and value and in the amount of crystallised sugar which exists between the kinds of raw sugar which are imported into this country, and the difference, therefore, in the duty that they can bear. If the hon. Member's proposal were adopted the affect would be that no raw sugar polarising below ninety-five degrees would be imported into this country at all, for if there was a fixed duty on all raw sugars importers would confine themselves to that class of raw sugar which contained the highest amount of pure sugar. The lower classes of raw sugar, which are about 95 per cent. of the 12,500,000 cwt. of raw sugar annually imported, would not be imported at all, the importation of sugar being thus confined to refined sugar and the very highest class of raw sugar. That, of course, would absolutely kill the refining industry in this country. The hon. Member has spoken of Messrs. Tate's refinery, which, no doubt, has prospered greatly in spite of the difficulties which have been put in the way of refining in this country by the bounties to refiners in other countries in Europe; but I will venture to say that it would be absolutely impossible for even that refinery to continue to exist under the proposal of the hon. Member. The hon. Member seems to think that there is no reason why sugar should be refined in this country at all, that it would be better if it was not so refined, and that foreign countries are the proper places where that refining should be done. Why should we destroy the industry in this country? I should like to quote to the hon. Member some words used by Mr. Gladstone in 1864, because I think they put the case so fairly and clearly that they are better than any words I could use myself. Mr. Gladstone was arguing in favour of a graduated duty on sugar as against a uniform duty such as the hon. Member suggests, and he gave an example of the operation of a uniform duty by comparing the effect of such a duty on 1 cwt. of refined sugar and on 2 cwt. of low-class sugar, which yielded, after being refined, 50 per cent. of crystallisable sugar. Mr. Gladstone said; "These 2cwt will, when refined, yield, without including the minor profits of refining, 1cwt. of sugar. The question is, Who is to manufacture the article, the refiner in India or the refiner in England?"

Mr. Gladstone was alluding to East India sugar, and therefore spoke of a refiner

in India. He continued;

"The point for our decision is, how are we to adjust our law in such a way that we shall by means of the duty give no inducement to any man to refine in England rather than in India, or in India rather than in England? The Indian refiner buys this 2cwt. of sugar, refines them, and sends the refined sugar to this country, and if the duty in this country is 10s. a cwt. he pays 10s. for the introduction of the 1cwt. of sugar. The British refiner, under a uniform duty, when he has brought his 2cwt. here so that he can refine it, has to pay 10s. duty on each cwt., so that while the English refiner, to get his 1cwt. of sugar into the market, has to pay a duty of 20s., the Indian refiner sends it in for 10s. And yet we are told that that is the way to do justice and to escape the stigma of protection."

That is a conclusive answer to the argument of the hon. Member.

*MR. LOUGH: The illustration was quite wrong.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: No, it was not.

*MR. LOUGH: Two cwt. of sugar would produce more than one cwt.; it would produce nearly one and nine-tenths cwt. of refined sugar. The illustration was wrong.

Mr. Gladstone was not a refiner, although he had other great qualities.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: In all these technical matters of finance Mr. Gladstone thoroughly mastered the subject, and I venture to say he knew far more about it than the hon. Member. Mr. Gladstone went on to say;

"Now, Sir, our sincere and impartial desire is to consider the question without prejudice, but there is no doubt of what the operation of such a uniform duty would be; it would be simply equivalent to a bounty approaching, more or less, nearly 10s. per cwt. upon refining abroad as against refining in England. We are not willing to give any premium for the employment of capital and labour in England rather than abroad, but certainly we are unwilling to be parties to imposing a penalty upon labour and capital in England as compared with foreign countries, and this is what, in our view, would be the effect of a uniform duty."

By killing the refining industry in England, the hon. Member would do something more. He would distinctly diminish competition in the sale of sugar in this country, and consequently increase its price to the consumer, and therefore I cannot imagine a more unjust proposal than the hon. Member has made to the Committee. I will not go further into the arguments in favour of a graduated duty on sugar as against a uniform duty. I have quoted Mr. Gladstone, and I could also quote Mr. Cobden, a Committee of this House presided over by Mr. Cardwell, and also the opinions of representatives of the nations who discussed this matter in 1864. From that day to this there has never been a proposal seriously made for a uniform duty on raw sugar. The hon. Member finds fault with the particular mode which I have adopted of calculating the graduated duty. I admit it is difficult, and at first sight I thought it was more complicated than the proposal which existed in 1874, under which there were five graduations in the tariff: 3s., 2s. 10d., 2s. 8d., 2s. 3d., and 2s. But why was it impossible in these days to do more than adopt steps of that kind? The reason was that the test was a most imperfect one. It was not a chemical test, but a colour test,

and depended entirely on trained eyesight, and the result of that scale was, I admit, not satisfactory. But under the system of the polariscope it is now possible to calculate accurately the amount of crystallizable sugar in any cwt. of raw sugar. The hon. Member created a laugh by the statement of his experiences with regard to the polariscope. I expect he went to the wrong place to find one. I have tested the polariscope myself, and I have seen it worked by a gentleman who thoroughly understands it, and he showed me how it was worked, and though I cannot profess to have any knowledge of chemistry, I think it was one of the simplest and easiest tests that any person with ordinary eyesight can conceive. There was nothing like the possibility of variation between the results of different persons using the polariscope that the hon. Member spoke of. The Customs Department have obtained a good many of these instruments, and they are now in use in places where raw sugar is imported. Of course I do not say that the particular scale I have adopted in this Bill is absolutely perfect, but I do say, in spite of what the hon. Member has said, that it is the most perfect scale in use in the world.

The hon. Member blamed me for having adopted it from the United States, but the United States understand these things very well. [An HON. MEMBER: They are Protectionists.] What does that matter? What has that got to do with the adoption of a scale for the detection of the amount of crystallizable sugar in a cwt. of raw sugar? The hon. Member says that it is protection for the refiners. I have already told the hon. Member that I cannot believe it is anything of the kind. I have had remonstrances from refiners in this country against the scale, who contend that they are placed by it in a worse position than they were in before. On the other hand, I have had a very few objections that it would interfere with the importation of refined sugar. The hon. Member anticipates that the large imports of refined sugar into this country will be diminished by the operation of the duty, and that raw sugar will be substituted. That is a matter of opinion. I do not believe it; but it can only be tested by results. If it be found, by the experiences of time, that the scale works unfairly, why, of course, the scale can be altered. In the meantime I must ask the Committee to some extent to repose confidence in me in the matter. At any rate I have no Protectionist leanings. I have shown that, I think, this evening. I have done my best in concert with those able officers by whom I am assisted to make this scale fair to all parties and to all classes of sugar, and to the interest of the consumer quite as much as to the interest of the producer. I can only place my own authority and the authority of the Customs Department against the authority of the hon. Member in this matter. But I must say that I believe that the hon. Member has been entirely misinformed as to the operation of this scale. In my judgment it is fair to the trade, fair to the producers of sugar, and fair to the consumers.

MR. KEARLEY said that he would remind the Chancellor of the Exchequer that when the polariscope test was criticised during the discussion of the resolutions he then gave a certain pledge, if he might so term it. The right hon. Gentleman stated that he wished the Committee to understand that the scale which was fixed was only to be regarded as tentative. He said that he worked on

the best material he could obtain, but that he would be perfectly ready to benefit by experience. There was a general feeling that the polariscope test was not reliable, and he would ask the right hon. Gentleman if he would consent to the appointment of a Committee of sugar experts; he meant chemists and others who knew the properties of various sugars; who would make an independent examination on behalf of the Revenue? He did not think the Chancellor of the Exchequer would deny that the sources of his information originally were the sugar refiners. He thought he knew where the right hon. Gentleman worked a polariscope. It was at a sugar refinery.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: It was in my own room at the Treasury.

MR. KEARLEY said of course he would accept that. The right hon. Gentleman stated that the new method was discovered in 1874. That was a long time ago in chemistry. He said: "Since 1874 a new method has been invented."

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: "Since" 1874. [The right hon. Gentleman added an observation which was not audible in the press gallery.]

MR. KEARLEY said that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was distinguishing himself by being particularly polite to him that night. He thought, however, that he would make better progress with his Budget if he adopted the advice which was once given by the Colonial Secretary, and kept a civil tongue in his head.

*THE CHAIRMAN: That is language which should not be used to any member of the House.

MR. KEARLEY said he used it under provocation and would withdraw it. He had no desire to misrepresent the Chan-

cellor of the Exchequer, and would put his words before the Committee. They were: "Since 1874 a new method has been invented by which the amount of crystallisable sugar in raw sugar can be ascertained." Whatever the date might have been, it had been conclusively proved since that time that the methods were not accurate. The right hon Gentleman had said that this scale had been adopted by the trade, but he did not explain what he meant by the trade. As a matter of fact, he meant the shippers of raw sugar to this country. It was true that the polariscope was used as the test to find the saccharine matter upon which revenue was to be paid. In the calculation the amount of ash had a very important bearing; it was assumed that the percentage of ash prevented five times its weight in crystallisation, but he was informed by two of the best chemists in this country that one per cent. of ash prevented only three times its weight, so that any sugar which did not crystallise was treated as molasses, and the refiner got a greater amount of crystallised sugar than was supposed. The right hon. Gentleman had admitted that he was open to criticism with regard to the polariscope, and he ventured to say that the suggestion he offered was a reasonable one, namely, that a Committee of experts should be appointed to test this instrument, to ascertain whether the deductions which had been arrived at were accurate. He expressed regret that he should have imported any heat into the observation he had made, and he hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would take no notice of it.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I should be very sorry to say anything to any hon. Member that was calculated to give offence. With regard to the suggestion of the hon.

Member, I will say this, that it is to my interest more than that of anybody else that this test should be accurate and fair. I do not see how, *prima facie*, you could get a fairer test than one which is accepted by the seller of the article on the one side and the buyer on the other as the means of determining what is the amount of sugar for which the buyer pays. I am quite aware that there are differences of opinion as to the precise action of the polariscope on certain kinds of sugar, and I shall carefully watch the matter, and if I see any cause for entertaining doubt upon the subject I shall be very willing to consider the appointment of a Committee of experts to inquire into it.

*MR. MOULTON (Cornwall, Launceston) said that he hoped the hon. Gentleman would not press his Amendment to a division. They were now endeavouring to ascertain how best to arrange a tax which the country would have to bear, and to do this they must avail themselves of the known means of measuring the article taxed. It was ridiculous to discuss the polariscope, as if it were not an instrument of which the results were not perfectly well known as an instrument of science. It might be true that it was not more than fifty years ago since the rotary polarisation of sugar was discovered, and that in 1874 it was first put to practical use; but the reliability of the instrument had been fully established, and it was perfectly well known that one could now read off the degrees of polarisation upon this instrument just as easily as one could read off the results of any other instrument. In fact, the polariscope was to sugar what the hydrometer was to alcohol, and to quarrel with an instrument which was scientifically accurate, and which had been accepted as a practical test by buyers and sellers for twenty-five years, was surely a mistake for a Committee engaged in a task like this. If scientific men only were agreed upon this matter there might be room for the discussion, but when practical men also were satisfied with the instrument the Committee could not do better than to adopt it. With regard to the scale, in the schedule which was taken from the customs regulations of the United States of America, as representing fairly the amount of sugar which might bear taxation in mixed goods, he had not heard one word to lead him to think that that scale was inaccurate. It was not the interest of any Government, in collecting duties, to adopt an inaccurate scale, and therefore, as they must start with a scale of this kind, they could not do better than start with one which came from such a high authority. Personally so far as he could form an opinion, he thought the scale was fairly accurate, but in any case he urged the Committee to adopt the polariscope, which the trade and the shippers had adopted, the gradations of which would neither favour the high or the low qualities of sugar. If they favoured the low qualities it was protection to the sugar refiners of England. If they favoured the high it was a distinct advantage to the foreigner. He thought the Committee could with confidence trust the right hon. Gentleman in this matter.

*MR. LOUGH said he thought there was nothing more monstrous in this Committee than for hon. Gentlemen, especially lawyers, to plunge into a discussion in this way merely because they understood a scientific instrument possibly better than

any other gentlemen on the Committee. The only argument for bringing an instrument of this kind into use was that it was accurate, but there had been business men who had been able to arrive at an accurate result of the quality of the goods they dealt in although they had no such scientific instrument. On Tuesday the Committee were proposing a graduated duty on tea and the hon. Gentleman who brought forward that proposal showed that the method which prevailed in the trade for testing tea was perfectly accurate, and although that was admitted, the Government rejected the graduated duty. The hon. Member did not prove his case when he said that this was an instrument scientifically accurate, He had to go further and prove that it was desirable to drag this instrument in at a certain stage of the production of sugar, and measure the duty by this instrument. In the earlier stages of the sugar industry the qualities were tested by taste, by colour, and by scent, and the man who was a large dealer in sugar tested it in that way. He did not know how many degrees of sugar it might contain, and he did not care, and when a man went about buying sugar abroad he knew what he could sell it for in England, but now with this complicated scale of duties they could not do that; they could only say that this will have to bear one of twenty-four duties, and we cannot tell which. The argument of the hon. Member for Launceston was good so far as it went, but it did not go far enough. He did not prove that it was desirable to introduce this scientific instrument into the dealings of the market. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer had quoted a passage from a speech which Mr. Gladstone made in 1864, and he then ventured to state that the right hon. Gentleman would find all the bad arguments for the policy which he was introducing in that speech of Mr. Gladstone's. In 1864 Mr. Gladstone said that 2 cwts. of low-class East Indian sugar would yield 1 cwt. of crystallised sugar. There were two mistakes in that statement, which showed that Mr. Gladstone had not gone to the bottom of the subject. Ten years later he would not have used that argument at all. In the first place, 2 cwt. of low-class East Indian sugar would yield 1½ cwt. of crystallised sugar; and, in the second place, the refuse would be of value, and taxable in the Budget. The mistake of the right hon. Gentleman was in thinking that it was necessary for him to mark by differential duties the differences in the value of sugar. But this was not so. The higgling of the market accomplished all that was necessary. The day these duties were proposed to the Committee the prices of sugar in England ranged from 8s. for the lowest to 13s. for the highest quality. This was a difference of 5s. per cwt. By putting a duty of 2s. on the lowest of these qualities and 4s. 2d. on the highest, in a single night the House of Commons had established a difference in the price of sugar of 7s. 2d. a cwt. He submitted that nothing ought to be done in this House which would affect in this way the price in the market; and in his opinion the fair thing was not to differentiate between the qualities but to tax all alike. He had worked out what the effect would be of introducing 1 cwt. of sugar into this country and refining it if the same duty was paid upon all, and he found that, even where the lowest class sugar was dealt with, the duties being equal, a very respectable profit was left to the refiner. This system of taxation could only result in giving protection to the

sugar refiners of this country. He had had the opportunity of seeing an advance copy of a prospectus which was about being issued to the public, in which it was pointed out that the action of the Government had made it possible by imposing these duties for a sugar refinery which had not paid during the last ten years, and which was doing only half what it did before the Spanish and American war, to be worked at a profit. That single instance would show the foolish act which the Committee were hurriedly committing to-night, and would have its effect upon the consumers of this country before many months were over.

*MR. MOULTON said the hon. Member for West Islington drew a piteous picture of the man who in the early years of sugar refining had nothing but his taste to trust to, and protested against the terrible accuracy of the polariscope being introduced as against this trade custom. But the argument answered itself. In those years people tasted to find what the sugar would sell for. But it was sold; by the polariscope, so that, in other words, they tasted in order to find what the polariscope would now tell them. It was because they found that their taste enabled them to anticipate what the polariscope would say that they trusted to their taste, and for the same reason they might trust to it now. The only change was that then it was used for determining the price; now it was to be used for determining the duty also.

MR. E. J. C. MORTON (Devonport) said he was opposed entirely to the sugar duty, and this Amendment was neither more nor less than a red herring drawn across the scent which the Committee ought to pursue. Many speeches had been made to-night upon the subject, including that which had fallen from his hon. friend the Member for Launceston, who, perhaps, knew more about it than any other Member of the Committee. He might say with regard to the remarks of the hon. Member for West Islington that they clearly proved to him that the hon. Member did not know what a polariscope was. He was informed that there was only one firm in the world who made the polariscope for testing sugar, and that was a firm in Berlin, and their method was that instead of having to estimate when the light was darkest

there was a comparison between two lights, and one had to determine when those lights were alike, which everybody knew was the easiest thing in the world to do. That was the method adopted by that particular class of polariscope, and the whole argument as to the difference of human eyes went by the board. It was only since 1874 that the polariscope had been used to test the amount of sugar in various products, and 1874 was the last year in which a duty was levied upon sugar imported into this country, and that being so, he was right in assuming that until the right hon. Gentleman made his speech there was not a custom house officer who had used it. Under those circumstances the Chancellor of the Exchequer would have to organise a whole army of custom house officers who would be experts in the use of the polariscope, to test the sugar which came into this country. The right hon. Gentleman had said he was going to collect this £5,000,000 at an expenditure of £40,000. He did not know how many polariscopes the right hon. Gentleman would have to buy, but having inquired into the price of these instruments and of Iceland spar, he did not think his estimate of

£;40,000 would purchase the number that would be required, owing to the very limited supply of Iceland spar in the world. That limited amount of Iceland spar was hoarded by those who had it, and instead of being able to get a reduction of price by taking a large number of the instruments, the effect of trying to make a large purchase would be to raise the price enormously, because it would result in the taking of Iceland spar out of the kingdom. It was said that a concession was given to a particular firm in Iceland twenty-five years ago for the production of Iceland spar, and that that firm had gone on the economic principle of limiting the output, and that they, having got out a certain amount of Iceland spar, would not get out any more. Even supposing they could be compelled to increase the output by the Icelandic Storting, that body only met once in three years, and their last meeting was during the late autumn, and, inasmuch as the present price of the polariscope was £;30, he ventured to suggest the right hon. Gentleman would not collect his £;5,000,000 for a total expenditure of £;40,000.

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS did not think the right hon. Gentleman had appreciated the argument of the hon. Member for West Islington, which was that the use of this scientific instrument was an imposition on the trade; that when a foreign seller sold a fine class of sugar, and was asked to make a price, he would not be able to do so; that that was a serious impediment to place in the way of those introducing fine sugars into this country, and that it would make it impossible for them to introduce these fine sugars. The Committee would see that there was a distinct difference between a man who could say "I sell at 8s. 6d. per cwt." and a man who said he sold at 8s. 6d. per cwt. per cent. The accuracy of the test depended on the by-products which were to be obtained in the process of refinement, and he submitted that the result of the system to be instituted would be the giving of a certain stimulus to the refining industry in consequence of the profit that would be obtained in by-production. The molasses coming into the country were to be taxed, and he would like to know whether the molasses produced in the home refineries would be taxed to some extent.

MR. JORDAN said that a great number of hon. Members interested in the sugar trade knew nothing whatever of the polariscope, which was a most costly scientific instrument. Would the right

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Bignold, Arthur

Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Bigwood, James

Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Blundell, Colonel Henry

Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge

Allhusen, Augustus Hy. Eden

Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-

Cranborne, Viscount

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Bousfield, Wm. Robert
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Brassey, Albert
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Crossley, Sir Savile
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Arrol, Sir William
Butcher, John George
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward H.
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Austin, Sir John
Cautley, Henry Strother
Dickson, Charles Scott
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Baird, John G. Alexander
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Balcarres, Lord
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worcr'
Doughty, George
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Doxford, Sir William T.
Balfour, Maj K R (Christchureh
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Banbury, Frederick George
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Fardell, Sir T. George
Bathurst, Hon. A. Benjamin

Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H (Bristol)
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Fergusson, Rt. Hn Sir J. (Manc'r
Beckett, Ernest William
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst

hon. Gentleman place one in the tea-room for their examination and consideration?

MR. O'MARA agreed with a great deal that had fallen from the hon. Member for West Islington, and that any graduation of sugar duties was bad, but he did not believe it would affect the sugar refineries. The right hon. Gentleman might be trusted so far that he would see that any graduation would be so directed that it would not afford any protection to the manufacturers of this Kingdom. This, however, did not reconcile him to any system of graduation in the sugar duties. The right hon. Gentleman on a previous occasion had strongly opposed any system of ad valorem duties, but this was an ad valorem duty on sugar. The right hon. Gentleman had said that an ad valorem duty would increase the cost of collection; this graduation of the sugar duties was of the same nature exactly as an ad valorem duty. But, apart from that, there was a much stronger objection against a graduation of any duty, which was that it raised the prices of the high-class article beyond the market value, and reduced the lower class to below the market value. The consequence was that a premium was placed on the low and a discount on the high class article. On these grounds he would support the hon. Gentleman if he pressed his Amendment to a division.

Question put.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 226 Noes, 132. (Division List No. 265.)

Finch, George H.

Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Richards, Henry Charles
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Rickett, J. Compton
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Leveson-Gower, Fred. N. S.
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Fisher, William Haves
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose-
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (Bristol, S.)
Ropner, Colonel Robert

Fletcher, Sir Henry
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Flower, Ernest
Lucas, Col. F. (Lowestoft)
Round, James
Garfit, William
Lucas, R. J. (Portsmouth)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Gordon, Hn J. E. (Elgin&Nairn
Macartney, Rt. Hon. W. G. E.
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Gore, Hn. G. R C Ormsby-(Salop
Macdona, John Gumming
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw J.
Gore, Hn. S. F. Ormsby-(Line.
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Seton-Karr, Henry
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Maconochie, A. W.
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Goschen, Hn. George Joachim
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinbur'h W
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Green, Walford D (Wednesbury
M'Killop, Jas. (Stirlingshire)
Smith, H C (North'mb Tyneside
Greene, Sir E. W (B'ryS Edm'nds
Majendie, James A. H.
Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks.)
Gretton, John
Malcolm, Ian
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Spear, John Ward
Groves, James Grimble
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John Wm.
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Guthrie, Walter Murray

Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Stock, James Henry
Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G (Mid'x
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Hamilton, Marq of (Lnd'nderry
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Stroyan, John
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robt. Wm
Moon, Edw. Robert Paey
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Morgan, David J (Walthamst'w
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Morgan, Hn Fred. (Monm'thsh.
Talbot, Rt Hn J G. (Oxf'd Univ.)
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Morrell, George Herbert
Thornton, Percy M.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Heaton, John Henniker
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Valentia, Viscount
Helder, Augustus
Moulton, John Fletcher
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Henderson, Alexander
Mount, William Arthur
Walker, Col. Wm. Hall
Hermon-Hodge, Robert T.
Mowbray, Sir Rbt. Gray C.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Hoare, Edw. B. (Hampstead)
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Hobhouse, H. (Somerset, E.)
Myers, William Henry
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Hope, J. F. (Sheff'ld, Brightside
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Webb, Colonel William George
Hornby, Sir William Henry
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens

Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne)
Hquldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(Birm
Houlb, Joseph
Parkes, Ebenezer
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington
Wills, Sir Frederick
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Peel, Hon. Wm. Robert W.
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Penn, John
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Plummer, Walter R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Wilson, J W. (Worcestersh., N.)
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Pretymann, Ernest George
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Pym, C. Guy
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Keswick, William
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Kimber, Henry
Randles, John S.
Wylie, Alexander
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Rankin, Sir James
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Knowles, Lees
Rasch, Major Fred. Carne
Younger, William
Lambton, Hon. Frederick W.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Law, Andrew Bonar
Remnant, James Farquharson
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)

Renshaw, Charles Bine
Lawson, John Grant
Rentoul, James Alexander
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fare'm
Renwick, George
NOES.
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)
Burt, Thomas
Dillon, John
Allan, William (Gateshead)
Caine, William Sproston
Donelan, Captain A.
Ambrose, Robert
Caldwell, James
Doogan, P. C.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Duffy, William J.
Atherley-Jones, L.
Causton, Richard Knight
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Cawley, Frederick
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Channing, Francis Allston
Fenwick, Charles
Bell, Richard
Cogan, Denis J.
Ffrench, Peter
Black, Alexander William
Colville, John
Field, William
Boland, John
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Crean, Eugene
Gilhooly, James
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Crombie, John William
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Brigg, John
Cullinan, J.
Hammond, John
Broadhurst, Henry

Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan)
Hayden, John Patrick
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Delany, William
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir A. D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Norman, Henry
Shaw, Chas. Edw. (Stafford)
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary Mid.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh.)
Jacoby, James Alfred
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Joicey, Sir James
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)
Soares, Ernest J.
Jones, David Brymor (Swansea)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Spencer, Rt Hn C.R. (Northants)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Stevenson, Francis S.
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Dowd, John
Strachey, Edward
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Sullivan, Donal
Layland-Barratt, Francis
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N)
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Leamy, Edmund
O'Malley, William
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
O'Mara, James

Thomas, J A (Glam'rg'n, Gower)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Tomkinson, James
Leng, Sir John
Partington, Oswald
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Lewis, John Herbert
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Lundon, W.
Pirie, Duncan V.
Weir, James Galloway
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Power, Patrick Joseph
White, George (Norfolk)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Price, Robert John
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
M'Dermott, Patrick
Rea, Russell
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
M'Govern, T.
Reddy, M.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Mooney, John J.
Redmond, William (Clare)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Morgan, J. L. (Carmarthen)
Rigg, Richard
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Murnaghan, George
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Yoxall, James Henry
Newnes, Sir George
Robson, William Snowdon
Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.)
Roe, Sir Thomas
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;Mr. Lough and Mr. Kearley.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)

Schwann, Charles E.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 2, to leave out lines 16 to 20, and insert the words:

£;

s.

d.

'Molasses (except when cleared for use by a licensed distiller in the manufacture of spirits) and all sugar and extracts from sugar which cannot be tested by the polariscope;

If containing 70 per cent. or more of sweetening matter
the cwt.

0

2

9

If containing less than 70 per cent. and more than 50 per cent. of sweetening
matter

per cwt.

0

2

0

If containing not more than 50 per cent. of sweetening matter
the cwt.

0

1

0

Glucose:

Solid

the cwt.

0

2

9

Liquid

the cwt.

0

2

0"

;(Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.)

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

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS doubted whether the right hon. Gentleman's desire to assist
agriculture in this matter would be carried out by the method adopted.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH suggested that the discussion could better take place on the
question of the insertion of the words proposed.

Question put, and negatived.

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

*MR. LOUGH pointed out that the words now left out established a maximum duty on

molasses of 2s. per cwt. He understood that representations had been made to the Chancellor of the Exchequer that with regard to some of the qualities of molasses used for cattle feeding the proposed duty of 2s. was too high, and as a result the right hon. Gentleman had agreed that a lower quality of molasses than was mentioned in the original scheme of the Budget should be admitted at 1s. per cwt. That was a very proper decision to arrive at, but on the scheme being laid before the House it was found that, in addition to reducing the tax on the lower quality of molasses to 1s., the right hon. Gentleman proposed to charge 2s. 9d., or 9d. higher than was originally proposed, on the higher quality. If the amount charged for sugar on the polariscopic scale was compared with that suggested for molasses it would be seen that there was something very unequal in the two. Sugar polarising up to 76 per cent. was admitted at 2s., but molasses containing over 70 per cent. of sweetening matter was to be charged 2s. 9d. He could see no reason why that should

be so, and therefore he desired to move to omit the words "If containing 70 per cent. or more of sweetening matter, 2s. 9d. per cwt." The effect of this Amendment would be that the highest quality of molasses, which did not contain more sweetening matter than the lowest mentioned quality of sugar, should pay 2s.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment;

"In line 4, to leave out from the word 'containing,' to the word 'more,' in line 6.";(Mr. Lough.)

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

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH was understood to reply that molasses was really a by-product of raw sugar, and that practically the first part of the proposal, referring to articles containing 70 or 75 per cent. of sweetening matter, would not apply to it. Extracts from sugar, however, which were extracts from fine sugar or sugar of high polarisation were not by any means by-products like molasses. The hon. Member was apparently under a misapprehension.

*MR. MOULTON asked how it was that the extracts were charged a higher duty than the 76 per cent. sugar.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH said he understood that these were extracts from fine sugar or sugar of a very high polarisation, and that, therefore, they could not be contrasted with the article to which the hon. Member alluded. Sugar of 76 degrees polarisation would be a very low class sugar.

*MR.. MOULTON certainly did not suppose that the term included invert sugar. Invert sugar was not an extract from sugar; it was a modified sugar. If the provision referred to invert sugar, surely the amount to be paid should be in proportion to the amount of invert sugar contained in the article; it should not stop short at 70 per cent.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH said the difficulty was that invert sugar could not be tested by the polariscope. It could only be tested by a chemical process, by which the amount of sweetening matter in it was ascertained. At present it was impossible to prepare a precise table for molasses, glucose, and extracts of the kind referred to which could compare with that for sugar itself, but it was

hoped that in time something of the sort would be arranged. They had, therefore, to be classified in the way proposed, and he was advised that the words "extracts from sugar" would include invert sugar. If the hon. Member was of a different opinion he would consider the advisability of altering the words at a later stage.

*MR. MOULTON did not think invert sugar could be classed as an extract from sugar. But the point to which he desired to call the attention of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was that if the words "sweetening matter" referred to invert sugar and to some of the modified sugars, the clause might land him in considerable difficulties. Glucose might be called a "sweetening matter"; indeed there was a vast class of substances which might be called "sweetening matters." He had presumed the words referred only to cane sugar, but if they were intended to refer to invert sugar he thought there should be some more specific reference to it.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH said the point should receive his attention.

MR. KEARLEY assured the Chancellor of the Exchequer that he was entirely wrong in stating that invert sugar could not be tested by the polariscope. Cane sugar rotated the plane of light to the right, while invert sugar rotated it to the left. That was the real explanation of the very term "invert." Probably what had caused the right hon. Gentleman to make this differentiation between common molasses, so-called, and high-class syrups was the fact that fine refined sugars were being inverted and used in syrups of a very high character.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH said that if they could be tested by the polariscope they would come under the sugar definition.

MR. KEARLEY, to prove that invert sugar could be tested by the polariscope, mentioned an experiment he had made. He desired to watch the action of the polariscope in dealing with cane sugar

and invert sugar. An equal amount of liquid of the same class of sugar was placed in each of two glass phials, one sample being of cane sugar not inverted and the other having in it one drop of acid which immediately inverted it. In the first instance, the polariscope indicated the degrees of sugar to the right, but in the other the polariscope rotated to the left. That was conclusive proof that invert sugar could be tested by the polariscope.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick) was glad an arrangement had been come to with regard to the lower quality of molasses, but he could not understand why an additional 9d. per hundredweight could not be put on the higher quality. The Amendment was an exceedingly moderate and reasonable one, and ought to be accepted in view of the technical difference which existed. He hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would keep the range of taxation with regard to molasses as low as possible, as it would be a mistake to handicap manufactures which had but recently been developed.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.) said the term "sweetening matter" introduced in the Amendment proposed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer did not appear in the original Bill, and therefore the Committee should have some explanation as to the exact meaning of the phrase. To the ordinary man in the street molasses itself was sweetening matter. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would state what

exactly was meant by "75 per cent. of sweetening matter," and how the amount of sweetening matter in molasses was to be ascertained?

MR. ALEXANDER ROSS said he understood the Chancellor of the Exchequer intended to revise his first proposal in regard to molasses. Of the molasses imported into this country 95 per cent. were used for the feeding of cattle. All the molasses he had seen imported, with the exception of an inferior quality from Germany, contained over 50 per cent. of sweetening matter. He trusted that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would inquire further into this matter.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH, in reply, was understood to say that he could not allow molasses of a very high sweetening power to pay a low duty.

MR. DILLON said that "sweetening matter" was a new term which had been introduced, and he hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would inform them what it meant. The hon. Member opposite, who was an expert, had pointed out that there was a great difference and much uncertainty about the term "sweetening matter." They did not know whether it was to apply to the crystallisable sugar in the molasses or other substances which were not crystallisable, although they were sweetening matter. This was a very important point, for there appeared to be great uncertainty as to what sweetening matter meant.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH said he was afraid he could not give a technical definition of sweetening matter.

MR. O'MARA said he should support the hon. Member for Islington if he pressed his motion to a division.

MR. LOUGH said he did not wish to put the Committee to the trouble of a division, but he should have to do so if he was not met in some way. Some doubt had been expressed in regard to the term "sweetening matter," and he thought that point should be cleared up before deciding the question.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The 2s. 9d. rate will not touch molasses at all.

MR. DILLON said the Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated that sweetening matter was not cane sugar, although it was the same as saccharine.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I said it was saccharine, not crystallisable sugar.

*MR. MOULTON thought it was advisable that the Chancellor of the Exchequer should provide a clearer definition upon this point. The right hon. Gentleman was evidently using the term "sweetening matter" in a different sense from that which was implied by cane sugar. Therefore he ought to put in some definition, because there were many glucoses which had different sweetening properties. If the right hon. Gentleman was going to take the proportion of 70 per cent. of sweetening matter as fixing the duty, he ought to indicate the test by which it was to be taken.

There ought to be reference to a schedule which gave the definition, otherwise it would be quite impossible to realise what was the exact substance for which they would have to pay duty. He thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer would find this an easy solution of the difficulty, for then they would have a perfectly clear scientific definition of the term "sweetening matter."

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I shall be very glad to consider the suggestion made by the hon. Member, and I will communicate with him upon the subject.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): Whatever the right hon. Gentleman

does upon this question I hope he will not amend the Bill under the gallery. The Committee is already

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole

Hardy, Laurence(Kent, Ashf'd

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)

Harris, Frederick Leverton

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)

Haslam, Sir Alfred S.

Allhusen, Augustus Hy. Eden

Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge

Haslett, Sir James Horner

Anson, Sir William Reynell

Cranborne, Viscount

Hay, Hon. Claude George

Archdale, Edward Mervyn

Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)

Heaton, John Henniker

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Crossley, Sir Savile

Henderson, Alexander

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Cust, Henry John C.

Herraon-Hodge, Robt. Trotter

Arrol, Sir William

Dalkeith, Earl of

Hoare, E. Brodie (Hampstead

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Dalrymple, Sir Charles

Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset E.

Austin, Sir John

Davenport, William Bromley-

Hope, J. F. (Sh'ffield, Brightside

Bain, Colonel James Robert

Dickson, Charles Scott

Hornby, Sir Wm. Henry

Baird, John George Alexander

Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.

Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry

Balcarres, Lord

Digby, John K. D. Wingfield

Hoult, Joseph

Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)

Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cock field
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Doughty, George
Johnstone Heywood (Sussex)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Balfour, Maj. K R (Christchurch
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Banbury, Frederick George
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Keswick, William
Bathurst, Hon. Allen B.
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William H.
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Beach, Rt Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn E.
Knowles, Lees
Beckett, Ernest William
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Lambton, Hn. Fredk. Wm.
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Finch, George H.
Law, Andrew Bonar
Bignold, Arthur
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Lawrence, Joseph (Monmouth
Big wood, James
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool
Blundell, Colonel
Fisher, William Hayes
Lawson, John Grant
Bond, Edward
Galloway, William Johnson
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareh'm
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Garfit, William
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Bousfield, Wm. Robert
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Brassey, Albert
Gordon, Hn J. E. (Elgin&Nairn)

Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
 Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
 Gore, Hn G. R. Ormsby-(Salop)
 Llewellyn, Evan Henry
 Burdett-Coutts, W.
 Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc)
 Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
 Butcher, John George
 Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
 Loder, Gerald W. Erskine
 Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
 Goschen, Hon. George J.
 Long, Rt. Hn. W. (Bristol, S.)
 Cautley, Henry Strother
 Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
 Loyd, Archie Kirkman
 Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lanes.)
 Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)
 Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
 Cavendish, V C W (Derbyshire)
 Greene, Sir E W (B'ryS Edm'nds
 Lucas, R. J. (Portsmouth)
 Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
 Gretton, John
 Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
 Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich
 Greville, Hon. Ronald
 Macartney, Rt. Hn. W G Ellison
 Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
 Groves, James Grimble
 Macdona, John Cumming
 Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
 Guthrie, Walter Murray
 Maclver, David (Liverpool)
 Chapman, Edward
 Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Midd.
 Maconochie, A. W.
 Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
 Hamilton, Marq. of (L'donderry
 M'Arthur, Chas. (Liverpool)
 Colomb, Sir J. Charles Ready
 Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robt. W.
 M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim E.

in a somewhat confused state of mind upon this point.

MR. KEARLEY said he desired to point out how reasonable was his original request that the Chancellor of the Exchequer should appoint a Committee of experts to go

into this question. He the ought the right hon. Gentleman now realised that he might be wrong in some of his deductions, and it would give confidence to the Committee if he would appoint a Committee of Inquiry. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would give an undertaking to call together a Committee of experts to consider this point, and if he did this he was sure they would accept with the greatest confidence the decision arrived at.

Question put.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 215; Noes, 131. (Division List No. 266.)

M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.)

Randles, John S.

Stroyan, John

M'Killop, Jas. (Stirlingshire)

Rankin, Sir James

Strutt, Hn. Chas. Hedley

Majendie, James A. H.

Rasch, Major Frederic Carne

Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)

Martin, Richard Biddulph

Reid, James (Greenock)

Talbot, Rt. Hon. J. G. (Oxf'd U.)

Mildmay, Francis Bingham

Remnant, James Farquharson

Thornton, Percy M.

Molesworth, Sir Lewis

Rentoul, James Alexander

Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray

Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)

Renwick, George

Tufnell, Lt.-Col. Edward

Moon, Edward Robert Pacy

Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge

Valentia, Viscount

Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow

Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson

Walker, Col. William Hall

Morgah, Hon. F. (Monm'thsh.)

Rolleston, Sir John F. L.

Warde, Col. C. E.

Morrell, George Herbert

Ropner, Colonel Robert

Warr, Augustus Frederick

Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.

Rothschild, Hn. Lionel Walter

Wason, John C. (Orkney)

Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford

Round, James

Webb, Col. William George
Moulton, John Fletcher
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Mount, William Arthur
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alex.
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Seely, Chas. Hilton (Lincoln)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Myers, William Henry
Seton-Karr, Henry
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Sharpe, Wm. Edw. T.
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. Renfrew
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Parkes, Ebenezer
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darling'n)
Smith, H C (Northm'b Tyneside
Wylie, Alexander
Peel, Hn Wm. Robert Wellesley
Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks.)
Wyndham, Rt. Hn. George
Plummer, Walter R.
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Spear, John Ward
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Pretymann, Ernest George
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Stock, James Henry

NOES.

Abraham, William(Cork, N. E.

Goddard, Daniel Ford

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.

Allan, William (Gateshead)

Griffith, Ellis J.

Partington, Oswald

Ambrose, Robert

Haldane, Richard Burdon

Paulton, James Mellor

Ashton, Thomas Gair

Hammond, John

Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)

Asquith, Rt. Hn Herbert Henry

Harmsworth, R Leicester

Pirie, Duncan V.

Barry, E. (Cork, S.)

Hayden, John Patrick

Power, Patrick Joseph

Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)

Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-

Price, Robert John

Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.

Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.

Priestley, Arthur

Bell, Richard

Helme, Norval Watson

Rea, Russell

Black, Alexander William

Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Chas. H.

Reddy, M.

Boland, John

Joicey, Sir James

Redmond, John E. (Waterford)

Brigg, John

Jones, David Brynmor Swansea

Redmond, William (Clare)

Broadhurst, Henry

Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)

Rickett, J. Compton

Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)

Jordan, Jeremiah

Rigg, Richard

Bryce, Rt. Hon. James

Kennedy, Patrick James

Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)

Buxton, Sydney
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Robson, William Snowdon
Caldwell, James
Leamy, Edmund
Roe, Sir Thomas
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. Accrington
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Causton, Richard Knight
Leng, Sir John
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Cawley, Frederick
Lundon, W.
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)
Channing, Francis Allston
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Cogan, Denis J.
M'Arthur, Wm. (Cornwall)
Soares, Ernest J.
Colville, John
M'Dermott, Patrick
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R Northants
Condon, Thomas Joseph
M'Govern, T.
Stevenson, Francis S.
Crean, Eugene
M'Kenna, Reginald
Sullivan, Donal
Crombie, John William
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Cullinan, J.
Mooney, John J.
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devon port)
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gow'r
Delany, William
Moss, Samuel
Tomkinson, James
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)

Murnaghan, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Dillon, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Warner, Thos. Courtenay T.
Donelan, Captain A.
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway. N.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Doogan, P. C.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Weir, James Galloway
Douglas, Charles M (Lanark)
Norman, Henry
White, George (Norfolk)
Duffy, William J.
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Md
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Elibank, Master of
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
Williams, Osmond Merioneth
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Ffrench, Peter
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Field, William
O'Dowd, John
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;Mr. Kearley and M. Lough.
Gilhooly, James
O'Malley, William
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
O'Mara, James

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

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: There has just been a division which was entirely unnecessary. My hon. friend rose for the purpose of asking leave to withdraw his Amendment, but it was not conceded. I rise for the purpose of supporting the appeal that has been made to the right hon. Gentleman to consider favourably the

idea of having a Committee to inquire into these points. Some of these, which are of extreme technical interest, are matters upon which all of us are not qualified to form an opinion. The Chancellor of the Exchequer is advised, no doubt, by skilled chemists and scientific men, but there is another side to the question altogether, namely, the point of view of practical men of business; and might it not be possible to induce the right hon. Gentleman to consider whether a conference on the subject could be held between men of experience in the trade, who are not, after all, destitute of a certain sort of scientific knowledge and experience, and the purely scientific gentlemen, in order to adjust those questions of difference? I think if that was understood it would tend very much to facilitate the disposal of the Amendments to the clause.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The right hon. Gentleman no doubt is not aware that for the last two months there have been constant conferences at the Customs between persons engaged in the trade affected by the sugar duties and experts highly qualified, and all these matters have practically been dealt with to the satisfaction of the trade. I do not wish to say that further consideration may not be required, and I am quite prepared to consider how that could be arrived at. But the right hon. Gentleman has been impressed unduly by the hostility to this measure displayed by two hon. Gentlemen sitting behind him. I do not find that other gentlemen engaged in the trade take at all the same view. Those two hon. Members may be right in some of the views they have expressed, and I should be very glad if they would communicate with the Customs. But I cannot say anything further than that. I would venture to say that if there had been any widespread objection in the trade against the manner in which it is proposed to deal with the sugar duties, it would have found expression in the press and in other ways.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I do not owe my inspiration entirely to my hon. friends the Members for Devon-port and West Islington. I have received elaborate communications which are perfectly unintelligible to me from persons in the trade, which are very much to the same effect as what my hon. friends have been saying. That was the ground on which I made the appeal to the right hon. Gentleman.

*MR. MOULTON said he wished to point out a serious omission from the clause. He understood that the right hon. Gentleman now included in sweetening matter invert sugar. There was no mention of an import duty on invert sugar unless it was included in the "extracts from sugar," and anything above 70 per cent. only paid 2s. 9d. But if the invert sugar was made in England it must be made from cane sugar, and that cane sugar paid a very much higher duty. He was sure it was an omission, and that there was no intention to give a preference to the foreign over the English manufacturer. He thought the matter ought to be looked into.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I am certainly advised that a tax of 2s. 9d. on invert sugar, having regard to its sweetening power, would place it on an equality with invert sugar manufactured here. I will think over what the hon. Member has said. It would perhaps be better to insert the words "invert sugar" in the definition clause.

MR. DILLON said that after all that had occurred there were not two men in the

House who could tell what sweetening matter was. He asserted that without out fear of contradiction. He defied all the Members of the House to get up and tell what sweetening matter was. He was not quite sure that it was clear to the Chancellor's own mind.

*MR. LOUGH, who had on the Paper an Amendment to decrease the duty on saccharine from 1s. 3d. to 9d. an oz., said that saccharine was a substance with 300 times the sweetening property of sugar. The duty on saccharine was not more than 300 times the duty on sugar in the tariffs of foreign countries which he had examined.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH said saccharin was an extremely sweet article, and it was necessary to have a duty of 1s. 3d. on it.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.) said he wished to know what saccharine was made of. He believed it was made of coal tar. That was an industry in this country, and they ought to encourage native industry. He thought this would lead to a good deal of smuggling. Therefore he trusted that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would explain this point, because it made a very great deal of difference.

MR. MOULTON pointed out to the Chancellor of the Exchequer that saccharine embraced two qualities, one of which was 300 times and the other 500 times as sweet as sugar. He thought the schedule should show the test by which saccharine was to be determined, for it would be unfair to tax saccharin which was 300 times as sweet as sugar upon the same basis as saccharine which was 500 times as sweet as sugar.

MR. O'MARA thought it would be better to endeavour to reduce the number of duties rather than increase them.

Question put, and negatived.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 2, line 25, at end, to insert the words, 'Provided that, as from the nineteenth day of April up to the eleventh day of June nineteen hundred and one the duties on molasses and glucose shall be deemed to have been chargeable at the rates specified in the Resolution of the Committee of Ways and Means of the eighteenth day of April nineteen hundred and one.'";(The Chancellor of the Exchequer.)

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

MR. CHARLES M'ARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange) appealed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to reconsider this point. This duty was referred to by the Chancellor of the Exchequer as a temporary duty, and it was to be the maximum duty at the time when it

operated. He thought it was only reasonable that it should be reduced. With regard to molasses; the Committee would remember that the Chancellor of the Exchequer proposed a 2s. rate per hundredweight for all classes of molasses. When it was pointed out to him that a large proportion of molasses was used chiefly for cattle he introduced a differentiation, making the rate 1s. per hundredweight for the low class of molasses. He did not think that the importer should suffer through the want of information on the part of the Treasury upon this matter. Since the Chancellor of the Exchequer had made his statement a large quantity of this low grade of molasses had arrived and it was found by the

importers that there were no bonded stores where they could put it in warehouses and the great bulk of it remained untouched. In reply to a question, the Chancellor of the Exchequer said that if these importers had asked for bonding facilities they could have obtained them in their own warehouses. But they had not done so, and he did not think they ought to be penalised simply because they had not been as sharp as they might have been and because they had depended upon the good faith of the Government to treat them fairly. If the duty was to be levied at this higher rate and only reduced from the 11th of June it would be very unfortunate. They had paid the duty and they could not get it back.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: My hon. friend has brought this matter under my notice, and I may say that it relates solely to the action of one particular firm. It is impossible to make an exception for one firm alone, who, if they have done what is alleged, have suffered entirely through their own negligence. If I did what has been asked it would give an unfair advantage to the clients of my hon. friend. I believe that other firms have paid the duty and sold and delivered the goods to their customers.

MR. CHARLES M'ARTHUR said that in the few cases where the goods had been sold they had been sold on the understanding that the duty would be returned.

*MR. LOUGH said that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had given a pledge that a drawback would be given to the customers, but now the right hon.

Gentleman seemed to have further complicated matters. In the case of certain firms who did not take the necessary precautions the right hon. Gentleman now refused the very moderate suggestion made to reconsider their case. He thought this was a very hard course to take because it would be impossible for these men to get rid of their stocks at the higher rates which they had paid.

MR. KEARLEY said the Excise duty on manufactured glucose was not to be levied till 1st July according to the Bill as originally presented, but the Chancellor of the Exchequer came with a resolution the other day by which it was proposed that the duty should take effect in June. He asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer why he did not impose the Excise duty on glucose on the same day as the import duty. The right hon. Gentleman imposed the coal duty on the very day it was proposed, but he allowed the manufacture of glucose to go on in this country free from any tax whatever up to a date in June. There had been an enormous amount of glucose manufactured for brewers. The hon. Member did not think it was fair that the right hon. Gentleman should levy a tax on one branch of industry at the earliest possible moment and defer the imposition of a tax affecting another industry.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: Whatever I do or whatever I don't do the hon. Member always differs from me. If the hon. Member had studied the history of the Excise duties he would have discovered that they cannot be imposed at once like Customs duties. Excise duties on manufactured articles cannot be imposed without very considerable preliminary arrangements, which can only be made after consultation with the manufacturers in order to see the best method by which they can be imposed. That could not be done before the day the Budget was introduced. The officers of the Inland Revenue told me that it would be impossible to make the necessary arrangements for levying the Excise duty before 1st July. I heard,

however, that there was going on a considerable manufacture of glucose in the country, and having ascertained from the Inland Revenue that their arrangements for the Excise duty would be ready earlier I moved the resolution.

MR. KEARLEY: I imputed no motives whatever, and I do not think the observation of the right hon. Gentleman concerning me ought to have been made.

MR. DILLON said the Chancellor of the Exchequer gave an unqualified pledge that if there was any alteration made on the duties, manufacturers or importers who had been unfairly charged would, as a matter of course, get back what they had paid beyond the amount due. There could be no doubt he used that language, and therefore any importer who had been charged a higher rate of duty than was now to be levied should receive back the difference.

Question put, and agreed to.

MR. LOUGH asked whether the debate could not now be adjourned.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH suggested that the Amendments on the clause should be disposed of now.

*MR. LOUGH, with the view of obtaining the opinion of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, moved to insert a proviso to the effect that on sugar, glucose, or molasses used in brewing a drawback equivalent to the duty on the sugar, glucose, or molasses should be allowed to the brewer under such regulations as the Commissioners of Inland Revenue might make from time to time. The hon. Member explained that this was in accordance with a provision made in the early part of the Budget for distillers who used sugar, and while, if any good reasons were given against it, he did not wish to press the amendment to a division, he would like to know what was the reason for this differential treatment.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 2, line 25, at end, to insert the words, 'Provided that on sugar, glucose, or molasses used in brewing, a drawback equivalent to the duty on the sugar, glucose, or molasses be allowed to the brewer, under such regulations as the Commissioners of Inland Revenue may make from time to time.'"; (Mr. Lough.)

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

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I have given a great deal of consideration to the subject, and I must resist the Amendment. It is to be remembered that there is nothing in what I propose which prevents brewers from using sugar or glucose or any other material in the manufacture of beer; all I ask is that whatever they use they should pay the same duty upon it which other manufacturers must pay. There has been a material change in the relative value of sugar and glucose which brewers use as compared with barley, and I do not think the brewers will be seriously affected by the proposal in the Bill.

*MR. MOULTON asked why the Chancellor of the Exchequer made an allowance to the distiller and not to the brewer.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The duty on the alcohol in spirits is so much more than the duty on the alcohol in beer that I do not like to add to the duty on spirits.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.) said that in this case the Chancellor of the Exchequer was adhering to sound common sense, and he hoped the right hon.

Gentleman would refuse any Amendment on the subject.

*MR GROVES (Salford, S.) appealed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to allow brewers a drawback on sugar used in brewing, on the ground that it was unfair to tax an article twice over. Some brewers might continue to use sugar and tax their profits twice over, but before the additional tax had been on for one year he felt sure that the use of English barley would be largely displaced by foreign barley. It was immaterial to the brewer what he used so long as he produced an article which was appreciated by the public. If he could not produce an article to please the popular taste under these new conditions he would have to fall back upon foreign barley. For these reasons he appealed

to the Chancellor of the Exchequer not to be misled by his agricultural friends.

MR. CREAN (Cork, S.E.) said that some of the brewers in Ireland boasted that they used no sugar at all, and that they used home grown barley. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would stick to his proposal, and not alter it for the reasons given by the hon. Gentleman opposite.

*MR. LOUGH pointed out that foreign barley could be imported free, and owing to the conditions under which it was grown it contained more sweetening matter than the English barley. This was a very large matter, because no less than 150,000 tons of sugar were used every year by the brewers. The right hon. Gentleman was now proposing to deal with distillers differently to the brewers. He did not think anything of this kind ought to be done by a side wind.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE said that this was a very important matter. As the representative of an agricultural district he had made inquiries in connection with a large brewing interest in his constituency, and he was informed that the effect of this proposal would be that the brewers would consume considerably less English barley. The figures put into his hands showed that whereas up to the present time they had been using 60 per cent. of English barley in future they would only use 30 per cent., and they would make up the difference by using foreign barley. He sincerely hoped that the agricultural interest would not be injured by this proposal.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

BERWICKSHIRE COUNTY TOWN BILL [Lords].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Committee report to sit again upon Monday next.

Adjourned at One of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 21st June, 1901.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

CHRIST'S HOSPITAL (LONDON) BILL [Lords].

(BY ORDER.)

MR. RICHARDS (Finsbury, E), in moving the Instruction standing in his name, said he wished first to protest most strongly against the allegation which was constantly being made, that he and those who were supporting the action of his noble friend and himself had a desire to destroy the sale of the property by the

authorities of the hospital and thus prevent them from recouping themselves for the purchase of their new premises at Horsham. But a certain distinguished person before he ascended the Throne, speaking on behalf of St. Bartholomew's Hospital in relation to the action of the governors of Christ's Hospital;

*MR. SPEAKER: It is not in order for an hon. Member to bring the opinions of the Sovereign into debate.

MR. RICHARDS said the observations were made before His Majesty ascended the Throne, but he would not further allude to them except to remark that what was contended for by St. Bartholomew's Hospital had already been embodied in the Bill which had passed through its various stages in another place and would shortly come before the House of Commons, and that fact effectually disposed to that extent of the contention of the authorities of Christ's Hospital that they were not to be allowed to sell the site except en bloc. He now wished to show how unjustifiable were the suggestions of the authorities of Christ's Hospital. Those who were anxious to preserve open spaces came before the House with full authority for what they were doing. The House had recognised long ago that consecrated ground could not be built upon except by the special authority of Parliament. The House had gone further, and had passed within the last ten years two Acts providing that all ground set apart for burial could not be built upon except with the authority of Parliament. But what was the present position of affairs? The governors of Christ's Hospital were asking for special authority to sell their property, although in the same breath they said there was no necessity to obtain the authority of Parliament because they could get an order from the Charity Commission. He did not deny that the authorities of Christ's Hospital could sell their property under an order of the Charity Commission without coming to Parliament, but he maintained they could not by any such order obtain the right to build on burial ground, whether consecrated or not. He held that this was an attempt to get behind the principle of two Acts of Parliament passed within the last ten years. They were constantly being told that the authorities of Christ's Hospital had been offered £;700,000 or more for the site provided they could get it freed from the legal disabilities which existed with regard to the two or three graveyards situated upon it. He ventured to think it would be a public scandal if the permission to build upon those burial grounds were granted. If the Bill passed without this Instruction the authorities of Christ's Hospital would be able to build, if they thought fit, on a portion of the ground which now formed about one-third of the Postmen's Park and which was closed as a burial ground by Order in Council in 1863.

SIR P. DIXON HARTLAND (Middlesex, Uxbridge): It is on a different side of the road.

MR. RICHARDS said he went over the site the previous day; he met the churchwardens of the parish there, and they protested most strongly against this attempt on the part of the governors of Christ's Hospital to secure a piece of land which they believed belonged to the parish churchyard, and which they had laid out and preserved as part of the Postmen's Park. It was supposed to be one of the first principles of Churchman-ship to preserve consecrated ground, but if

such ground was to be sold to the highest bidder it was a pity that Oliver Cromwell was unable to carry out the sale of St. Paul's Cathedral to another body for £;200,000. It was of no use protesting against disestablishment if they were going to throw over the first principles and sell consecrated land to the highest bidder. According to the high authority of the late Sir Walter Besant, among the names of those whose bones probably lay in this piece of land now proposed to be sold were the following; Margaret, wife of Edward I.; Isabella, Queen of Edward II.; Joan, Queen of David Bruce; Roger Mortimer, Earl of March; John Hastings, Earl of Pembroke; Sir Nicolas Bramber, one of the great Lord Mayors of London; the Duke of Bourbon, who was taken prisoner at Agincourt; and Sir Thomas Mallory, who wrote the history of the Holy Grail. As he had before stated, Parliament had enforced the law preventing the erection of buildings on disused burial grounds; but the law courts had gone even further than Parliament, for the present Master of the Rolls had decided that land which had been purchased for a cemetery could not be resold, because it was a portion of land set apart for burial purposes. It was asserted that if his Instruction were carried it would spoil the sale of the site altogether. Who was it that made that assertion? The same authority as protested against the sale to St. Bartholomew's Hospital. It was the Charity Commission, represented by his hon. friend the Member for Tonbridge, whom he was surprised to find in favour of desecrating burial grounds. There was an ancient saying that an old poacher made the best game-keeper, and remembering his hon. friend's earliest efforts in that House to defeat proposals of the Charity Commission, he could only say when he saw him now prepared to support one of the grossest acts of desecration that he seemed to have followed the example set by game preservers. It would be a disgrace that land which had been preserved for three hundred years should now be put up for sale for the mere purpose of making the site more valuable. This land could be economically and satisfactorily built upon and the open spaces at the same time preserved. All honour, he said, to the London County Council, who were carrying on the work of preserving the historic sites in the City and the County of London. He could only say that he should decline to have anything more to do with fighting County Council elections on a political basis. He would rather see honest Radicals on the Council who had a respect for history than dishonest Conservatives who were prepared to sell anything for what it would fetch. He hoped the House would not decide to reverse the position taken in regard to every burying ground throughout England simply to oblige the authorities of Christ's Hospital and an amiable and misguided Sheriff who had misled the City of London, and he appealed to friends of open spaces in London to present this disgraceful scandal.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): seconded the motion, because this matter affected a large number of his constituents from every point of view. The object of the Bill was to get an absolutely clear title to some five acres of land in the heart of the City of London in order to sell the land at its highest commercial value, and to the minds of ordinary men of the City this might overrule all other considerations. He could quite understand that gentlemen who had spent

their lives in the City accumulating wealth, would consider historical buildings of small value as compared with pounds, shillings, and pence. This the promoters desired, to carry out the Act of 1890 in reference to the transfer of their school to the new site at Horsham. No part of London had suffered more severely than his constituency from the pressure of business outwards from the centre, the erection of huge warehouses, and the consequent serious congestion and the rise in rents of the last ten years. A portion of this site included the burying ground of the Grey Friars Monastery, where there were arches remaining of the thirteenth century buildings, and cloisters designed by Wren enclosed the ground. In the cloisters he had observed a monument on which was inscribed a request that the bones of a benefactor might not be removed. Surely that was the least the governors could do for one of their benefactors! But the gist of the question was in finance. It was said that a sum of £;500,000 was required for the purchase of land and erection of buildings at Horsham. But £;254,000 had been paid, and it would be quite possible to raise £;300,000 on the £;550,000 worth of property reinvested at Horsham. The expenses of the school were something like £;50,000, and the gross receipts £;72,000, of which £;62,000 was available for school purposes, leaving a net profit of £;12,000. The accounts of the foundation by no means showed that the proposal in the Bill was necessary, and, seeing that the total value of the site was over £;730,000, the governors could well afford to leave as open spaces the two disused burial grounds in proximity to the cloisters and much of the work having historical and antiquarian interest. The Postmen's Park had been alluded to. Might he point out that within a few hundred yards of this very piece of ground 10,900 persons were daily employed in the Post Office, and that the park was the only open space available for them. He would be the last to urge any proposal which would cripple the educational schemes of the governors, but he did not believe that that would be the effect of the Instruction. That part of the scheme of 1890 which provided for the establish-

ment of day schools the governors had not carried out, although they had a surplus of about £;11,000 annually. His contention was that it was only right that the Instruction should be carried, so that the subject might be dealt with, not in the interests of education alone, but in the three-fold interest of open spaces, of the preservation of historical remains, and of the carrying out of the wishes of the donors of the charity for enlarging the educational facilities for Londoners as a whole.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it be an Instruction to the Committee on the Christ's Hospital (London) Bill [Lords] to consider in what manner the site of Christ's Hospital can be best dealt with, having regard alike to the reasonable requirements of the charity and of St. Bartholomew's Hospital, to the provisions of the Disused Burial Grounds Acts, to the interests of London in relation to open spaces, and to the importance of preserving some at least of the more interesting buildings of the Hospital.";(Mr. H. C. Richards).

*SIR JOSEPH DIMSDALE (London) said, not being a lawyer, he could not argue from a legal point of view the points raised by the hon. and learned Member for East Finsbury. As a layman he had heard that when a lawyer had a bad case he always

abused the opposite side. He was sorry that the hon. and learned Member for East Finsbury should have made use of the words "audacious," "audacity," "desecrating burial grounds," etc., when he was speaking of the governors and almoners of Christ's Hospital, a body of gentlemen who, with rectitude and honour, were endeavouring to carry into effect a scheme which this House passed ten years ago. The resolution proposed by the hon. and learned Member for East Finsbury raised three distinct issues in regard to the Bill now under discussion. First, it was suggested that it was proposed to abrogate two recent Acts of Parliament which now protected ancient burial grounds. Second, that it was desirable that some portion of the site should be retained as an open space. And third, that it was most important to preserve the interesting and historic buildings of the hospital. As to the first contention, it was true that a small portion upon which the great hall was situated was, up to the end of the seventeenth century, used as a place of burial, but under the Act of 1795 this land was made over to the governors, exempted from all further burial claims, and allowed to be built over in consideration of the then governors substituting another ground for burials. That condition was complied with by the governors obtaining the burial ground, in King Edward Street which was outside the site covered by the scope of the Bill now before Parliament. The hon. and learned Member for East Finsbury had asserted over and over again that these were ancient monastic burial grounds and that they had been consecrated. He could only say that the Corporation of the City of London, which had probably greater access than any other body or individual to the most ancient and authentic records appertaining to Christ's Hospital, had been unable to discover the slightest trace of evidence that they had ever been consecrated grounds, and, with the exception of the one portion to which he had referred, it could not be said that they had ever been set aside for burial purposes. It was undoubtedly the case that at one time it was the custom to bury the children of the hospital within its precincts, and there were two vaults, into one of which the remains were transferred during the rebuilding of the school between 1820 and 1831. The last interment took place in 1864. There was not the slightest evidence, so far as could be discovered, that this ground was set apart as a burial ground in the ordinary acceptation of the term, nor was there any authentic record that it had been consecrated. It was only fair to state on behalf of the almoners and governors of Christ's Hospital that, when the Post Office Sites Act of 1885 was before a Select Committee of the House, it was seriously suggested that the Government should acquire the whole site of Christ's Hospital, and the idea was only negatived on account of the unavoidable delay that would be incurred and the extreme value of the property. The Post Office therefore obtained property in the immediate neighbourhood of less value; but had the Government become possessed of the site of Christ's Hospital there was little doubt that the whole of it would have been covered with huge buildings, and nothing would have been heard of these technical and straw-splitting objections which were now raised. The second point raised by the hon. and learned Member for East Finsbury was that this valuable property in the heart of the City, and the centre of the

commercial world, should be retained as an open space. He could not imagine that the House of Commons would seriously entertain it. As a citizen of London, born in the City of London, and having spent most of his time there, and knowing every inch of it quite as well as the hon. and learned Member, he did not hesitate to say that if there was one spot in the City of London where an open space was not wanted, it was Newgate Street. Within a stone's throw of it was the Postman's Park, and that was by no means overcrowded. They were told that the night population of the City was decreasing, and he could assure the hon. and learned Member that the great bulk of those who travelled east daily did not go with the idea of taking a siesta in open spaces. They went for business; to do their work as quickly as possible, and then go home. If those philanthropic bodies; the Commons and Footpaths Preservation Society and the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings; could induce their subscribers, or if the London County Council could induce the ratepayers, to believe that it was absolutely essential that there should be an open space in Newgate Street, of the value of at least £;140,000 per acre, then the governors and almoners of Christ's Hospital were quite prepared to receive offers from either, provided the amount exceeded the sum they were at present negotiating for, namely, £;720,000, and they could then do with the site whatever they liked.

The third point raised was that interesting and historic buildings should be preserved. In that he had not the slightest doubt but every Member of the House would entirely coincide. Every citizen of London deplored the removal of Christ's Hospital, one of the greatest of City institutions and possessed of a great historic past. They recognised that it had hallowed traditions, but they were not unconscious of the fact that, although the governors of Christ's Hospital opposed the removal of these hospital buildings for twenty years, Parliament in its wisdom ten years ago passed a scheme, and when that scheme became law the governors and almoners endeavoured to carry it out. As to the antiquity of the buildings, the fact was that there were very few ancient structures at all on the site of the hospital, the original fabric having been lost in the great fire of London in 1666. The Great Hall dated only back to 1825. A portion of the court room was built in 1680 and enlarged in 1788. The only really ancient piece of architecture upon the site consisted of a few arches of the thirteenth century. He could inform the House, however, that every care and attention was to be given to the preservation of these and any other matters of antiquarian interest. So also was it the earnest wish of all to pay proper reverence and respect to any human remains that might be found. He might mention that the fact that burying had taken place in a particular spot did not constitute it a burial ground. When his firm excavated the foundations for their bank they came across human remains, but that did not constitute the site a burial ground. The hon. and learned Member for East Finsbury had not brought one tittle of evidence in support of his very weak case. Before he passed from the burial ground question, he would remind the House that the London County Council, who were taking up such a philanthropic attitude that day, were carting away loads and loads of human remains in making their new road from Holborn to the Strand. He understood from

the hon. and learned Member for East Finsbury that there was no intention to wreck this Bill, but he ventured to say that if this Instruction was passed it would practically ruin the Bill. The governors and almoners had a firm offer of £;720,000, but that was contingent that there was to be an unassailable title. Technicalities might exist, and might be valuable to lawyers hereafter. What they asked, in bringing forward this

Bill, was to enable the governors to say to this would-be purchaser, "Parliament has overlooked these technicalities, and we can give you an unassailable title." Upon that, and that alone, depended this large sum, and the successful carrying out of the scheme which had been settled by Parliament. The whole matter shaped itself into a very small compass. After twenty years of controversy the Charity Commissioners passed in this House a scheme for the removal of Christ's Hospital from London to the country. The scheme imposed great responsibility on the governors. It made it compulsory for them to erect a new school in the country for 700 boys, and a school for 300 girls; a preparatory school for 120 boy boarders; a science school for 600 scholars, and a day school for 400 girls. It was obvious to any unbiassed mind that that scheme would never have passed Parliament if it had not been thoroughly and morally understood that this very valuable site was to be turned into money with which to erect and maintain these new schools, with their far-reaching educational effects. The hon. Gentleman opposite had asserted that the governors had a surplus income of £;20,000, although upon consideration he had brought it down to £;11,000 or £;12,000. CAPTAIN NORTON said the hon. Gentleman misrepresented him. He had pointed out that the statement published by certain petitioners was an error, and had quoted, in order to correct that error, the report of the governors for last year, showing a surplus of £;11,000.

*SIR JOSEPH DIMSDALE said that whether it was £;11,000 or £;20,000 it was absolutely erroneous. Owing to the prudent policy of the governors and almoners of this great charity they had been cutting down the numbers of their scholars as low as possible, pending their removal to the country. It was quite true that last year showed a paper surplus of £;11,000, but if the scheme was carried out and the children brought up to the standard of the scheme the income necessary would be £;70,500, or £;10,500 more than the present income. To meet this a capital sum was now required of £;350,000. The estimated amount of capital required to complete and equip the new schools at Horsham and the girls' boarding school was £;290,000, in addition to the £;360,000 already appropriated for the purpose by sales and realisations, and but for which appropriation the present available income would, of course, have been proportionately more. If the day and science schools for 1,000 children, as directed by the scheme, were to be provided for, it was estimated that, without reckoning for any free places or exhibitions, a capital sum was needed of £;300,000. That made a total fresh capital expenditure required of £;940,000. The actual value of the stocks now remaining in the hands of the governors was £;223,000, of which £;177,000 was alone applicable to educational purposes, the remainder having been hypothecated and earmarked for exhibitions and such like objects. It therefore followed that, even if the site realised £;720,000, and if Parliament sanctioned this Bill,

they would only have £177,000 more, making the aggregate sum of £897,000, to meet an estimated outlay of £940,000. It was consequently imperative that Parliament should give assistance to those who were carrying out this great educational scheme. The Bill began and ended with enabling the governors to turn a long leasehold held by the corporation into a freehold, and to say to a would-be purchaser, "Parliament has spoken, and has carried through this scheme, and has enabled us to give you an unassailable title." He would conclude by quoting the words of the right hon. Baronet the Member for Dartford. Speaking in 1890 as Vice-President of the Education Department the right hon. Baronet said, "The House has only to decide on the educational advantages of the scheme as it stands, and I feel sure that the House will endorse this excellent scheme."

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.) said that he might be old-fashioned in his ideas of Parliamentary practice, but he must confess that he resented the system of moving Instructions to Committees upstairs, as if the House had no confidence in the justice with which these Committees would act. Instructions only hampered the discretion of the Committees as to what they

ought or ought not to do. His hon. friend who had just addressed the House had said that he deplored the transference of Christ's Hospital School from the City to the country. He would not have ventured to interfere in this debate at all had he not once had the honour of occupying the position of medical officer to a public school, and could claim therefore to have some knowledge of the conditions in which a public school ought to be carried on. He thought that anyone acquainted with Christ's Hospital School knew the inferior sanitary conditions under which scholastic work was carried on; the poor bedroom accommodation, and the miserable conditions in which the boys were compelled to take their play in narrow, sanded courts, instead of in grass fields in the free air of the country. He was bound to say that he thought a very wise step had been taken when the governors of Christ's Hospital, like those of Charter House, determined to pull up their roots in the crowded City and go into the free air of the country. Anyone who had visited Charter House since its removal to the country would realise what a magnificent success the transference had been. No longer were the boys poor, dwarfed, and stunted, but bright, strong, and healthy. The whole case in favour of the aesthetic character of the building had been absolutely shattered. Something had been said about Charles Lamb; but anyone who had ever read the life and writings of Lamb would remember the misery, semi-starvation, and wretched sanitary conditions of these hospitals in former days. He entirely agreed with those who wanted to change the site of the school to the country, and he opposed the motion because he held that it would seriously interfere with the work of the school. Something had also been said about ancient burial grounds. He had a certain respect for the dead but more respect for the living. He thought that if the comfort and convenience of the living required that a burial ground should be used for that purpose, then the comfort and convenience of the dead should give way to that of the living. He went further; he thought it was very inconvenient that dead bodies should be buried at all. He should prefer that they should be cremated.

He was entirely opposed to this Instruction, because he objected to Instructions

to Committees; and in the second place, because it would seriously cripple the governors of Christ's Hospital in carrying out their scheme.

SIR W. HART DYKE (Kent, Dartford) said that as the Minister who was responsible in 1890 for carrying this scheme through Parliament he would be compelled to oppose the motion. What was the present position of the scheme? Such schemes went through a very harsh process. First of all they were framed under the Endowed Schools Act, 1869, and other Acts; next they went through a certain process at the Education Department; then they were subjected to the machinery of an appeal to the Privy Council, and after that they had to lie on the Table of the House for a certain time in order that the criticisms of hon. Members might be applied to them. He was at the Education Department when the scheme before the House was considered, and he knew that it had been very closely dealt with by the Charity Commissioners, who spent four or five days over it. He himself thought it a great pity that a matter of the kind should be hung up, and he was moved by one argument; namely, fresh air and green fields. The scheme passed the House unanimously. It was twice discussed, and on neither occasion was it pressed to a division. It passed through a searching inquiry at the Education Department, and there was an appeal to the Privy Council in which judgment was unanimously given against the appellants and in favour of the scheme. When it came before the House his right hon. friend the present Chairman of Committees, who then represented the Charity Commissioners, stated that the scheme was assented to by all parties. He wished to make an appeal to the House. It would, he thought, be a grievous shame, eleven years after a decision had been arrived at, for Parliament, by a side wind, to wreck such a scheme as that. There might be difficulties connected with the settlement, but the Committee upstairs was completely competent to deal with them, without the House fettering their discretion by an Instruction. He would appeal to hon. Members, therefore, while admitting that everything was to be said for open spaces, not to drive the hospital too hard.

MR. LAWSON WALTON (Leeds, S.) said he fully accepted the grounds on which the right hon. Gentleman had just appealed to the House; but while accepting the appeal he felt that there were grounds which should induce the House, although quite friendly to the measure, to adopt the Instruction which had been moved. The Bill appeared to have been drawn on somewhat singular lines. Power was given to the governors to dispose of two classes of property, with regard to which at present they had no powers of sale. One was leasehold property, and the other was very vaguely described as property in which interments had taken place. The governors could not deal with that property at present; it did not belong to them in any effective sense, because it could not be converted to the purposes of the charity, and the Bill provided that the governors should be now allowed to dispose of the whole site. He could understand the argument that would be used upstairs, that the Committee could not take into consideration any public interest attaching to the site in special relation to the user to which it was at present subject. All that the Instruction provided was that the Committee should have power to consider not merely the educational necessities of the charity, but the public requirements of the City of London, having regard to the

mode in which the site was at present used. There were two modes of use to which attention had been drawn; one was consecrated ground, and the other was open spaces and the portions of the site formerly used for burial purposes, which were now used as open spaces. They were dealing with three open spaces which at present afforded a recreation ground for the people living in that portion of London, and which were very advantageous for the public health. The Instruction suggested that the Committee should not be influenced solely by the financial needs of the charity, but should take into consideration, first of all, the reasonable requirements of the charity, and next should have regard to the interests of London in relation to open spaces and the importance of preserving some, at least, of the more interesting buildings. Surely an indication of opinion from the House that the Committee should have regard to these open spaces, and the provision the governors were prepared to make with reference to them, should commend itself to every friend of the measure.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): The House is not now dealing with some case which might possibly arise of a greedy corporation desirous of selling a site for money, and so adding to their resources. It is not a case of that kind at all. What are the circumstances which have brought Christ's Hospital to this House? They did not want to leave the City; they had no desire whatever to convert this valuable piece of ground into money so as to add to their financial resources. They were sorry to leave the City, and the City was very sorry to part with Christ's Hospital, which for years has been one of the most prized institutions within its limits. They were forced to go by the scheme of the Charity Commissioners, very much against their will, and very much against the will of the City. We must, in matters of education, consider what is most beneficial for the young people receiving education, and there can be no doubt that so far as they are concerned; so far as light and air and education are concerned; they will unquestionably benefit by the change. But, whatever the merits or the demerits of that matter may be, I would beg the House to remember, in dealing with this question, that they are dealing with a body that has been forced to part with this property much against their will and to erect buildings in the country. Now, in order that they should do that, they find it necessary to ask for certain powers with regard to the site, and the House is now asked to place a limitation upon them in respect of the sale of the site.

The hon. and learned Member said they had a right to act as is suggested, as the governors of Christ's Hospital came to Parliament to ask for two or three privileges of great value which they did not now possess. One of the privileges was that a certain piece of land was going to be converted from a leasehold into a freehold. That is perfectly true, but what is the extent of the leasehold? It extends for 790 years, and I am told that the ground rent does not exceed £10 a year. To get rid of this is, of course, a technical advantage, but, after all, it is not very much that Christ's Hospital is asking Parliament for, that they should get their assent to an arrangement which the ground landlords are perfectly willing to enter

into; namely, the conversion of a leasehold of 700 or 800 years at a ground rent of £;10 a year into a freehold. That is not very much of a ground on which to ask Christ's Hospital to part with a valuable consideration. Then it is said that power is being asked to build over three open spaces. The ground on the other side of the street has been referred to, but I am told that power is not being asked to build over that at all. It was given in exchange many years ago, and will remain exactly in the position in which it now is, even if the House does not pass the Instruction. Then, as to the burial ground, it is spoken of as if it were almost unprecedented that Parliament should be asked for powers to build over a burial ground. Parliament has given that power again and again under certain restrictions and limitations, and the same restrictions and limitations will apply under the Bill.

The hon. and learned Member spoke of the requirements of the City in regard to open spaces. Anyone who knows the City would laugh at the idea of an open space in Newgate Street. There is no resident population, it is one of the business parts of the City, and the land is worth I do not know how many thousand pounds an acre, and to say that it is required as a recreation ground is really almost trifling with the House. The City has not too many open spaces, but there are open spaces, and hardly a man who knows the City would say that this is the place where anything of the kind is required. So that whether with regard to open spaces or with regard to the burial ground, I do not think there is any case made out for the Instruction, which undoubtedly would have an effect, and it might possibly be a very serious effect, on the finances of the hospital. If the Instruction were passed, and if there were incorporated with the Bill that which the hon. and learned Member who moved it desires, the value of the site would be enormously reduced, without, in my opinion, any adequate return to anyone. I would like to say also that it is not at all certain that if the Instruction were carried the objects which the hon. and learned Member desires would follow. As I understand it, what might follow would be that the Bill would be abandoned and that the Governors of Christ's Hospital would dispose of the site at a lower figure or would themselves build on it, so that, in any event, I do not believe that that desired by the mover of the Instruction would follow.

I have another point which I should like to impress upon the House. I understand that the London County Council are proceeding to present a petition against the Bill, and that they have raised in the petition every one of the points referred to by the hon. Members who have spoken in support of the Instruction, so that without an Instruction of this kind the Committee will have these matters before them if they consider it advisable to take them into account. That is a very different thing from the House passing an Instruction, because by passing an Instruction of this kind the House will lend important support to the propositions contained in the Instruction, while otherwise they will be considered in the ordinary way by the Committee on a petition presented by the London County Council. But whether that be so or not, I think no argument of any valid character has been used in support of the Instruction, and I very much hope that the House will not give countenance to what I consider a most unfair

method of procedure by passing an Instruction which, while it would in my opinion greatly damage the value of the site, would not really secure that which the supporters of the Instruction desire should be carried out. I hope, therefore, the House will not pass the Instruction.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) said that the right hon. Gentleman did an injustice to many who supported the Instruction when he said that there was anything unfair in their methods of procedure. The governors of Christ's Hospital had undoubtedly a right to sell their property, but it was not good enough for them without a special Act of Parliament. They asked Parliament to improve and enlarge their title, and the Act of Parliament would be worth from £;200,000 to £;250,000 to them. Parliament being about to grant that benefit, had not the public some emphatic right to a quid pro quo, especially as Christ's Hospital, which had since its foundation been an essentially metropolitan charity, was now about to be removed from the sphere of the metropolis. He was extremely sorry for it himself, and he applauded the action of the governors in fighting against it for twenty years. It was a pity, too, that when the governors had all England to choose from for their new site, they should have dumped their schools at the side of the railway and on a soil that was five feet thick with clay, and that they should have erected buildings which, even in the opinion of the Local Government Board, were notoriously ugly barrack schools. As to the antiquarian interest of the question, there were buildings by Wren which were extremely fine, and the hall, to which the Corporation attached very little importance, was one of the finest halls in London. Just at this point was Newgate Gaol, also a very fine building, which had only been condemned by the City.

*SIR JOSEPH DIMSDALE: I must correct the noble Lord; that is not so. There has been no delay on the part of the Corporation. The Corporation has been desirous of rebuilding the Old Bailey for twenty-five years past, but the plans have from time to time been questioned or condemned by His Majesty's judges.

LORD BALCARRES said he would not pursue that matter, but with regard to the burial ground he would just say one word. The hon. Baronet had said that it was not certain that this was a burial ground. Then why was the Bill brought in? The cloisters, not merely on the existing southern site, were full of graves. The hon. Baronet said that the City authorities had no record of its ever having been a burial ground. It was not in the City that these things were to be found, but in the British Museum, and the fact that this was a consecrated burial ground was unanswerable. These human remains were to be removed and placed elsewhere in spite of what was perhaps the most humble piece of eloquence ever written or spoken; the inscription upon a tablet in the southern cloisters was, "Here lies the benefactor; let no one move his bones." Yet, in spite of that, and in spite of the fact that this has been a burial ground, these human remains were, in the words of the Bill, to be placed in "well pitched shells" and removed elsewhere. There was no doubt whatever that this charity was not such a poverty-stricken corporation as the promoters of the Bill expected the House to believe. The accounts of this charity had to be published annually for general information, but he had found it very difficult

to get hold of them. It was evident from them that the almoners had at their disposal for educational purposes very considerable sums which they did not possess ten years ago, and as the almoners appeared to have approached this question from a purely commercial point of view, why should they not consent to raise a considerable sum upon the mortgage of their new freehold;[Sir JOSEPH DIMSDALE: Who would give it?];as they easily could unless they had been very much deceived in the property on which they had spent £;550,000. It had been said that no proposal would be made to build upon that open space known as the Postmen's Park. In the opinion of the governors of Christ's Hospital and of the Home Secretary there was no further need for open spaces in the City. If that was to be the permanent opinion of the right hon. Gentleman he would undertake to come to close quarters with him on many occasions during his term of office. With regard to building over open spaces he apprehended the right hon. Gentleman had again been guilty of rather an error; he said they were not open spaces in the sense that the public had access to them. That was true. As a member of the public he had no access to Grosvenor Square, but as a member of the public he would consider himself legitimately aggrieved if the owner of that property built over it, and the same argument applied to open spaces in the City;especially to such as had

been consecrated. He wanted Christ's Hospital to sell their ground, and he also desired that they should be able to use these buildings for the purposes for which they required buildings for schools and offices. They had to have a school within three miles of the Mansion House or the Royal Exchange, and what an ideal spot this would be for the London University, now housed, he believed, in the back parlours of the Imperial Institute. All he asked was that when Parliament was giving a magnificent gift to the governors and almoners of Christ's Hospital, without which the price offered to them would be £;200,000 less, the House should pass an Instruction asking a Committee upstairs to inquire whether, subject to the interests of the educational establishment, as set forth in the Instruction, something could be done by which this great, valuable, and historic site might be used for the benefit of the public and of education.

THE PARLIAMENTARY CHARITY COMMISSIONER (Mr. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN, Kent, Tunbridge) said it was his duty, as representing the Charity Commission in this House, to say he was a supporter of the Bill and an opponent of the Instruction. In the view of the Charity Commissioners the Bill was the best and the only proper means of carrying out the scheme passed for Christ's Hospital ten years ago, and in obedience to which Christ's Hospital was removed into the country. He opposed the Instruction because it would practically destroy the Bill, and would prevent Christ's Hospital from realising their site to the best advantage. It seemed to be thought by a large number of the Members of this House that if the Instruction was carried an open space and ancient monuments would thereby be preserved. If the Instruction was carried and the Bill was withdrawn the result would be, not that the governors would not be allowed to sell, but that, subject only to the consent of the Charity Commissioners, which would be given, Christ's Hospital would deal with the site and lay itself open to the possibility of a lawsuit. The whole site could be cut up and buildings could be erected. No open

space would be preserved except that a small courtyard in the middle might be preserved if the courts decided that this was a burying ground, and so far from attaining the object which his hon. friend had in view it would do nothing of the kind; the only result would be that the educational establishment of this great charity would get £;200,000 less than they would if this Bill was passed. The hon. Gentleman said that this was a gift of £;200,000 to Christ's Hospital, but as a matter of fact all they were doing was to enable this great educational charity to deal with its property to the best advantage, as was done by all other public schools. Why should not Christ's Hospital be allowed to deal with its property to the best advantage? Why should not this site be devoted to educational purposes rather than to an open space? The hon. Gentleman below the gangway said that if this Bill were allowed to pass the Charity Commissioners would be poachers, but if this Instruction were carried the hon. Gentleman would be the greatest poacher of all, because he would take away the

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.

Flower, Ernest

O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)

Allan, William (Gateshead)

Flynn, James Christopher

O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.

Allen, Charles P. (Glouc. Stroud

Gilhooly, James

O'Malley, William

Ambrose, Robert

Goddard, Daniel Ford

Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay

Austin, Sir John

Hammond, John

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.

Balcarres, Lord

Harms worth, R. Leicester

Philipps, John Wynford

Baldwin, Alfred

Hayden, John Patrick

Pierpoint, Robert

Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey

Helme, Norval Watson

Power, Patrick Joseph

Barry, E. (Cork, S.)

Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.

Rea, Russell

Bell, Richard

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

Reddy, M.

Bignold, Arthur
Jacoby, James Alfred
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Jordan, Jeremiah
Redmond, William (Clare)
Boland, John
Kennedy, Patrick James
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Brigg, John
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Rickett, J. Compton
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Leamy, Edmund
Rigg, Richard
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Leng, Sir John
Russell, T. W.
Caldwell, James
Levy, Maurice
Schwann, Charles E.
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Lloyd-George, David
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh
Carlile, William Walter
Lough, Thomas
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Channing, Francis Allston
Lundon, W.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Cogan, Denis J.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C R (Northants
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Crean, Eugene
M'Dermott, Patrick
Strachey, Edward
Crombie, John William
M'Govern, T.
Sullivan, Donal
Cullinan, J.
M'Kenna, Reginald
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)

Malcolm, Ian
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Delany, William
Mansfield, Horace Rend all
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Mooney, John J.
Walton, John L. (Leeds, S.)
Dillon, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Donelan, Captain A.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
White, Patrick (Meath, N.)
Doogan, P. C.
Norman, Henry
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Duffy, William J.
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Duncan, J. Hastings
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Dunn, Sir William
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Emmott, Alfred
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipp'rary Mid
Wylie, Alexander
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
Yoxall, James Henry
Fenwick, Charles
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Ffrench, Peter
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Field, William
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Mr. Richards and Captain Norton.
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
O'Dowd, John

educational character of this charity and turn it into a charity of quite another kind. This Bill would have to be read together with the rest of the scheme which had been forced by the Charity Commission and Parliament on Christ's Hospital. A Royal Commission was appointed in 1877, and the

Commissioners said that it would be better to move the hospital into the country, and that the site should be sold for the purpose of carrying out the scheme. Not a word was said as to imposing any restriction on the sale of the site, and when the scheme was opposed in this House the objector to it said that that was the best part of it. It was because he thought a grave injustice would be done and a great blow dealt to this charity that he asked the House to pass the Bill, and to defeat the Instruction.

Question put.

The House divided:;Ayes, 116; Noes, 224. (Division List No. 267.)

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.

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

Moss, Samuel

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.

Mount, William Arthur

Aird, Sir John

Graham, Henry Robert

Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute

Allsopp, Hon. George

Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds

Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)

Anson, Sir William Reynell

Gretton, John

Myers, William Henry

Anstruther, H. T.

Gunter, Sir Robert

Nicholson, William Graham

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton

Nicol, Donald Ninian

Arrol, Sir William

Guthrie, Walter Murray

Nussey, Thomas Willans

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G (Mid'x

Palmer, Sir C. M. (Durham)

Bailey, James (Walworth)

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

Partington, Oswald

Bain, Col. James Robert

Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robt. W.

Paul ton, James Mellor

Baird, John George Alexander

Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)

Pease, Alfred E. (Cleveland)

Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Pease, Herbt. P. (Darlington)
Balfour, Maj K R (Christchurch
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Banbury, Frederick George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Peel, Hn Wm. Robert Wellesley
Bartley, George C. T.
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir A. D.
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Bathurst, Hon Allen B.
Heaton, John Henniker
Plummer, Walter R.
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Helder, Augustus
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Black Alexander William
Higginbottom, S. W.
Pretymann, Ernest George
Bond Edward
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Purvis, Robert
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Horner, Frederick William
Randles, John S.
Bowles, Capt. T. B. (Kings's Lynn
Houldsworth, Sir Wm Henry
Rash, Major Frederick Carne
Brassey, Albert
Hoult, Joseph
Reid, James (Greenock)
Brodrick Rt. Hon. St. John
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Remnant, James Farquharson
Brymer, William Ernest
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Bullard, Sir Harry
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge
Burt, Thomas
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. T.
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Gl'g'w)

Johnston, William (Belfast)
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Cautley, Henry Strother
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Jones, David Brynmor (Swans'a
Robinson, Brooke
Cawley, Frederick
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir J. H.
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Kimber, Henry
Rothschild, Hn. Lionel Walter
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Coddington, Sir William
Knowles, Lees
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Labouchere, Henry
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Law, Andrew Bonar
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Lawrence, Joseph (Monmouth)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Seely, Capt. J. E B (Isle of Wight
Craig, Robert Hunter
Lawson, John Grant
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Cranborne, Viscount
Lecky, Rt. Hon. William Edw H
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareh'm
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Crossley, Sir Savile
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)

Smith, H C (North'mb Tyneside
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks.)
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S
Soares, Ernest J.
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Lewis, John Herbert
Spear, John Ward
Dewar, J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (Bristol, S.)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Disraeli, Conings by Ralph
Lowe, Francis William
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Stroyan, John
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Lowther, Rt. Hn. James (Kent)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Lowther, Rt Hn J W (Cum. Penr
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Tennant, Harold John
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings
Elibank, Master of
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph D.
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Thornton, Percy M.
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W G Ellison
Tollemache, Henry James
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Maclver, David (Liverpool)
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray

Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Maconochie, A. W.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Tufnell, Lt.-Col. Edward
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Wallace, Robert
Fisher, William Hayes
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Walrond, Rt.Hon. Sir Wm. H.
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Welby, Lt.-Col. A C E (Taunton
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H E (Wigt'n
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Foster, Sir Michael (Lond. Univ
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Garfit, William
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Gibbs, Hn. A.G. H. (City of Lond
Morgan, Hn Fred. (Monm'thsh.
Wills, Sir Frederick
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. Herbert J.
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Morrell, George Herbert
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh, N.
Morton, Arthur H A. (Deptford
Wodehouse, Rt Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
Sir Joseph Dimsdale and
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Younger, William
Sir William Hart Dyke.

MILITARY LANDS PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

EDUCATION BOARD PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION (ACTON) BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 6) BILL.

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

Bill, as amended, to be considered upon Monday next.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP L).

MR. BILL reported from the Committee on Group L of Private Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, they had adjourned till Tuesday next, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to Horley District Gas Bill, without Amendment.

That they have agreed to, Cardiff Corporation Bill; Leatherhead Gas Bill, with Amendments.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act for empowering the Worcester Tramways, Limited, to construct new tramways in lieu of their existing tramways, and to work the same by mechanical power; and for other purposes."; Worcester Tramways Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill, intituled, "An Act to extend the limits of supply of and to confer further powers upon the Newport (Isle of Wight) Gas Company; and for other purposes." Newport (Isle of Wight) Gas Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confer powers upon the Corporation of the borough of Smethwick with respect to tramways and to their electric lighting and other undertakings; to make further provision for the improvement and good government of the borough; and for other purposes." Smethwick Corporation Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend section four of the Central London Railway Act, 1899, and to authorise the raising of further capital; and for other purposes." Central London Railway (No. 2) Bill [Lords].

And also a Bill, intituled, "An Act to empower the mayor, aldermen, and burgesses of the city of Bristol to construct an additional dock and railways and other works; to extend the city and county of Bristol; and for other purposes." Bristol Corporation (Docks and Railways, etc.) Bill [Lords].

WORCESTER TRAMWAYS BILL [Lords].

NEWPORT (ISLE OF WIGHT) GAS BILL [Lords].

SMETHWICK CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

CENTRAL LONDON RAILWAY (No. 2) BILL [Lords].

BRISTOL CORPORATION (DOCKS AND RAILWAYS, ETC.) BILL [Lords].

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

PETITIONS.

CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

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

COAL MINES (EMPLOYMENT) BILL.

Petition from Newmarket Haigh Moor, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (CONTINUATION SCHOOLS) BILL.

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

EDUCATION BILL.

Petitions for alteration, from Oldham; Brighton and Preston; and Rochdale; to lie upon the Table.

FINANCE BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Rotherham Main; Wharncliffe Silkstone; and South Hiendley; to lie upon the Table.

MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.

Petition from Newmarket Haigh Moor, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC WORSHIP REGULATION ACT (1874) AMENDMENT BILL.

Petition from Sion College, against; to lie upon the Table.

ROMAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY IN IRELAND.

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

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

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

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Abercrave; Salford Priors; Paddington; Lewannick Kilkhampston; Egloskerry; Calstock; Dudley; Hackney; Nottingham; Cowes; Great Harwood; Eedbourn; and Kettering; to lie upon the Table.

SOVEREIGN'S OATH ON ACCESSION BILL.

Petitions against, from Walthamstow and Bath; to lie upon the Table.

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

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRUSTEE SAVINGS BANKS.

Return presented, relative thereto ordered 17th June; Mr. Mount; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. No. 220.]

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 6) BILL.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 20th June; Mr. Gerald Balfour]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 221.]

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 10) BILL.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 20th June; Mr. Gerald Balfour]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 222.]

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICA;BOER PRISONERS-INTERMENT IN INDIA.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether the fort within which the Boer prisoners are kept at Ahmednagar is

surrounded by a high-walled embankment which shuts out every breeze; whether the huts are roofed with corrugated iron, and the temperature noted at midnight inside the huts was several times over 100, and at times as much as 108 during the month of May; and whether steps can and will be taken to remove the Boer prisoners to a more healthy position.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): I have already stated that there is no intention of removing the Boer prisoners. I have no information as to the details referred to in the hon Member's question; but, as I stated yesterday in answer to the question of the hon. Member for East Clare, the station is considered to be one of the healthiest and most agreeable in India.

MR. CHANNING: Will the noble Lord make inquiries as to the accuracy of the statements I have laid before him?

LORD G. HAMILTON: No, I will not make any inquiries. The Governor of Bombay has visited the place, and he found the prisoners perfectly well satisfied. The attacks made in this country on the salubrity of Ahmednagar are received with universal ridicule throughout India.

MR. CHANNING: I beg to give notice that I will call attention to the subject on the first opportunity.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): May I ask the noble Lord whether it is not absolutely the fact that the Army Medical Department has declared this place, last year or the year before, to be the most unhealthy station in India?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The question has been answered.

CAMPS OF CONCENTRATION.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state the total number of children in the camps of concentration in South Africa, and how many of such children are now under instruction; whether he is aware that the Bloemfontein camp contains about 2,000 children, while school accommodation is only provided for 200; and whether the necessary steps will be taken as soon as practicable to provide all the children with school accommodation.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): The total number of children in these camps was 34,112 at the end of May. No figures of the actual numbers attending school have been reported, but every effort is being made to provide ample school accommodation at all the camps. Schools have been started in most of the camps, being held either in a large room set apart in one of the iron and wood structures or marquee tents.

MR. C. P. SCOTT (Lancashire, Leigh): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether any decision has yet been taken as to relaxing the rule under which all persons in the concentration camps in South Africa have been compulsorily detained in them, and how soon he expects to be able to publish the new regulations on this subject; and whether he will give orders that very young children who cannot be properly fed in the camps where they are now confined shall, with their mothers, be removed to camps in Cape Colony where no similar difficulty would exist.

MR. BRODRICK: I have nothing to add to what I have already said on these

subjects.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): Does the right hon. Gentleman recollect that he told me about six weeks ago that in every one of these camps persons were free to come and go as they liked?

MR. BRODRICK did not reply.

MR. DILLON: The right hon. Gentleman made the statement to me across the floor of the House; that everyone was free to come and go as they liked.

MR. BRODRICK: I said nothing of the kind. What I did say was that in respect to the particular camp in Cape Colony, so far as my information went, those who were there were free to come and go, but I warned hon. Gentlemen that if these questions were pressed on me when I had not full information I could only give such information as I was aware of.

MR. DILLON: This is a very serious matter, but I suppose I shall only be in order in giving notice that at the earliest possible moment I will call attention to the fact that the statement made by the right hon. Gentleman now is not correct, and that he did inform me some weeks ago that every person was free to come and go.

MR. BRODRICK: I must say that the question was pressed on me, among several others, as a supplementary question, and I gave such information as I could on the spur of the moment.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Mr. Speaker;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! Of any further questions notice must be given. The right hon. Gentleman, in answer to the question, said that he could add nothing to the information he had already given.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: The question I wish to ask;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! I have said that no further questions can be put without notice.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Then I beg to give notice that I shall ask the right hon. gentleman at what date these unfortunate women and children will be released.

DR. AMBROSE (Mayo, W.): On a point of order, Sir, I wish to ask what authority the right hon. Gentleman has;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

† Refer to Debates [Fourth Series], Vol. xciii., p. 930; also Vol. lxxxix., p. 1021.

BLOEMFONTEIN CONCENTRATION CAMP.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he has received a report from the medical officer on the state of the health of the children in the Bloemfontein camp; if so, what is the nature of the report; and will the recommendations it contains be acted upon.

MR. BRODRICK: The report in question has not reached me.

NEGOTIATIONS WITH BOER LEADERS.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will state when and by whom communications were made to the Boer leaders asking them to undertake the responsibility of feeding the women and children in the denuded districts; whether they were accompanied by an assurance that the food supplies provided by the Boers for that purpose would not be taken

away or destroyed by the British troops; and whether he will lay on the Table of the House the correspondence, if any, which passed on the subject.

MR. BRODRICK: Information on some of these points will be found in the correspondence relating to farm-burning which I propose shortly to lay upon the Table of the House.

ARMY REMOUNTS; TRAMWAY HORSES.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that the Corporation of Glasgow, in consequence of the adoption of electric traction on their tramways, are disposing of their stud of horses, numbering between 4,000 and 5,000, which horses are being sold in batches, the last batch averaging £26 per horse; and whether, seeing that the average price of an artillery horse in this country is £42, and that up to the present time no attempt has been made by the remount department to secure any of these horses, nor any of the same class sold some time ago under similar circumstances by the Liverpool tramways companies, he will consider the advisability of now securing some of the most suitable of these hard-conditioned horses.

MR. BRODRICK: I am aware of the sales in question. The horses, however, are not considered suitable for artillery services.

CAPTAIN NORTON: Are none of them suitable for remount purposes or any other military purpose?

MR. BRODRICK: I can add nothing to my answer.

HORSE TRANSPORT; THE "CERVONA."

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether it has been brought to his notice that during the voyage of the transport ship "Cervona" from New Orleans to the Cape the remount officer, contrary to the advice of the veterinary surgeon, threw 270 horses overboard in the belief that they were suffering from glanders, whereas when bad weather put a stop to this operation it was proved that the horses had only common colds; and whether, seeing that this action represents a waste of £6,750, exclusive of the cost of freight, he will consider the advisability of appointing none but officers of the Army Veterinary Department to the Remount Department.

MR. BRODRICK: My attention has been drawn to this matter, which is now under the consideration of the military authorities.

ARMY CONTRACTS; SOUTH AFRICAN CONTRACTORS.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can now state approximately the total amount payable or paid to contractors in South Africa in connection with the war up to date.

MR. BRODRICK: As I have explained to the House on a previous occasion, this information can only be obtained by a very laborious process. A letter, however, was despatched to South Africa to inquire what information could be readily obtained and forwarded to the War Office.

RETURN OF THE SEAFORTH MILITIA.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that when the Lewis section of the Seaforth Militia, numbering about 600 men, reached Kyle of Lochalsh last Tuesday night from Egypt,

it was found that the steamer "Lovedale," which had been appointed to convey them to Stornoway, could carry only 370 of the men, in consequence of which the remaining 230 were left at Kyle, where there are but few houses and only limited accommodation, at the station to await the sailing of the "Clydesdale" on the following afternoon; and, seeing that the "Lovedale" affords little protection from the weather for so large a number of men, and was unsuited for the conveyance of troops just returning from a hot climate on such a night as the 11th June, which was cold, wet, and stormy, will he state who is responsible for having neglected to provide sufficient steamer accommodation to admit of the whole of these men proceeding to Stornoway on the night of their arrival at Kyle.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): Under ordinary circumstances the men would have found their own way home after disembodiment at Dingwall, but in deference to the desire of the local authorities for a public reception at Stornoway, arrangements were made with the agent of the Highland Railway Company to secure their transit by the "Clansman," a vessel capable of conveying the whole 600 men. At the last moment, however, this vessel proved not available, and the "Lovedale" was substituted by the owner of the steamboats. Every effort was made by the local military authorities to secure further accommodation at once, but without success. No blame can be attached to the military authorities.

AMMUNITION FOR VOLUNTEER CORPS;MESSRS. KYNOCH'S OFFER.

MR. NORMAN (Wolverhampton, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that Messrs. Kynoch, Limited, are offering to supply to Volunteer corps reliable ammunition for the service rifle at a lower price than that charged to Volunteer corps by the Government; will he state whether the Order recently issued by the War Office, forbidding Volunteer corps to purchase ammunition from any other source than the Government, was made on the grounds that Messrs. Kynoch's ammunition is of inferior quality to that supplied by the Government; and, if not, for what reason Volunteer corps have been forbidden to avail themselves of this cheaper source of supply.

MR. BRODRICK: I understand that Messrs. Kynoch have offered to sell a Volunteer corps small-arm ammunition that has not passed the Government tests. No new Order has been issued on the subject, but attention has been called to paragraph 2,035 of the King's Regulations, which lays down that, as serious damage may be done to rifles by the use of unsuitable ammunition, commanding officers are to forbid the troops under their orders to use any ammunition, whether ball, blank, or dummy, except that provided by the Government.

MR. NORMAN: But is that the fact that Messrs. Kynoch offered to sell their ammunition at £1 per 1,000 rounds less than it is supplied by the Government?

MR. BRODRICK: I have informed the hon. Gentleman that it is understood the ammunition which they offered to sell was ammunition which had not passed the Government test.

MILITIA DISEMBODIMENT.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): On behalf of the hon. Member for North Aberdeen, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state whether it

is now intended to disembody any of the Militia battalions serving at home; if so, can he name them and give the dates of the intended disembodiment.

MR. BRODRICK: No decision has yet been arrived at.

WHALE ISLAND BANDSMEN.

MR. REGINALD LUCAS (Portsmouth): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that certain Army pensioners engaged in the band at Whale Island only receive second class lodging allowance instead of the first class which was granted to them on joining, and is still enjoyed by the remainder of the band who are not pensioners; and whether the Admiralty will consider the possibility of granting to these pensioners the maximum allowance.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): The allowance referred to is not a lodging allowance, but compensation in lieu of provisions, fuel, and lights. On their first appointment in August, 1895, the rate of compensation paid to certain Army pensioners serving in the Whale Island band was 1s. 6d. a day, the amount granted to active service ratings. In the same year, however, it was decided that the allowance to these men should be made uniform with that granted to the whole of the other pensioners in reserve and stationary ships; namely, 1s. 1d. a day. This arrangement took effect on 1st September, 1895, and is now in force.

STOKERS FOR THE NAVY.

MR. PLATT-HIGGINS (Salford, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he is aware that owing to the insufficient number of stokers rating at Chatham, Portsmouth, and Devonport, many warships during the last six months while in the reserves have had to be content with barely more than one-third of their proper allowance of men for care and maintenance of machinery and double bottoms, and what steps he proposes to take for increasing the allowance.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: It is undoubtedly the fact that, owing to the large number of ships at present in commission, the number of stokers available is inadequate. In order to meet the deficiency 500 additional stokers are being entered during the present year.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): Is there any intention of increasing the pay of the men in order to induce a sufficient number to join?

[No answer was returned.]

RUSSIA AND THIBET.

MR. NORMAN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether his attention has been called to the Embassy from the Dalai Lama of Thibet to His Majesty the Emperor of Russia, with the alleged object of soliciting the protection of Russia against British encroachments; and whether His Majesty's Government has made, or proposes to make, any communication to the Russian Government upon this subject.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRANBORNE, Rochester): It has been recently reported in the Russian press that a special mission from Thibet, consisting of seven persons, headed by the Lama Daroshiyeff, was on its way to St. Petersburg, but His Majesty's Government have received no confirmation of this statement.

SALE OF WINE FROM THE ROYAL CELLARS.

MR. M'DERMOTT (Kilkenny, N.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if the wine from the Royal cellars, advertised to be sold on Monday next as duty paid, has paid duty; and, if not, whether duty will be now charged to the purchaser.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): It has been arranged some time since that the duty on the wine in question will be paid out of the proceeds of sale, and not by the purchaser.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the catalogues which have been extensively circulated state that the duty is paid. Is not that a false description?

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: Not if it is to be paid out of the proceeds of the sale.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: But it is not paid.

COAL DUTY.

*MR. PLUMMER (Newcastle-on-Tyne): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can state when and under what circumstances the tax already paid upon coal shipped for export under contracts made before 19th April, 1901, which have since been duly filed and returned by the Customs authorities, will be refunded.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The duty already paid upon coal shipped for export under any pre-Budget contracts which may be accepted and registered by the Board of Customs will be refunded by them upon verification of the shipments under the contracts.

*MR. PLUMMER: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in view of the fact that the person responsible for placing the coal f.o.b. is, upon the Tyne, usually not the person who enters the coal for shipment, he can state who, under these circumstances, is responsible for paying the export duty.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The person who enters the coal for shipment is the person to whom the Board of Customs look for payment of the export duty.

MERCANTILE MARINE; RETURN OF SEAMEN.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the Return of the number, ages, and ratings of seamen, in continuation of Command Paper 8579 of 1897, which was to be postponed for the Census, can now be given.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The Return asked for is in course of preparation, but it will not be ready for presentation for some time. The figures are taken from the inward lists of vessels, many of which were absent from the United Kingdom on Census day and some of which will not return for some months.

MERCANTILE MARINE; OFFICERS' CERTIFICATES.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether foreign merchant officers' certificates are accepted as the same as British certificates for officers in British ships.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: No, Sir; certificates required under the Merchant Shipping Act to be held by officers of British ships must, in all cases, be British certificates.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Can the right hon. Gentleman give me any information as to the number of certificated officers ordinarily carried on ships of various

tonnages?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Every British foreign-going merchant ship and every passenger ship of 100 tons and over is bound to carry at least one certificated officer besides the master.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Can the right hon. Gentleman say whether large vessels;ships of over 2,000 tons;are not required to carry more than one mate with the captain?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: There is no legal requirement of that kind. The legal requirements are set forth in Section 92 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894.

SEA FISH CULTURE.

MR. LAYLAND-BARRATT (Devonshire, Torquay): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he proposes to appoint a Committee to inquire into the whole question of sea fish culture; and, if so, what form the Committee will take, what the terms of reference to the Committee will be, and if the Committee will hold local sittings to collect information in the principal centres of the fishing industry.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I propose to appoint a Departmental Committee "to inquire and report as to the best means by which the State or local authorities can assist scientific research as applied to problems affecting the fisheries of Great Britain and Ireland, and in particular whether the object in view could best be attained by the creation of one central body or department, acting for England, Scotland, and Ireland, or by means of separate departments or agencies in each of the three countries." It will be for the Committee to determine the manner in which their inquiries will be conducted.

COMMERCIAL INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEE.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade, having regard to the fact that some time since a Commercial Intelligence Committee was appointed in connection with the Foreign Office representing Government departments and commercial interests, whether he can give the names and composition of that Committee, and state what duties it performs, how often it meets, and when the last meeting was held; and whether any Report or recommendations have been issued relative to the commercial interests of the country.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The Committee consists at present of two representatives of the Board of Trade, one representative of the Foreign, Colonial, and India Offices respectively, two representatives of the Imperial Institute, and seven representatives of the commercial community appointed on the recommendation of the Associated Chambers of Commerce. Some representatives of colonial commerce are about to be added. I shall be happy to show a list of names of the present members to the hon. Member if he so desires. The duties of the Committee are to supervise generally the collection and diffusion of commercial information through the Commercial Intelligence Branch of the Board of Trade, and to advise the Board on any matters that may be referred to it. The Committee has met four times during the past year, the last meeting having been on April 30th. The Committee being an advisory one, it is not the practice to publish its Reports and recommendations but I may mention that among the subjects which have

recently been under it consideration have been the probable effect on British trade of the forthcoming revision of the German tariff and the improvement in the methods of obtaining commercial information with regard to the colonies.
QUEEN'S HALL MEETING OF OPPONENTS OF THE WAR.

SIR JOHN STIRLING-MAXWELL (Glasgow, College): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can state what numbers of police were employed at the meeting held in favour of the Boer cause at the Queen's Hall on Wednesday last, in the hall itself and in the approaches to it; and will he state what numbers are usually employed at other political meetings in the same hall, and what extra expense has been entailed on the ratepayers or taxpayers of the country.

The following question also appeared on the Paper;;

MR. MALCOLM (Suffolk, Stowmarket): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will state the number of extra police employed to maintain order in connection with the recent meeting on 19th June at the Queen's Hall; whether the constables thus employed were withdrawn from their ordinary duties or leisure for the occasion; whether any parts of London were thereby deprived of their normal police protection; whether the cost of such extra protection will now and in the future be paid by the promoters of meetings; and whether he will consider the advisability of prohibiting similar meetings as calculated to cause a breach of the peace.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): Before the question is answered I wish to call attention to the expression in the question, "the meeting held in favour of the Boer cause," and to ask whether this is not controversial matter, and whether therefore such an expression is in order.

*MR. SPEAKER: It is desirable to exclude controversial matter from questions, but I presume that this is an account given by the hon. Member, who vouches for the description himself.

MR. LABOUCHERE: I was chairman at the meeting, and I entirely deny the accuracy of the statement. The meeting was held against the Government, sitting on that bench.

*MR. SPEAKER: It is very difficult to draw the line exactly as to whether a phrase in a question is controversial or merely descriptive. If my attention had been called to it, I think I should have suggested a less controversial form.

SIR JOHN STIRLING-MAXWELL: I should like to say that I had no wish to put this question in a controversial form, and the form in which it was put arose simply from my having read the resolutions passed by the meeting.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): In answer to these two questions, I have to say that, in accordance with the invariable practice in the case of meetings of a political nature, there were no police employed inside the Queen's Hall. The total number of police employed in the course of the evening in the vicinity of the hall in consequence of the meeting was 357. So far as I am aware, there have been no political meetings there before with which a comparison can be made. Promoters of meetings are never asked to pay anything in connection with the employment of extra police for the purpose of keeping order in the streets, but on this occasion no extra

expense was incurred. Whenever an abnormal number of people are likely to assemble, extra police must necessarily be present, and necessarily also these extra police are withdrawn from their ordinary duties and leisure for the occasion. It is not in my power to prohibit meetings in private buildings.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the presence of the extra police was in any way due to the incitements which appeared in various London newspapers for several days in connection with this meeting, also by way of handbills circulated on the Stock Exchange and anonymous placards published in the press?

*MR. RITCHIE: No, Sir. I am not aware that the presence of the police was due to any such cause. It was known that in all probability a great amount of feeling would be displayed, and that a large crowd would collect, and it is the duty of the police in these circumstances to keep order in the streets.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham): May I ask whether it is not the fact that the policy of allowing extravagant opinions to be expressed in perfect freedom is the best means of bringing those opinions into contempt?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! That question does not arise out of the answer.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Arising out of the answer of the Home Secretary, may I ask him whether on the next occasion that extra police are required;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Whether he will draw them from County Mayo, where they are not required?

*MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. Member asks an irregular question and I call him to order, it is not usual to disregard my ruling. It is highly disrespectful, and contrary to the rules of the House.

CITY CHARITIES;ST. GEORGE, BOTOLPH LANE.

MR. TOMLINSON (Preston): I beg to ask the hon. Member for the Tunbridge Division of Kent, as representing the Charity Commissioners, if he can state whether the sum of £;60 per annum allotted by the Charity Commissioners for the payment of an assistant curate in the parish of St. George, Botolph Lane, has been paid during the past seven years, or during what period since services have been discontinued in the said church of St. George, Botolph Lane, and St. Botolph, Billingsgate; and if, as set forth in the scheme now lying upon the Table of this House for the union of benefices of the said parishes of St. George, Botolph Lane, and St. Mary-at-Hill, the said sum continues payable; and whether he can give the names of the rector and the assistant curate by whom the allotted stipend has been received.

MR. GRIFFITH-BOSCAWEN: The annual sum of £;60 was assigned to Canon MacColl during his tenure of office as rector of St. George, Botolph Lane, for the payment of a curate under a clause (48) of the central scheme for the City parochial charities, which deals with ecclesiastical vested interests and payments. This payment has been made for the last seven years, during which period the services have been discontinued in the church of St. George. In the event of the union of the benefices of St. George, Botolph Lane, and St. Mary-at-Hill, and the appointment as incumbent of the united parishes of some other person than the present rector of St. George, the payment in question would fall

into the residue of the City Church Fund, and become applicable by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. The Commissioners are without information as to the name of the assistant curate by whom the payment has been received.

MALLAIG MAILS.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether any agreement has yet been arrived at with the North British Railway Company in regard to the conveyance of mails over the new railway between Fort William and Mallaig; and, if not, will he explain the cause of the delay and state the terms of the proposed contract.

MR. HAYES FISHER (Fulham) (for Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN): An agreement has not yet been arrived at with the North British Railway Company in regard to the conveyance of mails over the new railway between Fort William and Mallaig, the company being unwilling to accept the terms offered. Negotiations are proceeding. The failure to come to an agreement has not, however, prevented the Postmaster General from making use of the line so far as it has been found advantageous to do so.

POST OFFICES SAVINGS BANK;RURAL POST OFFICES.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he will state whether, with a view to the encouragement of thrift in rural districts, he will consider the advisability of arranging for the transaction of savings bank business at all rural sub-post offices serving a population of 200 and upwards on at least one day a week, preferably Saturday; and, having regard to the fact that postal orders cannot be cashed at a large proportion of the sub-post offices in the rural districts, will instructions be given for these orders to be cashed on the day selected for savings bank business.

MR. HAYES FISHER (for Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN): The restriction of savings bank or postal order business at small post offices to one day a week would not reduce the cost of administration or the difficulty of finding suitable persons to do the work, which are the grounds on which the present limitation in the number of offices doing such business is based. The Postmaster General is, however, usually ready to extend savings bank and postal order business to any post office under a guarantee for the necessary expenses.

HOUSE TO HOUSE DELIVERY OF LETTERS.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he will state whether the house to house delivery of letters, authorised by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his Budget for 1897, is now effected throughout England, Scotland, and Ireland; and will he state, approximately, the number of letters per annum estimated to have been thus brought into the official delivery; and which, under the arrangements existing prior to 1897, would have been left at post offices or places of call.

MR. HAYES FISHER (for Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN): The house to house delivery of letters is now effected throughout England, and practically throughout Scotland and Ireland as well. There are a few places in the two latter countries at which it has not yet been possible to afford a delivery, but steps are being taken to provide a service in all cases where it is practicable to do so. From May, 1897,

up to the end of September, 1900, it is estimated that about 57 millions of letters a year had been brought into the official delivery, and since that time it has not been considered necessary to keep special records.

PUBLIC HOLIDAYS IN THE POST OFFICE.

MR. HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he can state why certain sections of the Post Office employees received a holiday on 24th May, 1901, while others did not have one; whether overtime was worked subsequently in order to perform the work that would otherwise have been done on 24th May; and whether steps can be taken to provide that in future when a holiday to civil servants is granted it shall be given to the more poorly paid members of the staff as well as the major establishment of the Post Office.

MR. HAYES FISHER (for Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN): Only those employees who could be spared from their duties without inconvenience to the public service received a holiday on the 24th May last, and on the corresponding day in previous years. It is probable that in some cases overtime was worked subsequently in order to perform work that would otherwise have been done on that day. It has never been possible to grant a holiday on the occasion in question to those of the operative staff whose attendance is required on that day, and it is not practicable to make any change in that respect.

LONDON TELEGRAPH CLERKS; MEAL RELIEFS.

MR. HAY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that telegraph clerks in London employed on evening duties from 3 p.m. to 11 p.m. and 4 p.m. to midnight do not receive a meal relief, being employed upon telegraph duties without intermission, and whether, seeing that seven months have elapsed since the Postmaster General promised to consider the advisability of altering the arrangement, an answer can now be given.

MR. HAYES FISHER (for Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN): The Postmaster General has sanctioned meal reliefs on the duties to which the hon. Member refers, and arrangements will be commenced as soon as practicable for this purpose. Some little time must, however, elapse before full effect can be given to the decision.

REGISTRATION OF TEACHERS.

MR. BOND (Nottingham, E.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether the Consultative Committee have framed Regulations for the registration of teachers; and, if so, at what date an Order in Council dealing with the question will be laid upon the Table of the House.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): Yes; the matter is now under the consideration of the Board of Education.

COCKERTON JUDGMENT.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education, in view of his suggestion* that the school boards should arrange with the local municipal authorities for the continuance of their evening school work, rate expenditures upon which have now been declared

illegal, whether his attention has been called to the fact that, of the two funds at the disposal of these local authorities, the first, the whisky money, is practically all absorbed for purposes of technical instruction, and the second, the penny rate leviable under the Technical Instruction Acts, is also wholly or partially absorbed in a number of cases for the same purpose; and, seeing that under the Technical Instruction Acts the municipal councils are debarred from aiding the instruction of pupils, adult and otherwise, in the obligatory and standard subjects of the Whitehall Code out of the rate fund at their disposal, whether he can suggest any other course for relieving school boards of their present disability.

SIR J. GORST: The question and answer referred to by the hon. Member related to the City of Leeds, which, like the County Council of London, has as yet expended no part of the rate under the Technical Instruction Acts. The question and answer referred to related to instruction for commercial and industrial pursuits, and not to reading, writing,

* See page 909.

and arithmetic, though I must not be understood to accept the construction which the hon. Member puts upon the Technical Instruction Acts.

DR. MACNAMARA: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he is of opinion that money raised under the Technical Instruction Acts can be used in the maintenance of the instruction in the obligatory and standard subjects of the Whitehall Code?

SIR J. GORST: No; it is no part of my duty or that of the Board of Education to interpret Acts of Parliament.

WELSH INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether Sub-section (2) of Clause 6 in the Education Bill, introduced by the Government this session, would enable an urban district council in Wales or Monmouthshire under any conditions to claim from the education authority any share in the management or control of a county school (situated within such urban district) established under the Welsh Intermediate Education Act of 1889.

SIR J. GORST: I should think that no such claim could be substantiated under Clause 6 (2) against the will of the education authority, but the point shall be considered when the Bill is in Committee.

BRECHIN INTIMIDATION CASE.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether his attention has been called to the sentence of thirty days imprisonment without the alternative of a fine imposed upon James Bean at Brechin on the 31st May for the offence of intimidation; whether he is aware that nothing was proved against the prisoner beyond the use of opprobrious epithets directed to certain men who had refused to join in a local strike and whether, under the circumstances, the Secretary for Scotland can see his way to recommend a remission of the remaining portion of the man's sentence.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): I have already stated in reply to the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil that the Secretary for Scotland sees

no reason for advising any remission in this case. This decision was reached after a careful consideration of the circumstances of the case, and the Secretary for Scotland cannot depart from it.

AFFORESTRY IN IRELAND.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the proceedings of the Cork County Council, on the 13th instant, in connection with the subject of tree planting; and whether, in view of the want of timber in many parts of Ireland, the Government will introduce a short Bill giving county councils power to compulsorily acquire waste lands for the purpose of re-forestation, or in the alternative give facilities to private Member's Bills in this direction.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The Department of Agriculture is advised that county councils are empowered under Section 19, Sub-section 5, of the Agriculture and Technical Instruction Act, 1899, to borrow money for the purchase of land for tree planting, the consent of the Local Government Board being first obtained. The reply to the last part of the question is in the negative.

NEW RULES ON IRISH INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state what percentage of pupils who successfully pass through the junior grade of intermediate education in Ireland succeed in subsequently passing the senior grade; and what opportunity members of this House will be afforded for discussing the new rules brought forward by the Commissioners of Intermediate Education.

MR. WYNDHAM: For the last three years 7 per cent., approximately, of students who passed in the junior grade succeeded in passing in the senior grade. It may be stated that but a small percentage of successful junior grade students proceed to the senior grade.

MR. FLYNN: And when are we to have an opportunity of discussing the new rule?

MR. WYNDHAM: That depends on the arrangement of the business of the House.

MARLBOROUGH STREET, DUBLIN, TRAINING COLLEGE.

MR. JORDAN (Fermanagh, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that the position of principal of the male department in the Marlborough Street Training College is now vacant; is he aware that the Commissioners of National Education, on the inception of the scheme of the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant in 1890, made a rule that from that date appointments would be made to the college with due regard to the various denominations attending it; and seeing that this rule was sanctioned by the Lord Lieutenant, will he state whether it is to be acted upon in making the new appointment to the principalship; and if no regard is to be had to religious denomination, will the senior professor of the college be appointed principal.

MR. WYNDHAM: The principal of the Department referred to resigns from the 31st August next. In April, 1891, the Commissioners made an order providing that in respect to all future appointments to this college the appointments shall be

made, as far as practicable, with due regard to the relative number of students in training of the several religious denominations, so as to provide that each denomination shall be represented in due proportion on the staff of the training college. This order does not appear to have been submitted to the Lord Lieutenant for sanction. The Commissioners have not yet considered the question of appointing a successor to the principal.

TEMPLEMORE WATER SUPPLY.

MR. KENDAL O'BRIEN (Tipperary, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, in October, 1899, the Urban Council of Templemore, by a majority, decided to bring in a water supply scheme in consequence of the present source having been pronounced unfit for human use by Sir C. Cameron; that engineers were appointed, and plans, etc., drawn; that the military authorities have complained of the insufficient and impure water; and that the Local Government Board have been for years urging the necessity for a better and more satisfactory supply; and seeing that the urban council instructed their solicitor nearly two years ago to take the necessary steps for obtaining a Provisional Order for this purpose, will he explain why an inquiry was not held and the wishes of the local public representatives acceded to.

MR. WYNDHAM: The facts are generally stated in this question. The Local Government Board is not aware why the solicitor to the council has not lodged a petition for a Provisional Order with the Board. No steps can be taken by the Board in the absence of such a petition, or of a formal complaint made under the 15th section of the Public Health Act, 1896.

SERGEANT SHARKEY, ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY.

*MR. MOONEY (Dublin County, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been called to a case of assault heard recently at Dundrum Petty Sessions, in which Sergeant Sharkey, Royal Irish Constabulary, was charged with having assaulted and kicked a blind boy named Martin; whether he is aware that the chairman announced that an assault had been committed, but that in view of the long service of the defendant they would not inflict any punishment, but would dismiss the case with a caution; and will he state whether long service in the police force secures immunity from punishment for such an assault, and whether the police authorities intend to take any action in the matter.

MR. WYNDHAM: The facts are correctly stated in the first and second paragraphs. I cannot criticise the action of magistrates in the exercise of their judicial functions. The conduct of the sergeant, from a disciplinary point of view, is now under the consideration of the Inspector General.

MR. P. T. WALSH, J.P.

MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has any official information to the effect that the Mr. P. T. Walsh, recently elected chairman of county Waterford, is the same person who was recently a defendant in a United Irish League conspiracy case, and whether it is the intention of the Lord Chancellor to sanction his

appointment as a justice of the peace.

MR. P. J. POWER (Waterford, E.): Is it a fact that Mr. Walsh was not convicted, although forty-three jurors were ordered to stand aside, and is it not also the fact that the majority of those on the bench which returned him for trial were against so doing?

MR. WYNDHAM: I must ask for notice as to that. As to the question on the Paper, the reply to the first query is in the affirmative. Proceedings are pending against Mr. Walsh at the approaching summer assizes, and this being so, the question of his retention on the Commission of the Peace cannot be determined by the Lord Chancellor until after the trial.

MR. P. J. POWER: But is it not the fact that the jury disagreed, although forty-three were ordered to stand aside?

MR. WYNDHAM: They did disagree.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): Is not Mr. Walsh one of the most highly respected gentlemen in;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

SWANLINBAR RESIDENT MAGISTRATE.

MR. M'GOVERN (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state who is the resident magistrate in charge of Swanlinbar petty sessions district, and how often he has attended the petty sessions in Swanlinbar during the past two years.

MR. WYNDHAM: The petty sessions at Swanlinbar are held on the same date as those at Belleek. Mr. Bull, the resident magistrate of the district, has attended all the sessions at Belleek during the past two years. No inconvenience appears to have been caused to the public by his absence from the Swanlinbar Petty Sessions, but the question of a revision of the existing arrangements is under consideration.

CORK GASWORKERS' STRIKE.

MR. J. F. X. O'BRIEN (Cork): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the interference of Police-sergeant Williams, of Cork, in the strike now existing in that city; whether he is aware that this action of Sergeant Williams is resented by the Cork United Trades' Association and the Gasworkers' Society, and whether, in the event of Sergeant Williams having exceeded his duty, he will be warned not to interfere again in this dispute between employers and employed.

MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member has communicated to me a copy of a statement containing a report of an alleged conversation between a man named Cronin, lately employed in the gasworks, and Sergeant Williams, to the effect suggested in the question. The sergeant emphatically denies that he used the language attributed to him by Cronin; who, I may observe, was convicted of intimidation arising out of the strike, on the 15th instant.

BELFAST DISTURBANCES.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state if the owners of the building in Belfast on which the street preacher Trew delivered the speeches inciting to riot requested

the Government to prevent these speeches being delivered.

MR. WYNDHAM: I presume the hon. Member refers to the steps of the Custom House in Belfast, from which many of these speeches have been delivered. The control of this building is vested in the Board of Works, and the steps have also been used for many years as a platform by persons representing various sects and religious denominations. The expediency of enclosing the steps so as to exclude the public is doubtful.

DR. AMBROSE: Have these steps ever been used by Roman Catholic preachers? [No answer was returned.]

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): was putting a question about the Dublin Custom House steps when he was stopped by the Speaker.

WEXFORD LOCAL GOVERNMENT INQUIRY.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that the Local Government Board for Ireland have refused to give the Wexford County Council a copy of the report of their representative who conducted the recent inquiry at Wexford into the question of the salaries of the county and district surveyors, and if he will lay that report upon the Table of the House; if he is also aware that the Local Government Board have refused to give any reasons for their increase of the salaries of the officials in question; and if, in view of the fact that these officials admitted at the inquiry that they had no increase of duties under the Local Government (Ireland) Act, he can explain how the salary of the county surveyor has been raised from £;650 to £;846, and the salaries of the three deputy surveyors from £;240 to £;428; and if he will give the difference, respectively, between the salaries now fixed by the Local Government Board and those previously fixed by the Local Government Board and declared by the Court of Appeal to be illegal.

MR. WYNDHAM: The reports made by the inspectors of the Local Government Board in such matters are confidential documents and it would be contrary to invariable practice to lay them upon the Table. The decision of the Board was based on the evidence given at the inquiry and on Section 115 (18) of the Local Government Act of 1898. The officials did not admit they had no increase of duties; on the contrary, the surveyor stated, on oath, that his duties had increased over 70 per cent. The other officers also gave particulars of their increased duties, and no rebutting evidence was offered on behalf of the county council. The difference between the salaries now fixed and those originally fixed is £;26.

ATTACK ON A CLERGYMAN, CO. DUBLIN.

MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the assault, by three young men on the evening of Sunday, the 2nd June, upon the Rev. Nevin Bradshaw as he was returning from Kill o' Grange Church, whether he is aware that Mr. Bradshaw, after being insulted, was knocked down by a blow, for which assault the accused were sentenced to fines with the alternative of terms of imprisonment, and whether he will take steps to protect Mr. Bradshaw from such treatment in future.

MR. WYNDHAM: The facts are, generally, as stated. The assault was committed by three men under the influence of liquor, and the evidence showed that their misconduct was attributable to that cause. There is no reason to apprehend that the reverend gentleman will be further molested.

LIMERICK COUNTY COUNCIL MEETINGS.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will recommend the Local Government Board for Ireland to empower the Limerick County Council and district councils to hold their proposal meetings, in connection with the Local Government Act of 1898, half-yearly instead of quarterly, which would save them expense and otherwise facilitate matters

for them, and which would be in accordance with the wishes of the county and district councils as well as of the Finance Committee, as expressed by resolutions of those bodies; or whether he will recommend the purport of such resolutions to be embodied in the amended Local Government Act, as, according to Order in Council, at present under consideration.

MR. WYNDHAM: Under the Application of Enactments Order, 1898, the county and district council are bound to hold four quarterly meetings every year for the transaction of general business. This provision of the Enactments Order could not be amended by the Procedure Order now before Parliament. The Local Government Board has not received any representations which would lead them to believe that the course indicated in the question would meet with the approval of county and district councils generally.

FERMOY AND CORK DIRECT RAILWAY.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is now in a position to state, as the result of his communications with the Irish Government and the Fishguard and Rosslare Company, when the works for the construction of the Fermoy and Cork Direct Railway will be commenced.

MR. HAYES FISHER (for Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN): The Treasury is in communication with the company and the Irish Government on this subject, but I regret that it is not yet possible to make any statement upon the subject.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON IRISH UNIVERSITY EDUCATION.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the sittings of the Royal Commission on University Education will be held in Ireland; whether the Secretary to the Commission has been appointed by the Commissioners or by the Government, and whether he can give his name.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.):

The Royal Commission will, of course, determine for itself the places at which it will hold its inquiry. I have, for reasons well known, taken pains to make the majority of the Commission residents on this side of St. George's Channel, being persons engaged in the work of higher education. Under these circumstances it is inevitable that, many of these gentlemen being busy men, especially at certain times of the year, regard will have to be paid to that fact in relation to the meetings of the Commission. In regard to the last part of the question, no name has been fixed upon at present.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can state which will be the Government Orders that will be placed at the head of the list on Wednesday next, and in what order they will stand.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have not brought with me the extract of my speech in which I informed the House what would be the course of business on this Wednesday, but I think I made it explicit that after the first two Orders of the day, which were respectively the motion to send the Sale of Liquor to Children Bill and the Pure Beer Bill to the Grand Committee, the rest of the day would be devoted to Private Members' Bills, taken in the order in which they would have been taken had there been no interference with the usual course of business.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): What will be the business next week?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The Finance Bill will be proceeded with day by day next week, but the arrangements announced for Wednesday will be adhered to, and Irish votes in Supply taken on Friday.

DR. MACNAMARA: When does the right hon. Gentleman propose to proceed with the Education Bill?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I cannot say.

TOOK THE OATH.

One other Member took and subscribed the Oath.

LARCENY BILL.

Reported, with Amendments, from the Standing Committee on Law, etc.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 223.]

Minutes of Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 223.]

Bill, as amended (by the Standing Committee), to be considered upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 222.]

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEE).

Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Members from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures; Sir Walter Thorburn and Mr. John Redmond (added in respect of the Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and the Factory and Workshop Acts Consolidation Bills), and had appointed in substitution Mr. Arkwright and Mr. William Redmond.

Report to lie upon the Table.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend the Law with respect to Drunkenness." Drunkards Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill, intituled, "An Act to alter the qualifications of Licensing Authorities and the time of holding Licensing Sessions." Licensing Bill [Lords].

SOLICITORS BILL [Lords].

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 223.]

COUNTY COURTS. (IRELAND) BILL [Lords].

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Tuesday next, and to be

printed. [Bill 224.]

SUPPLY [12TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

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

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES, 1901–2.

Class IV.

1. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £;713,881 be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, for Public Education in Scotland, and for Science and Art in Scotland, including a Grant in-Aid."

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): When this Vote was before the House about six weeks ago we were discussing the question of training colleges. I believe that the motion for a reduction which was then made by my hon. friend the Member for North-West Lanark has lapsed. If that is so, I propose to renew the motion of my hon. friend, not, of course, with any intention of taking a division, but with a view to confining the discussion for a short time to the subject then raised. My hon. friend brought forward a question with regard to training colleges which is one of great importance. Since he did so, there has occurred an event which I think will be memorable in the history of Scottish education. I mean the gift, by a munificent benefactor, of an enormous sum of money for the benefit of Scottish universities. I should like to be permitted to join in the tribute which has been paid on different occasions to the public spirit and generosity which has been displayed by Mr. Andrew Carnegie. It is not irrelevant to do so here, because I believe Mr. Carnegie's gift has a most important bearing upon the question we are discussing. I would pay this tribute not only to Mr. Carnegie's generosity, but also to the care and thought which he has devoted to the question, because he has shown other qualities almost as admirable and uncommon as his generosity itself. He has shown a singular wish to obtain and to profit by all the counsel that could be given him as to the best way to apply the fund; he has shown a resolution to omit no precaution that could possibly be taken to render that fund effective for good and to prevent it being in any way misapplied; above all he has shown a wise foresight and sense of the possibility of change of circumstances in the future which have caused him to vest in his trustees very wide powers of varying the application of this gift to meet new conditions, so long as the main purpose of the gift is observed. That, I think, is a somewhat rare event in the case of these large gifts, and it is likely not only to contribute very largely to the value of the fund, but also to furnish an admirable example to other benefactors who may follow.

This gift has made a very important difference to the proposal brought forward on the last occasion by my hon. friend. It has made the case for that proposal stronger than it was before. I must admit that in his reply on that occasion, the Lord Advocate was sympathetic, but I think he was far from being specific. He hardly gave us a definite indication of the policy that the Scottish

Education Department was supposed to follow on the view which he took of my hon. friend's suggestion. I may tell the Lord Advocate what I think my hon. friend desired. I think he desired that no more money should be spent at present in further equipping or developing the training colleges. I think he desired, and certainly it is what I myself should desire, that any further grants given by the Government for this purpose should be spent on developing the university work and not on the training colleges themselves. When I say "training colleges," I mean the Presbyterian training colleges, because the case of the Presbyterian training colleges, maintained by the United Free Church and the Established Church of Scotland, is quite different from the case of the great training colleges maintained by the Roman Catholics and the Episcopalians. The Roman Catholics and the Episcopalians continue to desire that the teachers whom they employ should be prepared in their training colleges. They wish these institutions to be strictly and wholly denominational. In 1898 they had, I believe, only eight of their students in attendance at University courses. That is not at all the case with regard to the Presbyterian colleges. I do not think that any of us would desire to interfere with the Roman Catholics or the Episcopalians in the conduct of their system. At any rate that would raise a larger question, into which I do not now wish to enter. My desire is to keep controversial issues out of a question which I think may be considered from a purely educational point of view. The Presbyterian colleges are not denominational institutions in the sense in which the Roman Catholic and the Episcopalian colleges are. I believe that a certain number of students at the Established Church colleges belong to the United Free Church, and, similarly, that a certain number of students at the United Free Church colleges belong to the Established Church. I do not think that either of these churches regards its training colleges now; whatever may have been thought formerly; as agents for the propagation of its particular creed or for in any way strengthening its position in the country. In Scotland we are very far from having the same kind of denominational spirit in these matters as that which largely prevails in England. There is no desire on the part of the Scottish churches to make these training colleges denominational institutions. I believe that both churches are at present perfectly willing to consider any scheme which the Government may propose for dealing with them. I understand, also, that both churches are unwilling to spend more money on their training colleges; in fact, I believe they have intimated as much to the Government. If that is so; surely the way is quite open for the Government to adopt a plan for training teachers at the universities' rather than at these colleges. The two churches have not yet delivered any official opinion upon the subject, but I believe I am expressing their views correctly. It is fortunate that at this moment there reigns in Scotland a state of good feeling and harmony between the two great Presbyterian churches, which encourages the hope that no controversial matters between them will emerge in any proposal that may be made with regard to the training of teachers. I put it to the Government that it would be a very great pity to spend any more public money upon these training colleges when we have before us a more excellent way

of spending it, namely, in developing the university training. At present a certain amount of money is spent on King's students, and it would be better to spend more money on King's students than in maintaining the training colleges. Here comes in the importance of Mr. Carnegie's gift, because a part of the expense incurred by the Government in regard to King's students, and which is incurred in any education of intending teachers at the universities, is the expense connected with fees. Mr. Carnegie's gift is intended to relieve the students of these fees. That is a large contribution, and, as I understand it, greatly diminishes the expense to which the Government would otherwise be put. Why should the Government spend £28 a year upon the instruction, altogether apart from the maintenance, of a student in a training college, when a better instruction can be obtained at one of the universities for a smaller expenditure; while now, owing to Mr. Carnegie's gift, that expenditure will be saved altogether? If I am right in that view, Mr. Carnegie's gift furnishes a strong reinforcement of the arguments presented by my hon. friend.

What we should like is that those who are preparing for the educational profession in Scotland should go to the universities just in the same way as medical, theological, and engineering students now go, and will, I hope, when we have improved our scientific instruction, go in much larger numbers. We desire them to go not as seminarists, not as persons who are to receive from the first special instruction for a special profession, but as art students who are to take their instruction as much as possible along with other students, and who are not to embark upon a specific and special course until their general education has been concluded, that education having been carried on in company with students intended for other professions. The only difficulty which I understood the Lord Advocate to make was that there is not so much hold over King's students at the universities as over persons who are being prepared at the training colleges I cannot see why that should be so unless it arises from the fact that students in training colleges become professional from the first, that they are isolated from other men, are subjected to a purely professional atmosphere, and in that way are, so to speak, run into the teaching mould at an earlier age than is the case with those who remain in the freer and larger life of the universities. If that is so, I think it is a disadvantage. But I am not sure that there is really any stronger hold over training college students when they emerge from the colleges, because if they choose to devote their abilities and knowledge to following other professions, they are quite free to do so. I therefore fail to appreciate the Lord Advocate's argument that you have a better security for a supply of teachers through the training colleges than from a system of King's students.

I will sum up what I believe to be the three benefits to be expected from the proposal of my hon. friend. The first is that it will make the teaching profession more attractive, because whatever tends to improve the status of the teaching profession and to make it one profession all through, from the universities down to the elementary schools, renders it more attractive to aspiring and ambitious men. If you have a larger proportion of your intending teachers passing through a university course you have a larger proportion of men

who are fit to rise from an elementary to a secondary school, and the prospect of rising to a secondary school tends to induce abler men to enter the profession than would do so if their horizon was bounded by the prospect of an elementary school. I do not think anything does more to improve a profession as a whole, and to elevate the tone and spirit in even the humblest portions of its work, than the prospect of rising to the highest posts it can offer. In the second place, this proposal would be a good thing for the universities themselves. It would keep up one of the characteristics which has been the pride of our Scottish universities, that they have been in an eminent degree popular institutions accessible to the whole of the people in a way which the English universities have not been. They have always had a large proportion of students who have come

from what may be called the humbler classes. I remember that when I was a student at the University of Glasgow there were students who worked as blacksmiths and stone-masons during the summer, and attended the classes in the winter. In many cases they carried off the highest prizes in the classes, and received nothing but respect and deference from their fellow students. That, characteristic of Scottish universities is a thing we are most anxious to preserve and develop, and we may hope that Mr. Carnegie's gift will help in that direction. Nothing will contribute more to that end than having as large a proportion as possible of teachers trained in the universities. English Members may be interested to know that in 1898, out of 3,867 male teachers in Scottish elementary schools, there were no less than 781 who had graduated at Scottish universities. That is a very fine showing for Scotland as compared with England, but we should be glad to see the proportion even larger yet. Those who remember Scotland in past times will recollect that many of the teachers in the old parish schools had been university graduates, and one reason why so many promising students came up from the old parish schools was that the schoolmaster was able to give an instruction in Latin, Greek, and mathematics to the most likely boys, which fitted them to enter the universities and to profit by university education. That state of things seemed for a time to be endangered in the system which came in about fifty years ago under English educational methods, but I am happy to say that the proportion of graduates is now largely rising, and we desire to see it still further enlarged.

Another point to which, perhaps, I ought to refer is that Mr. Carnegie's gift must have a very important effect upon Scottish elementary and secondary education. If students are to come in larger numbers to the universities because their fees are paid, it is all the more important that both elementary and secondary instruction in Scotland should be improved. There must be better and wider instruction given if the full benefit of freeing the universities from fees is to be obtained. It follows from that that it will be necessary to improve the quality of our elementary and secondary education, and I suggest that that can best be done by improving the quality of Scottish teaching. Therefore the third benefit which I think we ought to expect from sending teachers to the Universities, instead of to the training colleges, is that their tone and teaching capacity will be improved. It will be a great

benefit to them for their minds to be liberalised and enlarged by the teaching that they, will, receive in the universities It has been one of the greatest benefits for the clergy, of Scotland and of England that they have been, unlike the Roman Catholic clergy on the continent of Europe, educated, not in seminaries, but in company with other young men of their own age who were being prepared for other professions. The same thing; would apply to the teaching world. Training college work has a kind of seminary character about it. Young men are separated from others who are to follow different professions; they do not breathe such a stimulating atmosphere as in the universities. All the benefits which a university education gives will be given to the teaching profession if the plan of my hon. friend is carried out. I believe that whatever enlarges and stimulates the minds of the teachers will be a great benefit to Scottish education, and will enable elementary, secondary, and university education to advance to an even higher level than that on which we are proud it at present stands. For these reasons I venture to hope that we shall have a sympathetic reply from the Government. I beg to move, pro forma, to reduce the Vote by £;100.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item Q (Grants for Training-Colleges) be reduced by £;100.";(Mr. Bryce.)

MR. RENSCHAW (Renfrewshire, W.) said he was sure every Member who was interested in education;and he thought that included every Scottish Member in the House;felt that they were indebted to the hon. Member for North-West Lanark for having raised this question of the training colleges. The sentiments also of the right hon. Member for South Aberdeen were very much those entertained by many hon. Members

in approaching this question from the educational point of view. He wished to direct the attention of the Committee to a more practical side of the question, and that was the continuing difficulty of obtaining a sufficient number of teachers under the existing system. It seemed to him that the existing system was threatening to break down, and in view of the great and munificent gift of Mr. Carnegie and of the passing of the Bill last Wednesday, which would undoubtedly increase the attendance at the elementary schools, he thought it absolutely essential that those responsible for maintaining the teaching staffs in the Scottish schools should have their attention directed to the insufficiency of the provision for the training of teachers. The training colleges had only accommodation for 1,370, and the total number of certificated teachers was 10,845. Now, in his opinion, that number was obviously insufficient for the requirements of the Scottish educational authorities. In support of his argument he referred to the advertisement pages of the Scotsman and Glasgow Herald. In these journals school boards were advertising for every class of teachers, whereas scarcely ever was there an advertisement by a teacher wanting a situation. That indicated that the demand for teachers was outrunning the supply. The teaching profession was a highly honourable one, and had always appealed to the sentiments and sympathy of the Scottish people. And now it was attractive even financially, as was shown in the last Report of the Committee of Council on Education. The average remuneration earned by certificated teachers

for the last year was £142, whereas in 1870 it was only £101. Fifty per cent. of the total number of certificated teachers had got incomes of over £150. Why was it, therefore, that they had such a comparatively small number of men coming forward to enter the ranks of the teaching profession? He imagined that there must be a period in the life of very many young men when they asked themselves whether they would become teachers or clerks, and why was it that the number who applied to go into offices as clerks was apparently almost innumerable, while the number who went into the teaching profession

was so limited? He could not see that the life of a clerk was pleasanter than that of a teacher; and certainly the position and the prospects of a teacher were, in his opinion, infinitely better than those of an ordinary clerk. The teacher had longer holidays and a bigger salary, and by an Act passed in the last Parliament, provision was made in respect to superannuation.

Notwithstanding all these advantages they had the fact that there was an unlimited number of applications by young men, from twenty to twenty-five years of age, for clerkships where the remuneration was not more than £60 to £80 per year, while if a school board wanted a certificated teacher they had to pay at least £120 per year, and even then the choice was so limited that they were compelled to accept whatever they could get. There could be only one reason why a larger number of young men did not seek to enter the teaching profession, and that was the restrictions and difficulties to their becoming teachers. There was too great a congestion in the training colleges. If the suggestion of the hon. Member for North-west Lanark was capable of being carried out, they might increase the facilities given for young men and young women going through a course of university training, and having their minds broadened and freed from the narrow influences of ordinary schools, and so becoming capable of giving to the scholars in Scotland better and wider training than under the opportunities afforded at the present time. For his part he hoped that the discussion of this question would focus attention in Scotland on the matter; and unless the Lord Advocate could give some assurance to the Committee as to the prospects in future in the direction of improvement, they should have either a Departmental Inquiry or a Select Committee on the question of the supply of teachers.

MR. HALDANE (Haddingtonshire) said that the appearance of tranquillity which the House of Commons presented when it went into Committee on the Scottish Estimates was phenomenal, but he would be a very superficial observer who was misled as to the importance of the business that was being transacted.

They were really the Great Council of the Scottish nation. They were there to discuss thoroughly practical topics about which they all knew something, and in which all Scottish Members were interested, and which they were able to discuss without introducing party feeling. There were no supplementary questions, no motions for adjournment, not even any party political differences. His hon. friend opposite had made a speech just as progressive, satisfactory, and reforming in tone as that of the hon. Member for North-west Lanark. On the last occasion on which this question came before the Committee the Lord Advocate had spoken in a sympathetic, if also in a somewhat cautious spirit; and his right hon. friend the Member for South Aberdeen had examined the whole matter with a

fulness of knowledge which showed that complete and thorough grasp of educational subjects which his long studies and academic position entitled him to do. What was the practical point; for they were a practical people in Scotland, and tried to come to the practical point at once? They had got a suspicion; not at all a hostile suspicion; that the Government had in contemplation to do something to deal with an evil which was admitted on all hands, namely, the difficulty in getting a supply of Scottish teachers in the schools. To cope with that evil it was necessary to make some further provision for the training of teachers. That might be done in two ways, one bad, and the other good. They had a fear lest, with the breakdown of the existing arrangements, that it would enter into the minds of those who had the control of these matters that, instead of making use of the universities, they would try to take over the training colleges from the churches and put them under the control of the Education Department. They did not know whether such a policy had been definitely come to, or was even contemplated, but they had the feeling, from fragments and traces in recent speeches, that that was possible. Now, he thought there was a general agreement on both sides of the House that that was not the most auspicious way of entering upon the task of getting a better supply of Scottish teachers. The training colleges were very peculiar bodies. There were four Presbyterian colleges, one Roman Catholic, and one Episcopalian; all managed by the churches. The Presbyterian colleges were managed in a spirit which was wonderfully free from sectarianism. They were really great pieces of machinery which, only by a sort of accident, were managed by the churches, although the Government found the money. They were national institutions, and must be treated on that footing. He entirely agreed with the hon. Member for West Renfrewshire that there was difficulty in getting young people to enter the teaching profession. They did not care to go into the training colleges because they were not of the status of certain other educational institutions in Scotland. There was nothing more striking, he thought he might say, than the decay of individuality in the teaching profession. What they were suffering from was a certain dead level. It was a high level; it had improved very much in the last few years, but there was less of that rugged individuality of character, that sort of Carlylean characteristic in the Scottish schoolmaster which existed twenty-five years ago. They had come to a time when there was some hope of something like a chance being obtained of getting back to the old position. About the great gift of Mr. Carnegie he would not say more than that it would enable an enormous stride to be taken in Scottish education. Through the splendid munificence of Mr. Carnegie it was now possible to do something not only in the direction of assisting students to go to the universities, but in the direction of developing the universities themselves and making them more attractive and comprehensive. There were two alternative plans. One was to take over the training colleges and manage them from Dover House. Dover House was a most efficient institution, but he could not help feeling that if they did that they would not get rid of that tendency to a dead level which he deprecated. He would rather see the development of the policy of training the teachers in the universities themselves. That would be no new departure. The hon. Member for

West Renfrewshire had spoken of the number of teachers in the training colleges as being between 1,200 and 1,300; but there were besides that 380 of what were called King's students at the universities, whose training for the teaching profession was supervised by local committees; some at Aberdeen University and the others at St. Andrews University. Experience had proved that that system was an enormous success, and the number of King's students was rapidly increasing. The system, which was much appreciated, gave every indication of showing the way in which the training of students for the teaching profession in Scotland might be greatly popularised. He would not talk of the Roman Catholic or the Episcopalian colleges, for they were sectarian institutions; but surely it would be better, instead of doing anything in the direction of State control of the Presbyterian colleges, rather to look to the universities as the training ground for teachers. He would like to say that, although the right hon. Gentleman opposite had on the last occasion on which this question was debated alleged that this was not a very practicable scheme, inasmuch as it provided no substitute for the training colleges in supervising the young teachers while being educated at the universities, experience had shown that that work of supervision was being efficiently carried out by local committees in Aberdeen and St. Andrews; and there was no reason why it should not be done in Edinburgh and Glasgow. Surely it was for the school boards themselves to take part in the supervision of the students while undergoing a course of university training. Glasgow, indeed, had already told the Government, through the lips of the school board, that it was quite ready to take in hand an experiment such as that which had succeeded so well in Aberdeen and St. Andrews. They had got in the Carnegie Trust a means of developing that side of university life; the means of cheapening the entrance to the universities for these students. But he thought that, even without resorting to the Carnegie Trust, the university training was cheaper than that of the training colleges. The cost of the training college was £28 per year and of the university £16 per year. Speaking for himself, he first of all advocated this change in the interest of getting more individuality in the teacher, and secondly because it was good for the

teaching profession, good for the university, and for what they all aimed at; the reform which should bring the university, the secondary school, and the elementary school all into line and relation with one another. They were on the verge of a new departure, and if the Lord Advocate could give them an assurance on this matter he would confer an obligation on the whole people of Scotland.

*MR. J. A. CAMPBELL (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) said he was in general sympathy with what had been said. He knew that the difficulty of getting teachers had been very much felt. He also agreed that it was very desirable to encourage the attendance at the universities of young men and young women who were preparing for the teaching profession. That was already being done to an increasing extent. He was glad to hear the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen admit the efficient way in which the training colleges had done their work. These colleges were under denominational management; but their teaching was not denominational in the sense of being peculiar to any Church,

and the general work that they had done had been acknowledged to be excellent. He did not think it could be said that the training colleges had scared young people from proceeding towards the teaching profession. There had been no objection on their part to the training colleges. While the colleges had not been the only avenues to the teaching profession, the fact still remained that they had been the main avenue, and the only complaint against them of late years had been their insufficiency to train the number of teachers that was required for the staffing of the schools. He hailed the suggestion that more should be done through the universities, and he was glad to know that the experiment that had been made in regard to King's students had been satisfactory in Aberdeen and St. Andrews. They must remember, however, that that system was in the experimental stage as yet. He hoped the experiment would continue to be successful, and that by-and-by they would find a large accession of teachers through that channel, and that the authorities in Edinburgh and Glasgow, when they saw that the system had succeeded elsewhere, would adopt it. At the same time, he must express the hope that the Scotch Education Department would not be encouraged by this discussion to withdraw or lessen their assistance to the training colleges until they were quite sure that a good substitute had been found. The training colleges had done their work well and were worthy of all the assistance they received. They were originally founded by the churches, which had raised the money for the buildings, and now the churches were taking an interest in their management, not in any sectarian, but in a broad educational spirit. He should think that the churches would not put any obstacle in the way of any new system so long as they were assured that that new system would produce equally good results with the old.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid) said that before the Lord Advocate replied he wished to say a few words. For many years before this question had been brought before the House the necessity had been felt for increased facilities for training teachers. Scotch education had undoubtedly suffered from the want of a sufficient supply of accommodation in the training colleges. He was not going into the comparative merits of the university system and the training college system. There were a great many arguments in favour of both but, as the right hon. Gentleman had just pointed out, he did not think they had yet had sufficient experience of the working of the university system to lead them to determine now any change on a very large scale. What he was particularly anxious about was that they ought to have an increase in the means of training teachers in the training colleges. It had been said that then had been a difficulty in getting young people to enter the profession. He did not think there was any difficulty of that kind, because they found from the Report of the Scotch Education Department that the great source of supply of teachers came from the pupil teachers, and at the examination for admission to the training colleges hundreds of pupil teachers who had passed the examination were not admitted to the training colleges because there was not room for them. The Glasgow newspapers had many letters from parents complaining that their children who had qualified by passing the examinations to enter the training colleges, could not do so simply because there was no room. The last

report showed that out of 972 who had qualified, only 342 were able to be taken into the training colleges. Only thirty-six King's students and thirty-eight graduates had been appointed teachers, so that the number of teachers to be obtained from those sources was not very large.

As regarded pupil teachers who had been qualified by exam., but had not been admitted to the training college, there was a gross injustice. They had been encouraged to enter into a contract of service. They fulfilled that contract so far as they were committed to it by qualifying to pass the exam., but they had not been given the advantage of trained teachers as regarded emoluments, simply because the Education Department had not accommodation to enable them to fulfil their own part of the obligation. That was grossly unfair. It was not astonishing that so few joined the teaching profession, because it was found that after a person had qualified in every way he was not admitted to a training college, and did not receive his certificate as a trained teacher at all.

Persons in the towns were able to pass the exam, owing to the special facilities they had, but pupil teachers in the country districts, who had not similar advantages, were naturally left out in the cold. Obviously the teachers were the mainspring of education. As had been pointed out, the characteristic of education in Scotland in other days was the individuality of the teacher. It was the teacher, and not the parents, of a boy that induced him to prepare for and to go to a university, and he ventured to say that there could be no real education without thoroughly trained teachers.

In the inspector's report the great difference between teachers trained in the training colleges and teachers without that training was noted, and the inspectors deplored the increase in the number of untrained teachers. In the Report it was stated that of the new teachers 207 were males and 765 females; or three and a half times as many females as males, and that the total number of teachers was roughly 4,000 males and 6,000 females. The female teachers were increasing year by year. Why? The school boards found such difficulty in getting male teachers, and the salaries were so high, that they were driven in self-defence to employ as many female teachers as possible. Under the present system managers had no choice, and practically had to take every man coming out of the training colleges. There was no subject of more pressing importance than the training of teachers, and it was an extraordinary thing to find men qualified as pupil-teachers who could not attend the training colleges because there was no room. He admitted that there was a little improvement recently as regarded the number of teachers trained, but it should also be remembered that the school attendance was increasing. Last year 14,000 pupils were added to the school registers and 8,000 to the average attendance, and that swallowed up the increase in the number of trained teachers. He hoped therefore that the training of teachers either at the universities or at the training colleges would be attended to. The reason why the training colleges were not enlarged was because they were private property, although they were practically State institutions. They were not increased because of the difficulty of breaking away from the old traditions of denominational institutions. But that difficulty must be overcome, and it must be recognised that the training colleges were no longer of a denominational

character, but really State institutions. They should be worked to the very best advantage, and more accommodation should be provided for, and a little more money spent in, the training of teachers.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) said that as an English Member, and a Member of the largest school board south of the Tweed, he wished to state that he had studied the Report with envy and admiration. First of all, as to the age to which children remained at school, it

was very remarkable indeed that, although the statutory limit in Scotland was ten years, yet according to the Report 42 per cent. of the children in the elementary schools in Scotland were over that age, whereas in England, where the statutory limit was twelve years, only 30 per cent. of the children were beyond the age of ten. Therefore, it was quite clear that the Scottish people were a much longer way ahead of their statutory obligation than the English people. He also observed that in Scotland 3 per cent. of the children at school were over fourteen years, whereas in English schools not 1 per cent. was over the age. Then as regarded the higher grade schools, no smaller a proportion than 35 per cent. of the children were over fifteen years of age.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I must remind the hon. Member that the debate is now confined to the question of the training colleges.

DR. MACNAMARA said he understood the Committee were discussing the Scotch Education Office.

*THE CHAIRMAN: A reduction has been moved in respect of the training colleges, and the discussion must now be confined to that particular reduction.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): I had better now reply to the further remarks that have been made on this subject which has been reintroduced by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen. Of course, he need make no apology for further discussing this subject, because I have made it perfectly clear that, so far as the Department is concerned, we are fully alive to its importance. Indeed, I think the right hon. Gentleman quite admitted that the reply I made to the speech of the hon. Member for North-west Lanark was sympathetic, although he said it was somewhat wanting in specialisation. I should be the first to admit that it was wanting in specialisation, and for the reason that I have already explained, namely, that although I found that the hon. Member for North-west Lanark was entirely in sympathy with the views that we held, what I was left rather in doubt about was what he proposed, and exactly what in a practical way he wanted. The right hon. Gentleman to-night spoke of the "proposals" of the hon. Member for North-west Lanark, and he afterwards, in the latter portion of his speech, actually spoke of his "plans." I only wish I could discover what the plans of the hon. Member were, and I do not think his observations could be exactly characterised as proposals. I entirely agree that we should as far as possible foster the connection between the training of teachers and the universities, and, so far as we possibly can, take advantage of university education in the training of teachers. That is, of course, entirely our view, and I need scarcely tell the Committee that we have tried to do a great deal in that direction. I am only recapitulating, but at the same time let me remind the Committee that, so

far as the training colleges are concerned, we encourage them to send students to the universities by paying, as part of the expenses of the training colleges, the fees which the students pay in attending university classes. Over and above that, we have introduced this system of King's students, of which I think every hon. Member who has addressed the Committee thinks well; and beyond that we have given special grants to allow the training of teachers in special subjects under another branch of the Code.

Now, the question is, What further? I cannot help thinking that if we could imagine an intelligent foreigner listening to this debate he would have gone away with the impression that a man could only be a teacher in a Scottish school if he had in some way or another passed through a training college or had been a King's student, or had been at one of these particular classes. That, as hon. Members know, is not the case. There is nothing to stop a man with the highest university degree in the kingdom from becoming a teacher. Even the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen might become a teacher if he went for six months, or whatever it is, to a public elementary school. But why does he not become a teacher? Why, because he has other and better things to do. It is regarded as curious that we do not have a greater number of persons entering the teaching profession. I am afraid the reason is that for the highly educated there are other things which offer more attractive fields than the teaching profession. Let us compare the career of a teacher with the possible career and opportunities of a clerk. The clerk begins as an office boy, and then becomes a clerk. He earns his own subsistence at a very early age, and accordingly, I think, there will always be a redundancy in that particular class, because, although the position may not have the attraction or the certain prospect of getting as good a salary as a teacher, yet it is an easier career on its inception and may eventually lead to higher things than the teaching profession.

Now, I pass from that to the question, What next? The hon. Member for West Renfrew told us that we must not be deceived by the seeming tranquillity of a discussion of this sort; that other things may be hidden under it. I confess I could not listen to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman without wondering whether there was not something underneath it. I am not, of course, suggesting anything on his part; but what I want to know is, Does he go the length of saying; that we had better give up the training colleges? because that is a question which neither he nor the hon. Member for North-west Lanark at all faced.

It is all very well to say; and we all agree; that we should foster connection with the universities as much as we can, but are we to give up the training colleges? The training colleges, as the Committee knows, are conducted by the churches. The right hon. Gentleman made it perfectly clear that he did not mean for a moment to propose any change in either the Episcopalian college or the Roman Catholic college. The Roman Catholic training college, as he knows very well, is very much the strongest of the whole set, and it is so for one very good reason, that it is the only residential college in the set, and therefore it has a great hold, and, for the matter of that, spends a great deal more money

on the students than is spent on the students in the other training colleges. But as regards the other training colleges, would he give them up or not? The right hon. Gentleman said something vague as to there being a sort of feeling that no more money should be spent, but does he think that the abandonment of these training colleges is in accordance with Scottish opinion? It is all very well to say that these colleges, although they belong to the churches, have not been conducted in a proselytising spirit, but there is no great incentive to proselytism when everyone believes the same way as you do, and inasmuch as the great majority of the Scottish people is Presbyterian; and although there are differences as regards church government, which I should be very sorry to enter upon, between the two great churches, yet, fortunately for the people of Scotland, these differences have never practically affected the elementary education of the children in religious subjects, and it has been common ground between all the Scottish churches that the children shall be denominationally taught. The hon. Member shakes his head, but it is my opinion, and the opinion of many other people. It is not a training, for instance, that would please my noble friend the Member for Greenwich. It is denominational in the sense of being Presbyterian as against anything else; consequently there has been no necessity to proselytise, and, of course, like every other educational institution of the sort, there is nothing in the shape of a test. We are absolutely free in that way. I would put it to the right hon. Gentleman, would he have the courage to stand up in Scotland and expect the Scottish people to agree with him, and say that the time has come, so far as the training of teachers is concerned, to cut the connection with the churches altogether, and have no church control of any sort? Personally I do not think the right hon. Gentleman would; I do not mean he would not have the personal courage, but I mean he would not have the courage of that opinion in Scotland. Surely that is, I will not say an answer to the hon. Member for North-west Lanark, for my criticism is that he did not put forward a proposition that admitted of an answer, but it is an answer, to a great extent, as to what we are going to do.

I have a little fault also to find with the hon. Member for Mid Lanark. He has addressed himself to this subject for several years, and he says that the practical difficulty in making the training colleges larger is that they do not belong to us. That brings me to the speech of the hon. and learned Member for Haddington. He seems to have conceived a fear that we are going to take over the training colleges, and to make them Government institutions. Whether that would please the hon. Member for Mid Lanark or not I am not quite sure, but it would at once get over the difficulty he sees in the way of making the training colleges larger. I can, however, assure the hon. and learned Member that such an idea, so far as I know, has never entered the head of His Majesty's Government up to the present, and that consequently there is no practical proposition or idea to take over the training colleges, nor have the churches given any intimation that they propose to give them up. Of course we are entirely in sympathy with the view of the right hon. Gentleman that we should get as many university men as possible, but does he think that it would ever be possible to

really practically supply the whole teaching profession in that way? Personally I think not. May I ask him to consider the difficulties? In the first place there must be for the training of teachers a systematic training in very elementary subjects; in other words the universities should provide classes which they have not at present, and which really do not belong to university education. Of course we should all like every one to be a graduate of the very highest class, but we cannot have that; and, as a matter of fact, for the humbler ranks of the teaching profession it would, unless the circumstances are altered very much be quite impossible that they should come up to the standard of the higher classes in the universities, and I am quite sure the right hon. Gentleman would be one of the very first to deplore anything which would have the immediate result of tending to lower the present university standard. It is not a theoretical but a practical difficulty, and there are many in the humbler grades of the teaching profession for whom, in present circumstances, it would be Utopian to expect that they would ever come up to the university standard. One word as to what has been said about the King's studentships not prospering in Edinburgh and Glasgow as at Aberdeen and St. Andrews. So far as the Department is concerned there is no reason, but the local authorities have not taken them up in the same way at Edinburgh and Glasgow as they have at Aberdeen and St. Andrews.

AN HON. MEMBER asked whether the right hon. Gentleman would be willing to allow the establishment of King's students side by side with the training college at Edinburgh and Glasgow.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I understand there is nothing against it, and I believe that the authorities at Glasgow are conferring upon that subject at the present time, but these matters must be dealt with largely upon the initiative of the local committees. Now, one other word. I hope I have given the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen sufficient assurance that, so far as strengthening the ties of the university is concerned, I am entirely with him, but I think, in discussing this subject, we must discuss it purely from the point of view of whether we are prepared to abandon the training colleges or not. We are not prepared to do so at the present moment, and I very much doubt whether any hon. Member would get up and say that he was. I do not know whether I shall be strictly in order, but perhaps, Mr. Lowther, you will allow me to reciprocate the well-chosen words used by the right hon. Gentleman with regard to the magnificent gift of Mr. Carnegie. It is a matter for congratulation that Mr. Carnegie has taken studious care to eliminate from his proposals and their discussion all party politics, and I am glad to think that among his most trusted advisers were not only two gentlemen sitting on the Front Opposition Bench, but the First Lord of the Treasury. The right hon. Gentleman rather indicated that the gift of Mr. Carnegie would make the matter all the easier for the Government, because, whereas we have paid the fees of the students of the training colleges at the universities in the past, now these fees may be got from the Carnegie fund. We do not entirely know what the whole plan is, but I understand that fees are only to be paid for those students who are not in a position to pay for themselves. I assure the Committee

that the Education Department are fully alive to the importance of doing everything they can to strengthen the connection between the training colleges and the universities, and that they are not in the position to give up the present system.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question again proposed.

DR. MACNAMARA said that by whatever touchstone the matter was tested the Report upon Scotch Education showed a considerable advance on the north of the Tweed on anything that had been prayed for on the south. He ventured to point out to the Committee that although the statutory obligation in Scotland to keep a child at school was ten years of age, yet the percentage of children beyond that age still attending the schools was 42 per cent.; whereas in England, where the statutory obligation was twelve years of age, only 35 per cent. of the children attending the schools were over ten. With regard to the question of higher grade schools, as set out in the Report, he found in the higher-grade schools in Scotland 35 per cent. of the pupils were over fifteen years of age. In England a child was not permitted to remain at school over fifteen years of age, and he could only look with admiration upon a system which permitted 35 per cent. of children to remain at school over that age, when in England they were compelled literally to turn them into the street. He noticed that 4 per cent. of the children in the Scotch higher grade schools were over seventeen years of age. What would happen in England if children were kept at school until such an age he would not venture to suggest, but even yet the Scotch Education Department were not satisfied. The average daily attendance of those enrolled in the schools was 84 per cent. in Scotland; in England it barely reached 82 per cent. In the matter of regular attendance England to-day was where Scotland was ten years ago, and that was

the state of affairs which represented England's position in all educational matters. With regard to evening schools in Scotland, the number of pupils enrolled was 11 per cent. of the number enrolled in the day schools. England and Wales could not show 9 per cent. The most striking fact, however, was the scope of work which was permitted in Scotch evening schools, which was far more extensive than that permitted in the English. The new evening school code for free instruction from school board rates for pupils of any age permitted subjects which took the pupil up to the most advanced stage of technical and artistic training. Some of the subjects mentioned in that Code as elementary were, the study of any language; ancient or modern; approved by the Department; commercial correspondence; business procedure; the study of any language with a direct view to its use in business; algebra; mensuration; dynamics; the application of mathematics and science to specific industries; machinery construction; building construction; naval architecture; various electrical industries; mining, agricultural, and horticultural, or any other industries, the scientific principles underlying which demanded attention. Those were a few of the elementary subjects, but he had never heard the Lord Advocate come to the House and gibe at the differential calculus, as he had heard the Vice-President of the English Board of Education. He would like to see a Scotch

Cockerton come forward and challenge some of these subjects. He thought if anyone ventured to come forward on such an errand he would have a very bad time at the hands of Scotch Members. All these things were legitimate in Scotland, and why should they not be so south of the Tweed? If all the partially-qualified assistant teachers and pupil-teachers were excluded from this Return, and only the certificated adult teachers allowed to remain, the percentage of certificated adult teachers for the Scotch schools was 63 per cent. In England the corresponding percentage was only 42, and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Aberdeen might, therefore, take comfort from the fact that there was a much larger percentage of adult teachers in Scotland than was permitted to England. The Scotch schools had a certificated teacher for every 69 children enrolled, but in England it was one for every 90. The amount of money which was spent in the maintenance of education given in the ordinary schools was 2s. 2d. per head more than in England and Wales. The maintenance charge for the county of Inverness-shire was 61s. 2d., while in the county of Cambridge it was 44s. 2d. In Argyll-shire it was 71s. 11d., whilst in Cornwall it was 42s. 4d. He could only say that he hoped Scotch education would go on and prosper. There was not an English or Welsh town of any importance which had not at the head of the municipal body or at the head of some firm interested in the great undertakings of the city a Scotchman who had been induced to become a not unwilling exile from his native heath for a large salary, and if the Scotch Education Department went on as they were going on at the present time, and English education was to be left in the position it was at present, he would not be surprised to see these unhappy exiles increase to a very large extent. Question put, and agreed to.

2. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £2,000, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, for a Grant to the Board of Trustees for manufactures in Scotland in aid of the maintenance of the National Gallery, School of Art, and Museum of Antiquities, Scotland, &c."

MR. CALDWELL said that he desired to ask one question with regard to this Vote. He did not think that Scotland was getting anything like the amount that it should get for the maintenance of the art galleries of Scotland, and last year he found that the whole of the money granted was not spent. He noticed that there was a balance of £303 11s. 1d. What he wished to know was whether any of the money was being spent in buying pictures, or what was being done with it, and whether the trustees had any scheme for spending this little money, or whether it was being accumulated in the same way as the moneys which were given to England and Ireland for this purpose.

*SIR JOHN STIRLING-MAXWELL (Glasgow, College) said that he did not think that the hon. Member who had just sat down could have looked at the Estimates. The National Gallery in Edinburgh had been handicapped throughout its career by being tied up in the Board of Manufactures with a bundle of other institutions. It was much to be wished that the National Gallery should be allowed to stand on its own legs, but in the meantime it was only proper that Scotland should

realise the gallery was in such a financial position that it had no money to spend on pictures, and though it was given a grant which might be expended in pictures, it had all to be spent in repairs. He regretted the temporary grant had not been continued, and he commended to the Government the advisability of increasing the grant, so that the National Gallery in Edinburgh might be a place of some interest and less a subject of laughter to their neighbours than at present.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I am not able to give the exact details of the expenditure of this money. With regard to a further subvention to Scotland for purposes of art, we should all like to get as much money from the Treasury for this purpose as we can, but it is not always possible to get all we could wish.

*SIR JOHN STIRLING-MAXWELL: Will you ask?

*MR. GRAHAM MURRAY: We have often asked, but we do not always get what we ask for.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.) asked whether the money not expended was allowed to accumulate, or whether it was paid back to the Chancellor of the Exchequer at the end of the year.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: It is allowed to accumulate.

MR. CALDWELL suggested that, as there were convenient buildings in Glasgow and Edinburgh, an addition should be made to the grant in order to enable those cities to get loan collections down from London, much in the same way as the Corporation of London obtained them for the Guildhall. It was a great pity when they had such excellent buildings in Scotland that they should not be used. It only meant the cost of removal and that was a very good reason for increasing a Vote of this kind. Of course, it meant money, but the complaint with regard to this Vote was that it was too little; and as the only way of obtaining an increase of the Vote was to move to reduce it still less, and also having regard to the fact that this was the only opportunity which offered for at least a year, and that it would be a thousand pities to allow the Vote to pass without emphasising it a little, he moved to reduce the Vote by £100.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,900, be granted for the said Service.";(Mr. Caldwell.)

DR. FARQUHARSON said the hon. Gentleman who moved the reduction had failed to appreciate the extent to which, both Glasgow and Edinburgh had taken advantage of the South Kensington circulating collection. When in Glasgow last year he met the travelling superintendent of South Kensington, who was there in charge of the finest collection of water-colour drawings he had ever seen. At Glasgow, Aberdeen, Edinburgh, and Dundee this loan system, had been carried on to great advantage. The art treasures of London were, so far as he could see, freely placed at the disposal of the provincial towns.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): expressed the opinion that the hon. Member for Mid Lanark had taken the proper course in moving the reduction of the Vote. Scotland in this matter had a grievance, in which Ireland shared; the treatment meted out to the national galleries of Scotland was only equalled, by that meted out to Ireland. The House was always ready to provide money for the National Gallery of London, or for giving the people of London all sorts of opportunities

of enjoying and studying valuable works of art; but in Scotland, as in Ireland, the people were differently treated. It was absolutely impossible to get a niggardly Treasury to pay proper attention to the wishes of the people either of Scotland or Ireland, and especially was it impossible to induce them to grant sufficient money to provide a proper collection of pictures. The principle seemed to be that English Members were to be entitled to all they asked for, and Scotland and Ireland were to have nothing.

MR. PARKER SMITH (Lanarkshire, Partick) said the hon. Member who had just sat down had dealt with two separate questions. He did not think Scotland wanted any assistance in regard to loan collections, and he thought that Glasgow was quite equal to arranging any loan questions she desired, but that was a totally different thing to increasing the grant. He was entirely in favour of an additional grant to the National Gallery.

*SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee) said at this moment there was an excellent and valuable collection of pictures in the Art Gallery at Dundee sent from South Kensington, and if other cities had not a similar collection it was because they had not applied for them. There was not only a very competent inspector in charge, who had selected an admirable collection, but that gentleman gave excellent lecturettes, explaining to those who went to see his pictures their historical and other connections. So far as loan collections were concerned, they had nothing either to complain of or desire.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: So far as this Vote is concerned, it does not pretend to be a Vote for the purchase of pictures. There have been Votes in the past for that purpose, both for Scotland and for Ireland. The view of the Treasury is that the Votes for the actual purchase of pictures should be made equal to the contributions from the locality. Through the munificence of Mr. William M'Ewan and the late Mr. J. R. Findlay, who gave a sum of £5,000 each, the Treas-

ABRAM, William (Cork, N. E.)

AMBROSE, Robert

BOLAND, John

ALLAN, William (Gateshead)

BARRY, E. (Cork, S.)

BRIGG, John

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

BLACK, Alexander William

BROWN, Geo. M. (Edinburgh)

surely gave an equal sum for the purchase of pictures, and a similar course, I believe, is followed in the case of Ireland. This being a grant-in-aid, it does not come under the rule of the Treasury with regard to unexpired balances.

*MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty) said he was glad to find the Lord Advocate in sympathy with the hon. Member for Mid Lanark in so far that he did not think this was an adequate sum, and he assumed all Scotch Members would be glad to support the right hon. Gentleman in asking for an increased amount. The amount granted for this purpose was really only £1,400, the other £2,000 being

allocated under the treaty of Union. He hoped his hon. friend would go to a division in order to support the application of the Lord Advocate for a larger grant from the Treasury.

*SIR JOHN STIRLING MAXWELL said that in the present grant hon. Members were introducing a new subject in asking for money to purchase pictures, but whether such a grant should be given was a matter well worthy of consideration, and the Lord Advocate would be well advised in considering whether pressure could not be brought to bear upon the Treasury with regard to it. There was another point to which he wished to draw attention. He had asked some years ago, as to whether it was necessary to harass every visitor to the galleries by charging a penny for taking care of his umbrella, and the answer he received was that it was necessary to get all the money they could. That was a very regrettable state of affairs. He hoped the Lord Advocate would take the matter up and press for a grant for the National Gallery from the Treasury. The poverty of the institution was a discredit, he would not say to Scotland, but to the Empire, of which Scotland formed a part.

Question put.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 94 Noes, 128. (Division List No. 268.)

Burt, Thomas

Harmsworth, R. Leicester

O'Malley, William

Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)

Hayden, John Patrick

O'Mara, James

Causton, Richard Knight

Helme, Norval Watson

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.

Cogan, Denis J.

Jordan, Jeremiah

Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)

Condon, Thomas Joseph

Kennedy, Patrick James

Perks, Robert William

Crean, Eugene

Leng, Sir John

Power, Patrick Joseph

Crombie, John William

Levy, Maurice

Reddy, M.

Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)

Lundon, W.

Redmond, John E. (Waterford)

Cullinan, J.

MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.

Redmond, Wm. (Clare)

Dalziel, James Henry

Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Reid, Sir R Threshie (Dumfries)
Davies, Altrud (Carmarthen)
M'Dermott, Patrick
Rigg, Richard
Delany, William
M'Govern, T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Sinclair, Capt John (Forfarshire.
Dillon, John
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Donelan, Captain A.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Sullivan, Donal
Doogan, P. C.
Newnes, Sir George
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Duffy, William J.
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Dunn, Sir William
Norman, Henry
Weir, James Galloway
Emmott, Alfred
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'ry Mid
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Penwick, Charles
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.

Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
Ffrench, Peter
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Field, William
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Dowd, John
Mr. Caldwell and Mr. Charles Douglas.
Gilhooly, James
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Hammond, John
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
NOES.
Acland Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Green, Walford D (Wednesbury
Morton, Arthur H. A (Deptford)
Allsopp, Hon. George
Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G (Mid'x
Mount, William Arthur
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nde'y
Murray, Rt Hn. A Graham (Bute
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert W.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Arrol, Sir William
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Austin, Sir John
Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotter
Parkes, Ebenezer
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Higginbottom, S. W.
Pease, Herbert Pike (D'rtingt'n.
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manc'r
Hope, J. F. (Sheffi'ld, Brightside
Pierpoint, Robert
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Hoult, Joseph

Plummer, Walter R.
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Pretymann, Ernest George
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Purvis, Robert
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Randles, John S.
Bigwood, James
Kemp, George
Reid, James (Greenock)
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Keswick, William
Renwick, George
Bull, William James
Kimber, Henry
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Bullard, Sir Harry
Knowles, Lees
Ritchie, Rt. Hon Chas Thomson
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Law, Andrew Bonar
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney
Cautley, Henry Strother
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Lawson, John Grant
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Leamy, Edmund
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Seton-Karr, Henry
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S
Sharpe, Wm. Edward T.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Skewes-Cox, Thomas

Cranborne, Viscount
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Dalkeith, Earl of
Lowe, Francis William
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Spear, John Ward
Dickinson, Robt. Edmond
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Dickson, Chas. Scott
Lucas, Col. F. (Lowestoft)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Lucas, R. J. (Portsmouth)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinbu'gh W
Valentia, Viscount
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Fielden, Edw. Brocklehurst
Manners, Lord Cecil
Warde, Col. C. E.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts-
Fisher, William Hayes
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Morgan, David J. (Walthams'w
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Morgan, Hn. Fred. (Monm'thsh
Wills, Sir Frederick
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wylie, Alexander

TELLERS FOR THE NOES;

Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh, N.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

Sir William Walrond and.

Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm

Younger, William

Mr. Anstruther.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

Class III.

3. £58,193, to complete the sum for Prisons (Scotland).

[MR. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.), in the Chair.]

MR. ORR-EWING (Ayr Burghs) said he wished to bring before the Committee one or two points in connection with prison administration in Scotland. He would deal first with the matter of governors. Some years ago it was generally agreed that the system of appointing governors was not satisfactory, and an inquiry was made into the matter. It was the opinion of those who conducted the inquiry that the best man who could be appointed governor of a prison was one who had served in the Army or Navy. A very large number of those appointments had been made. No less than twenty-nine of the prison governors in England were colonels, majors, or captains; but in Scotland, where, of course, there were not so many prisons, only three of the governors were discharged soldiers. There had been a few appointments made in the last year or two, but in none of these cases were they given to discharged soldiers or sailors. They were given to men who had risen from the ranks in the prison service. He quite agreed with appointments from the ranks. The fact that it was known a man could rise to the highest rank naturally had a very good effect on the service, but at the same time he thought those appointments should be made only in very special cases, and the men to whom they were given should be very exceptional men. He had not a word to say against those men, but when it was so hard to find employment for those who had served the country, and when there were so many good men amongst them who would make excellent governors, in every possible case the appointments should be given to them. He hoped the Committee would receive some assurance that such appointments were only made in special cases to others. Dealing with the matter of visiting committees, the hon. Member said that in the old, days the prisoners were practically under the control of the local magistrates. There was not the same necessity then for visiting committees, but it was felt by this House that when the prisons; came under direct official control it was absolutely necessary to have some sort of buffer; some sort of safeguard against stereotyped official rule. Official rule had never been popular in this country, however excellent the particular official might be. If the visiting committees disappeared the safeguard would also disappear. The visiting committees were appointed largely to give confidence to the public in the new prison administration. They had done excellent work up to now, and although it might seem to some a sort of dual control, they had never clashed with the prison authorities. He wished to direct the attention of the Committee to a special case of Ayr prison visiting committee. That committee had practically retired,

and so far as, the county was concerned they had retired altogether. The committee when appointed consisted of twelve members; five from the Royal and Parliamentary burghs, one from the county of Argyll, and six from the Ayr County Council. The five gentlemen appointed from the Royal and Parliamentary burghs had practically left all the work to the members appointed by the county council. The gentleman appointed from the county of Argyll never attended at all. The duties of the visiting committee were defined in a letter from the Secretary for Scotland, dated 1st January, 1898, as follows;

"Lord Balfour has decided to call upon the visiting committees to make an annual report to the Secretary for Scotland on the 31st of October of each year with regard to all or any of the matters referred to in the rules with respect to visiting committees, or to any other matters pertaining to the prison that they may deem expedient."

That seemed to give a pretty wide margin. In accordance with that rule the Ayr visiting committee made a report, recommending various things. They pointed out the disparity between the salaries of the chaplains and medical officers in England and Scotland, and stated their opinion that an inquiry should be held regarding the position of Scotch prisons as to staff and remuneration.

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.): called attention to the fact that there were not forty Members present.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have just had a division, and I am satisfied that there are more than forty members within the precincts.

MR. ORR-EWING said no notice was taken by Lord Balfour in his letter, dated 21st November, 1898, of the recommendation in regard to salaries, and so the committee pointed out to him that part of the report had not been answered. On 18th January, 1899, an answer was received simply acknowledging the letter, and saying it was noted that the committee wished this inquiry made. In the same year an inquiry was granted into the Scotch prisons, and naturally the visiting committee were very pleased that they would have a chance of ventilating their grievances. The Clerk of the Commission wrote to the chairman of the committee asking for a precognition of his evidence. When the Commission came the chairman, Lord Elgin, called the chairman of the committee aside and told him that some of the points mentioned in his precognition were outside the scope of the reference, and therefore he would be asked no questions on them. Well, what was left for this committee to do? They had been told by the Secretary for Scotland to make a report on all matters pertaining to prisons. Having taken evidence, the Commission issued a Report in which they said in the introduction that they understood it was not within the scope of their reference to investigate any feeling of dissatisfaction which might appear to exist among members of the prison staff, and they added;

"Accordingly we express no opinion on this question, but we cannot ignore the fact of the existence of dissatisfaction in certain quarters."

All their efforts having failed, the visiting committee resigned their positions. He asked the Lord Advocate on 7th May last if he was aware that the county council of Ayrshire at their statutory meeting

in December refused to appoint members because of the way the recommendations had been dealt with by the Prison Commissioners, and if any steps could be taken to remedy the present state of affairs? In his reply the Lord Advocate said he was aware the county council resolved not to appoint members to the visiting committee, but that no official intimation of the fact had been made to the Secretary for Scotland. As a matter of fact the Clerk to the Prison Commissioners was informed by letter, which he acknowledged. The Lord Advocate went on to say that the Secretary for Scotland did not propose to take any steps in the matter, he then asked the Lord Advocate if he was aware that the recommendations of the county council had never been inquired into, and the hon. and learned Gentleman replied that some members of the council gave evidence before the Committee, and if they were so inaccurate in their evidence as not to bring the recommendations before the Committee it was their own fault. They were not allowed to give their evidence because of the scope of the inquiry. This position of affairs was extremely unsatisfactory, and in the interest of the prison service it should not continue. It appeared to him to be setting this House at defiance. He trusted they would get some assurance now that full inquiry would be made into this condition of affairs, and that things would not be allowed to go on as they were.

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

MR. PARKER SMITH said he concurred with his hon. friend as to the desirability of choosing officers and men of high social position for appointment to prison governorships. It seemed to him a matter of very great importance that the men should be in an unquestionable social position, and if they looked at the governors they would find no complaint could be made as to lack of quality. He was a member of Lord Elgin's Committee, and he understood that the hon. Member for the Ayr Burghs did not differ from them on the question that the points the visiting

committee desired to raise were outside the scope of the inquiry. The Committee, therefore, had no right to go into them, but they indicated in their Report that there were questions they thought ought to be investigated. The Committee investigated certain charges made from various channels against prison administration in Scotland, and he was glad to say that they found there was no foundation for them whatever. They found a very sound condition of things. They found that the prisoners were treated very well all through Scotland, and they formed a very high opinion of the capacities of the Chief Commissioners.

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

MR. PARKER SMITH said the Committee formed a high opinion of the officials, and considered that the warders were more humane in the performance of their duties than was the case in England. Certain criticisms were made upon the system, but on the whole the Committee considered that the Scotch prisons were fulfilling their dreary purpose adequately. The Committee felt that the reference was limited in its scope to the actual conditions of life and of treatment, and that they were not free to deal with the wider questions which visits to the prisons necessarily brought to their minds. They saw how little discrimination could be

made between the criminal ruffian who was there, and the man who was merely in prison because he had failed to pay the fine for some absolutely non-criminal police offence. They found how little distinction could be drawn between the hardened offender and the juvenile or semi-juvenile of eighteen. The Commissioners thought these questions needed more examination. They were not satisfied with the rigidity of the present system. They felt that there was no danger of physical ill-treatment, and that they need not be afraid of the prisoners being starved or abused, yet they did feel that the existence was a dingy one, and that the reforming element had not sufficiently come into their life. They felt that foreign ideas might wisely and properly be considered in order to see

whether they could learn anything from other countries. In regard to that he was glad to see that the Chairman of the Prisons Board was paying a visit to the United States, and he hoped that on his return they might have his report published.

The last report of the Board showed that a considerable number of the recommendations of the Inquiry Committee had been carried out, and the Prisons Bill contained a good many of the other recommendations of the Committee. He asked how much was being done in the way of properly training nurse warders, who would have to undertake in the prisons the care of those cases that were not grave enough to justify regular medical treatment in the hospital? Hitherto the doctor had just gradually trained a warder to attend to such cases, but the Commissioners considered that the English system should be adopted, and that a six months course of training should be given in the large prisons to some of the warders. He wanted to know whether anything could be done in regard to probationers. Probationers were treated as part of the staff, but, of course, for the first two months after a man came into the prison service he was of little use. In England they were treated as supernumeraries for some months. In regard to Duke Street prison he mentioned that the hospital accommodation there was inadequate, and although something was being done to remedy that, a great deal more ought to be done. A sum of £250 had been put down for that purpose, but that would go but a very short way towards doing what was required. When the Commissioners were there they found that three ordinary cells had been run into one, and the place was used as a hospital. When the prisoners there were suffering from delirium tremens the noise they made disturbed other people. The Commissioners considered this was a wholly unsatisfactory arrangement, and the only excuse they found for it was the cramped condition of the ground round Duke Street prison. He hoped that his right hon. friend would be able to say that as soon as possible something more radical would be done than this expenditure of £250, and that an effective separate hospital would be established in Duke Street, where all the prison warders from the whole of Scotland could be trained. Then in Duke Street they found that the chapel was a wholly inadequate building, entirely un-ecclesiastical in design, and unfitted for the purpose for which it was intended. The only excuse for that was the difficulty in connection with the want of space. But if the Government were not willing to consider the possibility of moving the great women's prison out of

Glasgow and were determined to keep the prison in the middle of Glasgow, near the court house, they should obtain more land in the neighbourhood and make those changes, so as to provide a proper chapel, a proper separate hospital, and improved houses for the accommodation of the staff. Duke Street Prison was in fact starved in comparison with English prisons. In England one saw fine buildings, beautiful chapels with a real ecclesiastical aspect worthy of any place, and when one compared these with the miserable penny-scraping erections in Scotland one felt that the Scottish prisons, from one cause or another; it might be from the parsimony of the Treasury; were not sufficiently furnished for what was proper in public buildings of that description. Without any undue claims on the Treasury one might ask that more money should be spent on them. Another point on which the Commissioners made observation was in regard to the prison doctors. They found that these were over-burdened with work and underpaid; the work was heavier on their shoulders than they could adequately perform. Some improvement had been made in this direction, but more and more the treatment of prisoners was getting to be a medical question, and more and more they must have doctors with modern ideas as to the treatment of criminals. They had also made a recommendation, which had not yet been carried into effect, that there should be a medical member on the Prisons Commission. That was the case in England and Ireland, and they thought that it should also be the case in Scotland, and it could be accomplished without any great additional expense. There was an inspector who was considered rather a superfluous officer under present circumstances, and he believed he might be dropped and a medical man placed on the Commission, for many questions as to the treatment of prisoners should be decided by a medical officer who could speak with the authority of a member of the Commission. He wanted to know what was going to be done in regard to juvenile and semi adult prisoners. That, they regarded, as an important part of their inquiry. They found that the magistrates would not send boys to prison, and quite rightly; and the Secretary for Scotland had the strongest objection to boys being sent to prison, and quite rightly. But how were they going to punish them? There was far more hope of the recovery from a criminal path of these youths from sixteen to twenty-one years of age than of older criminals. A special place for the separate treatment of these youths was required, like Petworth in England. Could they not find a prison in Scotland, even if it meant bringing all these young men from every part of the country, where this hopeful treatment might be applied to young prisoners separated from the older and more hardened offenders? If they had such a prison the magistrates would be more willing to commit the youths, and these could be treated more effectually and with greater success than under the present system. What was being done to carry out the Inebriates Act? No sum appeared upon the Estimates for that purpose at all. It was thought to use Perth Prison for that purpose, but he did not believe that Perth was suited for the treatment of inebriates. These ought not to be treated in a closed-in place; they ought to be sent into some country place where they could work in the fields, as at Springfield. Another matter he wished to press on his hon. friend was the classification of prisoners. In the English Prisons Act very great power was given in that

direction. The second division was intended to be for non-criminal offences, and the court laid down the classification so as to secure separate classes and segregation. That system had been worked in England, and highly approved of by the English commissioners, and there ought to be no difficulty in its being introduced into Scotland.

Various other points, he was glad to say, were met in the, Government Bill, which

he hoped would be passed, such as additional visiting committees for the convict prison and for Perth Prison. It was provided, he gladly recognised, that women might be made members of the visiting committee, for the commissioners found that it was women prisoners who were most susceptible to the influence of women visiting them. He was also glad to see that the Bill contained provision for the remission of sentences for good conduct in the case of all prisoners. What was a prison for? Most people would say it was to hold criminals in seclusion, and to punish them. But they had no longer a great criminal population. Serious crime was steadily decreasing both in England and Scotland, but the number of committals of prisoners was rapidly increasing. These consisted of people who were sent to prison for trivial offences. They were received into prison, kept there, and were generally sent out in a better state of health than when they went in, but from a criminal point of view they were no better and no worse. The habitual criminals, on the other hand, went out ready to commit crime in the shortest time possible. But those who were really not criminals went out with a stigma of the prison upon them. The committals were increasing to a terrible extent. In 1897 they amounted to 51,000; last year they were 60,000. They had been increasing much faster in Scotland than in England. In England they had been standing still for many years. In 1898, in England, the number of people per 100,000 imprisoned on indictment was 25½, and on summary conviction 470. But in Scotland the number who were sent to prison after full committal, which roughly corresponded to indictment, was 37½ per 100,000, and the number sent summarily to prison was 1,356; that was very nearly three times as many as in England. The number of committals in Scotland in the last forty years had trebled, but at the same time the daily population of the prisons had remained very much the same, because the sentences had come down so much in that time. He did not believe anyone realised for what trivial offences people were sent to prison in Scotland. The average duration of the sentences in Scotland was only fifteen days, whereas

in England it was nearly twice as much. Out of nearly 57,000 imprisoned in Scotland, 44,000 were imprisoned for not more than a fortnight, and only 4,400 for more than five weeks. The number of people sent to prison in Scotland on account of not paying fines was something like 40,000. Out of 94,147 who were fined in Scotland in 1898, 58,320 were fined in not more than ten shillings, and in half these cases the money was not forthcoming and the person was sent to prison instead; and only 2,112 were fined in more than forty shillings. The offences were mostly drunkenness, common assault, or offences against various police regulations. The figures were very striking. Out of 40,775 who were fined for breach of peace, 15,287 underwent sentence. Out of 22,629 who were fined for

drunkenness, 14,215 underwent sentence. Out of 11,313 who were fined for miscellaneous police offences, 4,169 underwent sentence. Now, in England far fewer people, in proportion, who were fined went to prison in default; only amounting to one-sixth as against nearly one-half in Scotland. Several reasons might be alleged why that was so. Some people said it was the thrifty habits of the Scotch, who preferred to work it out in prison rather than pay. He did not believe that that was the case. He thought that in Scotland they used the criminal law and the system of imprisonment for much too trifling offences, and that the tendency was increasing to a very dangerous extent in the way of enforcing new statutory offences, and in a new strictness in enforcing old offences. He sat lately on a Committee where one of the Scottish authorities asked power in a Bill for a month's imprisonment for everyone who dropped a piece of paper on the street. Of course, the Committee did not pass that clause; but that was a typical case. This was a matter that should be watched by the House with the very greatest care. These multiplied short sentences were absolutely useless, and did no good whatever to the prisoners. That was accepted by all prison authorities. It had been stated emphatically by all the Committees which had sat on the subject, and by all other authorities, that it interfered very greatly with the discipline and the working of the prisons. Compare, for instance, Glasgow and Liverpool. There they had much the same class of population, but the number of persons who were taken into custody for drunkenness and breach of the peace in Glasgow was eight times more than those in Liverpool, although it could not be said that Liverpool was better or worse in that respect than Glasgow. Multiplied short sentences were useless, and were no good to the individual, and were not necessary to good order. The offenders learned to despise the prison and he or she returned again and again. Last year in Scotland 550 prisoners had been in prison more than fifty times, and four-fifths of them were women. That was not a satisfactory position and could not exercise any reformatory influence. It made the prison discipline very difficult. The only thing was, as one of the doctors said, to give them a smart saline purge and then let them out again. It was quite true that this was a matter of magisterial and judicial discretion with which the House should not interfere; but there was one thing which the Committee pressed strongly, and which Mr. Ruggles-Brise, in his most interesting paper read before the Penal Conference at Brussels, urged, and that was that all those who committed persons to prison should be familiar with what went on in the prisons, that they should visit the prisons and should form a judgment of what effect the sentences they were giving were likely to have. It was more and more necessary when they had got fresh ideas on classification introduced into practice. Magistrates who were in the habit of sending batches of people every Monday morning to prison would then be much more familiar with what went on in the prisons.

There were a good many things which might be remedied in administration by those responsible for the government of the prisons. Improved classification would do a great deal. There was hope, also, in regard to juvenile and semi-juvenile offenders, and in the remission of sentences for good conduct. Then if inebriates were treated in a proper way, and for a long period of time in

inebriate homes, the prisons would be relieved of one of the most hopeless classes of prisoners. He

also thought that they ought to increase the use of sureties. In regard to fines everything ought to be done in the way of accepting payments by instalments. Costs ought also to be reduced, because they often brought up a small fine to a very considerable sum. In Scotland they had a system of a man taking out his punishment half in time and half in a money payment, which was working very satisfactorily. He apologised for taking up so much of the time of the Committee, but he felt that he knew something about this subject, and that it was important that hon. Members should look into this matter each for himself and see what was going on. He did not think that much patching in detail was needed, but it was of the greatest importance that they should get into their minds that the prisons were comparatively little used for serious criminals, but as places for detention for people who had committed small offences, or who had been overtaken in a moment by an indiscretion; either by getting drunk, or in consequence of getting drunk, assaulting someone else, or using improper language which in their right senses they would not have used.

DR. FARQUHARSON said his hon. friend had very effectively used his experience as a Prison Commissioner. From his own experience he could corroborate all that his hon. friend said about the treatment of prisoners. They were well found, well fed, and well looked after. What had struck him, as it had struck his hon. friend, was the great number of people who were sent to prison in Scotland for small offences. In visiting Glasgow prison he found a boy who had been there for three weeks. He asked him, "What are you in for?" and the boy replied, "I am in because I kicked a football in the streets." Probably the ball hit someone. He was bound to say that the local regulations in Glasgow were about the most stringent and oppressive in the world. He had been instrumental, when sitting on a Committee which considered a Glasgow Corporation Bill, in striking out of it a large variety of offences which would have made life in Glasgow miserable, if not absolutely intolerable. Then there was a great inequality in the punishment for some offences. There were many good men, excellent in private life, who sat on the magisterial bench and who masqueraded as lawyers. The sentences which these bailies imposed were unequal, absurd, cruel, and harsh. He knew that poor women were bitter at the inequality of the treatment they received. Then, again, from their infrequent incarceration a certain class of people got hardened, and they much preferred to go to prison than to go to work. When they got out of prison on Monday they broke a window on the Tuesday in order to be sent to prison again, where they were much better treated and were more comfortable than in the workhouse. Prison doctors ought to be engaged to make a serious study of their profession. There was much complication in the cases with which they were called upon to deal, which made it difficult to tell whether a man was shamming or not. There should not be a hard and fast cut and dried rule, and every prisoner should be a special study for the doctor. He thought the hon. Gentleman was well advised in making the claim that a doctor should be a member of the Prisons Commission, not; only called in to give evidence, but having an accredited position, which would

enable his opinion to carry weight. There was a very mysterious condition of things which had been going on for some years one prison had been abandoned and another built; that was, he thought, a great waste of public money. He could not see the reason of abandoning the prison at Perth and building another at Balmeney, which was shockingly overcrowded. Anybody who knew anything about criminals would know how dangerous it was to put two or three prisoners in one cell. Yet this was done at Balminy, while the Perth prison stood empty. He hoped the Lord Advocate or the Solicitor General for Scotland would be able to give some explanation of the matter.

*THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SCOTT DICKSON, Glasgow, Bridgeton) said he could neither complain of the manner in which this subject had been introduced nor the time which had been taken up in discussing it, because everyone would recognise the importance of the question. The hon. Member for Ayr Burghs had dealt with two matters

alone. In the first place, the hon. Gentleman had expressed his views as to the necessity of the governors of prisons being in the main drawn from the ranks of retired naval and army officers. That was a view with which the Government was entirely in sympathy, but it would be out of the question to say, so far as the governorship of prisons was concerned, that a hard and fast rule should be laid down which might result in the idea being generated in the minds of those serving in those institutions upon the ordinary staff that they were not entitled to look forward to the highest positions which their experience entitled them to occupy. So far as that question was concerned, the Government would not be backward in recognising the claims of retired officers, but each case would have to be treated upon its own merits. The Government did not at all accept the view of the hon. Member for Ayr Burghs when he said that the opinions of visiting committees were ignored, or when he contemplated the possibility of the visiting committee disappearing. He need hardly say that in the view of the Government, and all those who had been concerned in the administration of prison affairs in Scotland since 1877, the visiting committee had carried out most important functions, and it would be most unfortunate if the idea got abroad that the views of such committees should be otherwise than entitled to the most serious and cordial consideration. It was regrettable that certain members of the visiting committee at Ayr should have entertained the idea that due regard was not paid to their recommendations. He thought it was a mistake on their part, and that on further consideration they themselves would admit this. The duties entrusted to them were most important duties, and the recommendations made by them so far as related to those duties were considered with all respect. It would, however, be incorrect to think that they had a roving commission; the visiting committee had certain important duties committed to them, but necessarily there must be a limit, and he did not think the visiting committee themselves would desire to extend the scope of their duties beyond the very wide limits already ascertained. The hon. Member for the Partick Division had spoken with special authority upon this matter, having regard to the experience he had gained, not only as a member of the Departmental Committee in the previous year, but in many other ways. He had spoken upon a good many

matters of general importance. The Departmental Committee presided over by Lord Elgin did much excellent work, and the Government had been very quick to appreciate the value of the recommendations they had made. The Report of the Committee was only dated 26th May last year, and a great many of their recommendations had already been carried into practical effect. This seemed to show that the Government recognised that there was room for an inquiry, and they had determined, as far as possible, to carry out the recommendations made. He agreed with his hon. friend that the visit which the Chairman of the Prison Commissioners had made to America was likely to result in considerable advantage in the matter of prison administration in Scotland. There were a great many questions dealing with prison administration to which more attention had been given in America, and a better result had been obtained with regard to them than in this country, and he hoped that the Report on this question would be made public in the ordinary course, and that it would be of advantage to those interested in carrying out every improvement with regard to prison administration. The Prison Bill which was at present before Parliament was also so framed as to carry out further recommendations of the Departmental Committee. In particular, that Bill made provision for two of the most important matters referred to by his hon. friend; namely, the classification of prisoners and the remission of sentences for good conduct.

MR. PARKER SMITH said the classification he alluded to was the classification by the court.

*MR. SCOTT DICKSON said that that was a question which the Bill made provision for, in as far as it gave the court power, if they thought fit, to order a prisoner on conviction to be placed in a particular class, and in that way it approached the standard of regulations

already existing in England. The question of the treatment of sick prisoners, and especially of the provision of adequate nursing for them, had been considered and dealt with since the Committee reported, and very considerable amelioration had been made in the condition of matters so far as that was concerned. He regretted that he was not able to deal with all the points raised by the hon. Gentleman, but not having anticipated them he had not looked up the detailed information to enable him to specifically reply as to all of them. With regard to the state of Duke Street prison, Glasgow, that had been under consideration by the Prison Commissioners since the Committee reported. For instance, the state of the hospital had been under consideration, with the result that alterations were to be made. With regard to the chapel, there was a good deal of difficulty in making improvements without further accommodation, so far as ground was concerned, than at present existed; but the views of the Commissioners would be carried out as opportunity offered, and funds were included in the Estimates for the coming year for that purpose. With regard to the remuneration of the medical officers, he thought the hon. Member would agree that so far as the most serious case was concerned it had been adequately dealt with. The question with regard to the appointment of a medical man as one of the Prison Commissioners was one of more difficulty. The Committee would remember that at the present moment not only were there medical officers for all the

prisons, but there was a very competent medical adviser to the Commissioners. The question of requiring one of the Commissioners themselves to be a medical man raised much larger issues, and he was afraid that the Government were not entirely in accord with the views of the hon. Member for Partick or the hon. Member for West Aberdeenshire. The recommendation of the Committee, however, would be considered. The question of the treatment of semi-juveniles, or lads between sixteen and twenty, was a difficult one, and he hoped that the experience which Colonel M'Hardy obtained on his visit to America would enable the Government to propose some practical scheme which would secure a better chance for the reclamation of these young lads than the present system afforded. In regard to the administration of the Inebriates Act neither the Prison Commissioners nor the Government could do much; the initiative lay to a large extent with those who had to deal with the prisoner on conviction. Not much had been done in Scotland with a view to providing inebriate reformatories. Glasgow had provided one, and the Government had thought it right, with a view to showing an example at any rate to local authorities, to do what they could in the matter as speedily and economically as possible, by making a portion of Perth Prison available for this purpose. As yet, however, they had not succeeded in finding an occupant for that part of the premises. As for the number of committals and sentences for small police offences, to which reference had been made, these were hardly matters with which the Government or the Prison Commissioners could deal, though the matter undoubtedly deserved consideration by those who had the duty of practically administering the law. The observations which had been made on both sides of the House would, he had no doubt, be received with due regard by those responsible for the administration of the law. With regard to the question of costs he would only say that that abuse was not so flagrant in Scotland as it appeared to be in England, because under the Scotch system there were no costs at all in the vast majority of summary public prosecutions, and that was a point in which the law of Scotland was in advance of that of England. The only other point to which he would allude was the suggestion of the hon. Member for Partick as to the desirability of magistrates who committed to prison visiting the prisons to see the sentences carried out. There was every desire that as many magistrates as possible should frequently take the opportunity of visiting the prisons. The Commissioners and the Government would be in entire sympathy with the visitors.

DR. FARQUHARSON asked whether the hon. Gentleman could clear up the matter of the prison at Bulminy.

*MR. SCOTT DICKSON said that that matter, as he understood, had been before the House on many occasions, and he would ask his right hon. friend the Lord Advocate to deal with that.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The hon. Member may say this question has not been satisfactorily answered, but I have myself during the last ten years answered it five or six times. The Perth Prison was originally a convict prison, but in late years, with the more enlightened views which were entertained with regard to the manner of treating convicts, it became evident that this prison was unsuitable for that work, because in that prison it was impossible to give the convicts

work. Therefore the whole convict establishment was removed to Peterhead. Then there remained the other Glasgow prison, which was used for prisoners serving short sentences. It is quite true that, the Perth Prison remained practically empty, because that prison is now used for female convicts, and owing to the decrease in female convicts it remained practically empty.

MR. CALDWELL thought that everyone would be gratified at the manner in which the Solicitor General for Scotland had answered the questions put to him, which left nothing to be desired. He thought the discussion had been a very full one, and in his opinion the Government were entitled to the Vote.

Resolution agreed to.

Resolutions to be reported.

Class II.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £7,954, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, for the salaries and Expenses of the Office of His Majesty's Secretary for Scotland and Subordinate Office, and Expenses under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, including a Grant-in-aid of the Congested Districts (Scotland) Fund."

*MR. WEIR moved the reduction of the Vote by £100 in order to call attention to the failure of the Secretary for Scotland to look after the interests of the Highlands and Islands. He hoped the Lord Advocate would give them some information in regard to the Hydro-graphical Conference which was held last month at Christiania. He also desired to know whether the Secretary for Scotland had approached the Treasury for more money for cruisers to protect the interests of line fishermen round the coasts of Scotland. An efficient steam packet service for the Western Highlands was much needed. And during the five years which had elapsed since the Light Railways Act was passed not a single light railway had been constructed in the Highland crofting counties. It was the duty of the Secretary for Scotland to look into all these matters. Why did he not go to the Hebrides to see the actual state of things for himself? He had brought up the question of the congestion in the Island of Lewis time after time; memorials had been sent up, but no attention was paid to the condition of this island. In 1898 he brought forward the question of Croir Farm, and pointed out its suitability for the settlement of the people. More recently he called attention to the fact that the two large sheep farms in Kintail were about to be cleared for deer, but the right hon. Gentleman told him that the Secretary for Scotland had no knowledge of the matter. Surely it was his business to get some information from the district. Instead of this the Secretary for Scotland, it is said, applied to the Chairman of the Deer Forests Commission of 1893, who resides at Brighton.

The hon. Member then proceeded to deal with the congestion in the island of Lewis, and read a memorial which had been forwarded by the parish council of Stornoway to the Secretary for Scotland, which declared that the sufferings of the crofters, squatters, and cottars due to this cause were indescribable, and urged that the Lewis fisherman ought to have at least three to four acres of

land attached to his house. The council further urged that, seeing that out of a population of 30,000 nearly 5,000 men were connected in one way or another with the defence of the Empire, these grievances deserved to be inquired into. That was the opinion of the members of the Stornoway Parish Council, who knew all the facts, and who lived on the spot. Yet the Secretary for Scotland had apparently done nothing. He hoped

the Secretary for Scotland would inquire into the matter himself, and not ignore appeals of this kind. Only yesterday he asked why it was that not a single yard of land had been acquired in Ross-shire or in the Island of Lewis by the Congested Districts Board. He was told in reply that some twenty-eight or twenty-nine lots had been offered in Stornoway parish at the rate of 25s. per quarter acre. He hoped the Secretary for Scotland would go to that district; he would not only improve this knowledge of Highland questions, but also his health, and he would find in the Island of Lewis a purer air than in any other part of the kingdom. Why did not the Congested Districts Board acquire land for the people? The Secretary for Scotland was the Chairman of that Board, which was established under an Act of Parliament having for its object the settlement of the people on the land, and £35,000 a year was set aside for that purpose. On the 31st of May last the Board had a balance of £61,867. Why did they not spend the money? This year's grant would be £35,000, which would give close upon £100,000 available.

These poor crofters, squatters, and cottars were not asking for doles. Money expended in settling the people on new holdings was not a gift, for it would be repaid by the people. It was very wrong that only £18,000 out of this £98,000 should be expended upon this object. In the Island of Lewis there had been no land acquired by the Congested Districts Board. He was a lover of peace and order, and he wanted things to go on peacefully and comfortably in the Highlands. He sometimes wondered if the Secretary for Scotland was anxious to have a repetition of what occurred in 1885 and 1886, when gunboats were sent down to the Highlands. Because the Board had not acquired land the law had been broken, and would be broken again. He was anxious to avoid conflicts between the people and the military. It was the Secretary's inattention to this matter that had incited these men to break the law. There were nearly 2,000,000 acres of land scheduled by the Deer Forests Commissioners as suitable for the people, and he wished to know if the Congested Districts Board had approached the proprietors in order to acquire any of that land. What was wanted was not a system of leases, but the settlement of the people on the land under the Crofters Act. They did not want leases at the expiration of which the poor people might be turned off land on which they had sweated and toiled to make fertile. That was not the object for which the Congested Districts Board was appointed. The hon. Member instanced a case in which an attempt was being made to shift the crofters from a particular township to a place some miles off, the object being, as he contended, to make that township into an extended deer forest. The main purpose of the Board was the emigration of the people from the congested areas, but, amongst other matters, it had also powers to provide stallions, bulls, rams, and so on for the Highland districts. He was sorry to have to bring the bull into

the arena of the House of Commons once more, but he felt bound to do so. The number of bulls required last year was sixty, but the Board were able to provide only forty-five. Surely the remaining fifteen bulls could have been secured in Ireland. The excuse of the Secretary for Scotland that the bulls could not be obtained was childish in the extreme. The Board conducted its operations in a most un-businesslike manner. In addition to providing bulls and rams, the Board was supposed to encourage the breeding of poultry, but in three years all that had been done in that direction was the provision of five cockerels and twenty-two hens. Another branch of the operations of the Board was in connection with bees, and the result in this direction amounted only to twenty-four swarms of bees and two extra hives. It was simply scandalous that although the Board spent each year nearly £;900 in salaries, and £;500 in travelling expenses, all that could be shown for it was about £;18,000 spent for land, over and above the cost of forty-five bulls, five cockerels, twenty-two hens, and twenty-four swarms of bees. He hoped his Amendment would receive the support of a number of hon. Members on the other side of the House. The Board had powers also for the purpose of making roads, but instead of roads being made in districts where they would be useful to the people, they were too often made simply to suit the convenience of landlords and big farmers. A large number of passages might be quoted from the report to show the miserable inefficiency of the Congested Districts Board. The money set aside for the purposes of the Board, instead of now being expended for the benefit of the people, was hoarded up, and on the 31st March last there was a balance of over £;61,000. As he stated when the Board was established, compulsory powers for the purpose of acquiring land were absolutely necessary, and until such powers were bestowed the Board would continue to fail to secure land in certain districts. He appealed to the Lord Advocate to urge these matters upon the attention of the Secretary for Scotland, whom he was sorry not to see in the Peers' gallery. These matters were discussed only once in the year, and his Lordship might at least have attended in order to listen to the debate upon these important matters affecting the Highlands of Scotland. He moved to reduce the Vote by £;1,000.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £;6,954 be granted for the said Service.";(Mr. Weir.)

MR. JOHN WILSON (Falkirk Burghs): desired to ask the Lord Advocate two questions, to which he hoped he would receive straightforward answers. The first was with regard to the appointment of a sheriff substitute for Lanark. The people of the ancient and royal burgh of Lanark, which he had the honour to represent, were very much dissatisfied because the burgh was not dignified by the permanent residence there of the sheriff of the county. According to the terms of his commission the sheriff was bound to reside in Lanark, but he was now allowed by the Secretary for Scotland to live in Glasgow. He believed it was said that a house could not be obtained in Lanark, but if the sheriff was directed to abide by the terms of his commission there was not the slightest doubt that a suitable house would be found. The second question he desired to raise was in connection with another ancient and royal burgh, which also he had

the honour to represent, namely, that of Linlithgow. A procurator fiscal had been appointed at Linlithgow who, he was informed, was not a qualified law agent. In reply to a question in the House it had been stated that this gentleman had over thirty years experience as a deputy fiscal. That, however, must have been a mistake, because the Act under which deputy fiscals were appointed was not passed until 1877. He desired to know why, when so many properly qualified law agents applied for this position, this unqualified gentleman was brought from outside the burgh and pitchforked into the office? It should also be borne in mind that, not being a qualified law agent, this gentleman was liable to a penalty of £50 for any legal business he might transact.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY understood that the hon. Member had to leave the House early, and therefore he would reply to his questions at once. With regard to the first, point, the hon. Member was speaking of the sheriff-substitute and not of the sheriff. When the Act of six or seven years ago was passed there was not a sheriff-substitute resident in Lanark; most of the Lanarkshire sheriff-substitutes resided in Glasgow. During the time of the late Government, in consequence of the great amount of work thrown upon the sheriff-substitutes by the Fatal Accidents Inquiries Act, it became absolutely necessary to appoint an additional sheriff-substitute. The Treasury consented to the appointment, and, as it had long been known that the people of Lanark were anxious to have somebody residing there, although the authorities were aware that most of the work would be in Glasgow, they consented to it being arranged that the gentleman appointed should live in Lanark. This stipulation was accordingly stated in the commission. The gentleman appointed, however, was not a new officer, but was transferred from another district. He was transferred "between terms," when it was impossible for him to get a house suitable for a sheriff-substitute to live in. He therefore asked permission from the Secretary for Scotland, who referred the matter to the sheriff, to live for the first year in Glasgow, where practically the whole of his work was, while he was looking out for a suitable house in Lanark.

MR. JOHN WILSON dissented from the statement that all the work was in Glasgow

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY contended that most of the work was in Glasgow, so much so, indeed, that the last occupant of the office applied again and again for transference to Glasgow altogether. There was no intention on the part of the Secretary for Scotland to alter the arrangement made when the appointment was first agreed to. With regard to the second matter referred to by the hon. Member, a procurator-fiscal had recently been appointed at Linlithgow, but the patronage of the appointment was not with the Government. Procurators-fiscal were appointed not upon his (the Lord Advocate's) recommendation to the Secretary for Scotland, but by the sheriff. The only grounds on which it was in order to refer to the matter at all on the Vote before the Committee was that the Secretary for Scotland had a veto in case of the appointment of an improper person. It need scarcely be said that the discretion of the sheriff was never interfered with unless it was feared that an entirely improper person was being

appointed; in fact, he had never known a case in which that veto had been exercised. The sheriff appointed this gentleman, from among many candidates, because both he and the local sheriff-substitute had been entirely satisfied with the manner in which he had done the work of deputy-fiscal for the last six years in the same court. The hon. Member had rather given the Committee to understand that this gentleman had been brought from somewhere far away from Linlithgow, and that nobody knew anything about him, whereas the fact was that he had proven himself to be a useful public servant, and had served in that particular court for six years to the entire satisfaction of the sheriff himself. More than that, he had had thirty-three years experience as deputy-fiscal.

MR. JOHN WILSON asked whether the Lord Advocate was not aware that the Act under which deputy-fiscals were appointed was passed in 1877, so that he could not have had thirty-three years experience.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY said he was not aware of anything of the sort. The Act under which deputy-fiscals were appointed under present conditions was passed in 1877, but before that it was a matter entirely for the sheriffs, and the office of deputy-fiscal had been in existence for the last 200 or 300 years. This gentleman had testimonials from sheriffs under whom he had served in different parts of Scotland. It was true that he was not a qualified law agent in the sense of having passed the Law Agents' Examination, but he was practising long before the Act under which those examinations were held was passed; and, as a matter of fact, the law agents' qualification had never been required for a fiscal at all. There were several other deputy-fiscals who were not qualified law agents. The point was that the gentleman knew his business thoroughly, and had had a very long experience, and the idea that, with these testimonials, the Government could interfere with the action of the sheriff was altogether out of the question. With regard to the liability to penalty, the particular Act by which that liability was imposed had been repealed.

MR. JOHN WILSON read from the Stamp Act of 1891 a list of acts for the committing of any of which an unqualified person was liable to a penalty of £50.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY pointed out that a deputy fiscal did none of the things which the hon. Member had mentioned.

MR. JOHN WILSON said that some of the fiscals in Scotland did.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: If this deputy fiscal practises;

MR. JOHN WILSON again rose to speak.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order! We really must have one speech at a time.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY said that this deputy fiscal had what was called "restricted employment," and if he engaged in other practice he would be liable to the penalty; but the present Stamp Act, in the view of the law officers of the Crown, had absolutely no application to the office of fiscal. He had thought it well to go into this matter fully, as otherwise an injustice would have been done to a gentleman

who had been a very estimable public servant, and one who ought not to be spoken of as having been pitchforked into his position.

*MR. JOHN DEWAR (Inverness): desired to call attention to the operations of the Congested Districts Board, especially in the western islands. The question was a very serious one, and the present state of affairs had given rise in his constituency to a great deal of discontent and unrest. He approached the subject in no unfriendly spirit, for he recognised that the Board had done a very great deal of good work. His complaint was that enough had not been done, that what had been done was not done in time, and in some cases it had not been done in the right way. If one read between the lines of the report it would be seen that the Board themselves believed that enough had not been done. The work of the Board consisted in trying to improve stock and agriculture; in carrying out of public works in the shape of piers, roads, and so on; and the settling of people on the land. The last-named duty was the most important of all, but the Board appeared to think it the least important. They had not realised the intensity of the desire of the inhabitants to occupy the land. With regard to the improvement of stock, he could not speak of the manner in which the duty was carried out, but he could assure the Committee from his own observation that there was very great need for it, and the work was one to which the energy and enterprise of the Board might very well be devoted. The work of the Board with regard to piers was a most important one, for the purpose of improving the conditions of life in the islands. It was very desirable that more rapid means of communication should be established, and he only wished the Board could give some assistance in making the postal communication in the islands more effective. With regard to the building of piers, he knew one pier which had been built through the assistance of the Board to which there was no access by either sea or land. There was no road to the pier, and the approach from the sea was so dangerous that it was very seldom that boats of any size could reach it. He appreciated very highly the work of the Board with regard to roads. They had made many excellent roads, and in Harris alone they had been the means of making a good many miles of footpaths, which were of great service in enabling school children to get to school, and otherwise in improving the means of communication. But of the methods of carrying out their operations he could not speak with so much approval. In this connection, he desired to read an extract from a letter he had received;

"As an illustration of the manner in which this work is occasionally carried out, the Factor of an estate was asked to meet one of the Supervisors of the Board to arrange about a road which was to be made. The Factor arrived on the ground only to find that the Supervisor had been sent without any instructions whatever, although the road had been surveyed by three different engineers before that, and they had received two different estimates. It took two days to reach Lochmaddy to wire for instructions and to return, the instructions being to do the best they could, and those two days besides all the previous labour were wasted and thrown away."

That was a practical criticism of the methods by which the works were carried out. While they must have the greatest respect for the Board in some ways, the inspectors they employed were not exactly the kind that were needed. The most

important work of the Board, and the work which would yield the best return, was the settling of people on the land. The Board seemed altogether to fail to realise that the people were so anxious to get on to the land, to till and to occupy it; they did not appreciate the gravity of the situation. The Lord Advocate had more than once said that it could not be expected that those who broke the law would get anything. That was a very proper observation, but when the Committee knew the facts of the case they would probably wonder whether after all the crofters were the proper persons to be in the dock. In Barra it required eight years of constitutional agitation and a general rising to draw the attention of the Congested Districts Board to the condition of the people. At present there was a great opportunity to settle people on the land in those parts on reasonable terms. Sheep farms were not now profitable, and the landlords were very willing to treat. His fear was that if the people were not settled

on these farms they would be devoted to deer, and he was anxious that they should be occupied by men and women rather than by deer. In England the difficulty was to get the people to stay on the land; in Scotland there was a great population which was anxious to settle on the land, and it was the duty of the Board to make it as easy as possible for them to do so. In order to show the benefit to the country of having men and women on the land, he would give a concrete case which had come under his own observation. The particular case to which he had referred was a farm in the Western Hebrides which had been let at a rental of £;120 per annum. The farmer's profits might be put at another £;120, and there were six labourers employed at £;30 a year each. That made a total of £;420 a year as the return to the country from that land used as a sheep farm. That farm was now in the occupation of twenty-four crofter families, each of whom paid a rent of £;5, making £;120 in all; an amount equal to the rent previously paid. But each of those crofters was earning from crops and stock at least £;30 a year. This made £;720 altogether, or a total return of £;840 as against £;420. Then, to look at what Mr. Kruger would call the moral and intellectual return, he would refer to the Borge settlement, on the estate of Lord Fincastle. There were on that settlement several men serving His Majesty in the Army or Navy or Naval Reserve; five of them at the front, and there were two young men from the district studying for the learned professions. The Commissioners say:;

"Mr. E. K. Carmichael, C. E., who acted for us in arranging the holdings, and who is familiar with crofting life in the Long Island, visited the Borge settlement in November last. He has submitted a report on the condition in which he had found the settlers; in the course of that report he says: 'I expected to see a considerable change, but I was not prepared for so great an improvement as had been wrought, not only in the place, but in the people. A great part of this improvement is undoubtedly due to the splendid road the Congested Districts Board are making. The crofters have, however, drained the land allotted to them, so that even in this wet season it seems quite a different place from the bog through which one waded last year. Two of the crofters had erected "white" houses, and a number of others have put up houses in which they live

in the meantime, but which will be converted into byres and barns when they have had time to build more permanent dwellings.

"The people themselves are greatly improved. Always a fine, independent set of men, they have now gained more enthusiasm and more life, and a good deal of friendly rivalry has sprung up among them.'

"Mr. Carmichael assures us that the people are doing their best, and that 'the changes in the last year forecast a great success for the Borge settlement, benefitting the proprietor no less than the tenant.'"

In the cases he had mentioned the work had been well done, but he wanted more of such work done by the Congested Districts Board. What had been done in these cases had been done upon the initiation of the landlords; and why had the Congested Districts Board not done more with the balance of £;60,000 which they had in hand? There was only one case for which the Board deserved credit, and that was the case of Barra, and the result in this case was largely due to the personal influence of Lord Balfour.

The whole of the Island of Barra belongs to Lady Gordon Cathcart, and there is a large population on the island living under conditions which would not be tolerated if they were nearer public opinion. They have petitioned Lady Gordon Cathcart for years to give them land, not so much for cultivation, although they desire that also, as for the erection of decent and suitable houses. On the passing of the Allotment (1892) Act they presented a petition to receive the benefits of that Act, and on the creation, of the parish council they approached that body, who investigated their case and wrote Lady Gordon Cathcart's factor, in July, 1895, asking if Lady Gordon Cathcart would voluntarily give the necessary land. The factor, in his reply of the 26th August, asked particulars, which were given in a letter of the 29th. Tanuary, 1896. This letter he believed was never answered. The parish council eventually applied to the county council to put the provisions of the Allotment Act in force. The application was received with disfavour, but ultimately a committee was appointed to investigate the circumstances on the spot. This committee was supposed to be prejudiced against the application, but after their examination they reported unanimously in favour of it on 29th September, 1897.

Instead of acting on the report of their own committee, the county council, at a meeting on the 21st October, 1897, carried a motion referring the parish council to the Congested Districts Board, although, in view of Lady Cathcart's refusal to sell the land, the county council only had power to acquire it compulsorily. The Congested Districts Board, he believed, replied to that effect. The county council, on the 5th May, 1898, sent to the parish council a series of questions, some of which the parish council could not answer, and replies to the others might have been given by their own committee who made the investigations. No action having been taken, by the county council, the parish council laid the whole matter before the Congested Districts Board. The next appearance of the county council is, claiming £;37 15s. from the parish council to pay the expenses of their deputations to investigate the matter. In view of the hopelessness of getting the request for land for erection of decent houses, the cottars and crofters made their demonstration last autumn. At this crisis Lord

Balfour brought his own personal influence to bear on Lady Gordon Cathcart, and induced her to sell 3,000 acres to the Congested Districts Board. This is said to be not nearly enough. The constitutional agitation had been going on from 1892 at least. In another letter he had received from Barra, the writer stated; "I fear that the cottars of the east side have been treated to rather less than half a loaf, as all the decent arable land on the east side has been retained by the Macgillivrays, and a croft of purely hill-grazing will never answer for their needs in the matter of potato ground and grain crop. Of course it will relieve congestion to some extent, even on the east side, and the west side people will come off all right, but really they would have needed about another thousand acres of land, mostly arable, to give them a proper chance."

Why did the Board in this case wait for an outbreak; for they had all the powers which they now possessed in 1892, and this agitation had been going on for eight years, and yet the Congested Districts Board did nothing to get the land until the people defied the law?

The disturbance in Barra led to further disturbances, and he would give briefly the history of the North Uist case. The estate belonging to Mr.

Campbell Orde has been in the market some time. The neighbouring crofters said it was extremely suitable for a crofters' settlement, and it was occupied sixty years ago as a crofters' settlement. On the matter being brought before the Congested Districts Board they got a report which said that it was not suitable for a crofters' settlement. Nothing will make the crofters who know the locality believe this, and they took possession of the farm. The Congested Districts Board have sent one of the Crofters' Commissioners to give another report, and they thus had another case of respectable, peaceful citizens being compelled to break the law to obtain justice. The Congested Districts Board had done excellent work in carrying out crofter settlements on the estates of Sir Arthur Orde, Viscount Fincastle, and also, he believed, on the estate of the Duke of Sutherland: but in every case those settlements were due to the initiation of the landlord, and not to the Congested Districts Board. So far as he knew, the only case in which the Congested Districts Board deserved credit for having tackled this question was the Barra case, and that was due, he believed, almost entirely to Lord Balfour's personal exertions and influence.

In the Scouser case the Crofter Commission was so restricted that, although they were convinced that sheep should be substituted for cattle, they had no power to enforce their decision. The landlord offered another site, but the crofters declined to go there, although they offered to go to Scorriebrick, which was another part of the same estate, and was part of the land scheduled as suitable for crofter holdings by the Deer Forest Commission. He wished to impress strongly upon the Committee the importance of this work, and he thought it was their duty to urge the Congested Districts Board to do a great deal more in this direction. The Board was composed of excellent men. Lord Balfour was chairman, but he was the busiest man in Scotland, and could not be expected to give personal attention to all these matters. Sir Colin Scott Moncreiff lived in London, three of the members lived in Edinburgh, one in Mull, one he thought in Sutherlandshire, and another in Brighton; and the circumstances were

such that it would be difficult for the Board to have many conferences. The secretary only gave part of his time to the work, being employed in the Exchequer Office in Edinburgh. It seemed to the hon. Member that it would be a very much better arrangement to have a man who would give his whole time to the work, and who would go about finding out where the shoe pinched, in order to draw the attention of the Board to the matter.

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith Burghs) said the Report was not altogether satisfactory. It was a disappointing Report, and all the more disappointing because the Board was composed on the whole of very good men. Certainly Sir Kenneth Mackenzie, who had just been lost by the Board, was an able, kindly, and energetic man. He believed that member's place would be well filled by MacLeod of MacLeod. With such a Board, one would have expected more in the way of results. He thought the Board had frittered away its resources. It had taken up a great number of different matters, some of which had been gone into at considerable length by the hon. Member for Ross-shire. But the chief object of the Board was to settle the people on the land. He was not one of those who thought there was an unlimited amount of land available for that purpose. Although he might be singular in the opinion, he thought that a large population might be maintained on the land over a great part of the Highlands more readily by timber-growing than by crofting. In Lewis and other parts of the Hebrides, to which reference had been made, a large population could be maintained in comfort where there was ready access to the fishing grounds and landing places. He could state from his own knowledge that there were many parts in the outer Hebrides which could be used by crofter fishermen, and which had been put into large farms. Apparently difficulty was found in obtaining these sites. What had been done was very largely due to the efforts of two or three landlords who desired to help the Congested Districts Board. Work had been done in Sutherland and Strathnaver, and also by MacLeod of MacLeod; but where they wanted to extend the system of crofter holdings it had been found that the land was not dealt with in the same spirit as on the Sutherland and MacLeod estates. The members of the Board were of opinion that the powers granted by the Act were in some respects inadequate; they were inadequate in respect to the larger farms. The work of the Board had largely failed because they had not compulsory powers to deal with the more pressing cases. In the absence of powers to deal with such cases, the Board had been left to spend its money in a vast number of different ways, useful no doubt, but which were not the purposes for which the Board was instituted. They found the Board erecting lighthouses, making roads, dealing with questions of the improvement of stock, erecting meal mills, and dealing with a great number of useful subjects, but still outside the primary work for which the Board was instituted. He did not entertain any exaggerated opinion as to the amount of land that was really available for the purpose of extending the crofting area, but he held that there was on the west coast a considerable amount. It was unfortunate that the outbreaks referred to should take place because compulsory powers had not been given to the Board. He thought that to some extent they should be able to check the decline of the population. It was not very marked on the west coast as yet,

but it might come at any time. He believed they were all concerned in the maintenance of as large a rural population as they could in the Highlands, and it was a pity if this should be neglected through not being able to deal with land where the Board had not been able to get facilities from the proprietors.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I must say that if all matters which are dealt with by criticism were discussed in the temperate and generous spirit shown by the hon. Member for Inverness the duty of replying would be a very much easier one than it sometimes is. I want to say a few words upon the general question. In the first place it is rather surprising, I think, to hear that the primary object of the work of the Congested Districts Board was to settle the people on the land.

I do not, of course, wish to dispute about phrases. It is one of the great objects of the Board in so far as the Board see their way to do so, but the primary object was to deal

with the congested districts in whatever way they could best help them. I humbly think that the matter of settling people on the land is rather unduly magnified by hon. Members opposite; not magnified as to the desirability of doing it if it can be done, but magnified in judging the Board, who, after all, must be judged according to their resources and opportunities. I would remind hon. Members that it is perfectly obvious that if the idea was to remove congestion wherever there is congestion by means of enlarging the holdings of the people, it would require money, but of course the amount of money at the command of the Board would be absolutely and entirely inadequate, I could not help thinking that there was a strong condemnation of such a policy in the remarks of the hon. Member for Ross-shire. Taking Lewis as an example, he complained of what had been done for that island. He said it was absolutely necessary that the fishermen should have holdings of four acres. The hon. Member made himself the mouthpiece of the district council at Stornoway. He knows perfectly well that the population of Lewis is such that we could not do it. Of course it would be perfectly impossible to remove congestion in that way. I cannot think, so far as the experience of the Board is concerned, that the want of compulsory powers has anything to do with the question. I will tell hon. Members one or two points that have to do with it. Remember the class of people we have to deal with. They want small holdings and they object very strongly, as a rule, to removing very far from the neighbourhood in which they are. We have to consider this fact. You cannot expect, as a rule, that any landlord would be willing to what I may call pick out the eyes of his estate in order to give portions suitable for small holdings and keep the other portions, which are either unsuitable for that purpose or are already under crofter tenure and therefore not suitable for sale. On the other hand, if you wish to buy whole estates it is very seldom that you can get one entirely composed of land suitable for those small occupancies. If you take all these things together, it is not every place that is at all suitable for the furtherance of the object you have in view. I claim for the Congested Districts Board that they

really have done their best, and I am bound to say that I think they have had a good deal of testimony to that effect from the hon. Member for Inverness. It was rather significant certainly when he was speaking on the general question, and

wished to point out to the House how much it would benefit the country if we were to put people instead of sheep on the land, that he should take a case for illustration which had been actually carried out by the Congested Districts Board. I am not quite sure that I see eye to eye with him in his arithmetical problem, but it is enough for me that when he urged what was best for the interest of the country he should take one of the actual results that had come from my noble friend's hand in the Congested District Board. I think hon. Members will be surprised to hear that, as a matter of fact, I have before me, more or less, particulars of thirty-six different estates or parts of estates as to which there have been negotiations. Of course I am not going through these, for obvious reasons.

I would like to say a word or two on the questions of resettlement and migration which the hon. Member brought specially before the notice of the Committee. The hon. Member for Ross-shire complains that nothing has been done at Croir. I think he is aware that although the Board were anxious to obtain the settlement of crofters there, a lease of the farm had been given by the proprietor.

MR. WEIR said the people applied for the land long before the lease was granted.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: Not so far as the Congested Districts Board were concerned.

MR. WEIR: Your information is not correct.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The hon. Member and I must for once disagree.

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON: The point is that land is not to be got in Lewis.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: Of course holdings at Stornoway were refused. These were fens, and not farms. I pass on to say something of matters at Barra. The hon. Member for Inverness

has referred to what has been done, and he asked a question, which I can answer, as to why the whole of the farm has not been bought. It could not be bought because, as a matter of fact, the farm is at this moment running under long lease. The tenants were so anxious to get possession of the farm that they offered to buy the whole estate, so that really it was a very good compromise for the Congested Districts Board to be able to buy a considerable amount of the land. They did this after an arrangement had been mutually come to between the landlord and the tenants, because that meant that they got the tenants to give up the leasehold rights over the farm. The inducement given to the tenants was that they were enabled to become proprietors of another portion of land on a neighbouring farm.

I wish hon. Members would look at the Report, because it is exceedingly instructive to know what are the difficulties which are met with in dealing with the people themselves. The hon. Member for Inverness gave a perfectly fair account of the proceedings at Sconser, but he did not read out the whole condemnation of the place from the medical point of view. He knows, and any member of the Committee who reads the Report will see, that practically the outbreak of typhus was due to the insanitary conditions of the place. The township is entirely overshadowed by a hill over 2,000 feet high. The offer made was, as the hon. Member for Inverness admitted, a most generous one, and yet as a matter of fact none of these people would move to another place. It seems to

me that their action may be regarded as similar to that of a man who, if he received what you would call a generous offer of a house in Whitechapel, would reply, "I will take a house in Belgrave Square."

MR. CALDWELL: The Lord Advocate is omitting to make any reference to the fact that the crofters gave special reasons why they preferred another place.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I know those reasons perfectly, and if the hon. Member will read, page 8 he will find the reasons on the other side. The reasons of the crofters were very inadequate, I have not the slightest hesitation in saying. There, again, is an illustration of the difficulty you very often have in dealing with people of this class. They are not as a rule very anxious to migrate, but if you look for more land in their own immediate neighbourhood it is not always possible to find it. What I am anxious to show is that the Congested Districts Board are continuously keeping their eyes open to acquire any property of a suitable kind. It is not every property that is suitable, and although it is perfectly easy to indulge in general condemnation at the expense of the Congested Districts Board, as the hon. Member for Ross-shire has done, he must consider their opportunities, and that they have done their best according to their circumstances.

I think a great deal of the most valuable work of the Board is in other directions than migration. They have been doing a great deal in connection with the development of agriculture and stock. If hon. Members are interested in this they will find that the Report tells them in detail, and they will see that the Congested Districts Board has done a great deal of good in this direction. The hon. Member will pardon me for reminding him of one fact. He was concerned about the number of cockerels, but he entirely forgets that a sitting of eggs, which under ordinary circumstances eventually means stock, is as important as the distribution of live poultry. I want to say a word about roads. The hon. Member for Ross-shire made the very general accusation that these roads were not made in the interest of the country at all, but in the interest of the landlords and big farmers.

MR. WEIR: I said that in too many cases while the roads were seemingly for the benefit of the people they were for the benefit of the landlords and big farmers.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: These roads are not undertaken except upon the recommendation of the district council. Although the hon. Member has referred to a road in the island of Barra, I must say that that particular road was recommended by the district council of Barra. It is quite obvious that there is not the slightest use of making a road in a district if, immediately after that, the road is not to be kept up in the district, and the only authority that can keep up the road is the district council.

I have gone through somewhat rapidly and under pressure of the circumstances of the hour the various points raised by hon. Members. I believe the true justification of the action of the Congested Districts Board will be found by a perusal of the Report, and I would be perfectly willing to rest the judgment of those who read it against the vague declamation of the hon. Member for Ross-shire. The composition of the Board has been admitted to be individually

excellent. Something has been said about there not being a secretary giving his whole time to the work. Well, the Secretary for Scotland was of opinion at the outset, and experience has not made him alter the conviction, that it would be much better not to have the whole time of a man, but, if necessary, to send a man to report on various parts. If you had the whole time of a man there would, in one sense, not be enough for him to do, and in others there would be too much. He would occupy a great deal of his time not in proper secretarial work, but by turning himself into an inspector. He thought it better to have a proper secretary always at headquarters, and to get the necessary supplementary information by particular inspections in other hands. Experience has shown that he has not come to a wrong conclusion. On the question of land, I think the hon. Member has been misled as to the meaning of the Allotments Act. It has only been in existence for three years, and I quite agree with the hon. Member for Inverness on this matter.

It being midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House. Resolutions to be reported upon Monday next; Committee also report progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACTS AMENDMENT (EXPENSES).

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of any Expense incurred by the Secretary of State in any inquiry under the provisions of any Act of the present session to amend the Factory and Workshop Acts."; (Mr. Secretary Ritchie.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report progress; and ask leave to sit again."; (Mr. Patrick O'Brien.)

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): I hope the hon. Member will not object. The Bill merely authorises the payment of necessary expenses connected with holding an inquiry under the new procedure set up by the Bill.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid): On former occasions we passed this sort of thing without a resolution of the House.

Question put, and agreed to.

Committee to sit again upon Monday next.

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND) ACT, 1900 (RULES).

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry W.): I wish to draw the attention of the House to the rules recently issued by the Board of Education in Ireland. I trust I will be able to show to the satisfaction of the House that these rules are entirely unfair to the welfare of the people of Ireland, and entirely contradictory to the recommendations issued by the recent Commission which held an inquiry into the working of the Education Act in Ireland. Before I go into these rules and explain to the House the particulars I wish to remedy, perhaps it would be useful to point out the way in which the Board, which has given us these rules, is appointed, and to show the qualifications which they have for the work entrusted to them, and the consequences also which result to our country from

the inadequate and insufficient way the work is done. In Ireland most of our Departments are managed by a body of men nominated by the Lord Lieutenant. We have two education boards; an Elementary Board and an Intermediate Board. The Elementary Board consists of twenty men, and it is a strange fact that only one of these represents the great majority of the people of Ireland. Surely it is not too much to

claim for our country that the education system; primary and intermediate; should be placed on a proper footing, so that the people of Ireland whose children are interested in the welfare of the whole country, should have something to say in regard to the framing of the education laws. Unfortunately that is not the case. The Catholics, who form three-fourths of the population of the country, have only one representative on the National Education Board. But worse than that, in every selection that has been made men professing Nationalist principles, no matter how eminent they may be as educationists, are passed over? Is that the way to make the people of Ireland confident in the education system. No, it is not. It is strange that we in Ireland are treated in all matters affecting our welfare; material, educational, and national; in a manner directly opposed to the veriest elements of constitutional government. The treatment given to the Irish language in the rules now before the House is no exception to this autocratic, hostile, and insulting system of misgovernment. Surely the time has come when the education of our country; from the primary school to the university; should no longer be prostituted to party bigotry or race hatreds, but should be conducted in such a manner as will ensure its commanding the approval and support of our people by men who are in thorough sympathy with the people's pressing wants, and have given practical proof of their desire to remedy them.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, Ireland, with her people by nature intelligent and desirous of education, is, as a consequence of Castle Boards, in a condition of poverty which is a disgrace to any Government, is absolutely without the means of giving her children that technical training which would make their lot in the world afterwards better and more secure, is, in fact, a quarter of a century behind in the present struggle for existence. All this is directly and solely attributable to the disgraceful way in which the various education systems in Ireland are used, not for the improvement of the people according to their own ideas, or along lines initiated by themselves, but to crush the individuality of the race, to quell the sentiment of patriotism, to blot out all knowledge of and love for the past of their country, to bring about an ignorant, submissive, and spiritless uniformity so congenial to incompetent and unscrupulous rulers. Such has been the policy of the National Education Board. How far it has been successful in its main object can be judged by the presence on those benches of men openly and avowedly disloyal. How far it has been successful in crushing out education, in making Ireland unfit for Irishmen, the Chief Secretary himself has admitted. This Board and the Intermediate Board are nominated by the Lord Lieutenant. Most of the members of both Boards are men having no knowledge whatever of the working of elementary education; they have neither time nor inclination to devote to the subject; all, with one or two exceptions, are bitterly anti-Irish. The feelings and wishes of

the people of Ireland are openly flouted in those appointments in a manner which would not be tolerated in any other country. Fancy any system of government in a civilised and free country appointing boards to manage questions of such vital importance to the nation's future welfare, and refusing to appoint more than one man in a body of twenty of the same political views as the great majority of the Irish people! It is intolerable and disgraceful that the future of our children should be in the hands for ever of incompetent, irresponsible, negligent, hostile Castle Boards. It is intolerable and inconsistent with good government that the future of Irish education should be in the hands of a bigoted minority, for it is an undoubted fact, which must be seriously grappled with, that the great majority of the Irish people have no voice whatever; except through the single exception of the most Rev. Dr. Walsh; in framing, administering, or improving the present educational systems of their country. I challenge any man to find in the most enslaved or worst-governed country in the world a parallel to the wholesale flouting of the people's wishes which is shown in Ireland; and I challenge the Government to defend it on any grounds except as a hopeless pandering to the narrow bigotry of an insignificant minority.

Let me illustrate what I have said by the rules recently issued by the Intermediate

Education Board. A few years ago a Commission was held to inquire into the working of intermediate education in Ireland. During the course of the inquiry evidence was taken as to the advisability of giving the Irish language a better position than it previously occupied. The leading scholars of the Continental and even English universities spoke in the highest terms of the value and antiquity of the literary treasures stored in the Irish language; they all affirmed that for the mental training resulting from the study of two languages Irish was at least equal to French and German, while to the Irish child, whose national language it is, to whose mind it naturally appeals with far greater force than either French or German, to whom it is the embodiment of pride of race, of distinct nationality; they asserted it was from the educational standpoint of far greater importance than any other language. Alone amongst the universities of the world Trinity College stood in hostile opposition to the language of the country, whose educational destinies are for the moment in its hands. Since its professors were ignorant of the language, which European scholars had studied for years, they must needs insult both the language and the people who spoke it. To them, who were ignorant of it, it was "silly, indecent, etc.," to European scholars who had studied it in their universities and by the shores of Arran, it was "beyond any modern language as an educational medium." Yet, in face of the convincing and conclusive case made out in favour of the Irish language at the Commission, we find that again the bigotry and intolerance of the ignorant professors of Trinity prevails, and the unanimous demands of the Irish people, backed as it is by the unprejudiced expert opinion of the greatest living European scholars, is insultingly spurned by the Trinity professors who rule the Intermediate Board. In the old programme, Irish was handicapped by being allotted a smaller number of marks than any other subject. In the new programme the system of favouring special subjects by means of marks is

abandoned, and an apparent equality established between all subjects. By an insidious move the Board, while pretending to favour Irish by doing away with marks, and by making it an honour subject, have really attempted to crush Irish out altogether from the programme. Take, for instance, the programme for the preparatory grade. The essential subjects are English composition; one of either French, Latin, or German; arithmetic, drawing, or English, and any other subject. The only chance for Irish is as a nondescript subject.

In the preparatory grade we find that the compulsory subjects are English composition; either French, Latin, or German; arithmetic, drawing or English, and any other subject. In examining this matter it is well to remember that a Student on entering upon this programme sees before him a course of four years; he also sees the possibility of gaining a scholarship of £;20, £;30, or £;50 a year; and he learns from this programme that in order to obtain an exhibition in the ordinary literary course he must take up French or German. If he takes up the literary course he will be compelled not to take up Irish at the commencement. If he takes the classical course he must take up at the beginning Latin and Greek, and will therefore be prevented from taking up Irish, because there are four compulsory subjects and one optional, and the one optional includes in both the classical and the literary course either modern French or German. In the science course for exhibitions he has in the same way to take up subjects which will preclude the possibility of his taking up the Irish language. Therefore, at the very outset of his course as an intermediate student, if he ambitions to be a prize winner or an exhibitioner; and surely every young Irish child will so ambition; he is compelled to lay aside the language which the Commission of a few years ago unanimously recommended should be placed on better terms in the new programme. This better treatment has been unanimously demanded by the Irish people, by their representatives in Parliament, by the Catholic hierarchy in Ireland assembled at its synods, by the county and district councils, by a band of young Irishmen all over the country, and by the Gaelic League, numbering over 200 branches. Still, in the face of this Unanimous demand, in the face of the conclusive case made out for it, we find in the programme just issued, from which we expected better treatment, that the language is in an even worse and inferior position than before. It is to remedy this state of things that I have taken the liberty of addressing the House to-night. On a previous occasion I quoted extracts from various Continental scholars showing the beauty of the language, the literary treasures embodied in it, and its value to Irishmen if we wish to train and develop their natural abilities. Yet the Board which this House, through its representative the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, has nominated to attend to the educational requirements of our people, disregards the public opinion of Ireland and the unanimous demand made on behalf of this language to the Commission, and places Irish in a worse position than it even occupied before.

I come now to the second part of my Amendment. At page 24 the programme says; "To be eligible for prizes and examinations in Group I., students must reach the Honour standard in Greek and Latin."

Therefore, according to that, Greek and Latin in the Irish school programme are made practically compulsory for those who wish to take up the classical course. But while French and German are practically made compulsory the language, which is a modern language, demanded by the Irish child, and which is demanded by the Irish people, is relegated to a position of obscurity, and shut out altogether. This is a disgrace. It is intolerable, and it is a thing which Irishmen are not prepared to submit to.

I trust that this appeal of the representatives of the Irish people will receive the favourable consideration of hon. Gentlemen opposite. But supposing it does not receive favourable consideration, and supposing the reactionary attitude taken up by the Intermediate Education Board is backed up by this House, we are determined, after having taken so much trouble to revive the language we love, which is the language of our ancestors, not to fall back in the struggle. We mean to make Irish a living language and an educational medium, and surely hon. Members opposite do not wish that opportunities for improving the people and raising them socially and intellectually should be kept away from them. The Board has taken a reactionary step, and I trust they will not be supported. Men are appointed to administer education in Ireland, not because they are experts, not because they are prepared to pay attention to the drawing up of schemes suitable for the people, and not because they are in sympathy with the people, but because it is known and an admitted fact that they are the humble servants of the permanent officials. They are appointed to those positions because it is known that instead of devoting their time and attention and their energy and enthusiasm to this vital question they will sit down and do nothing, and leave matters entirely in the hands of the permanent official. England would not tolerate such a system for a moment, for she would not permit her educational system to be administered by a body of old, discarded, fossilised, and useless judges and lawyers. Irish is put in competition with a host of subjects, many of them far easier for the pupil, many absolutely essential in after grades if he wishes to try for prizes. While Greek and Latin are made practically compulsory in the classical group, and French and German in the modern group, Irish, the language of our people, which can be thoroughly learned and used in after life by all the students, to the majority of whom French and German will afterwards become dead or useless languages; is not thought worthy of being mentioned by name. It is relegated to a position of obscurity; it cannot be touched until the pupil has taken up three other languages, and under such circumstances it is impossible to expect either masters or pupils to take it up. This inferior position given to our national language by a Board wholly irresponsible, hopelessly anti-Irish, is a thing which Irishmen will not now tolerate. The time has passed when Irishmen silently submit to such wanton outrages on their national sentiments and desires; and if the Government intend to back up the Board in their utterly indefensible position, and refuse to accede to the very moderate demand made in the Amendment, then the time will have arrived for all Irishmen who respect their country and their race, who are not prepared to submit to be shuffled about, kicked, and insulted by every enemy of their race, to take a resolute stand and

direct

their energies not to getting concessions or alms from those who will never listen to justice or reason, but will submit to organised national opposition; the time will come, in fact has already come, when Irishmen should hurl these Boards from the power they have so long abused, and take into their own hands the educational destinies of their people. I beg to move the resolution standing in my name.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I rise to second the motion which has just been moved. Most Members of this House are aware of the radical and revolutionary change which has been inaugurated in the whole intermediate educational system of Ireland, and I desire to say at the very outset that those of us on these benches, who represent the majority of the people, recognise in that change, so far as its general provisions are concerned, a great reform, which we welcome as one of the greatest steps that has been taken in recent days; I might say for generations; towards establishing a tolerable system of education for the Irish people. We feel deeply grateful to those men who were instrumental in starting this change. The controversy, as the Chief Secretary and those who had examined the Amendment of his hon. friend were already aware, turned that night solely on the question of the position given to the Irish language in the new programme, although there were other points open to criticism. I wish to say that in my judgment it would be impossible to exaggerate the importance of this question. The feeling in Ireland among those for whom the Members on these benches spoke is intensely strong, and the disappointment at the provisions in the new rules issued by the Education Board is bitter in proportion to the expectations which have been aroused in the minds of the people. Now, I wish it to be clearly understood that our demand is not that the study of the Irish language should be made compulsory in any school or on any scholar, but that it should, in the programme of intermediate educational system in Ireland, be placed on a level of equality with any other language. That *prima facie* should appeal to the common sense of the House of Commons. It is a very serious matter, because the people of Ireland will not be content with any rules or programme which place the Irish language in a position inferior to that of any other language. We wish no superior inducements or superior authority for the Irish language. That is a very moderate claim, and the feeling of the mass of the people of Ireland is so intensely strong upon it that if that demand is refused there will be a very fierce agitation. In the new Code, so far from an improvement being made on the old system, which has been made the subject of complaint in the House of Commons, followed by still more violent complaints in Ireland, the Irish language has been placed in a much worse position. I see the Chief Secretary shake his head, but that is the universal opinion in Ireland. The process has been done in a very cute and cunning way. It is true that according to the old Code the same number of marks is given to the Irish language as to French and German, and that under the new Code the same number of marks is given to all subjects. The programme is so constructed as to shoulder out Irish from the preparatory course, and to pursue it throughout with a mark of inferiority. An extraordinary preference is throughout given to German and Greek over Latin,

French, Italian, Spanish, and Irish. Why should that be so? I yield to nobody in my admiration of the German and Greek languages, but it is a monstrous thing that a Board appointed to educate the Irish people should give such a substantial preference to those languages. In the preparatory and most of the other grades, you can pass with a minimum of forty marks in most subjects, but for German and Greek you require only thirty. Our first claim is that Irish should be accorded the most favoured language treatment. I should prefer that all languages should be placed on the same level, and the school authorities thus given a fair choice of the subjects they would take up. But if a preference is to be given to any language or languages, such as is here given to German and Greek, there will be an irresistible claim from Ireland that the Irish language should have equally favourable treatment.

As to our second claim, I turn to the programme of the preparatory grade which is vitally important, because it stands to reason that any subject or subjects taken up by the student in the preparatory grade will be carried by him through the whole of the course. In the preparatory grade a student must pass in five subjects; English composition; Latin, French, or German; arithmetic, experimental science, drawing or English, and one other subject. The only way in which Irish can be brought in is under that last head, and there it stands in competition with Greek, German, Italian, Spanish, algebra, and drawing. Is that just to the Irish language? In the first place, it is not mentioned at all, and four other subjects have been made obligatory before it can be selected. Therefore, I say, that inasmuch as Greek is a preferred subject with a bonus of ten marks in its favour throughout the course, and inasmuch as Greek is in the classical side of all the higher classes an essential subject for exhibitions, that programme is framed with the deliberate object, and certainly the undoubted effect, of squeezing Irish out altogether in the preparatory grade, and if it is squeezed out there there is no chance whatever for it in the other grades. We see in this the result of a crusade which has been undertaken deliberately by a large section; by a majority, as I am informed; of the members of the Intermediate Board, who represent the openly avowed spirit of Trinity College, Dublin. This is an extremely serious matter. The hon. Member opposite spoke contemptuously at the idea of giving the same number of marks for Irish as for German and French. If our Amendment is accepted in these rules it will still be open to any student in Ireland to ignore the Irish language without incurring the smallest disability. We do not propose to impose the smallest disability by our Amendment upon any student in Ireland; all we ask is that the student may not be put under a disability by taking it up. I was talking to a great educational expert in Ireland the other day, and he said that in his judgment and from his own experience he would almost say that any subject which children took up with an interest had an educational value, in proportion to the interest it excited in the minds of the children. If you notice that, for whatever reason, a body of children take up something that will arouse their interest and stimulate their minds I think it ought to be put forward as a permanent item in any educational course. I could quote educational authorities

from a great many foreign countries who have expressed themselves strongly in favour of the teaching of Irish. Considering the fact that the young children are studying this language with enthusiasm and mastering it, this ought to be sufficient to convince the Government that the Irish language is one of great educational value to the people of Ireland. What is the meaning of all this animosity? Why, if the children desire to learn the ancient language of their country, should they be prevented from doing so? These rules are part of an avowed policy in Ireland to wipe out the Irish language from the school, and I attribute this policy largely to Trinity College. I have here the evidence of Professor Atkinson, who said before the Commission that he objected to Irish because it was not of sufficient value to justify them in retaining it.

Professor Atkinson also held a further objection that Irish literature was so dirty and indecent that it was dangerous to allow an Irish child to understand its own language. I contend, on the same line of argument, that the study of Greek is also dangerous for the same reason. The object of the new rules is to exclude Irish, and these provisions are the skilfully drawn arrangements and plans of Trinity College for wiping out Irish altogether. This is the policy propounded by Professor Atkinson.

We have now a perfectly clear issue before us. On the one side you have this wretched system of irresponsible nominated boards. We have been told that Archbishop Walsh is on the Board, but he may be in a minority. The situation is that you have on one side a board nominated by the Lord Lieutenant and in no sense representative, and on the other side you have the unanimous demand of four-fifths of the Irish people, who represent the vast majority of the children for whose benefit this system of education is intended. What will be the consequences? What will be the

result if this demand is refused? Do not let hon. Members opposite lay the flattering unction to their souls that this debate will be the last. If this demand is refused the Chief Secretary will be face to face with a fierce agitation which will increase in vehemence until the demand is granted. I remember raising this question five years ago, and the President of the Board of Trade, who was then Chief Secretary for Ireland, made a not altogether unsympathetic speech on that occasion, but he treated the matter as one in which nobody took very great interest. I think that since then he has seen cause to change his mind. I warn the Chief Secretary that if this moderate demand we are now making is refused there will be immediately an agitation against the existence of the Board; an agitation of a formidable character; and for the handing over of the intermediate education of Ireland to a board representing the people. I certainly should not be sorry to be the mouthpiece of the demand which we will be compelled to put forward to sweep away the Board altogether as an obstruction to education in Ireland and a difficulty in the path of the Irish people. If the Chief Secretary desires to give this new reform a fair chance; and I confess I desire to give it a chance; I would urge upon him to use his influence, which we know in this matter can be used with effect, to induce those gentlemen to moderate their ardour against the Irish language, to give the Irish people local option in this matter, to grant the moderate demand now made, and

to place the Irish language in; such a position that pupils in Ireland will not be damnified or endangered or pulled back in the educational race by the fact that they have chosen Irish in the preparatory grade of the intermediate examinations.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House disapproves of the Rules of Examination of the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland, 1902, unless they be amended in the following particulars::

1. In preparatory grade, substitute 'Irish, Latin, French, German,' for present group 'Latin, French, German.'
2. In all grades in Modern Course, substitute 'Irish, French, or German,' for 'French or German.'
3. In all grades in Grammar School Course, substitute 'Irish, Greek, French, or German,' for 'Greek, French, or German.'
4. In Rule 34, line 9 of Rule, insert after 'Standard,' 'in two of the three following: Irish, French, or German.'
5. That the percentage required for pass in Irish be 30 per cent. as is the case in Greek and German; 25 per cent. for a pass in the honour course, the standard now required for Greek and German.";(Mr. Thomas O'Donnell.)

*THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The hon. Member for East Mayo concluded his speech with two propositions. The first was that unless the House assented now and forthwith to impose these five Amendments upon the Intermediate Education Board there will be an agitation throughout Ireland for the abolition of the Board, and that he will be prepared to head the agitation. The other proposition with which he concluded his speech was that at the same time he desires to give a fair trial to the new reform which this Board has initiated.

MR. DILLON: The right hon. Gentleman has misunderstood me. What I said was that I believed the Members on these benches (the Irish Members) would be compelled, whether they liked it or not, to head the agitation.

*MR. WYNDHAM: I shall not debate that point now, but I would ask whether that is a reasonable way in which to treat a scheme prepared by a board of experts, and from which many people, including the hon. Member, expect a great deal of good. I think the hon. Member and some of those who agree with him are under a slight misapprehension. The hon. Member read the evidence given by Dr. Atkinson, and if I followed his argument accurately, he held that the majority of the Board saw eye to eye with that gentleman and showed no consideration whatever for the minority of the Board. I do not think it would be proper or fitting to go behind the united action of the Board, and I do not think that the picture which the hon. Member has drawn of what had been going on was a true picture. So long as there are on that Board high-minded gentlemen who are experts in educational matters, and so long as they act together, the House is bound to defer to their opinions. The hon. Member dwelt on the educational value of the Irish language. I had the opportunity not so long ago of also dwelling on the educational value of the Irish language, and I adhere to every word I then said, but the hon. Gentleman will recall that I did on that occasion draw a distinction between the teaching of an Irish speaking child through the medium of the Irish language,

and the question before us; namely, the degree and place that should be given to Irish as a subject of secondary education. The hon. Member said that the rules had been contrived in order to squeeze out the Irish language, although he admitted it was given as many marks as any other subject. The general principle on which the Board had acted, it seems to me, is that every child is to take up two large subjects with a choice of another; and in that choice Irish is included. If the child goes in for a literary career or a grammar school course, it will take up Latin and Greek or Latin and French, or Latin or Greek and German, which have a cosmopolitan educational value. But when that is done it is at liberty, nay, it is encouraged to take up the study of the Irish language. The hon. Member said that he had arrived at the conclusion that under these circumstances the child would not take up Irish, but I believe that it would, and the whole of my argument showed that it is not advisable to come to so rapid a conclusion on the merits of this question, especially when we have just received a report from such eminent authorities, and to tell these gentlemen face to face that they are wrong and that we are right. We cannot treat in this way the body of men to whom this matter has been delegated, and who act entirely from public spirit, without remuneration. The hon. Member who introduced the discussion pointed out that there is one Board which deals with elementary education, and another which deals with secondary education. As I pointed out a little while ago, neither the Government nor the House has any direct control over even the Board which deals with elementary education, and I understood one hon. Member to express a preference for that Board over the Intermediate. Speaking of elementary education we are, perhaps, more entitled to express our views there, particularly on the question of children who speak Irish and do not speak English. Administration comes in. We can say that we cannot educate these children unless the teacher understands Irish. On that point the hon. Member for Waterford asked me whether there would be a teacher of Irish appointed at the training college, and I am glad to be able to inform him that the National Board has decided to make such an appointment. But I do distinguish that question somewhat sharply from the question we are now discussing. On the question of secondary education the delegation must be fuller if any good is to be secured. You cannot put up such men as compose this Board; many of them enjoying the confidence of hon. Members who have spoken to-night; such men as Archbishop Walsh, Dr. Molloy, Professor Starkie, and Father Findlay; I say you cannot delegate such a subject as this to such men as these, and then claim the right to criticise their every action at every turn.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: We did not delegate the subject to them.

*MR. WYNDHAM: If that is the position of the hon. Member, of course his motion goes a good deal further than appears on the face of it, because it then becomes a motion for the constitution of some other authority. I cannot embark on that subject to-night, but I do not believe that even the hon. Member has ready any alternative for these twelve gentlemen, who really discharge their duties, as is admitted by the hon. Member for East Mayo, upon every point other than this in a way which receives the approbation of hon. Gentlemen opposite. That, I say, is admitted even by those who have criticised the action of the Board most

severely, and the following statement was recently published by the Gaelic League; a statement by Dr. Douglas Hyde, who, I think, has supplied a good deal of the ammunition for this debate;

"We believe it to be a serious, well conceived, and courageous effort in the right direction."

If you can get that from any body of men in this imperfect world, I think you have a great deal to be thankful for. I do submit that it is a mistake, while this scheme is almost damp from the press, to put down five Amendments, and to state that if those Amendments are not accepted you want neither the Board nor their scheme. It must be remembered that the Viceregal Commission was appointed in 1898, and sat until August, 1899: upon that Commission were educationists whose authority hon. Members opposite will acknowledge; their Report was submitted to the Intermediate Board, who, after working for another year and a half, came forward in June of this year with these new rules and this examination programme.

I could argue this question on its merits if it were not so intricate, and I could take up some points made by the hon. Member who moved this Instruction, and by the hon. Member for East Mayo. I prefer, however, to read to the House what the Intermediate Education Board said upon this Instruction. When it was put upon the Order Paper I thought it only right to communicate with the Board, and to ask for any observations which they might desire to make upon it. These are the observations of the Board;

"The Board have been most desirous, in the preparation of the programme for 1902, to encourage the study of the Irish language, as far as can be done consistently with the general interests of education in the country. They have accordingly placed this subject in a more favourable position than it has previously occupied, especially in these two respects: (1) The study of the Irish language counts as much towards exhibitions and prizes as the study of any other language; and (2) the teaching of the Irish language counts as much towards school grants as the teaching of any other language.

"The Board will be prepared, after some experience of the practical working of the changes now introduced, to consider what further steps may be taken to encourage the study of the Irish language. But having given full consideration to all the evidence laid before the recent Commission, and having taken into account the imperfect resources at present available for the teaching of Irish, they do not think it desirable, in the general interests of education, to do more in this direction, at present than they have done in the programme now before the House of Commons."

With reference to the fifth point in the Instruction, and the alleged undue preference given to German and Greek, I find that the hon. Member referred to the fact that whereas a certain percentage is required for all other subjects, for German and Greek a lower percentage is allowed in order to secure a pass. The Intermediate Education Board upon that point go on to say;

"The lower percentage required for passing in Greek and German was fixed on account of the small number of students presenting themselves for examination in

these subjects, suggesting to the Board that these important languages were neglected. The arrangement made is only provisional, and should it have the desired effect of stimulating the study of these languages it need not continue in operation.

"In the case of Irish It was not considered necessary to give this special encouragement owing to the enthusiasm with which the subject has been taken up of late."

These observations are subscribed to by all the Members of the Board. I have no doubt that there are some members of the Board who do not agree with these new rules, but what I submit is that they should be left to the persons of the Board to determine, and we should not attempt to snatch the task out of their hands. I do not desire to argue the merits of this question at all. My point is that it would be a mistake for Parliament to interfere at the outset with the details, however important, of such a scheme. The scheme is, on the face of it, in some respects transitional, and, as the Board themselves recognise, to a certain extent capable of improvement. All I urge is that unless we are prepared to abolish this Board, and I am not prepared to do that, and I gather that the hon. Member for East Mayo is not prepared to do it;

MR. DILLON: I said I was sincerely anxious to give the new system a fair trial.

*MR. WYNDHAM: I suggest that an opportunity should be given by awaiting Amendments at the hands of the experts, and in the light of experience, and not by seeking to induce them, at the hands of Parliament, to alter the conclusion arrived at after long labour and infinite pains.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.) said the Chief Secretary had told them that it was not fair to criticise the new scheme at present, but he would point out that if no objection was taken to the rules within forty days after they were laid on the Table of the House they would become law as a matter of course. His hon. friend the Member for West Kerry, in dealing with the rules now, I was only acting in accordance with the Act of Parliament, following the injunction of this House, and adopting a perfectly regular and constitutional course. The Chief Secretary asked them to give reasonable treatment to the Board. He was sure they were prepared to do so, but, on the other hand, they had a perfect right to ask that the Board of Education should give reasonable attention to the people of Ireland in this matter. While the Irish Members were satisfied, speaking generally, with the new rules, there remained the question of the teaching of Irish, on which they considered they had cause to complain. In view of the strong feeling for the revival of the Irish language and the progress of the movement in the last four or five years, they certainly thought that the Board of Education had behaved very badly in not giving some interpretation to that feeling in the new code. He had read the rules carefully, and he and many others took the view that under them the Irish language was placed in competition with other subjects. What they claimed was that the study of Irish should be placed in competition with another language, and not with such a subject as geometry or drawing. Notwithstanding what the Chief Secretary had said, it seemed to him that the position given to the Irish language in the rules did not induce to its study. He understood that the rules were subject to

revision, and he hoped that revision would come at no distant date. His interest in this question arose from the fact that people who were not Irish were as anxious as the Irish people themselves to have the opportunity of learning the Irish language. He and his friends believed that the preservation of the Irish language was intimately bound up with the preservation of the Irish nation, and for that reason he asked for a revision of the rules. Some hon. Members opposite had interjected, in the course of the debate, their objections to the preservation of the Irish language. He did not want to be hard on them, but the reason for that unseemly behaviour was that they knew nothing whatever of Ireland or Irish literature. If they had had an Irish Administration responsible to the wishes of the people of Ireland they would have, long ago, proved to the world that the literature of ancient Ireland was perhaps the finest in existence.

MR. LEAMY (Kildare, N.): I confess I am much astonished that the Chief Secretary deprecates criticism of the Board of Education in Ireland and charges Irish Members with acting unfairly towards the Board, and with being desirous to prevent new reforms in education being carried out. The right hon. Gentleman seems to think that if this Amendment is carried we shall get rid of the Board. We do not want to get rid of the Board, but we do want them to fall in with public feeling in Ireland on this matter. The right hon. Gentleman speaks of five Amendments, but there is only one question before the House, and that is whether an Irish boy should be entitled, if he chooses, to take up the study of Irish instead of French, German, or Greek. The right hon. Gentleman speaks of the cosmopolitan value of Greek or German. Does he believe that any boy who takes honours in Greek or German ever knows much about either language five years after he has left school? We thoroughly approve of the reform which has been effected; we are desirous of giving it all the assistance we can; we simply ask that an Irish lad should be able to take up the study of the Irish language if he likes. I cannot understand why it is that the Board will not consent to this, knowing, as it must, the extraordinary movement which has grown up for the restoration of the Irish language. What is the revolution which it is feared this Amendment, if carried, would effect? You already have French, German, and Latin in the rules; we ask for the addition of the word "Irish." We do not ask that every boy should be compelled to learn Irish; we simply desire that it should be made optional. As to the literature of the language, we have as fine and as chivalrous characters in the heroes of Irish story as are to be found anywhere. The chief inspirations of all the great epic-makers and bards have been found in warriors and lovers, and, whatever may be said about Irishmen, they can never be accused of being laggards or cowards; whether on the battlefield or in the boudoir Irishmen have always been able to render a good account of themselves. But after all is said and done, what we are asking for is simply the right to teach our own language in our own schools. The majority of the Irish people are in favour of the demand we are making to-day. Remember, you cannot kill the Irish language now. I have heard it stated that there are at present 500 students in Maynooth College studying Irish; Irish priests are returning to the preaching of sermons in Irish; newspapers have taken up the

subject; children are engaged with it. We are simply amazed at the movement, which is the most astonishing that has taken place in Ireland for centuries. Why can you not assent to this request? Is there any single demand which the Irish people can make which will be assented to by the English Government without the country being brought to the verge of civil war? Would the Empire be endangered by the granting of this appeal? Why, in the name of God, is it not agreed to, so that we may have peace and quietude upon at any rate one single matter? We are told that if this Amendment is pressed the Board might throw up the whole business. Does the right hon. Gentleman really think that we could not get on in Ireland without this high-spirited Board? The right hon. Gentleman also told us that the Board are unanimous, or, at all events, that they are working in agreement. Will he tell us that there is not a single member of that Board in favour of our demand? Will he say that either of the four gentlemen whose names he mentioned is against our demand? I admit that there is some hope in the reply received from the Board, and I think the right hon. Gentleman acted very wisely in asking for their opinion upon this point. At the same time, I can assure him that we will never be content until our demand is conceded, and, therefore, the sooner it is granted the better.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.) said that by the new rules this beautiful Irish language, which compared favourably with Greek, was being thrown into the background. He wished to point out to the Chief Secretary that he had been a teacher of the Irish language for forty years, and he had done his best to propagate the language of his forefathers. The Irish literature was one of the finest in the world. They did not possess a more perfect record in Latin than they did

AYES.

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

Hayden, John Patrick

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

Ambrose, Robert

Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-

O'Dowd, John

Barry, E. (Cork, S.)

Helme, Norval Watson

O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)

Boland, John

Jordan, Jeremiah

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

Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)

Kennedy, Patrick James

O'Malley, William

Caldwell, James

Leamy, Edmund

O'Mara, James

Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)

Levy, Maurice

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Cogan, Denis J.
Lundon, W.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Reddy, M.
Crean, Eugene
M'Dermott, Patrick
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Cullinan, J.
M'Govern, T.
Redmond, William (Clare)
Delany, William
Mooney, John J.
Rigg, Richard
Dillon, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Doogan, P. C.
Nolan, Col John P. (Galway, N.)
Sullivan, Donal
Duffy, William J.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Weir, James Galloway
Elibank, Master of
O'Brien, Kendal (Tip'er'ry, Mid
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Ffrench, Peter
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Gilhooly, James
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W)
Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.
Hammond, John
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
NOES.
Acland-Hood. Capt. Sir Alex. F
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Morgan, Hon. Fred. (Monmths.
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Finch, George H.
Morrell, George Herbert
Anson, Sir William Reynell

Fisher, William Hayes
Mount, William Arthur
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Gordon, Hn. J. E (Elgin & Nairn)
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Greene, H. D. (Shrewsbury)
Pretymann, Ernest George
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manchester)
Gretton, John
Purvis, Robert
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Randles, John S.
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds)
Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G (Mid'x
Reid, James (Greenock)
Balfour, Maj K R (Christchurch
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Rbt. Wm.
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. T.
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel W.
Bignold, Arthur
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Bigwood, James
Higginbottom, S. W.
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Blundell, Col. Henry
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightsd.
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Bond, Edward
Hoult, Joseph
Seely, Chas. Hilton (Lincoln)
Brassey, Albert
Johnston, William (Belfast)

Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Brodrick, Rt. Hn. St. John
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Spear, John Ward
Bull, William James
Keswick, William
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Bullard, Sir Harry
Knowles, Lees
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Cautley, Henry Strother
Lawson, John Grant
Thornton, Percy M.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Tollemache, Henry James
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Leveson-Gower, Fredk. N. S.
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Corbett, A. C. (Glasgow)
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.
Valentia, Viscount
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Warde, Col. C. E.
Cranborne, Viscount
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Crossley, Sir Savile
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Dalkeith, Earl of
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W G E Ellison
Wilcox, Sir John Archibald
Davenport, William Bromley-
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Wills, Sir Frederick
Dickson, Charles Scott
Malcolm, Ian
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Manners, Lord Cecil
Wylie, A.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

Dorington, Sir John Edward
Maxwell, W. J. H (Dumfriessh.)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Sir William Walrond and
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Mr. Anstruther.

in the Irish language, and they possessed first-class Irish dictionaries and Irish grammars of the finest stamp. He concluded by reciting "Who fears to speak of '98?" in the Irish language.

Question put.

The House divided:;Ayes, 56 Noes, 107. (Division List No. 269.)

Adjourned at Two of the clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 24th June, 1901.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S HOSPITAL BILL [Lords]. (BY ORDER.)

Order for Second Reading read.

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

said he did not propose to move the rejection of the Bill, but the Charity Commissioners objected entirely to the principle of the proposal, which was to grant the compulsory powers of the Lands Clauses to one charity as against another. St. Bartholomew's Hospital wished to acquire, by compulsory powers, certain lands from Christ's Hospital. The Commissioners believed it to be absolutely without precedent for one charity to be granted compulsory powers against another charity, and they strongly objected to the very heavy cost which would undoubtedly be inflicted on the charity by the use of these powers. The Commissioners would have thought it their duty to oppose the Second Reading, only it was understood that the governors of Christ's Hospital, after the debate of last Friday, had agreed not to oppose the Second Reading or the preamble of the Bill. The view of the Charity Commissioners was that the Bill was quite unnecessary, because they had made it a condition of any sale of the site of Christ's Hospital that a certain part of it;namely, that part desired by St. Bartholomew's;should be assured to St. Bartholomew's by means of pre-emption at a price pro rata to the whole amount given for the site. He hoped that before long some arrangement might be come to between the two charities whereby the expense of the use of compulsory powers might be avoided.

MR. COHEN (Islington, E.), on behalf of the promoters of the Bill, thanked his hon. friend for not opposing the Second Reading of the Bill, the object of which was to enable a great institution to carry on its work more effectively. The governors of Christ's Hospital were very much gratified by the attitude of the Charity Commissioners. He did not think that any legitimate rebuke attached to

St. Bartholomew's in the matter.

Bill read a second time, and committed.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON TRADE, ETC.

Ordered, That the Standing Committee on Trade, etc., have leave to sit till half-past Three of the clock on every day on which the Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment Bill and the Factory and Workshop Acts Consolidation Bill are under consideration.:(Mr. Laurence Hardy.)

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

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

Harpenden District Gas Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

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

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

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill [Lords].

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill [Lords].

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords].

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords].

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

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

Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY BILL.

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

MERSEY DOCKS AND HARBOUR BOARD BILL [Lords].

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

MILFORD DOCKS BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, with an Amendment.

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE AND GATESHEAD GAS BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

NITRATE RAILWAYS COMPANY BILL [Lords].

RODGER'S PATENT BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, without amendment.

SHREWSBURY GAS BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

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

Read the third time, and passed, with an Amendment.

SWANSEA HARBOUR BILL.

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

Read the third time, and passed.

BIDEFORD AND CLOVELLY RAILWAY (ABANDONMENT) BILL [Lords]. (NOT AMENDED.)

Considered; to be read the third time.

CITY AND SOUTH LONDON RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

NEW SWINDON GAS BILL [Lords].

PAISLEY POLICE AND PUBLIC HEALTH BILL.

RHYL IMPROVEMENT BILL.

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

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

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

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

BARROW-IN-FURNESS CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

Read a second time, and committed.

BOLTON CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

Read a second time, and committed.

Ordered, That it be an Instruction to the Committee to insert the following Clause;;

Any scheme for the establishment of a superannuation or provident fund under this part of this Act shall not come into operation until the Corporation shall in respect of that fund have been registered under the Friendly Societies Act, 1896, and the provisions of that Act (except the proviso to Sub-section (1) of Section 8 and Section 41) so far as they are applicable and are not inconsistent with the provisions of this part of this Act shall apply as if (a) the Corporation were a society to which that Act applies and were the Trustees of such society; (b) as if the scheme were the rules of such society; (c) as if the superannuation or provident funds were the funds of such society; and (d) as if the contributors to the fund were the members of such society.;(Mr. Strachey.)

BRISTOL CORPORATION CEMETERY BILL [Lords].

Read a second time, and committed.

HEYWOOD AND MIDDLETON WATER BOARD BILL [Lords].

MANCHESTER AND LIVERPOOL ELECTRIC EXPRESS RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

WISBECH WATER BILL [Lords].

Read a second time, and committed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 6) BILL.

As amended, considered; read the third time, and passed.

INVERGARRY AND FORT AUGUSTUS RAILWAY ORDER CONFIRMATION.

Bill to confirm a Provisional Order under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Invergarry and Fort Augustus Railway, ordered to be brought in by the Lord Advocate and Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland.

INVERGARRY AND FORT AUGUSTUS RAILWAY ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL.

"To confirm a Provisional Order under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Invergarry and Fort Augustus Railway," presented accordingly; and, under 62 and 63 Vic, c. 47, s. 7 (2), ordered to be considered upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 225.]

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP N).

Sir JOHN BRUNNER reported from the Committee on Group N of Private Bills, That

the parties promoting the Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill [South Shields Order] had stated that the evidence of Frederick William Gibbon, of South Shields, physician and surgeon, was essential to their case; and it having been proved that his attendance could not be procured without the intervention of the House, he had been instructed to move that the said Frederick William Gibbon do attend the said Committee to-morrow, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Ordered, That Frederick William Gibbon do attend the Committee on Group N of Private Bills to-morrow, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

LONDON UNITED TRAMWAYS BILL.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to Dublin St. James' Gate Brewery Tramways Bill, with an Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to authorise the urban district council of Stratton and Bude to purchase the undertaking of the Bude Harbour and Canal Company, and to construct waterworks and supply water within their district and adjoining parishes, and to make further and better provision for the local government of the district; and for other purposes." Stratton and Bude Improvement Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confer further powers on the Easton and Church Hope Railway Company." Easton and Church Hope Railway Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill, intituled, "An Act to authorise the Corporation of Harrogate to construct additional waterworks; and for other purposes." Harrogate Water Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill, intituled, "An Act to authorise the Corporation of Harrogate to construct certain street improvements; and to make further provision in regard to the health and local government of the town." Harrogate Corporation Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill, intituled, "An Act to authorise the construction of certain new works for improving the harbour of Dover; the abandonment of certain authorised works; the raising of further moneys by the Dover Harbour Board; and for other purposes." Dover Harbour Bill.

And also a Bill, intituled, "An Act to authorise the Corporation of the city of Ripon to construct additional waterworks, and to make other provision for the health and good government of the city." Ripon Corporation Bill [Lords].

STRATTON AND BUDE IMPROVEMENT BILL [Lords].

EASTON AND CHURCH HOPE RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

HARROGATE WATER BILL [Lords].

HARROGATE CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

DOVER HARBOUR BILL [Lords].

RIPON CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

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

PETITIONS.

BEER BILL.

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

EDUCATION BILL.

Petition from West Ham, against; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions for alteration, from Halifax; West Sussex; Colchester; and Bideford; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (CONTINUATION SCHOOLS) BILL.

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

HOUSING OF WORKING CLASSES (REPAYMENT OF LOANS) BILL.

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

JURORS' EXPENSES BILL.

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

PUBLIC HEALTH BILL.

Petition from West Ham, against; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Beeston; Newbridge-on-Wye; Aston; Walsall; Ullenhall; Rugby; Willoughby; Forest Gate; Woodhouse; Biggleswade; Walthamstow; Tempsford; and Totland Bay; to lie upon the Table.

SOVEREIGN'S OATH ON ACCESSION BILL.

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

NATIONAL GALLERY (ACQUISITION OF ADJACENT LAND) BILL.

Petition from Westminster, against; referred to the Select Committee on the Bill.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

INEBRIATES ACTS, 1879 TO 1899 (REGULATIONS FOR STATE INEBRIATE REFORMATORIES).

Copy presented, of General Regulations for the Management and Discipline of State Inebriate Reformatories, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department in pursuance of the Inebriates Act, 1898 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING ACTS, 1882 TO 1890 (PROCEEDINGS).

Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade respecting the Applications to and Proceedings of the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 to 1890, during the past year [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

[No. 224.]

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1884.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 15th June, 1901, declaring that George Smith, engine driver, Royal Gun Factory, War Office 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.

TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION ACT, 1889.

Copy presented, of Minute sanctioning the subjects to be taught under Clause 8 of the Act, for the county of Cornwall (Seventh Minute), dated 9th June, 1901 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 2633 to 2635 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ADMIRALTY WORKS AT GIBRALTAR.

Copy presented, of Correspondence respecting Admiralty Works at Gibraltar [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

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

1. Inquiry into Charities (Administrative County of Durham). Further Return relative thereto [ordered 14th February, 1900; Mr. Grant Lawson]; to be printed. [No. 225.]

2. Public Records (Admiralty). Copy of Eighth Schedule containing a List and Particulars of classes of Documents which have been removed from the Office of the Commissioners for executing the office of the Lord High Admiral of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and deposited in the Public Record Office, but not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation therein [by Act].

APPEALS (HOUSE OF LORDS AND JUDICIAL COMMITTEE).

Return ordered, "showing for each of the years from 1890 to 1900, inclusive, (1) the number of days on which the House of Lords sat for the disposal of Judicial Business; (2) the number of days on which the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council sat for the disposal of Judicial Business; (3) the number of occasions (included in Items 1 and 2) on which the Lords and the Committee both sat at the same time.";(Mr. Blake.)

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR;TAXATION ON TRANSVAAL MINES.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in view of Sir David Barbour's statement in his Report that some of the gold mining companies of the Transvaal paid in 1898 dividends equal to their nominal capital, and that their profits will largely increase in the next few years, he will impose a special war tax on their profits in addition to the 10 per cent. tax for revenue purposes. At the same time I beg to welcome the right hon. Gentleman back to the House.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): I am much obliged to the hon. Member. In reply to his question, I have to say I must ask the hon. Member to refer to the answer given by me to the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy on Monday, the 17th June, in which I indicated, as far as I am able, the general views of His Majesty's

Government.† I can only add now that of course the larger the profits that may be made by individual miners the more they will pay in accordance with Sir David Barbour's suggestions.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES: Can the right hon. Gentleman say whether these mines will pay anything further than the 10 per cent. to which I have alluded? Does he refer to any other matter?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: In the answer to which I have referred the hon. Member I did not say anything about 10 per cent. What I did say was that, speaking generally, as regards the main principles laid down by Sir David Barbour in his Report, His Majesty's Government found themselves in agreement with them, but that the whole question would have to be gradually evolved and the details left to Lord Milner to be worked out on the spot.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he will bear in

mind that if we put a reasonable tax on these mines;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member is not at liberty to argue the point.

CAMPS OF CONCENTRATION;SPIRITUAL MINISTRATIONS.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that for a long period ministers of religion have not been allowed access to many of the camps of concentration in South Africa, and that, in many cases, the prisoners and refugees have been obliged to bury their own dead without the help of such ministers, and whether, under proper regulations, ministers of religion will in future be allowed access to the camps.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE OR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): Dutch Reformed ministers are granted access to the camps in the Orange River Colony and Natal.

I have no definite information as to the Transvaal

† See page 539.

and Cape Colony camps, but I have no reason to suppose that they are treated differently. Those in the Orange River Colony are receiving monthly salaries.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS: Since when has this permission been granted?

MR. BRODRICK: I cannot give the hon. Member the exact date.

VOLUNTEERS FOR ACTIVE SERVICE.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he is now in a position to state how many officers and how many non-commissioned officers and members of the Volunteer force joined the first levy, and how many the second levy of the Imperial Yeomanry, and how many in each levy were formerly members of the Yeomanry Cavalry.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): The figures are as follow:;First levy, 1900, Volunteers, 1,145; Yeomanry, 1,898. Second levy, 1901, Volunteers, 3,997; Yeomanry, 618.

ARMY CONTRACTS;FAIR WAGE RESOLUTION.

MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether any, and if so what, express provision is contained in contracts for supplies for the Army requiring the contractor to pay a rate of wages in accordance with the terms of the Fair Wages Resolution; whether any supervision is exercised by the War Office over contractors as to the rates of wages paid to their workpeople; whether the sub-letting of contracts is permitted, with or without notice to the War Office; and whether he can give any assurance that efforts will be made to procure compliance with the Fair Wages Resolution in all War Office contracts.

LORD STANLEY: All contracts for supplies of food in the United Kingdom contain the usual clause, viz.;

"This contract shall not be sub-let or transferred without the written permission of the

Director of Army Contracts. The wages paid in the execution of this contract shall be those generally accepted as current in the trade for competent workmen where the work is carried out."

Sub-letting, other than that customary in the trade, is not permitted except as above. Efforts are always made to secure compliance with the Fair Wages

Resolution as soon as any case of non-compliance is brought to the attention of the War Office, otherwise the Department does not intervene, on the assumption that the contractor carries out the conditions of the contract.

STAFF PAYMASTERS.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, seeing that the pay of the Chief Paymaster's Army Pay Department has been increased, he will consider the advisability of granting some increase to staff paymasters who have completed ten years service in that rank in view of the responsible additional duties assigned to them in connection with the monthly payments of separation allowance and allotments to the families of soldiers serving with their regiments in South Africa as well as to those of Militia battalions embodied for home service.

LORD STANLEY: The matter has been carefully considered, and it is not deemed expedient to make any increase of pay in the direction suggested. There is nothing to show that staff paymasters of ten years service are specially affected by the duties referred to. These officers are eligible for charge pay, varying in accordance with the magnitude of their responsibilities, from 2s. 6d. to 5s. per diem.

RELIGIOUS MINISTRATIONS ON WARSHIPS;THE "DIADEM" FATALITY.

MR. GILHOOLY (Cork County, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that at the inquest held at Castletown Berehaven relative to the death of a seaman, who met with an accident aboard the "Diadem," a lieutenant of the Navy stated that a Roman Catholic priest was not sent for to minister to the wants of the dying man because a Church of England chaplain was on board the "Diadem," and his services could be availed of if the dying seaman required them, and whether he will make inquiry in this case.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): There appears to be no foundation for the allegation that a lieutenant of the Navy stated that a priest was not sent for because a Church of England chaplain was on board. The evidence of the officer was to the effect that a Roman Catholic chaplain was not sent for because the injured man was not considered to be in immediate danger. Full inquiry has been made into this case, and the circumstances were explained in my answer to the hon. Member on Thursday.

NAVY CONTRACTS;FRESH MEAT.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the terms of contracts for the supply of fresh meat to the Navy in Ireland permit the substitution of foreign for home-fed meat; and, if so, in what proportion.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The terms of contract for the supply of fresh meat to the Navy are uniform throughout the United Kingdom. The conditions of the contract as to quality are as follows;

"The whole of the beef to be delivered under this contract is to be good, fat, well-fed, freshly killed ox or maiden heifer beef, sweet, wholesome, and free from bruises, such as shall be approved by the commanding officer of the vessel supplied as in all respects fit for His Majesty's service, to the entire exclusion of the flesh of any bull, bull stag, cow, or any beast whatever that

may have dropped on the road No refrigerated or frozen beef to be supplied."

There is no further stipulation as to the origin of the meat.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: Arising out of that answer, may I ask the hon. Gentleman whether steps will be taken with a view of preventing the supply of foreign meat to the Navy?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The question on the Paper asks for the terms of the contracts, and these have been read out at length.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: Yes, but what is done to prevent an evasion of them?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Precautions are taken to see that the terms of existing contracts are carried out, and as a matter of fact they are rigorously carried out.

MEDITERRANEAN FLEET; LORD CHARLES BERESFORD'S LETTER.

MR. NORMAN (Wolverhampton, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether his attention has been drawn to a letter from Rear-Admiral Lord Charles Beresford, in which the latter states that he has communicated his views upon the want of strength and the want of proper war organisation of the British Fleet in the Mediterranean to the properly constituted authorities in as strong and clear Anglo-Saxon language as he can command; whether such a communication has been received; whether its contents, or any part of it, can be published; and, if not, whether any steps are being taken to remedy the shortcomings which Lord Charles Beresford says cause him extreme anxiety.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: My attention has been drawn to the letter from the Rear-Admiral Second in Command in the Mediterranean, which has appeared in the public press. There is nothing to show that the letter was intended for publication, and it seems highly improbable that the Rear-Admiral would have taken a step so contrary to the discipline of the Navy as to make a public communication with regard to confidential reports transmitted by him in respect of the Fleet in which he is serving. All official communications from the Commander-in-Chief in the Mediterranean, as well as any communications from the Rear-Admiral and Captains of the Mediterranean Fleet, which the Commander-in-Chief of that Fleet has thought fit to transmit, have been carefully considered by the Admiralty. They are of a confidential nature, and there is no intention of making them public.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I wish to ask my hon. friend a supplementary question; whether, with regard to the regular communications to which the hon. Member has adverted, the Government will take into consideration the condition of the defences and the number of the garrisons at Gibraltar, Malta, and Egypt.

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

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The answer is; Yes.

IMPERIAL COURT OF APPEAL.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in the conference of colonial delegates in reference to the Imperial Court of Appeal, there will be any representatives from Ceylon, the Straits Settlements, and other Crown colonies.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Sir William Smith, the present Chief Justice of British

Guiana, who has also served as a judge at the Gold Coast and in Cyprus, has been selected to represent all the colonies other than those under responsible government.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Has the right hon. Gentleman received any representations on this subject from Ceylon or other Crown colonies asking for direct representation?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No, Sir; but I have had suggestions from various colonies that it might be desirable in the interests of Crown colonies that they should be represented.

COURTS OF FINAL APPEAL.

MR. BLAKE (Longford, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General whether, in view of the contemplated legislation with regard to the courts of final appeal for the Empire, he will consent to treat as unopposed the motion for a Return entitled Appeals (House of Lords and Judicial Committee) on this day's Paper.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): Yes, Sir; there is no objection to it.

INDIAN FINANCE.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he can say when the usual explanatory Memorandum on Indian Finance will probably be issued.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): The explanatory Memorandum on Indian Finance is in the hands of the printers, but some of the information has only just been received from India. I hope that it will be ready for delivery to Members in two or three weeks.

CHINA AND THE OPIUM DUTY.

*SIR JOSEPH PEASE (Durham, Barnard Castle): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether his attention has been directed to the declaration made in the opium debate in 1891 by the right hon. Member for North-east Manchester, who was then Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, that if the Chinese Government thought proper to raise the duty on opium to a prohibitive extent, or shut out the article altogether, this country would not expend £;1 in powder and shot, or lose the life of a soldier, to force opium upon the Chinese, and whether Great Britain has formally informed the Powers that she will not consent to China's increasing the duty on imports of opium and rice.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRANBORNE, Rochester): My attention has been directed to the declaration of my right hon. friend, to which reference is made in the question. As I have already stated in answer to the hon. Member for the Holmfirth Division of Yorkshire, the question of an increase in the Chinese duty on opium has not arisen.

FRENCH RAILWAY FROM TONKING FRONTIER TO YUNNAN-FU.

MR. NORMAN: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is able to afford the House any information concerning the proposed French railway from Haiphong to Yunnan-fu, particularly with regard to its possible prolongation to the Yangtsze, and the conditions governing its protection by French troops.

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: The French Government obtained from China in 1898 a concession for a railway from the Tonking frontier to Yunnan-fu. Its construction has not yet commenced, though surveys were carried out previous to the recent troubles. We have no further information, and we are not aware of any agreement authorising the employment of French troops for the protection of the line.

ANATOLIAN RAILWAY.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE (Wilts, Cricklade): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, in view of the fact that it is not proposed to present Papers with reference to railways in Asia Minor generally, he will be able to lay upon the Table Papers relating to the Anatolian Railway only.

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: A consular report will shortly be issued which contains information relating to Turkish railways and some particulars in regard to the Anatolian Railway.

TURKISH TARIFFS AND RAILWAY CONCESSIONS.

MR. JAMES O'KELLY (Roscommon, N.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any proposal has been made by the Turkish Government to increase the tariff charges on goods imported into Asia Minor; whether he has any official information showing that such increased taxation would fall chiefly on British merchandise, and that the Turkish Government intends to apply the proceeds of the increased taxation to promoting the construction of a railway from Konia to the Persian Gulf; and whether, in view of the commercial and political interests of Great Britain, His Majesty's Government will refuse to consent to any increase in the tariff on British goods imported into Asia Minor.

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: With regard to the two first paragraphs, there is no further information to add to the answer given to the noble Lord the Member for the Cricklade Division of Wiltshire, on the 18th instant, in reply to a similar question. The proposal of the Turkish Government was that there should be an increase in the tariff for the

See page 708.

whole Turkish Empire, and was not confined to Asia Minor, and it made no reference to the railway from Konia to the Persian Gulf.

SLAVERY IN ZANZIBAR AND PEMBA.

MR. J. A. PEASE (Essex, Romford): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether His Majesty's Government are proposing to reconstruct or abolish the system of paying compensation to the owners for slaves freed in the Islands of Zanzibar and Pemba, as recommended by Mr. Commissioner Last in his Despatch of 10th January, 1901.

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: His Majesty's Government are not proposing to take steps in the direction indicated. Such action lies, in the first instance, within the competence of the Zanzibar Government, and it appears from the Memorandum, printed at page 33 of Africa, No. 4, 1901, that Sir Lloyd Matthews contemplates advising the reduction of the average compensation by about one-half.

MR. J. A. PEASE: Then, is not the recommendation to be adopted?

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: The hon. Member could not have heard the first part of my answer, in which I say "the Government are not proposing to take steps in the

direction indicated."

NATIVE LABOUR IN EAST AFRICA.

MR. J. A. PEASE: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether it is intended to draw supplementary labour to the Islands of Pemba and Zanzibar from the British Protectorate of Uganda and British East Africa, under contracts for periods of three years, as recommended by Sir Lloyd Matthews last January; and, if so, what steps will be taken to secure for the natives full freedom in regard to entering into a contract, and full knowledge of the effect of any contract which may be entered into, and what arrangements will be made to secure for them satisfactory terms and conditions.

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: As was stated in the reply to the hon. Member for the Chesterfield Division on June 18th, His Majesty's Government do not, as at present advised, propose to act on the recommendation of Sir Lloyd Matthews.

RED SEA LIGHTS.

SIR J. FERGUSSON (Manchester, N.E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether His Majesty's Government are aware of the cause of the delay in the commencement by the Turkish Government of the construction of four new lights at the southern end of the Red Sea; whether the light dues surrendered by the Egyptian Government for this purpose and accumulated for the last ten years can be made available if a want of funds in the Ottoman Treasury is the reason for the continued danger to navigation caused by the absence of these lights; whether His Majesty's Government are using their best influence to procure the fulfilment of an undertaking entered into more than two years ago; what has occurred to delay the erection of a light on the Island of Socotra for which the Under Secretary of State for War in 1899 stated that the Government of India had been requested to prepare plans, taking into consideration the fact that the erection of this light has been regarded as important for many years, and that a shipwreck occurred in 1897 for want of it.

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: His Majesty's Government are informed that the construction of the four lights in the Red Sea will be commenced early in November. The lighting apparatus is being constructed, and will be ready in September. In regard to the light on Socotra, the Government of Bombay was unable to submit plans and estimates in a complete form until the end of last year. These are now under the consideration of the Trinity House and the Board of Trade.

GIBRALTAR AND THE COAL TAX.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether representations have been made on the part of the local community of Gibraltar to the effect that their undertaking to pay a portion of the cost of the commercial mole was largely based on the existence of a considerable trade in coal, which they now consider to be injuriously affected by the proposed coal tax; and what answer, if any, has been given to these representations.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): I have received through the Colonial Office communications from the Gibraltar Chamber of Commerce urging that the duty on coal should not apply to coal exported to Gibraltar. I cannot trace any such representation as that stated in the

question, and I do not think that the duty could by any possibility affect the power of Gibraltar to fulfil the arrangement made in this matter.

COAL DUTY INQUIRY.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydfil): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he has now received any reply from the Parliamentary Committee of the Mining Association of Great Britain to his inquiry as to whether they would support an extended investigation into the coal question; and, if so, whether he can state the tenour of it; and whether he has addressed similar inquiries to the representatives of colliery workmen, to chambers of commerce, coal-exporting ports, and to coal owners not connected with the Mining Association of Great Britain; whether, with the view of preventing an unsatisfactory conclusion from an inquiry confined to the probable effect of the coal duty, he can give an assurance that the investigation will be by Royal Commission and of a comprehensive scope; and whether he can before Clause 3 of the Finance Bill is reached give the terms of reference to, and the composition of, the Commission or Committee.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I have received a reply, which I have no doubt the hon. Member is acquainted with, as it appears to have been printed and circulated to the various local associations. I can only say that it does not seem to me satisfactory. I have addressed no inquiries on the subject to the other bodies named, who have not communicated with me. The answer to the second and third paragraphs of the question is in the negative.

THE "PRIMROSE HILL" INQUIRY.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he has received any complaints as to the way in which the president of the court conducted the inquiry into the loss of the "Primrose Hill," and as to his behaviour towards the solicitor who appeared on behalf of the parents of some of the drowned apprentices, and who at the conclusion of the case made a protest; and whether he can take any steps towards ensuring that those who have a right to be represented shall have the means of eliciting the essential facts of the circumstances attending a loss such as that of the vessel referred to.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): Yes, Sir; and the hon. Member himself asked me a question on the subject on the 14th of this month. I have nothing to add to my answer then; except that I have no power to take any such steps as those suggested.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether, in view of the serious nature of this case, in which the representatives of the relatives of the deceased men were refused permission to address the court, the Board of Trade will seriously consider the advisability of securing the fullest representation in all cases of this kind?

*MR. RITCHIE: I am not the President of the Board of Trade, and if I were I should not have the power to do as the hon. Gentleman suggests. Any person may have a right to be present, but there is a technical point; namely, that a solicitor representing parties has no right to address the court unless with the leave of the judge.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he considers

that a desirable state of affairs?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I will call attention to the matter on the Vote for the right hon. Gentleman's salary.

† See page 419.

BIRKENHEAD LICENSING CASE.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to a case (Superintendent of Police v. Hughes), decided on the 13th instant by the Birkenhead county justices, in which an executrix of a deceased publican, who was carrying on the latter's business prior to obtaining a transfer of the licence, was summoned for two offences on licensed premises; namely, permitting drunkenness and permitting gaming; whether he is aware that the case was dismissed upon the ground that the defendant was not a licensed person within the meaning of the Licensing Act, 1872, Section 17, and that, although entitled to sell, she could not be convicted of any offence under any of the penal sections of, that Act; and, seeing that this point is a casus omissus in the statute referred to, whether he will introduce legislation to remedy this defect in the existing law.

*MR. RITCHIE: I understand that the facts of the case are as indicated in the question, and it seems to be a case which would claim consideration on any opportunity of amending the licensing law generally. But I can make no promise on the point.

IMMIGRATION OF ALIENS.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the foreign population of the United Kingdom received last year a permanent addition of upwards of 14,000 aliens, in addition to 15,000 foreign sailors coming as passengers, and of whom no record is kept when they leave as members of the crews of outgoing British ships, and that there was an increase of over 800 per cent. in the number of Roumanians, of 39 per cent. in the number of Italians, and of 25 per cent. in the number of Russians and Poles arriving in this country, mainly for settlement in the East End of London; and seeing that 19,535 of these alien immigrants were in such a condition that they had to be relieved by the Jewish Board of Guardians and the Russo-Jewish Conjoint Committee, and 2,015, including 1,100 Russians and Poles, had to be supported by the poor rates of London, whether His Majesty's Government will deal with this matter, having regard to the difficulty of housing our own population in east and south London.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The figures in the first paragraph of the question are approximately correct, but it cannot be stated that the Roumanians, Italians, Russians, and Poles arriving in this country came mainly for settlement in east London, a large number of them being known to have proceeded abroad. The figure (19,535) stated in the question as the number relieved by certain voluntary Jewish organisations appears to represent the total number of persons, native and alien, assisted by those organisations during the last year. The number of aliens who arrived in this

country in 1900 and were assisted in that year by the agencies referred to may be estimated at about 4,000. During the year 1900 relief was given to 2,015 aliens (including 1,100 Russians and Poles) by London boards of guardians, but these figures included many persons who had arrived in this country in former years, and more than half of them received medical relief only. I am unable to make any promise as to legislation.

TREATMENT OF ALIENS BY THE UNITED STATES.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he is in a position to state how many of the aliens entering Great Britain last year, nominally en route for the United States, were refused passages by Transatlantic consular agents and steamship authorities at the ports of embarkation as undesirable settlers on American soil, and how many were refused admission at American ports under the Immigration Laws of Congress; and whether he is aware that these persons condemned as unfit by America were left in or thrown back upon Great Britain, their own countries also refusing them passports of re-entry.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I am unable to give figures as to passages to the United States refused by steamship companies. No Transatlantic consular agents have any power to refuse such passages. During 1900, 139 aliens arriving from the United Kingdom were refused admission to the United States under the Immigration Laws, but I cannot say how many of these entered Great Britain last year. This figure includes the persons rejected under the Contract Labour Law. I have no information confirming the statement in the last paragraph of the question as to the inability of these aliens to return to their native countries, and the information in my possession points in the other direction.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Have not Transatlantic consular agents at Liverpool power to refuse such passages?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I believe not. That, at any rate, is the information I have received.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Has the attention of the right hon. Gentleman been called to the Labour Gazette, published by his department, in which it is stated that the number of emigrants sent back to this country shows a very considerable increase? What has become of them?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I cannot say.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Does the right hon. Gentleman know how many went to Leeds?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: No, Sir.

FOOD SUPPLY OF MERCHANT SEAMEN;THE "MANCHESTER CORPORATION."

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that fifteen of the crew of the British steamship "Manchester Corporation" were sentenced by the magistrates at Montreal for refusing duty in consequence of not being supplied with sufficient food; that they were supplied with eight pounds of beef, three pounds of which was bone, for their dinner, and asked the captain for more, which he refused; whether he is aware that these men requested permission to go on shore to lodge a complaint to the proper authority, which the captain would not allow, and that the men then refused to work; that the magistrates ordered the men on

board and to pay all costs or go to prison for four weeks with hard labour; and whether it is his intention to recommend to His Majesty's Government the advisability of appointing a Committee to inquire into the question of the supply of food to seamen on British vessels.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: My attention has been called to the case referred to by the hon. Member, and I have been in communication with the owners of the "Manchester Corporation" and with the Shipping Federation. The master of the vessel has also attended at the Board of Trade to explain the circumstances of the case. I understand that the accuracy of the facts with regard to the men's food as stated in the question is denied on behalf of the owners. It appears that the fifteen men demanded to be taken on shore in a body to see the consul, and that, having regard to the exigencies of the ship's work, permission was refused. As the men refused duty they were proceeded against. I have seen the official certificate of proceedings at Quebec, from which it appears that they were convicted for refusing to obey a lawful command, and were each sentenced to four weeks imprisonment. This occurred on the 13th May. Ultimately the men agreed to resume duty, and were released from gaol on the 15th May, rejoining the ship. In reply to the last paragraph of the question, I am considering the advisability of appointing a Committee to consider questions affecting the interests of the mercantile marine as a whole, but I am not yet prepared to make any definite statement on the subject.

MR. NANNETTI: I should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether when the inquiry is held he will take steps to get the opinion of seamen who are interested in this matter?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I am not prepared to make any statement at present.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Is the right hon. Gentleman in a position to say what form this Committee will take?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: As I have said, I am not in a position to make any definite statement on the subject.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Will it be a Parliamentary Committee?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The right hon. Gentleman has already said twice that he is not prepared to make any further statement on the subject.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: But may I ask the right hon. Gentleman;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member must accept the answer. If he wishes to ask any further question he must put it down.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: OS course, Sir, I bow to your ruling, but I submit that my question arises out of the reply of the right hon. Gentleman.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! When a right hon. Gentleman has stated that he is not prepared to make any further statement, it is out of order to persist in asking other questions.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Very well, Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that I shall raise the question when the Vote for the right hon. Gentleman's salary comes on.

LASCARS ON P. AND O. BOATS.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg, to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the judgment of Mr. Justice Mathews, in the King's Bench, to the effect that under the Merchant Shipping Act lascars and

Europeans must be treated alike with regard to the crew space; and whether the Board of Trade intend to take any action in this matter.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Yes, Sir, my attention has been called to the judgment to which the hon. Member refers, but leave has been given to appeal, and, in these circumstances, I am not

prepared to make any statement in the matter at the present moment.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): Can the right hon. Gentleman say to what court it will be taken?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I am unable to answer that question.

AGRICULTURAL INSTRUCTION.

SIR W. HART DYKE (Kent, Dartford): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture if he intends to transfer the powers of his Board in respect of agricultural instruction to the Board of Education, or if he intends that the Board of Agriculture shall undertake the organisation and coordination of such instruction throughout England and Wales.

The following Question also appeared on the Paper:;

MR. WALTER PALMER (Salisbury): To ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he can inform the House whether it is proposed, in accordance with Clause 2 of the Board of Education Act, 1899, to transfer to the Board of Education the powers of the Board of Agriculture in matters appearing to relate to education; and, if such transfer is intended, whether he can state when it will take place.

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): I am not prepared to transfer elsewhere any part of the existing duties of the Board of Agriculture, the functions of which, especially with regard to agricultural instruction, might, on the contrary, with advantage be enlarged. I am unable to state as yet in detail how this can be brought about, but I attach great importance to the necessity for extending the work already done by the Board in collating and publishing the results of experiments and the most recent discoveries bearing on agriculture both in this country and abroad, and also to the advantage to be gained by friendly co-operation between the Board and county councils in devising the best methods of instruction and experiment.

TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION;SCHOOL BOARDS AND MUNICIPAL AUTHORITIES.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education, in view of the fact that the rate fund raised under the Technical Instruction Acts is not applicable for the maintenance of instruction in the obligatory and standard subjects of the Whitehall Codes, whether he can explain how school boards are to be assisted in the instruction of adult pupils in elementary subjects out of the moneys at present at the disposal of the municipal authorities.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): I am unable to answer this question, because, as I explained last week, I cannot accept the legal opinion upon which it is based.

DR. MACNAMARA: May I ask whether the question will be referred to the law officers of the Crown?

SIR J. GORST: I must have notice of that question.

INSPECTION OF SCHOOLS.

SIR W. HART DYKE: I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether he will state the number of schools in respect of which applications for inspection have been received under Section 3 of the Board of Education Act, 1899, and how many of such have been inspected.

MR. HANBURY (for Sir JOHN GORST): There have been applications from ninety-nine specific schools; of these twenty-four have been inspected, twenty are now arranged for, fifty-five are still under consideration. Besides this, applications have been received from county councils for the inspection of all their schools, which are under consideration.

WELSH COUNTY SCHOOLS.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS: I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether Subsection 2 of Clause 6 in the Education Bill, introduced by the Government this

session, would enable an urban district council in Wales or Monmouthshire under any conditions to claim from the education authority any share in the management or control of a county school (situated within such urban district) established under the Welsh Intermediate Education Act of 1889.

SIR J. GORST: I do not think that such a claim could be made under Subsection 2 of Clause 6 against the will of the education authority. The point, however, will be considered when the Bill is in Committee.

FLINT TELEPHONE EXCHANGE.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he will ascertain what is the cause of the delay in establishing telephonic communication with Flint, and whether it is possible to expedite the completion of the work.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): The Postmaster General understands that the National Telephone Company have for a considerable time been making arrangements to open an exchange in the town of Flint; but he has no information as to the date of opening, nor is the matter one in which he has any control over the action of the company.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS: Does the Postmaster General ever make friendly representations to the National Telephone Company when delays occur in establishing telephonic communication?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: No, Sir.

BUENOS AYRES PARCELS POST.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that all parcels from the United Kingdom arriving in Buenos Ayres by parcels post are not delivered, or even allowed to be inspected to see what they contain, until a tax of one dollar is paid on each; whether the exaction of the one dollar tax, not as import duty, is in accordance with the Postal Union regulations, and, if not, whether the British Government will make a representation to the Argentine Government with a view to its discontinuance; and whether in any case he will warn the British public that the receivers of parcels sent by parcels post to Buenos Ayres will have to pay the sum of one dollar on each, in addition

to the import duty, before they can find out what the parcel contains.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General is aware that in the Argentine Republic a stamp duty of one peso (about 1s. 9d.) is payable by the addressees of parcels received from abroad. This duty is said by the Argentine Post Office to be a fiscal and not a postal charge. The British Post Office is not a party to the Parcel Post Convention of the Postal Union. Nothing, however, either in the regulations of that Convention, or in those governing the parcels post between this country and the Argentine Republic, restricts the right to impose fiscal charges. In the forthcoming edition of the quarterly Post Office Guide the public will be warned of the imposition of this duty.

THE MANDAT CARTE.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he has yet come to a decision as to the introduction in this country of the mandat carte system, which works well on the Continent.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The introduction of the mandat carte into this country would be attended by practical difficulties; and the Postmaster General does not at present see sufficient reason for setting up a new system of transmitting money through the agency of the Post Office side by side with the existing money order and postal order systems.

COMPARATIVE COST OF FRENCH AND ENGLISH MONEY ORDERS.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that 5s. can be sent by money order from France to England for 1d., but that the cost of sending 5s. by money order from England to France is 6d.; and can he explain why 500 per cent. more is charged here than in France.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Yes, Sir. The French Post Office makes a uniform charge of 1 per cent. The British charges are framed with more regard to the cost of the service, which is not proportioned to the amount of the order. For sums under £;4 the advantage is with the French remitter. Above that amount it is with the English.

TELEGRAPHIC MONEY ORDERS.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that the money notified in each telegraph money order is brought to the residence of the person for whom it is intended in India and other countries, and that time and inconvenience are saved by this arrangement; and whether he will take steps for the introduction of this practice in the United Kingdom, or whether he will give it a trial.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General is aware that in India and other countries, where ordinary money orders are paid at the houses of the persons in whose favour they are issued, telegraph money orders also are so paid. But he is not prepared to introduce into this country an arrangement which would be confined to telegraph money orders, and to which there are practical objections.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON: Can the right hon. Gentleman say whether the system works well in India?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Yes, I think there are great recommendations in favour

of it.

TELEGRAPHISTS' EFFICIENCY BARRIER.

MR. WALLACE (Perth): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that, although the Norfolk-Hanbury conference definitely stated that technical knowledge was not to be required of telegraphists before passing the efficiency barrier, operators in the Edinburgh telegraph office have been called upon to produce evidence of technical skill before being allowed to proceed beyond the barrier; and whether the Postmaster General can state the reasons for this departure from the pledge given to the men in August, 1897, by the Duke of Norfolk and the right hon. Member who was then Secretary to the Treasury.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The regulations do not prescribe that any technical examination must be passed before a telegraphist can pass the efficiency bar, and if it is found on inquiry that there has been any misapprehension on this subject in Edinburgh, steps will at once be taken to put the matter right.

NEW POSTAGE STAMPS.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether the designs and colours of the new postage stamps have been approved; and whether, if the present contractors refuse to print penny red stamps, as in every other country and colony of the Postal Union, he will give other printers the opportunity of printing these stamps of equally good quality and at less cost.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The designs of the new postage stamps generally have been approved, but the colour of the new penny stamp has not been finally settled. There is no question of any refusal on the part of the contractors to print a red stamp.

QUEEN VICTORIA'S FUNERAL DAY; EXTRA PAYMENT FOR POSTMEN EMPLOYED.

MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, having regard to the fact that 2nd February, 1901, was ordered by the Postmaster General to be regarded as a bank holiday among Post Office employees, and to the rule that those clerks who do not get a bank holiday as a day of leave of absence receive another day in lieu, whether he can state why this practice has not been carried into effect at Southampton, Birmingham, and other offices with reference to 2nd February.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General decided that, while those of his staff who were required to perform their ordinary duties on the 2nd February, the day of Her late Majesty's funeral, should receive extra payment, the alternative of holiday at another time could not be allowed, because, in his judgment, that was not a suitable way of observing an occasion of public mourning.

SCOTTISH CENSUS.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether he has observed that the Return of the Population and Valuation of Counties, Burghs, and Parishes in Scotland just issued is based upon the Census of 1891; and whether, while the types are standing, he will agree to a corresponding Return based on

the Census of 1901.

*THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. C. SCOTT DICKSON, Glasgow, Bridgton):

The Return in question is issued triennially in advance of parish and county council elections, and it was thought inexpedient to wait till the new Census Returns are available; a revised Return incorporating the population figures for 1901 will be issued as soon as possible.

ACHILL POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS.

DR. AMBROSE (Mayo, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that there is no Sunday delivery of letters at Achill, county Mayo, and that inconvenience to the inhabitants is caused thereby; and would he see that in future letters and papers are delivered on Sundays.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The question of establishing a Sunday post to Achill, county Mayo, has been considered, but in view of the heavy deficit on the present service, the Postmaster General regrets that he would not be justified in sanctioning additional expense for the purpose of providing a Sunday service.

BALTIMORE MAILS.

MR. GILHOOLY (Cork Co., W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that the mails carried from Cork to Baltimore by the train leaving Cork at 11.50 a.m., arriving at Skibbereen at 2 p.m., do not reach Baltimore (a distance of nine miles) until the next day, that this mail mainly consists of letters from England which are of importance to fish buyers, and that the letters from Baltimore are conveyed by mail car at 4 p.m. each day, though a train leaves at 5.35 p.m.; and whether, in view of the fact that the line of railway from Skibbereen to Baltimore was constructed by the Government at a cost of £56,000 to promote the fishing industry, he will make arrangements with the Cork, Bandon, and South Coast Railway Company for the conveyance of the mails to and from Baltimore.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The total amount of correspondence for Baltimore is not large, and as the cost of the present service is high in proportion to it, additional expense for affording a second service in the day would not, as the hon. Member has already been informed, be warranted. Further inquiry is being made as regards the hour at which the night mail is despatched from Baltimore. Proposals have been made by the railway company with regard to the night mail service, but their demands have hitherto been such as the Postmaster General could not entertain.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has any objection to grant the Return relating to the Royal Irish Constabulary which stands on the Notice Paper for this day.*

*The following is the Return referred to in the question:;

"Royal Irish Constabulary.; Return showing the names, ages, religion, rank, and length

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): There are no official records at headquarters in Dublin which would give the information desired by

the hon. Member, and the preparation of the Return, extending over so long a period, would entail a very considerable amount of labour on the part of the constabulary throughout Ireland, as well as on the Clerks of the Crown and Peace. I hesitate to impose this labour unless satisfied that the Return will serve some useful public purpose. Perhaps the hon. Member will be good enough to communicate with me in the matter.

KILLAGLIN (CO. KERRY) LINE.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the attention of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction has been directed to the increase in the amount of the baronial guarantee in connection with the Killaglin, county Kerry, line; whether he is aware that this baronial guarantee has gone on increasing year after year, notwithstanding the fact that the traffic and receipts have also increased; and whether, having regard to the effect of the working of the Great Southern and Western Railway Company on the trade and prosperity of Killarney, he will cause the Department to compel an independent audit of the accounts of the line, at which the Kerry County Council can be represented, with the view of ascertaining the reasons for this increase in the baronial guarantee, and also so as to bring about the exclusion of the Killarney district from the payment of any portion of it.

of service of members of the Royal Irish Constabulary who were injured while on duty during the past twenty years; the name of the county to which each member was regularly attached, and the name of the county in which the injury was inflicted; the amount of compensation claimed and awarded in each case, and the name of the public authority, court of law, or otherwise, which made the award; the source from which the payment was made; the nature and extent of the injuries, and how caused; the duties, whether ordinary or special, and their nature, upon which such members were engaged when injured; the names of members retired as result of injuries, and the amount of pension, if any, in each case; the names and similar particulars of unsuccessful claimants, and the amounts claimed."

MR. WYNDHAM: The Department of Agriculture has no interest in or control over the line of railway referred to, and has no power to take action in the direction suggested in the third paragraph of the question. I am informed by the Commissioner of Valuation that the valuation of the railway was increased by a sum of about £1,000 in 1899, the former valuation having been merely placed on the land during construction and the buildings. This increase in valuation might affect the liability of the baronial guarantors to the extent of £350, but it would at the same time reduce the rates in the rating area through which the line passes by the same amount. Moreover, against this increased liability the guarantors last year received a bonus of £862 under the provisions of Section 58 of the Local Government Act.

WESTPORT POLICE ARRANGEMENTS.

DR. AMBROSE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that there is a police hut at Slinann and also at Moyna, in the Westport, county Mayo, police district; and that the distance between the

two is only three miles; and, seeing that there is a police barrack between and equidistant from these huts, and as the district is crimeless, would he see that the huts are removed and the police withdrawn.

MR. WYNDHAM: These huts were established for the purpose of preventing crime, and, in the opinion of the local authorities responsible, cannot at present be removed with safety.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL (Mayo, S.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the police at these huts have for a long time had nothing to do?

MR. WYNDHAM: I have no such information.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL: But it is the fact.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: Could not some of them be sent to Queen's Island, Belfast?
WESTPORT LAND SALES.

DR. AMBROSE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether any lands in the Kilmeena and Kilmaclatter districts of the Westport Union have been offered for sale by the landlord to the Congested Districts Board; and, if so, on what terms, and could he state when the purchase of such lands will be completed.

MR. WYNDHAM: This transaction has not yet been completed. It would, therefore, be inexpedient to disclose the terms proposed on either side.

BELFAST CONSTABULARY EQUIPMENT.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Royal Irish Constabulary in Belfast carry arms of any kind, and, if not, whether he will direct a change in this rule in view of the fact that the Royal Irish Constabulary carry arms in all other parts of Ireland.

MR. WYNDHAM: Since the year 1886 the baton has been the only weapon carried by the Royal Irish Constabulary in Belfast, except that during some disturbances in 1898 selected policemen were, by order of the Inspector General, armed for a short time with revolvers for their protection. Rifles are not carried in the streets except for ceremonial purposes, such as guards of honour. The Constabulary in Belfast have rifles and revolvers in their barracks, and are kept up in their knowledge of the use of firearms. The system as regards the arming of police in Belfast does not differ essentially from that in other towns in Ireland, as batons are the only weapons carried by men on ordinary town duty.

IRISH EDUCATION REGULATIONS.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will consider whether some alteration can be made in the new regulations of the Board of National Education under which all children, including infants under ten years of age, are obliged to be at the school at ten a.m., and are not allowed to leave the school premises, unless they obtain a doctor's certificate, till 3 p.m.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am informed that there is no such rule of the Commissioners as is referred to. On the contrary, managers of schools have been given a discretion under new regulations to permit infant children to leave before the termination of the regular school hours. The hour of attendance at school in the mornings is fixed by the local managers, and not by any rule or regulation of

the Board.

REEVES ESTATE, SKIBBEREEN.

MR. EDWARD BARRY (Cork County, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a farmer, named Cornelius Sullivan, of Kilnaclasha, on the Reeves Estate, near Skibbereen, has made several ineffectual attempts to dispose of the interest in his farm within the past few years; is he aware of the circumstances which prevent the sale being carried into effect, and will he endeavour to remove any impediment placed by the landlord to prevent the tenant from exercising the right of free sale in the open market.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Government have no power whatever to interfere in the manner suggested.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork): Cannot the right hon. Gentleman give the number of cases in the West Riding of county Cork in which tenants are similarly placed?

MR. WYNDHAM: I cannot.

MR. EDWARD BARRY: Can the right hon. Gentleman give any information as to the difference between the terms arranged by the Land Commission, on which the landlord can exercise his right of pre-emption, and the amount offered to the tenant in the open market?

MR. WYNDHAM: No useful purpose can be served by discussing that subject.

MR. EDWARD BARRY: Is not the amount at which the landlord is allowed to exercise his right of pre-emption less than one-third of the sum offered to the tenant in the open market?

MR. WYNDHAM: I am not prepared to discuss that aspect of the question. As I have said, the Government have no right to interfere.

MR. EDWARD BARRY: It is so, nevertheless.

INCENDIARY FIRES IN SLIGO.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, in the cases of alleged malicious burning of heather in Sligo county which were heard at the recent quarter sessions in Sligo the solicitor to the county council, who is also the Crown solicitor for the same county, has publicly announced his intention of appealing from the judge's decision to the Court of Assize; and whether he proposes to take steps against the Irish newspapers who have commented on these cases while still pending.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): At the request of my right hon. friend I will reply to this question. The answer to the first paragraph is in the affirmative. My attention has not been called to any comments on these cases calculated to interfere with the due administration of justice. No proceedings will, therefore, be instituted by the Crown, but if the parties interested are of a different opinion they can proceed by the same methods as are open to the Crown.

LOUGHREA HEATHER BURNING CASE.

MR. DUFFY (Galway, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland if his attention has been called to an application for compensation made by William Murphy, of Cupenagh, at the recent quarter sessions held in Loughrea before his

Honour Judge Anderson, for malicious burning of heather and grass on the 3rd May last; whether he is aware that the police swore that, during the course of their investigation into the cause of the alleged outrage, several parties, including two farmers named Clarke and Slattery, specifically stated that they saw William Murphy and his family set fire to the said lands, at the time and date sworn to in an information by Murphy that the malicious injury had been done to his property; whether his Honour Judge Anderson dismissed the application; and, considering the fact that Murphy was the principal witness in other malicious injury applications put forward by the landlord for the burning of mountain heather, over which Murphy acts as gamekeeper, and which were also dismissed by the Judge, whether he will direct criminal proceedings to be instituted against Murphy for swearing a false affidavit, upon which was grounded his application for malicious injury.

MR. ATKINSON: The reply to the first paragraph is in the affirmative; the claim was rejected by the county court judge. No evidence was given by the police to the effect stated in the second paragraph, nor were the police examined at the hearing of the claim, but statements have been made to them by three persons (including Clarke and Slattery), who allege they saw Murphy set fire to the lands. It is also the fact that Murphy was the principal witness in another similar claim for compensation, which was dismissed on the same occasion. The question of Murphy's prosecution is under consideration.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT; IRISH TRADES CONGRESS RESOLUTION.

MR. NANNETTI: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he has received a resolution passed at the Irish Trades Congress last month calling on the Government to so amend the Workmen's Compensation Act as to include all wage earners within its provisions, and urging that more efficient inspection should be exercised by the Home Office in order to secure as far as possible security from accident to the workers; also that all plant used in the execution of painters' work should be deemed scaffolding, and that the thirty feet limit should be removed from the Act; and whether the Government purpose this session to endeavour to give effect to this resolution.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, Sir, I have seen the resolution. We have never supposed that the present position of this Act was to be its final position. I have no further statement to make on the subject.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): May I ask the Chief Secretary when the Report of the Land Commission will be laid on the Table.

MR. WYNDHAM: I must ask notice of that question.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can arrange to take Irish Estimates on Friday next, and to put down first for discussion on that day the Votes for Supreme Court of Judicature and the Chief Secretary's Department.

MR. MACARTNEY (Antrim, S.): At the same time may I ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can arrange to take Irish Estimates on Friday next, and to put down first for discussion on that day the Vote for the Chief Secretary's

Department.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: My right hon. friend the Chief Secretary informs me that it is necessary, as I understand it, to take money under the Education Estimate in order to carry on the necessary work of education in Ireland, at a very early date. This matter calls for examination, and if it appears to be absolutely necessary I will put down the Education Vote first on Friday next. As regards the second Vote to be taken, I have an application from the hon. Gentleman that the Judicature Vote should be taken, and also an application from my right hon. friend the Member for South Antrim in favour of the Chief Secretary's Vote. There appears to be an agreement that one of these Votes should be second and the other third, and I will endeavour to make the most satisfactory arrangement I can between them, but I see no reason why both these Votes should not be got through as well as the Education Vote.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: May I say that the order in which I ask the Votes to be taken; namely, the Judicature Vote first; is the order desired by the overwhelming majority of the Irish Members? With regard to taking the Education Vote first, may I ask whether it is not the practice to settle the order of the Votes in accordance with the wishes of the Members from the country concerned, and whether, if the Education Vote is taken first, it will not mean the absolute breakdown of that arrangement, because it will necessitate the discussion of various matters which will postpone the consideration of the other Votes, which the Irish Members on both sides desire to be taken?

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: May I ask if the right hon. Gentleman did not state on Tuesday last that he would endeavour to arrange that the Votes be taken in the order of precedence desired by the Irish Members? And did I not then publicly ask him to put the Judicature Vote first?

MR. MACARTNEY: Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the demand of his supporters on this side of the House?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is quite true, of course, that if hon. Gentlemen on this side are in a minority, their views should not be ignored because they are in a minority, but as regards the questions put by the hon. Gentleman opposite and by my right hon. friend, as the House knows, I have always desired to put the Votes in the order which would meet the convenience of the House, having regard to the financial necessities of the administration. I will make careful inquiries into the matter, and if it is necessary to take the Education Vote I am afraid it must be done.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Has the right hon. Gentleman been informed, notwithstanding the Vote on Account, which was taken to cover several months, that it is necessary to get this Vote on Friday next? Of course it stands to reason it is not.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: There can be no controversy about it. I will inquire, and the Treasury will inform me whether it is necessary or not. It may be convenient, but if it is not absolutely necessary I will not press it. If it is absolutely necessary there is no choice in the matter.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: That is an indication of the absurdity of the system. The right hon. Gentleman has repeatedly stated that he is prepared to leave the

order of the Votes, not to his own side, but to the Opposition; to a Committee in which the Opposition would be in a majority. Now, if for the convenience of a Department that can be broken through, it shows the absurdity of the whole arrangement. It would be better to leave the Government to take the Votes on their own responsibility.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have suggested more than once the desirability of leaving the decision of how the Votes should be taken to a Committee on which the Government would be in a minority, but we know well enough that such a Committee, if Treasury reasons or reasons of administration affecting a great Department rendered it necessary that some particular Vote should be taken, would agree to give that Vote precedence.

MR. CHAPLIN (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury a question of which I have given him private notice, namely, whether the statement in The Times of Saturday, relating to an interview between the right hon. Gentleman and a deputation representing the London and County Brewers is substantially correct; whether the deputation urged the unfairness of sending the Beer Bill to a Standing Committee for a variety of controversial reasons, and strongly recommended its reference to a Select Committee, thereby rendering any chance of the Bill's passing into law this session practically hopeless; whether Mr. Cosmo Bonsor, who is stated to have introduced the deputation, is now serving in a judicial capacity on a Royal Commission which has before it a number of controversial questions of a similar character; and whether, if that is the case, Mr. Bonsor's services on that Commission are to be continued.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is quite true that on Friday last Mr. Cosmo Bonsor and some other gentlemen connected with the brewing interest called upon me in connection with the procedure to be adopted on Wednesday next, when the motion before the House will be that the Beer Bill be referred to the Grand Committee.

I informed them, as I should have informed any other deputation on any side of this question, that it was for the House to determine whether the Bill should go to the Grand Committee or to a Select Committee. I do not think that Mr. Cosmo Bonsor's action in this matter has, or ought to have, any effect upon his services as a member of the Royal Commission.

DR. MACNAMARA: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can give the House any assurance that the Education Bill will be proceeded, with this session.

MR. GRAY (West Ham, N.): At the same time, may I ask the First Lord, of the Treasury whether he can state when the Revenue Department (Customs) Vote will be taken.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I have no statement to make at present upon Government business beyond what I have already made, except to tell the House what I am informed, that it will be necessary to have a Ways and Means Bill at once, and I propose to introduce it to-night.

DR. MACNAMARA: May I point out that the answer, as I caught it, did not appear to be a reply to my question?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: What I said was that I really had no statement to make on the subject of Government business to the House at the present time, except the

statement I then proceeded to make in regard to Ways and Means.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): And what does that mean?

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: A Consolidated Fund Bill.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: We need not go into that.

FINANCE BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

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

Clause 2::

Question again proposed, "That Clause 2, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

MR. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Isle of Thanet) said he did not rise for the purpose of offering any opposition to the clause, because he ventured to think that it was a distinctly good one. He had always regarded the abolition of the sugar duties by Sir Stafford Northcote as a most deplorable blunder. It was a foolish act, for which, he, although himself an Under Secretary of State at the time, had declined to assume any personal responsibility, for he looked on it as one of the greatest financial blunders of the generation, with perhaps the exception of the abolition of the registration duty on grain by Mr. Lowe. Now the present Chancellor of the Exchequer tardily came forward to repeal the great mistake made by his colleague. The other day he accused his right hon. friend of being at least fifty years behind the times as regards the purview he took of financial questions, and the right hon. Gentleman had confirmed his opinion within the last few days by refusing an appeal made to him in the House of Commons to enlarge the advantages which we might confer on our fellow colonial subjects in this connection. A suggestion was made that the clause now under discussion afforded a favourable opportunity of making some return for the advances made by our colonies in connection with British trade. What was the reply of the right hon. Gentleman? His reply was that remedies of the kind had been tried and discarded forty years ago. The right hon. Gentleman, in fact, still hugged the delusions of past generations. He utterly failed to recognise the Imperial aspects of the question as it presented itself in the twentieth century. The right hon. Gentleman said they could not stand merely on sugar, but if they once accepted the principle embodied in a preferential tariff it must be extended to other colonial commodities. Certainly, and he for one could see no danger in frankly admitting that fact. He would not advocate exceptional treatment for sugar as distinguished from other taxable articles. He could quote the opinions of some of the right hon. Gentleman's most distinguished colleagues, Lord Salisbury and the Secretary of State for the Colonies strongly endorsing the principle of preferential trade within the limits of the Empire, which the clause now under debate offered a favourable opportunity of giving effect to. The Secretary of State for the Colonies had pronounced an opinion as to the desirability of offering special facilities to trade within the Empire. He said;

"There is a universal desire amongst all the members of the Empire for a closer union between the several branches, and in their opinion it is desirable, nay, it is essential, for the existence of the Empire as such. Experience has taught

us that this closer union can be most hopefully approached in the first instance upon its commercial side.

What did the Chancellor of the Exchequer say with regard to that? The speech of his right hon. friend referred rather depreciatingly to the practical effect of Canadian legislation and administration in carrying out the suggestion of the Colonial Secretary. That was not the way to support the Imperial principle which his right hon. friend's distinguished colleague had laid down with such emphasis. But his right hon. friend went further than that. In the discussion on Thursday last, he pointed out what he considered a great danger. He referred to the great difficulty of enforcing a provision such as was proposed, even if it were inserted in the Bill, and he talked about its being necessary to have in that event recourse to certificates of origin and other precautions of that kind. His right hon. friend went still further, and said that that provision could be easily evaded, and he gave hon. Members a geographical lesson by informing them that Cuba was not far from Jamaica; but the contrary statement held equally good, namely, that Jamaica was not very far from Cuba. During the last forty years the difficulties referred to by his right hon. friend had been successfully surmounted by every Government in the world. What did his right hon. friend fear? It was, he took it, that foreign goods would be received in the colonies and dependencies of the Crown, and transmitted to England under the seal of colonial produce. Was it in accordance with common sense to suppose that any colonial Government would for an instant allow its fiscal policy and revenue arrangements to be deranged by such a palpable device? The idea was absurd, as all other Governments

had devised means of checking evasions of that kind. The American Government, under the provisions of the McKinley Act, levied unequal duties on the produce of various countries according as the countries did or did not afford, in the judgment of the American Government, facilities for American trade. Sugar was at the moment a subject of acute controversy, largely a press controversy, he admitted, between the Governments of Russia and the United States, and did anyone suppose that the United States Government would allow Russian sugar to enter that country by Germany or France? It was unquestionable that what his right hon. friend was alarmed at was dealt with every day throughout the rest of the world. His right hon. friend spoke disparagingly of the attempt to enforce the right of this country and of Parliament to afford facilities for trade to the most distant portions of the Empire. The British Empire, so far as foreign nations were concerned, was one vast Imperial unit. Of course, financial arrangements differed in various parts of the Empire, but the object of the denunciation of what Lord Salisbury called "those unlucky treaties"; and he thought he even used a stronger term; was to allow such a policy. His right hon. friend admitted that Lord Salisbury had spoken strongly against the treaties which were now abrogated, but his right hon. friend apparently wished to reintroduce the system which the abrogation of these treaties had abolished for ever. His right hon. friend talked of the danger of reprisals from foreign countries, but was not that understood when the treaties were abrogated. His right hon. friend also talked about the strong feeling in Germany, and he would

add that he thought that that strong feeling had intimidated His Majesty's Government into what was a hostile act towards the great Dominion of Canada. He understood his right hon. friend warned the House of Commons against forcing the hand of the Government, or compelling them to assume an attitude which might give rise to offence in foreign countries, but foreign countries did not consider British feeling; they laid on every shilling of duty they could, and consistently framed their tariff arrangements according to their own necessities and requirements.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): So do we.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER: The hon. Gentleman opposite says "So do we," but the Chancellor of the Exchequer warned the House of Commons not to exercise its discretion, but to beware of offending foreign countries. He himself did not wish to say anything disrespectful of foreign Governments, but when the Chancellor of the Exchequer warned the House of Commons against exercising the liberty accorded to it by the action of Lord Salisbury, he might be permitted to quote what Lord Salisbury said. In June, 1891, in reply to a deputation, Lord Salisbury said;

"With respect to those two unlucky treaties (with Belgium in 1852 and Germany in 1863) that was made by Lord Palmerston's Government some thirty years ago, I am sure the matter of the relation of our colonies could not have been fully considered. We have tried to find out from official records what species of reasoning it was that induced the statesmen of that day to sign such very unfortunate pledges."

His right hon. friend would now wish to put the country back into the position from which Lord Salisbury rescued it; of not being able to legislate in concurrence with the colonies without obtaining the leave of foreign Governments. Lord Salisbury continued;

"But I do not think that they had any notion that they were signing any pledges at all. I have not been able to discover that they realised the importances of the engagements upon which they were entering. I think I can give you with the greatest confidence an assurance that not only this Government, but no future Government, will be disposed to enter into such engagements again."

In face of that statement of the Prime Minister, his right hon. friend had now conjured up the foreign bogey, and attempted to prevail on the House of Commons not to avail of that freedom of action accorded to it, but to allow its hands to be tied. Lord Salisbury concluded;

"We shall be glad indeed to take every opportunity that arises for delivering ourselves from those unfortunate engagements."

Lord Salisbury had obtained liberty of action for the Government, but now his right hon. friend showed a disposition to fetter that liberty. He should have scarcely thought that such a policy would be announced in the House of Commons by a colleague of Lord Salisbury. The action of the Government with reference to Canada was most unfortunate, especially in days when it was desired that the colonies should more cordially approach the mother country. He need not recall to the recollection of the Committee the resolution adopted at the Ottawa Conference, which consisted of

representatives of the whole Empire. That Conference passed a resolution, he thought with absolute unanimity, urging that liberty should be accorded to the colonies to make fiscal arrangements without reference to any foreign Power. The colonial Premiers, during their visit to England in the Jubilee in 1897, unanimously passed a resolution urging the adoption of the principle of preferential treatment.

He asked the House not to be frightened by the bogey raised by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, but to realise that the right to establish a reasonable preference for British goods within the British Empire was conferred upon them by the action of the right hon. Gentleman's own colleague. He warned the Committee that it was not a fact that public opinion was not favourable to such a policy. He thought that public opinion was favourable to it. Politics apart, the great mass of Members who had any opportunity of mixing with colonial statesmen were strongly impressed with the view that some solid substantial step in that direction was an essential element of Imperial rule. The colonies, of course, were able to look after their own interests. One saw, day after day, negotiations between the different colonial Governments and foreign countries. He asked a question himself not long ago of the Colonial Secretary as to whether it was not the case that a subsidised steamship line was actually in operation between Canadian and French ports, and the answer was that last year a steamship line involving a payment by the Canadian Government of £10,000 a year had been established between French and Canadian ports. His right hon. friend's speech the other night was a distinct repudiation, on the part of himself as at present responsible for the financial arrangements of this country, of the advance already made by Canada without any return, and his right hon. friend went so far as to hint that Canada did not know its own business. [Sir M. HICKS BEACH dissented.] He had certainly gathered that from the remarks of his right hon. friend, which, however, he unfortunately had to take second hand. He understood his right hon. friend, by an interpolation during another speech, to intimate that although it was true that trade between Canada and the British Empire had increased since the introduction of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's preferential tariff, nevertheless, Canadian trade with the United States had also increased, although the tariff arrangements did not apply. What did that mean? It meant that Canada would conclude that, after all, it would have done just as well if it had not adopted Sir Wilfrid Laurier's 33½ per cent. tariff. That was certainly calculated to discourage the Canadian Government, and he thought it was a most deplorable utterance. He would have been sorry to permit the clause to pass without uttering his emphatic protest against what he might call the levity with which a great Imperial movement had been treated by the Government. The Government had adopted the attitude they had without taking into account the unanimous opinion of the colonies. The great Commonwealth of Australia was guided by statesmen who had strongly pronounced themselves in favour of a moderate and reasonable application of the principle of preferential tariffs. There was a general demand throughout the Empire that such facilities should be granted, and he ventured to state there was a very strong and decided opinion in the United Kingdom itself

with regard to it. In the position in which they were now in, all he could do was to utter strong and emphatic protest against the short-sighted selfish policy which had been adopted, a policy which was calculated to drive the colonies into making bargains with foreign countries, perhaps to the disadvantage of Great Britain. He thought his right hon. friend was not fully alive to the great change of opinion on the subject which had taken place, not only in Great Britain, but throughout the Empire.

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): My right hon. friend says he is in favour of the general policy of the Finance Bill, but he has taken a most remarkable way of showing it. For a full half-hour my right hon. friend has entertained the Committee with a dissertation on matters on which we all know his opinion, and which have already been, on this clause, the subject of debate for three or four hours on Thursday last. Why did not my right hon. friend take part in that debate? Presumably my right hon. friend was in another and more agreeable place. Why was he not here on Thursday last? MR. JAMES LOWTHER: It was a fiasco.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: But if my right hon. friend had been present the fiasco might have been avoided, and his opinions might have been given effect to in some better way. As it was, the policy he now suggests was negatived almost unanimously by the House of Commons on Thursday last.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): But my right hon. friend will not say that that was a genuine expression of the opinion of the House.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: My right hon. friend has described it as a fiasco, but I am quite prepared to admit that the division on Thursday may not accurately represent the amount of support which the principle might obtain.

*SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I am quite satisfied.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I would ask hon. Members who have had an opportunity of expressing their views and of obtaining the opinion of the House, and who, like my right hon. friend, desire to support the clause generally, to be good enough to refrain from giving the House a repetition of the debate on Thursday last.

*MR. LOUGH thought the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman was a reasonable one. He quite agreed that if the Committee were to discuss the details throughout the clause there would not be any opportunity of coming to a decision on the general clause. The right hon. Gentleman's reply was not quite convincing, but it satisfied him that the proposal the Chancellor of the Exchequer was prepared to adopt was a reasonable one, and one which the Committee could accept. He desired to refer to two remarks which the Chancellor of the Exchequer made in his speech. In the first place, the right hon. Gentleman said that for the proposals of taxation the House must accept the authority of the Government. That was quite true, and the Committee was not entitled to reject a proposal of this kind unless it was prepared with an alternative proposal. The second remark was that the right hon. Gentleman would look into this matter in a year or two, and if he found in the practical working the Bill did not turn out well it should be modified.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I went further than that. I should not wait as long as two years.

*MR. LOUGH thought that nothing could be fairer than the way in which the Committee had been met, and that the result was to enable them to leave the details and approach the main question and discuss whether the tax was a wise one or not, and whether it was the best way to obtain the £;5,000,000 which the right hon. Gentleman proposed to raise by this clause. The hon. Member for the Isle of Thanet had said he was a Member of the Government which abolished the sugar duties, and had said what a foolish thing they had done by so doing, but he would quote what Sir Stafford Northcote, the Chancellor of the Exchequer of that Government, had said in 1874;

"The sugar duties are a source of revenue which does more harm than it produces good; their removal would be permanent; England would become the great entrepot of the sugar trade; and the result would stimulate and support the commercial interest of the country."

Those were the opinions of Sir Stafford Northcote, and it was highly interesting to consider them twenty-seven years

after. One prophecy Sir S. Northcote made was not fulfilled; the removal of the duties was not to be permanent; but a great many of his prophecies had been fulfilled. Sir Stafford Northcote said he hoped the island of England would become the entrepot of the sugar industries of the world, and what progress had been made in that district since the duties had been abolished? The consumption of sugar per head of the population in this country was 90 lbs., which worked out at a figure of at least 1,500,000 tons coming into our ports and distributed throughout the kingdom every year, or, in other words, 5,000 tons per week. This country had truly become the entrepot of the sugar industries; the consumption of sugar in this country was double that of any other country in the world. The next great consumers were Denmark and Switzerland, with a consumption of 45 lbs. per head; then came Germany with 30 lbs., France with 26 lbs., and Austria with 17 lbs. per head. All those countries were sugar-producing countries, yet owing to the wise act of Parliament nearly thirty years ago they produced not for themselves, but for the purpose of putting their products on our tables. As a result of that legislation there had been a steady improvement in the quality of Austrian sugar sent to this country, and the sugar sold in Prague at 4d. a pound was sold in this country at 2d. These were some of the advantages which were engendered by the wise act of twenty-seven years ago. The Committee must, however, consider that sugar was not only prepared food, but also the raw material forming the basis of hundreds of manufactures in this country. Great industries had been set up; the production of jam and marmalade had stimulated the growth of fruit in country districts; the manufacture of biscuits, confectionery, chocolate, and aerated waters had developed. No less than 150,000 tons of sugar were used in brewing in one year. When the Committee remembered these things they would see that it would be an evil day for this country when Parliament set itself to reverse the policy of 1874.

Having thus surveyed the practical effects of that policy he would ask the Committee to consider the principle which led, after great consideration, to these duties being removed. Adam Smith in his

great work on economics, in that chapter in which he dealt with "the most just taxes for the people," laid down principles for every good tax. The first principle was that the subjects of every State ought to contribute towards the support of the Government of the State as nearly as possible equally according to their respective abilities, with respect to the earnings which they enjoyed under the protection of the State. This tax set that principle at defiance in the most bold and open way. In 1776 Adam Smith treated sugar as a luxury, but no man to-day would deny that it was one of the most vital necessities of the people. Every good tax should be imposed in such a manner that all contributed in proportion to their wealth; in this case there was the exactly opposite effect. The rich man, if anything, used less sugar than the poor man, and £2,000,000 out of the £5,000,000 which the right hon. Gentleman hoped to obtain would be wrung out of the scanty pittance of those who could not afford to pay any tax whatever. Mr. Charles Booth showed that in London 40 per cent. of the population had to live on something that was below the proper margin of subsistence; all those people eat sugar, and the vice of the sugar tax was that, although the people could be made to pay, it was only to be done in the same manner as would be done by taking away a proportion of the food from an animal. The result of such a tax was that these people would become less efficient in their work, so that in a round-about way it would fall back upon the rich in the shape of higher wages or a smaller development of work. The second principle laid down by the same authority was that the tax an individual was bound to pay should be certain and not arbitrary. The amount in this case was not certain. No less than twenty-four different rates of duty were embodied in the Bill, and no purchaser abroad could tell exactly what was the rate at which his sugar would be admitted into this country. Adam Smith laid down the principle that it was better to lay on a heavy tax that was certain than a lighter one that was not, but that principle had also been set at defiance. The third principle was that every tax ought to be levied at the time and in the manner which was most convenient to the contributor to pay, and it certainly did seem convenient that when one bought an article he paid a small contribution; but Adam Smith also laid it down that it was the luxuries and not the necessities that should be taxed, and that if a barrier was placed between a man and what was necessary to him as great injury was inflicted upon him, and the State was not assisted. The best example of the luxury was beer. Nothing could be more proper than that on every glass of beer a contribution should be made to the State, because beer was not a necessity, and those whom necessity compelled to avoid the tax could very well abstain from using it. Sugar, however, stood in a different category, and the additional price would fall heavily on the people. The fourth principle was that every tax ought to be so laid as to take as little as possible from the people in excess of what was paid into the Exchequer. That was the most vital principle, and one reason why he opposed this tax was that he believed it to be a most extravagant tax; millions would be wrung from the pockets of the people which would not find their way into the Exchequer at all. The right hon. Gentleman had admitted that he had borrowed that scale from the United States. He had pointed out to the right hon. Gentleman that within four

years of the United States Government adopting that scale a great industrial combination had grown up in America called the Sugar Trust, which probably wrung from the pockets of the people as much as was got by the Revenue. He held that a tax imposed in such a way gave great opportunities; he would not say for fraud, but for practices which were very hurtful to the Revenue, and which no one who wished to see the tax voluntarily paid would approve. This sugar tax violated every one of the four vital principles which had been laid down by that great economist, and we were now to reimpose a tax which twenty-seven years ago had been abolished "for ever." He submitted that the Committee ought to be very slow to go back into the dark era out of which the country had come. He could not enter

into a discussion upon the Finance Bill without remembering that in this case there were two islands to be dealt with; Great Britain and Ireland. The duty would press with peculiar weight upon the people of Ireland. In that country 75 per cent. of the whole taxation was indirect and paid by the poor, and 25 per cent. was direct and paid by the rich, and this new duty, which imposed an additional burden of £500,000 a year on Ireland, would raise the proportion of indirect taxation to nearly 80 per cent. It would have been far better in the interest of trade and of the whole kingdom if, instead of the sugar and coal duties, 4d. had been added to the income tax. The sugar duty was certainly a bad and retrograde proposal, and he hoped it would be rejected by the Committee. MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said he did not oppose the sugar tax because he desired that less taxation should be raised this year. Indeed, he thought the Government had not imposed sufficient taxation to meet the expenses of the war and the ordinary expenditure of the country. But there were three other branches of taxation to which it would be better for the country, for trade, and for the consumer if the Chancellor of the Exchequer had gone for the additional revenue he required rather than to sugar and coal. He believed it would have been better to have increased the income tax to a larger amount. The yield of that tax had increased in ten years by some £120,000,000, which showed that there was very good ground for further increasing that tax. Apart from the question of income tax he differed from the view of the Chancellor of the Exchequer that further taxation could not be imposed upon wines, spirits, and beer. He doubted very much whether those particular liquor interests could not stand a considerable increase of taxation. At all events, an appreciable sum might have been raised by a large licence duty on public-houses. But assuming that that branch of taxation was exhausted, he would have much preferred an increase of the duty on tea or tobacco to the creation of a new duty, for the reason that the duty on tea and tobacco was practically a duty on the consumer, and only to a very slight extent did injury to trade. It would have been better to increase the duty than to disturb two great trades such as the sugar and coal trades for the comparatively small sum to be raised. The principle upon which our fiscal policy had for many years been based was that of freeing from taxation as far as possible articles of food and the raw materials of industry, and he opposed the sugar duty because it violated that principle. Its effect upon the consumer was the least important side of the question, the serious

aspect of the new taxation was its effect upon trade. With regard to the consumer, it was perfectly obvious that the imposition of a heavy tax upon sugar must hit very hardly the consumer, especially the consumer in Ireland, and, as was always the case with this sort of indirect taxation, the poorest classes were hit the hardest. The incidence of such a tax as the sugar tax, in the first place, whatever it might be in the ultimate result, must necessarily fall on the poorest classes, while in this particular case it would, he was afraid, fall more on the women and children than on the working men themselves. But putting aside the consumer, the gravity of the imposition of this tax was greatly increased from the fact that it was a new tax, which, for the first time for many years, would interfere in a most harassing and destructive manner with many industries throughout the country. The annual consumption of sugar per person worked out at 90 pounds, but in his Budget speech the Chancellor of the Exchequer had taken exception to that figure, stating that the personal consumption was only 56 pounds. That meant that the other 34 pounds per head were used in the different industries, so that a large proportion of the whole would not affect the consumer, but would do more harm by interfering with trade. In 1860, when Mr. Gladstone made a considerable number of alterations in the financial system of the country, he decided not to reduce the tea and sugar duties on the ground that those duties were simply revenue duties, and did not in any way interfere with trade, as they affected only the consumer, and he preferred to remit taxation which interfered with or disadvantaged trade. The same argument was used when the sugar duty was finally repealed. The people of the country were in a very different position now from that of twenty-five years ago, when that duty was repealed. At that time the duty was practically a mere revenue duty on consumption, and the total consumption, per head of the population was about 20 pounds per annum. It had now risen to 90 pounds, of which only 56 pounds were consumed by the individual, the remainder being used by the various trades. The total imports of sugar then were about £7,000,000, while now they were no less than £12,000,000. Therefore this duty on its reimposition would be a totally different thing from the duty repealed twenty-five years ago. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had argued that no real disadvantage would arise from the duty, because in 1893 the price of sugar was considerably higher than at present, and that it was since that time these different industries had to a large extent sprung up. But those industries had arisen chiefly because sugar was free, and could be dealt with in a free way, and because the trades believed it was cheapening, as it had cheapened. It seemed to him that it was no argument at all in favour of the imposition of the tax to say that at a time when the conditions were totally different the price was lower, and that therefore the tax could be imposed without interfering with or harassing trade. In connection with this question of trade he might point out that, thanks to the policy of successive Chancellors of the Exchequer, our import duties had been reduced in every possible way. Last year the number of heads and subheads of our tariff upon which taxation was levied, and which had therefore to be examined by the Customs officials, was forty-six. At one sweep the Chancellor of the

Exchequer was adding eight heads and no less than twenty-three subheads to the tariff, making a total of seventy-seven, instead of forty-six duties. This was in a free trade country, whose policy had been to free the tariff as far as possible. That meant the examination of all these imports and the handling of every parcel, with the result that much damage was done and great delay caused, while the freedom of trade, which was of the greatest possible benefit to the wage-earning classes, was very largely restricted. He did not desire to criticise the way in which the Customs authorities discharged their duty; he believed they did it as far as they could to the best possible advantage, but it was perfectly obvious that in any Customs system there must be a large amount of red tape, delay, and expense, and, still worse, a considerable uncertainty on the part of importers and others as to what new regulations might be sprung upon them at any particular moment. Recent debates in Committee had shown the impossibility of any goods of this sort being examined without leading to all sorts of harassing regulations and vexatious proceedings on the part of the Customs authorities against the importer.

Another point worthy of consideration was that, while at present sugar could be sent into the country, at any port the importer desired, and could be despatched direct to any place he wished, the imposition of this tax would of necessity lead to bonded warehouses for sugar, which would involve the sending of sugar to certain ports only. A large proportion of the sugar was imported by a few big firms, who would have their own bonded warehouses, with every facility, and so the small importer would suffer in competition by the difficulty he would have in clearing his goods and so on. He was afraid that one of the results of this policy would be the creation of great trusts, from which America had suffered so severely. The tendency of the legislation now under consideration would be to place these matters more and more in the hands of the great importers, to the detriment of the smaller men, and might ultimately result in a trust in sugar.

The fact was the Chancellor of the Exchequer had talked too glibly about broadening the basis of taxation. Broadening the basis of taxation of necessity meant equivalent restrictions on trade; and though it might be necessary to increase taxation, he regretted that the Government had not taken more trouble to avoid the disastrous results to a large number of industries in the country, and the destruction of many of the smaller ones in which sugar was largely used, which would arise from the harassing and vexatious nature of the duties. Instead of thinking, as the right

hon. Gentleman the Member, for Thanet had suggested, that Mr. Lowe and Sir Stafford Northcote were unwise in repealing the sugar duty, he thought the country had been fortunate in that for twenty-five years there had been, complete freedom from the duty. It might be said that there was want of foresight on the part of the Chancellor of the Exchequer of that date in relinquishing that particular branch of revenue, but it would have required a great deal of foresight to have anticipated the advent of such an extravagant Government as the one at present in power. It had to be remembered that in those days the revenue was very buoyant, the expenditure was kept down, and the system of throwing away money by means of doles had not been invented. If it was a

question of foresight, they might rather attack the present Chancellor of the Exchequer in view of the large sums of money given away in doles and the greatly increased public expenditure of the last few years. He should certainly vote against the proposal of the Government, not on the ground that so much taxation ought not to be raised, but because it might have been raised with much less distress to the consumer, much less injury to trade, and much greater advantage to the country as a whole.

MR. J. A. PEASE (Essex, Saffron Walden) said that if there was one subject more than another which interested the electors at the recent election in the Saffron Walden Division it was the imposition of the tax on sugar, and on behalf of those electors he desired to protest against the unfairness of the tax especially in its effect upon the poorer classes. He wished the Committee to realise how hardly the tax would press upon the poor and how little it would affect the rich. Recently he applied to a large co-operative store, which supplied 1,300 customers, 1,200 of whom were wage-earners, and asked how many articles they were about to raise in price in consequence of the imposition of this tax, and the list he received in reply contained the following twenty-seven articles; biscuits, home-made beer, blacking, bottled fruits, British wines, cake flour, cakes, candied peel, candy, chocolate, cocoa, condensed milk, preserved fruits,

health salts, jams, marmalade jellies, lemon cheese, lemon curd, sugar sweets, pickled bacon, lemonade, lime juice, pomfret cakes, sherbet, syrup, and treacle. If these articles were not directly increased in price there was an inferior article supplied as a direct consequence of the imposition of this tax, or the amount in bulk was reduced. The tax seemed to have not only disorganised the trade, but an increasing quantity of inferior sugar was being sold to consumers. He wrote to one of the largest grocers he knew in his constituency, and asked him how the tax affected his business, and he replied as follows;

"In reply to your inquiry respecting the operation of the sugar tax, our own experience is; and we supply a large number of small shops; that the sale of all kinds of sugar has decreased quite 20 per cent. Consumers amongst the working classes are purchasing an inferior quality. Retailers have only advanced their price ½d. per lb. The probable consumption of sugar per week in an average labourer's household is 6 lbs. per week. Of course, the increased cost of many other articles owing to the sugar tax bears very heavily on the working classes."

This grocer lived in a district where there was a great deal of grass land. Where there was a great deal of grass land the humbler classes could purchase milk, and for that reason they had a less quantity of sugar. On the contrary, where there was little grass, and where it was nearly all ploughed country, as was the case with the bulk of the county of Essex, a larger proportion of sugar was purchased by the working classes, and instead of 6 lbs. per week the quantity varied from 8 to 14 lbs. per week per household. It came to this, therefore, that owing to the imposition of this tax the average family had to pay something like sixpence per week every week in the year. If they assumed that it was only fivepence per week, and that the agricultural wage earner

received 17s. a week; the majority in the county which he represented got wages varying from 11s. to 13s. a week; the imposition of this tax meant 2½ per cent. of his income. He asked the Committee to compare this with the case of the richer individual who had an income of £1,000 a year. That individual, because of his greater wealth, consumed double the quantity of sugar, and 2d. had been added to his income tax. They were, therefore, only calling upon the rich man to pay 1 per cent. on his total income, whereas they were calling upon the poor man to pay 2½ per cent. of his total income. In that way this tax was unfair to the mass of the people. If he took the ordinary case of the agricultural labourer who had 12s. per week, and assumed that 12 lbs. of sugar was the amount his family consumed if living in an arable district, where they were unable to get any milk, the tax meant that this poor man would actually pay 5 per cent. of his total income; while the man receiving £10,000 a year would only pay 1 per cent. of his income. What were the principles on which taxation was imposed in this country? Were they rejecting the principles of Adam Smith, which the Member for West Islington had dwelt upon that afternoon? The hon. Member for West Islington alluded to the principle that payment should be made to represent equality of sacrifice between man and man. Instead of that principle being adopted, it appeared to him that equal payment or something similar was being adopted by the Government. If the principle of taxation in this country was, that every man, whether rich or poor, should pay an equal amount, the Government should say clearly that they desired a poll tax of say £3 per head, so that the electors might realise the principle which was involved. He objected to the tax not only on the ground that it was unfair to the poor, but because it was not proposed to make it even a temporary tax. In a period of declining prosperity this tax was placed on one of the staple foods of the people. In his judgment the last article any Government ought to place a tax upon was one which was an actual necessity in the daily life of the working classes of this country. He had always favoured direct rather than indirect taxation, and he should like every individual in the State to be called upon to pay his fair share for the government of the country; but it ought to be done in accordance with the principle of equality of sacrifice. In the past our prosperity had been largely attributable to the fact that we had free trade. When there were such men in the House as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Isle of Thanet and the hon. Member for Central Sheffield, who welcomed this tax because it was a protective tariff, and because it would lead to the imposition of a duty upon corn; men who regarded this tax as the thin end of the wedge; the Government ought to be on their guard and pause before instituting a tax which he believed would be retrogressive and detrimental to the great trade interests of the country.

MR. LOUIS SINCLAIR (Essex, Romford) said he also represented a division of Essex, and he could assure the Chancellor of the Exchequer that the sugar tax was popular. The working classes were quite ready to provide their quota of the expense of the war and to meet their obligation in connection with the increased expenditure of the country. The hon. Member for Saffron Walden had said that the poor man would be unduly taxed. Did the poor man consume chocolate?

MR. J. A. PEASE said his statement was that 1,200 wage-earners were consuming all these articles. He got the figures from a co-operative store.

MR. LOUIS SINCLAIR said that that was not his point at all. The hon. Member said that the man who had an income of £;1,000 a year contributed less in proportion than the working man. But the hon. Member did not take into calculation the number of employees which the man with £;1,000 a year engaged; and that if the man himself did not consume the sugar he consumed other dutiable articles.

Therefore the rich man was more taxed in proportion than the poor man, and it was perfectly right that it should be so. His object in rising was not to deal with these small matters, and he had no doubt that hon. Members opposite would take very good care that the burdens lay on those who could pay for them. So far as he was concerned, he could assure the hon. Member for Saffron Walden that he also stood there as a champion of the working classes, and that if there was anything to be done in their favour he would work with ardour equal to that of the hon. Member. He did not vote in favour of the resolution to allow a rebate on colonial sugar, as he thought that the colonies were quite able to fight for themselves. But he wished the colonies

to fight fairly, which up to the present they had not got a chance to do. If bounties were given by foreign countries on cotton, wool, grain, locomotives, and machinery, we should soon be up in arms, and put a countervailing duty upon these articles; and why not on sugar? The question was how the sugar bounties had affected the sugar producing colonies.

*The CHAIRMAN said he did not see how the hon. Member could connect the discussion of the clause before the Committee with bounties given by foreign countries on the export of sugar.

MR. LOUIS SINCLAIR said that the raising of the tax on sugar depended in great measure on the amount of sugar imported into this country, and if a trade were killed by imposing a tax on sugar the income which the Chancellor of the Exchequer would derive from the tax would be to that extent limited. He, however, did not wish to press the point of countervailing duties.

*THE CHAIRMAN said he did not think that the question of countervailing duties as applied to bounties was relevant to the discussion of this clause.

MR. LOUIS SINCLAIR: asked if he could pursue the question of bounties.

*THE CHAIRMAN said that the question of certain bounties which were given by foreign countries on the export of sugar could not be affected by anything in this clause.

MR. LOUIS SINCLAIR bowed to the Chairman's ruling. The hon. Member for West Islington had raised a question with regard to the polariscope, and had said that the density of sugar could not be accurately arrived at by the polariscope, because the power of eyesight was not equally the same in any two persons. But another hon. Member had given an interesting and accurate description of the polariscope, and he could assure the Committee that, with the aid of that instrument, there would be no difficulty in arriving at the density of all classes of sugar. In fact, the polariscope was used by foreign nations in giving their bounties. The amount of the bounty varied according to the degree of polarisation. In Germany, between 93 per cent. and 100 per cent., it

was £;1 3s. 4d.; in Austria, it was £;1 15s. 6d.; in Russia, it was even more, while in Holland it varied from £;1 18s. to £;2 3s. The hon. Member for Devonport had said that the West Indian sugar planters could produce sugar at a cost of £;8 16s. 8d. per ton, and that if they discarded their primitive machinery it could be produced at a cost of £;8 12s. They had, of course, to deal with the labour question, which had a great effect on the problem. He held that if only they could put the West Indian sugar planters on the same basis as other manufacturers they would not require anymore doles. The cost of producing sugar in Germany was £;11 15s. 6d. per ton, but on account of the bounties the manufacturers could put it on the market as £;10 per ton. If the West Indian colonies could have factories equal to those in Germany to enable them to meet the German competition, a great benefit would accrue to them, and he hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would enable them to erect such factories by guaranteeing loans to the West Indian planters.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order! The hon. Member seems to be discussing the question of the West Indian colonies and the sugar question generally. He cannot go into such a general discussion on this clause.

MR. LOUIS SINCLAIR said he had only wished to follow the arguments submitted to the Committee last week. He would simply urge that he considered this tax was a popular tax, and met with a far greater measure of approval from the working classes than any other tax suggested; and he hoped that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would adhere strictly to the programme of the Schedule.

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.) said that some relaxation of the tax as far as the colonies were concerned had been suggested in order to join the Empire together. He did not care very much about any attempt to join the Empire together, but if the Committee considered an exemption in favour of the colonies, he maintained that some exemption

should also be granted to the overtaxed people of Ireland. If the tax had been put on butter, instead of on sugar, it would afford an exceptional advantage, because butter was imported principally from, foreign countries. Of course, the tax was going to be passed. He had no hope that it would not, but he would appeal to the Chancellor of the Exchequer as to whether he would not give some assurance that it was not going to be a permanent tax. The tax would impose an extra duty of from £;500,000 to £;900,000 a year on the unfortunate Irish people, and it would be really cruel if the tax were to be permanent. He did not, think the Chancellor of the Exchequer had given any consideration to the effect of the tax in Ireland, otherwise he would have met the criticisms from the Irish Benches in a fairer spirit. Ireland, economically, was not capable of bearing an additional tax to the amount he had mentioned. There was in Ireland a larger proportion of non-productive population than in any other country in Europe; a larger number of inefficients in proportion to the wealth-producing people than in any other country. That was the effect of the declining and decaying state of the country which was shown not only in the emigration statistics, but also in the exceedingly low marriage rate, and in the exceedingly low birth rate. Therefore he thought that the Chancellor of the Exchequer before making the tax permanent should take these facts into

consideration. The Chancellor of the Exchequer ought also to take into consideration the fact that owing to emigration the population per square mile in Ireland was lower than any other European country. With reference to the new tax, he wished to know how much of the money which would be raised in Ireland would be spent in that country. What benefit were the Irish people to get from it? He himself did not think that any of the tax would be spent in Ireland; it would be spent in South Africa. The vast bulk of the Irish people had been opposed to the war at the beginning and were opposed to it still, and it seemed to him both unjust and unfair that they should be taxed to the extent of half a million a year to support a policy with which they were entirely out of sympathy. Then, again, whereas indirect taxation in England was only about fifty per cent., it was seventy-five per cent. in Ireland. In other words, seventy-five per cent. of the taxation of Ireland was derived from the earnings of the poor, who a few years ago, owing to bad seasons, were in a condition which could only be described as semi-starvation. In 1879, 1880, 1881, 1885, and 1886, certain districts in Ireland were in a state of starvation, and works had to be established in order to provide relief for the people. He hoped that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would give some assurance that the tax would not be permanent, or that, if it were to be permanent, he would afford some relief to the people of Ireland.

MR. JORDAN (Fermanagh, S.) said he opposed the clause in toto, not in any spirit of obstruction, but because he felt intensely and keenly the injustice of the tax. He did not oppose the clause because he wished to deny money to the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Only for the war the tax would not have been imposed, and he would put himself right by saying that no man regarded with greater detestation than he did such an unjust and unholy war.

*THE CHAIRMAN: This is not a proper opportunity to take to denounce the war.

MR. JORDAN said that, as he did not oppose the tax as a war tax, it might be concluded that he approved of the war. He felt strongly against the tax as an unwise tax. He thought that a tax should not be put on the food of the poor; it should have been put upon capitalists, who could have afforded it. It would have been a heroic thing on the part of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to have raised the income tax to 1s. 6d. in the £; and that would have saved him from having to tinker with sugar and coal. He did not intend to talk about polariscopes or things of that sort. He asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer to be good enough to put a polariscope in the library of the House, but the right hon. Gentleman did not respond, which rather astonished him, because he always admired the conciliatory speeches of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He desired to regard the tax from an Irish point of view. In the first place, he thought it would affect labourers in Ireland very seriously. Scarcely any food was used by the poor in Ireland into which sugar did not enter. Since the creameries had been started milk had become exceedingly scarce, and the people used sugar as a substitute. But the tax would also affect the farmers. In his part of the country wages were pretty high, and medium farmers found it exceedingly difficult to pay them. He did not object to servants getting large

wages, but middle-class farmers found it very difficult to pay them, and the addition of a tax upon tea and sugar would affect them very much. The tax would also crib, cabin, and confine the sugar trade. Traders in Ireland were not capitalists, and had no large balances in the banks, and had no large stocks. Suppose a trader bought a hundred bags of sugar, the tax would mean an addition of £50. That additional capital would have to be found, and the trader would probably have to raise it in a bank, at perhaps as much as 6 per cent. In the name of the traders of the country, therefore, he protested against the tax. The Chancellor of the Exchequer stated the other night that if the tax were reduced the reduction would go into the pockets of the middlemen. He denied that. In Ireland sugar was often sold at only 3d. per cwt. profit, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer would not have said what he did if he had known anything of the retail trade. As an Irish representative he opposed the tax strenuously and earnestly because it would be injurious to, farmers and labourers in that country.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport) said he did not propose to discuss the principle of the tax or its defects, but he wished to put a few questions to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, so as to have matters cleared up. The other night he was about to move an Amendment as to the special charges to be levied on particular classes of canned goods, but the right hon. Gentleman anticipated his desire, and promised to bring up an Amendment himself. He should be glad to know the character of the Amendment and when it would be introduced. He also pointed out to the Chancellor of the Exchequer that he ought to put the same duty on glucose that he put on the best refined sugar, because every pound of glucose used would depose a pound of honest sugar, on which the Treasury was entitled to its revenue. The right hon. Gentleman knew very well that glucose would be used not only by brewers, but also for adulterating confectionery and jams, and therefore its use should not be encouraged. He was not speaking in favour of the beer interest, although he supported the Pure Beer Bill, but if the Chancellor of the Exchequer wanted to protect the revenue and discourage the adulteration of food products, he would be well advised to put the identical duty on glucose that he put on the best refined sugar. The brewer paid on the specific gravity of the solution, and every pound of glucose used was exactly the same as sugar solution, and therefore not entitled to any preference. He had also endeavoured to draw the attention of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to the fact that the polariscope test was not reliable. He had pressed the right hon. Gentleman over and over again to appoint a Committee of chemical experts to inquire whether the test was right or not. It was pointed out the other night by his hon. and learned friend that the polariscope gave the exact percentage of sugar present. That was perfectly true and it was probably thought that by giving that exact reading the polariscope showed the Chancellor of the Exchequer straight away the amount of duty to which he was entitled. That was just what the polariscope did not do. What the right hon. Gentleman would want to know was what the refiner was going to get out of the sugar, as it was on that that the duty was levied. The polariscope did not ascertain that, it was the analyst. The analyst first ascertained by the polariscope the amount of sugar in the solution; then he

ascertained the amount of invert sugar, and finally the amount of mash sugar. The polariscope test, as far as the collection OF revenue was concerned, was serious in two respects. It deprived the revenue of taxation to which it was entitled, and it subsidised the refiner by enabling him to obtain more sugar than he paid upon. One per cent. of ash only prevented three times its weight of crystallisation. He only alluded to that to show what the effect would be between the sugar refiner and the sugar exporter. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would not leave the very strong position he taken had up with regard to this matter, but would watch it carefully.

*MR. STEVENSON (Suffolk, Eye) said there was one matter upon which he thought some further explanation was necessary before this Vote was taken, and that was with regard to the duty on glucose. When this tax was proposed to the House he understood that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was in favour of the principle that it should be regarded as a tax upon sweetness, and that any article into which that ingredient of sweetness entered should be taxed in proportion. There had been no opportunity for discussing this particular point, and he thought as it was a very important matter an opportunity should be given for discussing it before the Bill passed into law, or if no such opportunity occurred, would the Chancellor of the Exchequer take into consideration whether the sum charged upon glucose was sufficient to carry into effect the view he was understood to hold upon this subject? The sugar tax, he submitted, should not be enforced in such a way as to give the slightest preferential encouragement to other ingredients into which this sweetness entered, and if it could be shown by further research that any undue advantage was given to glucose as compared with sugar, he hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would take the earliest opportunity of setting that matter right. This was not an occasion when one ought to enter into the discussion of details; the tax was to be a permanent tax, and the only arguments which could be applied were those either in favour or against the tax. The hon. Member for Romford said it was a popular one. It could only be so described in the senses that it fell upon all. It violated all the economic canons; it was a tax on which more had to be paid than passed into the Exchequer, and one that pressed unduly upon those who could least afford to pay instead of those who could best afford it. In addition to that, it was an interference with trade, interfering with raw material used in great industries, and that being so it appeared to him that the right hon. Gentleman could hardly have alighted upon any article of consumption, to deal with which could have inflicted such great hardships from an economic point of view. If it had been a question as between tea and sugar, far less economic disturbance would be occasioned by increasing the duty on tea than by imposing a new duty upon sugar, which had long since been abandoned. Tea was not used as an article of production in this country, nor as an article of manufacture; whereas, sugar being so largely used in these respects, this tax would cause a very great disturbance in trade. He had noticed in a trade newspaper that at a conference recently held in the north of England it was stated that there were over 150 articles which would be affected by this tax upon sugar, and when the Committee considered how much of these articles were consumed, and the number of

people who were engaged in these manufactures they would agree that not only did the tax press hardly upon the consumers of sugar, but also on those engaged either directly or indirectly in these industries. He thought the income tax should have been raised, but that was a matter which could not now be dealt with, but he would just say that if that tax had been dealt with by means of a graduated scale the right hon. Gentleman would have obtained more revenue than he would from both tea and sugar.

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.) agreed that the tax was felt by large numbers of the poorer classes, but it was one of the most satisfactory signs of the times that there had been hardly any complaint from consumers. The great bulk of the population felt that, inasmuch as the expenditure was perfectly justified, they were quite prepared to make an effort to pay their share of it. This was a consoling thought to be noted when complaints had been loud from the wealthier classes.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): The hon. Member, while admitting that this tax will place a heavy burden on the poorest classes, claims that it is a satisfactory view of the situation that the poorest classes accept their burden without murmuring; but let me point out the ordinary poor consumers have no means of expressing their view, and we have yet to learn whether they have realised the effect of the tax. Perhaps the hon. Member is not aware that at the Co-operative Congress held a week or ten days ago, and which represented, I think, about six or seven millions of the population, there was a full debate and a unanimous and strong condemnation of the tax on the ground of its effect on the comfort and health of the working classes. The hon. Member thinks it is useful and patriotic that the poorer classes should bear a share of the burden of the war, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer has said it is in the true interests of peace and economy that they should know they are paying their share of the burden. But then he tells us this is to be a permanent tax. It is not therefore only a war tax, and once that fact is admitted the whole of the argument about the educational effect of this impost falls to the ground. My right hon. friend, who usually occupies a seat near me, the Member for the Montrose Burghs, has said something to the effect that "the tax-gatherer is a great schoolmaster," but I doubt if that is so in regard to indirect taxation, because nothing is more readily forgotten than the fact that high prices are the consequence of taxation. There is a well-known quotation, but I hesitate to ascribe it to anyone: "You may tax the shirt off a man's back without his knowing it"; and some five or ten years hence, when a poor woman is paying a high price for sugar, how will she know it is due to the war in South Africa? The argument upon educational effect is overdone.

I quite agree with what my hon friend behind me says, that this tax, perhaps more than any other, takes more from the consumer than he should be required to pay. If you are to seek some subject of indirect taxation, which should be increased without going into elaborate theories of economics, it should be a simple tax; but this is the most complex matter that can be conceived. I have here a list of some articles which has been taken from a trade journal. It includes aerated waters, beer,

blackening, biscuits, confectionery coffee extract, crystallised fruits, condensed milk, jams, jellies, fruit juices, china ginger (whatever that may be), chocolate, cocoa, custard powder, lemon squash, patent medicines, citrate of magnesia, sauces, and saline powders, British wines and spirits. Here is everything that can sustain man, spoil his digestion or cure his indigestion, or restore him after indigestion, or black his boots to enable him to take exercise. The list touches almost everything that affects mankind, and it must be remembered that if we look back to 1874 there were none of these things. Take, for example, condensed milk. The vast majority of the children in the large towns drink little less than condensed milk. It is not a luxury or an extravagant caprice which leads parent's to use condensed milk. It is the only way in which they see milk, and it will be raised disproportionately in price because of this duty. The right hon. Gentleman has, in many respects, met the Committee with extreme fairness. Many points which hon. Members have urged have been conceded. He made a concession, in which I have some interest, on Friday night, but which, I think, has not been noticed by the general public. The right hon. Gentleman abandoned the proposal to put the duty on apricots, which was proposed to be 7s., although no sugar was used at all; and in the adjustment of the graduation scale I am sure that he will take counsel of the trade, and not only of a purely scientific authority. We have great confidence in the right hon. Gentleman, he and his polariscope between them, to see full justice done. We believe in him, and in his desire to keep any trace of unfair protection out of the operation of the tax; but he cannot get over the main fact that this tax falls with the greatest severity on the very poorest in the country, the most helpless people, the women and children especially. A man may go to the public-house and seek his little enjoyment; he is not taxed extra for that; but upon the poor woman who has to provide sugar and condensed milk for the food of her children will

fall the burden. It is on their little budgets that this tax will fall.

The right hon. Gentleman used an expression which surprised me. He said the tax would have the effect of diminishing the consumption of cheap and unwholesome confectionery. I am afraid that it will have the effect of increasing the consumption of cheap and unwholesome sugar, because the experience of recent times has been that the less nutritious qualities of sugar have gone out of the market altogether, under the system of freer imports. Those who know most of the subject seem to be under the apprehension that with this tax these qualities will reappear. Sugar has become, as the enormous increase in its consumption has shown, a necessary element of the food of the people; and it is an excellent element of their food. Doctors have warned us against sugar. It is a bad thing if you live an unhealthy and sedentary life, but if you are a working man or woman few things contain more nourishment or do more to build up the health and strength of the people than sugar. Anything which checks the consumption of sugar or impairs the quality is surely a great misfortune to the country. I am opposed, therefore to the duty because it is cruel to the poor, because it causes the maximum of disturbance to trade, because it tends to, lower the quality of an essential article of food, and because it opens the door to the

possibility of protection of an insidious kind, against which the only safeguard we have is a polariscope managed and applied by the right hon. Gentleman. On these grounds I join cordially with my hon. friends in voting against the tax.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I will not detain the Committee more than a few moments, but there are two points which it is desirable I should notice. The right hon. Gentleman has attributed almost every possible evil to the duty on sugar. I have had to find many millions of additional taxation, and I am blamed for not having found a great deal more than the sum I have asked Parliament to provide. Hon. Members think that I ought to have had recourse to a greater extent to the income tax. The hon. Member for Islington said that another 4d. should be put on the

income tax, but I did not trace that suggestion in the right hon. Gentleman's speech. The right hon. Gentleman objected to the duty on sugar, but he occupies after all a position of some responsibility.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Not in the imposing of taxation.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I have not known a case in which the Leader of the Opposition admitted that a large sum had to be raised by additional taxation and denounced the Government for not having raised more by additional taxation and objected to the taxation proposed without suggesting anything else.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The right hon. Gentleman thinks that this is a void in my argument. I think something might be done to lay hands on a large part of the accidental increase in value of licensed houses. That of itself is a source which would furnish a greater amount I should think than this tax. Another source might be to withdraw those contributions from the Exchequer in aid of various interests.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I would ask the right hon. Gentleman and the hon. Member for Poplar to look into the statistics of this matter before they seriously make that suggestion again. Anybody who has done so will find that the scale of licence duties is an anomalous scale and one that requires readjustment. But if you are going to increase the duties for licences on public-houses by such an amount as the right hon. Gentleman suggests, then you will largely increase the vested interest, which is the great difficulty of all reformers of the licensing system. Would you not put a man who had paid a large sum for the grant of a new licence in a much stronger position than that which he at present holds? I do not believe that it is possible to approach this question of licence duties except as a part of a proposal for licensing reform; and I am certain that if it was so approached the right hon. Gentleman would find it absolutely impossible to raise anything like the sum which he contemplates from that source, because the great bulk of licensed houses are of small annual value, and because the increased gain on public-houses of comparatively large value would be as nothing compared with the five millions we are discussing. It has also been suggested that, instead of imposing a duty on sugar, I should have added to the tax on tea, which is a very high percentage on the value of tea at present; or that I should have dealt with tobacco, which is already taxed 250 or 300 per cent. All of these suggestions are absolutely impracticable for the purpose of raising so large an annual sum as is

contemplated by this tax, and if we are to retain any proportion between direct and indirect taxation we have no right to put any more on the shoulders of the direct taxpayers. The right hon. Gentleman denounced the sugar duty first of all as harassing and destructive to trade. Well, protests have been made by manufacturers on that ground, but I have taken care in the administration of the duty, and in the arrangements for drawbacks, to, as much as possible, avoid harassing the trade, and I think I may say that if the trade had been really harassed, or really anticipated the great injury that hon. Gentlemen opposite prophesied would be inflicted, the Committee would have heard very much more about it than we have yet heard.

Then the right hon. Gentleman dealt with the incidence of the tax on the poor, and quoted a resolution from the Cooperative Congress. But the Co-operative Congress naturally do not like the sugar duty, for one of the principal parts of co-operative business is the sale of groceries, and I admit that the sugar duty is not popular among the grocery fraternity. And when the right hon. Gentleman spoke of the duty extracting more from the pockets of the poor than it would yield to the Exchequer, he made a mistake, for the hon. Member for Saffron Walden, who has come fresh from contesting that constituency, and who is, therefore, primed with all the arguments, admitted that the tax to the consumer would only be 1d. per lb., or 6d. per cwt. more than it yielded to the Exchequer. It would not be easy to find an indirect tax which extracts less from the pockets of the consumers in comparison with its yield to the Exchequer. The right hon. Gentleman

has alluded to the various articles in which sugar is used, but I doubt if he would say that any of them could be considered necessities of life. [An HON. MEMBER: Condensed milk.] That, no doubt, has become a necessary, but its price has not been largely increased by the sugar tax. I have yet to hear any allegation of that kind. Of course, this tax is not a popular tax. No tax I ever heard of is popular. But of this I am sure, that the hon. Members for Romford and Islington were perfectly justified in what they said with regard to the willingness of the poorer classes of the people to bear this additional tax. As I said in introducing the Budget, this is by no means only a war tax, but is intended to meet the general expenditure of the country. With regard to the scale adopted in connection with the duty, I frankly admit that it has been a matter of great difficulty to settle it, but I think we have come to a fair conclusion as far as it is possible to judge at present. If we had settled it in such a way as to encourage the importation of a large quantity of very inferior sugar, so as to practically shut out foreign refined sugar and raise its price to the consumer here, I am quite sure we should have had strong remonstrances from foreign countries. We have had practically no such remonstrances at all, either officially or otherwise. That I put as *prima facie* proof that we have been fair between the two interests. At any rate, the proposals of the Government should have a fair trial before any adverse judgment is formed of them. The operation of the duty will be carefully watched in fairness to the interests concerned, including the Revenue. But it is not in the interest of the Revenue that we should charge duty according to such a scale as would be

protective to our refiners here. The tax on glucose I will deal with on Report, as I shall be

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. E

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Baird, John George Alexander

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Arrol, Sir William

Balcarres, Lord

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Ashton, Thomas Gair

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

Aird, Sir John

Atkinson, Rt. Hon John

Balfour, Capt C. B. (Hornsey)

Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.

Austin, Sir John

Balfour, Rt Hon. G. W. (Leeds)

Allsopp, Hon. George

Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy

Banbury, Frederick George

Anson, Sir William Reynell

Bailey, James (Walworth)

Bartley, George C. T.

Archdale, Edward Mervyn

Bain, Colonel James Robert

Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin

able to go into the subject more fully than is possible now. I trust that after the discussion we have had the Committee may be willing to come to a decision on a tax which I do not say is popular, but which I believe is required and cheerfully assented to by the mass of the population.

MR. E. J. C. MORTON (Devonport) pointed out that this matter had only been under discussion for two and a half hours, and, as it was a very important matter, he wished to say a few words upon it. It was the only tax imposed by the Government in the nature of an import duty, and he desired to point out one matter which he thought had been allowed to go by, and that was that it was not merely that sugar was now a staple article of food of the people, but that it had only become so during the last twenty-four years, and that it had taken the place of other articles of food which it had displaced, and the result was if they increased the price of sugar, and consequently the price of articles of food which contained sugar, the people would be forced (although it might not be a protective tariff) to return to the articles of food which sugar had taken the place of. An indirect effect of this tax had not yet been pointed out. The one country which had no bounty upon the sugar it exported; namely, India; had nevertheless been able to compete in the markets of Great Britain with the bounty-fed products of foreign countries, but if they destroyed or limited the

English market for sugar they would do much to crush one of the few export trades of India out of which the poorest population in the British Empire profited.

Question put.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 240; Noes, 159. (Division List No. 270.)

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

Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill

Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute

Bignold, Arthur

Gunter, Sir Robert

Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)

Bigwood, James

Halsey, Thomas Frederick

Nicol, Donald Ninian

Bill, Charles

Hambro, Charles Eric

Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay

Blundell, Colonel Henry

Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x

Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)

Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-

Hamilton, Marq. of (L'donderry

Parker, Gilbert

Bousfield, William Robert

Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.

Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley

Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)

Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashfo'd

Percy, Earl

Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn)

Harris, Frederick Leverton

Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John

Haslam, Sir Alfred S.

Platt-Higgins, Frederick

Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.

Haslett, Sir James Horner

Powell, Sir Francis Sharp

Bullard, Sir Harry

Helder, Augustus

Pretymann, Ernest George

Butcher, John George

Henderson, Alexander

Purvis, Robert

Carlile, William Walter

Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotter

Pym, C. Guy
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Hill, Arthur
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Cautley, Henry Strother
Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampstead
Rankin, Sir James
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lanes.)
Hogg, Lindsay
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Remnant, James Farquharson
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Hoult, Joseph
Rentoul, James Alexander
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Jackson, Rt. Hon. Wm. Lawies
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas Thomson
Chapman, Edward
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Russell, T. W.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Rutherford, John
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford

Colston, Charles Edward H. A.
Keswick, William
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Knowles, Lees
Saunderson, Rt Hn. Col. Edw. J.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm,
Seton-Karr, Henry
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Cranborne, Viscount
Law, Andrew Bonar
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Lawson, John Grant
Spear, John Ward
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Lecky, Rt. Hn. Wm. Edw. H.
Stanley, Lord (Lanes.)
Dalkeith, Earl of
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareh'm
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Davenport, William Bromley-
Leveson-Gower, Fred. N. S.
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Denny, Colonel
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Dickson, Charles Scott
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Thornton, Percy M.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.

Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Long, Rt. Hon. Walter (Bristol, S
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Lowe, Francis William
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Lucas, Col Francis (Lowestoft)
Valentia, Viscount
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Dyke, Rt Hn. Sir William H.
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. Ellison
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Fellowes, Hn. Ailwyn Edward
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Fergusson, Rt. Hn Sir J (Manc'r)
Maconochie, A. W.
Wason, John C. (Orkney)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Majendie, James A. H.
Webb, Colonel William George
Finch, George H.
Malcolm, Ian
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton
Fisher, William Hayes
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Maxwell, Rt Hn. Sir H. E) Wigt'n
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-un.-Lyne
Foster, Sir Michael (Lond. Univ.
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Galloway, William Johnson
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Garfit, William
Mildmay, Francis Bingham

Wills, Sir Frederick
 Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
 Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir Frederick G.
 Wilson, John (Glasgow)
 Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
 Mitchell, William
 Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh, N.)
 Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
 Molesworth, Sir Lewis
 Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
 Gore. Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
 Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
 Wodehouse, Rt. Hon. E. R. (Bath
 Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
 Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.)
 Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart
 Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
 Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
 Wrightson, Sir Thomas
 Goulding, Edward Alfred
 Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
 Wylie, Alexander
 Graham, Henry Robert
 Morgan, Hn. Fred. (Monm'thsh.
 Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
 Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
 Morrell, George Herbert
 Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
 Green, Walford D (Wednesbury)
 Morrison, James Archibald
 Younger, William
 Greene, Sir E. W (B'ry S Edm'nds
 Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford
 TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
 Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
 Mount, William Arthur
 Gretton, John
 Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
 NOES.
 Abraham, William Cork, N. E.)
 Goddard, Daniel Ford
 O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
 Allan, William (Gateshead)
 Grant, Corrie
 Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
 Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud

Griffith, Ellis J.
Partington, Oswald
Ambrose, Robert
Haldane, Richard Burdon
Pease, Alfred E. (Cleveland)
Atherley-Jones, L.
Hammond, John
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Pease, Sir Joseph W. (Durham)
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Hayden, John Patrick
Perks, Robert William
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Philipps, John Wynford
Blake, Edward
Helme, Norval Watson
Power, Patrick Joseph
Band, John
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Priestley, Arthur
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Rea, Russell
Boyle, James
Holland, William Henry
Reddy, M.
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Horniman, Frederick John
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Joicey, Sir James
Redmond, William (Clare)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Jones, David Brynmor (Swans'a
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Jordan, Jeremiah
Rigg, Richard
Burt, Thomas
Joyce, Michael
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Kennedy, Patrick James

Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Caine, William Sproston
Kitson, Sir James
Robson, William Snowdon
Caldwell, James
Lambert, George
Roche, John
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Leamy, Edmund
Schwann, Charles E.
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Channing, Francis Allston
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Cogan, Denis J.
Lewis, John Herbert
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Lundon, W.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Craig, Robert Hunter
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Sinclair, Capt John (Forfarshire)
Crean, Eugene
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Crombie, John William
M'Dermott, Patrick
Soares, Ernest J.
Cullinan, J.
M'Govern, T.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (Northants)
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Stevenson, Francis S.
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Strachey, Edward
Delany, William
Mooney, John J.
Sullivan, Donal
Dillon, John
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Taylor, Theodore Cooke

Donelan, Captain A.
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Tennant, Harold John
Doogan, P. C.
Moulton, John Fletcher
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Murphy, John
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Duffy, William J.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Newnes, Sir George
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gow'r
Dunn, Sir William
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Edwards, Frank
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Elibank, Master of
Norman, Henry
Ure, Alexander
Ellis, John Edward
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Emmott, Alfred
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Weir, James Galloway
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
White, George (Norfolk)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Farrell, James Patrick
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Fenwick, Charles
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)

O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Ffrench, Peter
O'Dowd, John
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
Gilhooly, James
O'Malley, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES;Mr. Lough and Mr. Kearley.

Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John

O'Mara, James

Clause 3::

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydfil) hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer, after hearing the arguments he was about to adduce, would agree to postpone the consideration of Clause 3. His reasons for asking him to accede to that request were based largely on the ground that in a very short time they would have a good deal of information bearing closely on the consideration of the clause which was not at present in the possession of the Committee. He understood that the right hon. Gentleman had under consideration, or at any rate had suggested, a full and complete investigation into the whole of the coal question, including, of course, the smaller question of the probable effect of the export duty upon coal. He hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer, if he honoured him with a reply, would state exactly his position now in relation to the inquiry which he

had suggested. In reply to a question that afternoon across the floor of the House, he stated that the answer of the Parliamentary Committee of the Mining Association of Great Britain had not been satisfactory; and he had, in fact, given a negative reply to the inquiry as to whether a Royal Commission would be appointed. But he (the hon. Member) did not understand from his having stated that the reply of the Mining Association was unsatisfactory that he did not intend having any investigation at all. He thought it was quite clear to the Committee that the whole opposition to the clause, as represented by the Amendments on the Paper, would be very considerably modified;he was sure it would be in his own case;if it was understood that a full investigation was to be made into the whole question, and if the right hon. Gentleman could only make a statement informing the Committee of the nature and scope of inquiry he proposed, the terms of reference, and, if possible, the composition of the Committee, he could assure him that for his part it would largely modify his opposition to the coal tax, because he was satisfied that the duty had only to be inquired into in order to show that it could not remain, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer proposed, a permanent tax. The next consideration he would ask him to weigh before he replied was that a very important Return had recently been

moved for by the President of the Board of Trade. It was moved for on the 14th of the present month and presented to the House of Commons on the 17th, but it had not yet reached the hands of Members. That Return related to the production and export of coal, and the number of persons employed in coal production in the principal countries in the world for a series of years from 1883 to 1899. He thought the Committee, including the Chancellor of the Exchequer, must see that a Return of that character, bearing so closely on the consideration of this question, should be in the hands of every member of the Committee before they were asked to consider the Amendments to the Bill.

There was another point. Section 3 of Clause 3, relating to the exemption of certain coal contracts which had been entered into, was now receiving the consideration

of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, but the right hon. Gentleman had not, so far as he could understand, come to a definite decision as to the exemptions he proposed to make. When the right hon. Gentleman first embarked on this coal tax he seemed hardly to know that there were any contracts at all; but he had discovered since then that a very large portion of the coal exported from this country was sold under contracts made some time before the coal was delivered. Many thousands of contracts had been sent into the Customs to be considered, but the Chancellor had not yet stated the exemptions he proposed to make. Before they entered upon the consideration of the clause at all they ought to know definitely what contracts he proposed to exempt, and to what extent in the matter of time he proposed to exempt them. They were entering upon the consideration of the clause with very little information as to its probable effect. The Chancellor of the Exchequer and the President of the Board of Trade had been asked again and again for information on various points, but they had not been given the information which it was essential the Committee should have before they considered the Amendments. He hoped by giving the Chancellor of the Exchequer a little further time he would be able to give them some of the information they wanted. For instance, there was a very important Amendment proposing to reduce the duty on small coal to half the amount of large coal, but he ventured to say that no one in the Committee, not even the Chancellor of the Exchequer, could tell how much coal exported from this country was large coal and how much small. Unless the right hon. Gentleman could tell them that, of course he could not in the least degree know what the effect of the exemption of small coal would be on the revenue he expected to gain. Then, again, there was the Amendment proposing to exempt the coal supplied to British residents abroad. At the present moment the Chancellor of the Exchequer did not know how much duty would fall on British subjects abroad. There were, indeed, a number of Amendments with regard to which the Committee could not arrive at a proper decision until they had further information, and on those grounds he hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would accede to the motion he desired to move.

Motion made, and Question proposed "That Clause 3 be postponed."; (Mr D. A. Thomas.)

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: This proposal has been before the country for more than two

months. The principle of the coal duty was fully discussed on the Report of the Resolution to the House and was approved by a very large majority, and it was further discussed on the Second Reading of the Bill when there was again a large majority. Now, when, two months from its first being proposed, we come to the consideration of the clause dealing with the subject the hon. Member asks for still further postponement in order that we may obtain information upon various points with which, I cannot help thinking, the hon. Member is pretty well acquainted already. Certainly, if he did obtain this information he would press for more, with a view to a further postponement. This is a purely dilatory motion; it is a proposal to which I cannot agree. The hon. Member has asked me to make a statement to the Committee upon certain points. As we come to the Amendments affecting those points I shall be ready to make those statements. We shall soon come to an Amendment with regard to the duration of the tax. Upon that Amendment I shall be happy to make a statement upon the question of the inquiry to which the hon. Member has alluded. We shall come later on to the question of the effect of the duty upon large coal and small coal, or upon the more valuable coal and the less valuable kinds of coal. There, again, I shall be quite prepared to make a statement to the Committee. Then there is the question of existing contracts, not a matter affecting the principle of the duty, but, if I might say so, an important side issue. When we come to the proposal in the clause for granting exemptions I shall be prepared to make a statement as to the principle on which the exemptions will be made. Therefore I think the request of the hon. Member to postpone this clause to some indefinite time merely in order that I may be able to make these statements is not a reasonable one, and I am not able to agree to it. I would, therefore, ask the Committee to reject the motion.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES (Swansea, District) said the Chancellor of the Exchequer was quite right in saying that this proposal had been before the country for about two months, but he apparently did not understand the real reason for which his hon. friend moved to postpone the consideration of the clause. The reason was that there were various subsidiary matters connected with the proposed legislation that arose even if they were to concede the main principle of the proposed tax. He would give an instance of what he meant, an instance that would very materially affect his attitude, once the principle was admitted, towards the actual terms of the clause now under consideration. He referred to manufactured fuel. When, some weeks ago, a deputation waited upon the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the very terms of the right hon. Gentleman's answer to that deputation showed that he was not adequately informed as to the character of the patent fuel trade carried on in Western Glamorganshire. Questions had been asked more than once as to the intention of the Government in regard to this manufactured fuel, but no satisfactory answer had been obtained, and he should support the Amendment in order, if possible, to receive information as to the exact effect of the tax not only upon the coal exporting trade, but also upon the manufacturers of fuel in Glamorganshire and other parts of the country. They had failed to extract that information, and before they went into details of the Amendment he should like to know what was the scheme of the Government. It was

obvious that one thing depended upon another, and the incidence of the tax upon the particular industry to which he had referred was a matter of very great importance.

MR. JOHN WILSON (Durham, Mid) said he was sorry that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had put his foot down so firmly in regard to the postponement of this clause. He thought it would have been better if he had waited to see if sufficient reason could be assigned to influence his mind upon this question.

When at first deputations waited upon

him for the purpose of asking him to withdraw this tax, they left his presence with the impression that the matter would be left open for future discussion before the final binding decision was given. Now the right hon. Gentleman told them that he could not possibly postpone the clause. Looking at this question from a workmans' point of view, he appealed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to postpone this matter until there had been a further inquiry. Both the President of the Board of Trade and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, as well as other hon. Members opposite, had stated that this tax would not affect workmen at all, because it could not reduce their wages. He thought that was too narrow a view to take of this question. There were other ways in which workmen could be injured besides a reduction in wages.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I do not see how that argument is relevant to the postponement of this clause. The same argument will apply to the clause even if not postponed.

MR. JOHN WILSON: said he was urging the postponement of this clause in order that the workmen's views might be inquired into before the decision of the House was made binding. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer would inquire into the matter more closely he would find that the workmen were far more concerned;

*THE CHAIRMAN: That matter cannot be inquired into and discussed until the clause is reached. Whether the clause is taken to-night or a week hence in this respect does not matter, and a discussion on the subject-matter which the hon. Member has raised cannot be raised until the clause comes on.

MR. JOHN WILSON said that already arguments had been put forward in regard to manufactured fuel and with reference to small coal and large coal being separated; also as to the advisability of a differentiation of the tax upon these classes of coal being made. Therefore he thought he was entitled to bring in the position of the worker, for he wished to show the right hon. Gentleman that if he would look up the workman's position he would find that this alteration

was as bad as a reduction of wages to the worker.

*THE CHAIRMAN: That argument, as far as I understand it, is possibly a good argument against the whole clause, but it is not relevant to the postponement of the clause. What the hon. Member really desires is the rejection of the clause. The hon. Member is only entitled to give reasons for the postponement of the clause, and not reasons for its rejection, and I must ask him to confine himself to the question before the Committee.

MR. JOHN WILSON said he was trying in the best manner he could to bring forward the reasons which were before his mind. If the questions of contracts and sub-contracts could be put forward as reasons for postponement he was bound to say

he did not see why such an argument could not be put forward as a valid reason for the postponement of the clause.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid) said that his strong argument in support of this motion was that they had not up to the present had the scheme of the Government upon this subject placed before them. This was a clause levying for the first time an export duty upon coal, and it was obvious that the scheme of the Government was entirely incomplete when the Chancellor made his Budget statement. The right hon. Gentleman had already told the Committee that he had statements to make upon various matters, and so far as the Committee were concerned they were quite in the dark as to the whole scheme of the Government. Before they were in a position to discuss this clause properly the Committee ought to know what the mind of the Government was upon this matter. Various matters had been pointed out of considerable importance which ought to conclusively prove to any reasonable-minded man that this clause ought to be postponed. Surely those were sufficient grounds for consenting to the postponement. Since it was stated that this was going to be a permanent tax the right hon. Gentleman had met the Association of Mine Owners, and he had held out to them the hope that they might look upon this as a temporary tax.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The hon. Member is quite mistaken upon that point. I simply asked them what their views were on the point, and they argued that it should be for one year only.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS thought that when the right hon. Gentleman invited mine owners to express their views he should be prepared to listen to them. This was one of the matters which he had taken into consideration in deciding to support the motion for the postponement of the clause. There were various other matters which went to the whole root of this question. Surely they were quite reasonable in asking that the clause should be postponed until they knew something about the scheme of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. If the contracts entered into before the proposal of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was put before the House in his Budget speech were exempted from the tax, practically the whole of the tax for this year would disappear. The question of putting 1s. per ton upon the inferior kinds of coal;

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is anticipating a number of Amendments which have already been placed Upon the Paper. He will see at once that no statement bearing upon those Amendments can be allowed upon the question of whether this clause ought to be postponed or not. Supposing this motion is successful, that would completely shut the mouth of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in regard to any questions which might be put to him upon this subject, and it would even exclude the very matter which the hon. Member wishes to be brought forward. I should certainly stop the Chancellor of the Exchequer if he attempted, upon a motion to postpone the clause, to make any statement of the kind indicated in regard to the proposals of the Government, because it would not be relevant.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS thought the reasons already given were entitled to a reply from the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Although this matter had been before the country some two months, they were still in the dark as to the scheme of the Government.

MR. ROBSON (South Shields) said he would confine his observations to one reason in favour of this motion, and that reason had been suggested by what the right hon. Gentleman had told them. When he introduced this tax the right hon. Gentleman made the very significant statement that it was extremely difficult in taxes of this character to collect information from the trade. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, therefore, had approached the tax with the plea of ignorance, for which he was not, of course, responsible. The very plea that he put forward was a most significant manifestation of the ignorance which he was admitting. There was no reason why, in regard to a tax of this kind, inquiries should not have been made from those concerned in the trade. There was no reason whatever, because this was a tax which did not admit of forestalment. What he desired was that the Chancellor of the Exchequer should give them a little more time, be it ever so little; be it only a week. He should prefer that he gave time for adequate and exhaustive inquiry. At any rate, they asked for more time in order that not only the coal trade, but the trades generally interested should be able to lay their views before the House. There was no fear of forestalling in this case, as in the case of tea, sugar, and tobacco. That could not be done in the case of coal. Coal had to be produced day by day, and deposited day by day at the pit's mouth. They could not because a tax was going to be imposed suddenly increase their output, except in small quantities, nor suddenly diminish their output. The trade must go on according to the line which it had taken up for some considerable time before the tax had been imposed.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer seemed entirely to ignore that, and the result was that he had deliberately refrained from making inquiries in the proper quarters, which would certainly have prevented him putting forward this tax in the form they now found it in the Bill. That consideration alone ought to be sufficient to induce him to delay the Bill further. How complete and how lamentable was the ignorance of those who advised the right hon. Gentleman was seen from that discussion. He was not even aware that those carrying on this trade did so under "long-forward" contracts. The other night he showed how little he had profited by the interval for the inquiry by putting forward an argument which must have astonished everybody in the trade. He said that during the month of April there had been a rise in the exports, and he put forward that argument; to a House containing among its Members those who were concerned in coal contracts, he solemnly put forward that argument to show that the tax had not diminished the volume of trade. One could not imagine a more complete misapprehension than that argument, and that misapprehension they desired to remove. He was not going to argue that point now; but he would simply explain that when the right hon. Gentleman suggested the tax, and said he was going to exempt existing contracts from the tax, obviously those concerned in the trade would seek to get out all their arrears under those contracts, and push them forward, and the first effect of the tax would be to increase the exports for that month; and yet the right hon. Gentleman came to the House of Commons and told them solemnly that the tax had been accepted by the trade, and that it had not injuriously affected the trade. He ventured to say that that was not the way in which the coal trade of the country ought to be treated.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Those arguments are not relevant to the subject under discussion, namely, the postponement of the clause. The hon. Member must address himself only to arguments which are relevant.

MR. ROBSON replied that he did not desire to evade the Chairman's ruling. He desired to point out the illustrations which had arisen in the course of the controversy as to the complete want of information. It was quite obvious that whoever had advised the right hon. Gentleman remained still in ignorance as to the commercial conditions of the trade, and every day afforded opportunity for him to profit.

MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) said he desired to support the Amendment of his hon. friend. Those engaged in the coal trade did not know at the present time upon whom the liability to pay this duty would fall.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The tax is being aid every day.

MR. M'KENNA said they did not know who would ultimately have to pay the tax.

*THE CHAIRMAN: That is a matter which can only be dealt with by an Amendment to the clause, and it is not relevant to the question whether this clause should be postponed or not.

MR. M'KENNA said that this Bill incorporated the Customs Consolidation Act, and there was nothing in the Finance Bill itself which imposed this duty upon anybody. There was no mention in this Bill of anybody who had to pay the tax, but by the Customs Consolidation Act this coal tax was to be put upon the exporter.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: There is an Amendment on the Paper which will enable that point to be discussed.

*THE CHAIRMAN: These arguments are not in the least relevant to the postponement of the clause, although they may be very proper arguments to bring forward when the clause itself is under discussion.

MR. M'KENNA said he only asked that this clause should be postponed until it had been decided who should pay the tax. Already in the north and in south Wales the Customs authorities were taking different lines, and under Section 20 the duty could not be recovered from the persons to whom the coal had been sold.

*THE CHAIRMAN: These arguments are not relevant to the postponement of the clause, although they may be relevant to the clause when it is reached; and then the hon. Member may ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer how he proposes to carry out his scheme, and how the payment is to be made. I must direct the hon. Member to discontinue his speech, on the ground of irrelevance.

SIR JAMES JOICEY (Durham, Chester-le-Street) said this was a very complicated question, and many of the difficulties had arisen because the Chancellor of the Exchequer was not in possession of sufficient information when the proposal was first made. The coal tax was a tax which had not been levied before for something like fifty years.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is now discussing the subject matter of the clause, and I have already pointed out that he cannot do so upon the question of postponing the clause. I must remind the hon. Member of the Standing Order relating to repetitions.

SIR JAMES JOICEY said the point he was endeavouring to make clear was that the

right hon. Gentleman did not possess sufficient information to deal with the point, and the House of Commons did not possess sufficient information. One of the chief reasons his hon. friend below him had given for the postponement of the clause was that a certain Return, which had been asked for, showing the reduction in the consumption of export coal, and the number of persons employed in coal production in the different countries of the world, had not been issued. That Return formed part of the information which, in his judgment, was absolutely necessary to enable the Committee to come to a decision upon the point. It was a most complicated affair, and hon. Members who were not familiar with it did not realise the difficulties there were in connection with it. They had had it under consideration now for two months, and there had been all kinds of negotiations going on to endeavour to inform the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the party he represented on the various matters connected with the subject, and surely there was a valid reason for asking the Chancellor of the Exchequer for the postponement of the clause till after the Returns, which were considered vital to enable the Committee to come to a decision upon the matter, had been placed before them. That was not an unreasonable request to make. It was not a dilatory matter. He did think that when they were going to make such an important change as this the Committee and the House should be in possession of all the information which was considered necessary. He thought information was being kept back from the Committee which was vital to coming to a proper decision on this matter. There was no question upon which not only the Chancellor of the Exchequer, but his Department, seemed to be less understood than the coal trade question, and the public themselves were perfectly ignorant of what the matter involved. It was a simple thing to say, "Put a tax of 1s. on exported coal," but surely before the Committee came to a decision upon an important question like that they should have sufficient information to see whether the tax would be imposed on a satisfactory basis.

*MR. FENWICK (Northumberland, Wansbeck) said since the Bill was introduced the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in relation to the duty on sugar, had had information given which justified him in altering the basis of the proposal. With reference to the tax now under consideration, he said that he intended to exempt contracts to a certain extent. Surely they were within their rights in desiring to have certain necessary information supplied to them before they came to the consideration of the tax. They desired the postponement in order that information might be supplied, so that they might be able to judge what effect the change would have so far as the contracts for the present year were concerned.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I would remind the hon. Member that the Chairman has already ruled that he will not permit any such statement on this Amendment. I hope hon. Members will not discuss this matter further.

SIR EDWARD REED (Cardiff) said this was a very important point. The Chancellor of the Exchequer was in a position where he could not give the information which some hon. Members thought necessary before the clause was discussed, and the Chairman could not allow them to proceed upon any other line than that of entering upon the discussion of the Amendments. At the same time he thought the

Chancellor of the Exchequer might make a general statement to the House, because of the unfortunate position in which they were placed. He was not aware whether the forms of the House would admit of any general statement such as was desired on the Opposition side. He did not speak with the slightest desire to cause delay. Many questions had been mooted and discussed for weeks past, and now the Committee entered upon the debate with respect to this clause in a perfect, fog as to what the intentions of the Government were. He certainly expected that, before they proceeded to discuss this clause, they would have had a statement of the decision of the Government in regard to certain matters which it was understood had been under the consideration of the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I will do so when the Amendments are submitted.

SIR EDWARD GREY (Northumberland, Berwick) said he fully admitted that there was great difficulty in discussing this clause on an Amendment, the effect of which was that the clause should not be discussed at present. The Chairman had ruled that it was impossible for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to make any statement of his intentions, or of any modifications he might propose to make, as long as this Amendment was before the Committee. At the same time the Amendment was not so unreasonable as the Chancellor of the Exchequer seemed to suppose. After all, what was their position in regard to this clause of the Bill? It was that time would show that their forecast of the operation of the duty was more just than that of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. It was, therefore, greatly on time that they depended to prove their case, and from their point of view the more time there was before this matter was finally decided the more chance there was of fresh information being forthcoming which might affect the mind of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He had the greatest respect for the mind of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and he had some hope that in course of time some impression would be made upon it by the working of this tax, and by the information which would be forthcoming. Some impression had been made already, AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)

Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)

Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)

Allan, William (Gateshead)

Channing, Francis Allston

Farrell, James Patrick

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

Cogan, Denis J.

Fenwick, Charles

Ambrose, Robert

Condon, Thomas Joseph

Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)

Atherley, Jones, L.

Crean, Eugene

Ffrench, Peter

Austin, Sir John

Cullinan, J.
Flynn, James Christopher
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Gilhooly, James
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Delany, William
Grant, Corrie
Blake, Edward
Dillon, John
Grey, Sir Edward (Berwick)
Boland, John
Donelan, Captain A.
Griffith, Ellis J.
Boyle, James
Doogan, P. C.
Hammond, John
Brigg, John
Duffy, William J.
Harwood, George
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Hayden, John Patrick
Burt, Thomas
Edwards, Frank
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Caldwell, James
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Helme, Norval Watson

for Amendments had been introduced since the tax was originally proposed. All he could say was that he fell back on the old proverb "Everything comes to the man who waits."

*SIR JOSEPH PEASE (Durham, Barnard Castle) said he sympathised very much with the view of the Chancellor of the Exchequer that he could not, while this Amendment was before the Committee, make a statement on certain matters with respect to which they wanted information. On the other hand, it was very difficult indeed to pass from the first Amendment without knowing what was to happen afterwards. The Committee had never had the slightest indication from the right hon. Gentleman of what was to be done with respect to coal exported under contracts current at the date when the tax was to begin. On that really a great deal depended, so far as their attitude towards the Bill was concerned. It was difficult to discuss the 1s. duty if they did not know the quantity of coal to which it applied.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS asked whether the Chancellor of the Exchequer would be prepared, with the leave of the House, to make a statement on the scheme as remodelled by the Government?

*THE CHAIRMAN: I will deal with the Amendments when we reach them, but I cannot deal with them until we reach the clauses to which they refer.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I will be glad to make a statement of the kind desired as soon as I am in a position to do so.

Question put.

The Committee divided::Ayes, 126; Noes, 167, (Division List No. 271.)

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

Norton, Capt. Cecil William

Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)

Holland, William Henry

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

Robson, William Snowdon

Horniman, Frederick John

O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid

Schwann, Charles E.

Joicey, Sir James

O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)

Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)

Jones, David Brynmor (Swans'a

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

Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)

Jones, William (Carnarvonshire

O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)

Sheehan, Daniel Daniel

Jordan, Jeremiah

O'Donnell, James (Mayo, S.)

Shipman' Dr. John G.

Joyce, Michael

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

Sinclair, Capt John (Forfarshire

Kennedy, Patrick James

O'Dowd, John

Soames, Arthur Wellesley

Leamy, Edmund

O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)

Soares, Ernest J.

Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)

O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.

Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R (Northants)

Leigh, Sir Joseph

O'Malley, William

Sullivan, Donal

Leng, Sir John

O'Mara, James

Taylor, Theodore Cooke

Lewis, John Herbert

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.)
London, W.
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Pease, Alfred E. (Cleveland)
Ure, Alexander
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Walton, John Lawson) Leeds'S.)
MacDermott, Patrick
Pease, Sir Joseph W. (Durham
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
M'Govern, T.
Philipps, John Wynford
Weir, James Galloway
Mooney, John J.
Power, Patrick Joseph
White, George (Norfolk)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Price, Robert John
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Morgan, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Rea, Russell
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Murphy, John
Reddy, M.
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Newnes, Sir George
Redmond, William (Clare)
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Reed, Sir Edw. James (Cardiff
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;Mr. D. A. Thomas and Mr. M'Kenna.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Rigg, Richard
Norman, Henry
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
NOES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Dalkeith, Earl of
Knowles, Lees
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Davenport, William Bromley-
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.
Davies, Sir Horatio D, (Chatham
Law, Andrew Bonar
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Denny, Colonel
Lawson, John Grant
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Dickson, Charles Scott
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Arrol, Sir William
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Lowe, Francis William
Baird, John George Alexander
Finch, George H.
Macdona, John Gumming
Balcarres, Lord
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Maclver, David (Liverpool)
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Fisher, William Hayes
Majendie, James A. H.
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.)
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W (Leeds
Flower, Ernest
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Bartley, George C. T.

Foster, Sir Michael (Lond. Univ.)
Mitchell, William
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)
Garfit, William
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Beckett, Ernest William
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Myrgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Bigwood, James
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Morgan, Hn. Fred. (Monm'thsh.
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Morrell, George Herbert
Bond, Edward
Greene, Sir E. W Bury S Edm'nds
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Morrison, James Archibald
Bousfield, William Robert
Hambro, Charles Eric
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Mount, William Arthur
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Bullard, Sir Harry
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Butcher, John George
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Parker, Gilbert
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Heaton, John Henniker
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert W.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Helder, Augustus
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Henderson, Alexander
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotter

Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampstead
Pretymann, Ernest George
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Hogg, Lindsay
Purvis, Robert
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Pym, C. Guy
Chapman, Edward
Hoult, Joseph
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham
Rankin, Sir James
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Rentoul, James Alexander
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Jebb, Richard Claverhouse
Renwick, George
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Ridley, Hon. M. W. ((Stalybridge
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Rutherford, John
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Wills, Sir Frederick
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Thornton, Percy M.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)

Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
 Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
 Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh, N.
 Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse
 Tritton, Charles Ernest
 Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
 Seton-Karr, Henry
 Tufnell, Lt.-Col. Edward
 Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
 Sharpe, William Edward T.
 Valentia, Viscount
 Wylie, Alexander
 Simeon, Sir Barrington
 Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H. (Sheffield
 Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
 Skewes-Cox, Thomas
 Warr, Augustus Frederick
 Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
 Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
 Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
 Spear, John Ward
 Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.)
 TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
 Stone, Sir Benjamin
 Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
 Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
 Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne)

*THE CHAIRMAN: The Amendments on the Paper in the names of the hon. Member for the Cricklade Division and the hon. Member for North Monmouthshire are in the wrong place. The Amendment standing in the name of the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil is not in order. It proposes that a Select Committee should be appointed, and that proposal is beyond the scope of the Bill.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS moved to insert, instead of "as from the 19th April," "as from the 19th October," so that the coal duty should be levied from the latter date only. He thought it would be obvious that the effect as well as the object of the Amendment was to postpone the operation of the duties on exported coal for six months. He thought it was not unreasonable to ask that some notice should be given, when a tax so unexpected as this was imposed upon a very complicated industry, before it came into operation. He might say that his interest in this matter arose entirely out of his position as a Member of Parliament, and it was because he thought this tax would fall upon the workman, and not upon the millionaire coal-owners of whom the Committee had heard, that he thought it right to move the Amendment, so as to allow the trade to look round and see what the effect of the tax would be. A great deal of coal which had to be delivered was on contracts which were entered into before the Budget proposals of the right hon. Gentleman were laid before the House. There were bunkering contracts,

contracts for bunker coal, which were generally made in October for the ensuing year, and it would be very hard upon those who had contracted for bunkering coal if the tax came into operation as from the 19th April. The right hon. Gentleman had

said that one of the reasons for bringing forward this proposal was that, in his opinion, it would fall upon the foreigner in a large degree. He did not wish to discuss the advisability of putting a tax on the foreigner, but he pointed out that, under a contract which he held in his hand, entered into by a London firm with the North German Lloyd, if this tax came into operation from 19th April the London firm would lose £2,500 this year, and the German line would gain it. If this tax came into operation as from 19th April it would press very hardly on those who had contracts running through 1901; but if it was postponed for six months they would have time to see what could be done with regard to it. If the tax was postponed they would to some extent get rid of the question of contracts, and to that extent get rid of a very difficult question. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would say what his proposals were with regard to the exemptions of coal which was sold to be delivered in the following six months. It might be said that if the Amendment was carried the exporters would be able to supply their contracts for two years to come; but that would not necessarily be the case, because words might be inserted in the Bill to show that it was only the coal which had to be delivered for these six months that was exempted. He begged to move.

*THE CHAIRMAN pointed out that if the Amendment was disposed of it would cut out the Amendment of the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil, as well as that of the hon. Member for Flint Boroughs, because he must assume that, if the Committee declined the proposition to postpone the operation of the tax for six months, still less would they incline

to extend that principle to eight months or twelve months.

MR. D. A. THOMAS submitted that it was the universal practice to put the larger amount and the longer time to the Committee first, and that such a course would not cut out his Amendment.

*THE CHAIRMAN: That was the system once, but it has not been so for many years.

MR. D. A. THOMAS asked whether he would be in order to put the point and divide the House upon the question whether the words "as from" should be omitted;

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order! I have already said that if the hon. Member for Mid Glamorgan was not successful the hon. Member's Amendment would not be in order. The hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil did not give notice in time; the hon. Member for Mid Glamorgan did.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: I gave notice this afternoon, and I submit that no notice is necessary.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order!

Amendment proposed;

"In page 2, line 28, to leave out the words 'as from the nineteenth day of April,' and insert the words 'from the nineteenth day of October.'"; (Mr Samuel Evans.)

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

Clause."

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: This is an Amendment I could not possibly accept, because the effect of it would be to postpone the operation of the duty altogether for a considerable part of the year, without distinction between contracts existing at the date of the Budget and contracts entered on after the Budget. I can see no reason for postponing the operation of the duty, either to the date suggested or to any other date. I have listened to the hon. Member very carefully, and so far as I could judge he gave no reason for the Amendment he has moved. I may state that I carefully considered this matter, because, as I reminded the Committee, when Sir Robert Peel revised

the duties in 1842, he allowed an interim of four months before the commencement of the duty. The result was that an enormous exportation took place within those four months in order to avoid the duty, with the worst results to the Revenue, and with some unfairness to those who were not able to accelerate their exportation. As to the exemption which I propose to allow, I might, by leave of the Committee, make a statement, but it must be on the understanding that that statement shall not be made the subject of a discussion, which will properly come later.

*THE CHAIRMAN: If the right hon. Gentleman makes a statement it will be impossible to preclude other Members from discussing it, and from various points of view. It is not regular to make such a statement; but sometimes it has been done by the general assent of the Committee.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: In that case I think it would be best, in reply to a question to-morrow, to state what the proposals of the Government are. The hon. Member has named the 19th October. I will say now that practically, though not in all cases, there will be a large exemption to existing contracts up to the end of September.

*MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs) believed that if the imposition of the duty could be postponed for a year there would be such an amount of information from all parts of the world to which the British coal trade extended as would satisfy the House that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was proposing a course of great danger to our commercial supremacy. When in South Africa, some years ago, he was shown the point at which British coal and Transvaal coal met in equal competition. That point was being steadily pushed towards Cape Town, and what took place in South Africa was taking place in other parts. The consular reports from Italy showed that manufacturers were considering the desirability of doing industrial work by water power, and the extension of that power would have the effect of lessening the consumption of British coal in the Italian market. The pressure of foreign competition was felt upon our coal trade in every part of the world, and the effect of the permanent 1s. duty would be to contract the fringe of that trade everywhere. Within the last few months there had been a marked change in the coal trade of his district, and the effect of a restriction of the export trade would be increase of competition in the home trade, and in this competition the poorer collieries, working on a very small margin of profit, would succumb.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES said he desired to say a word or two in the interest of a

class of persons who had been somewhat ignored hitherto in the debates on this question. He referred to the class of commission agents and middlemen at ports like Swansea and Cardiff, who had perhaps made their arrangements for carrying on the coal trade from year to year. These men had suddenly found themselves face to face with a completely new situation. He was not speaking without some knowledge of the way in which the coal trade was carried on, at any rate in the port of Swansea, because it so happened that he had been concerned in many cases in which questions regarding the Welsh exportation of West Glamorganshire coal from Cardiff to France and to North Italy had arisen, and he found that a very considerable trade had developed between Swansea and Genoa. The margin of profit, however, was very small indeed. Now, the Western Glamorganshire export coal trade was totally different from that which took place at Cardiff. It was not an export trade carried on with the view of supplying the great navies of the world with steam coal. It was a precarious trade, carried on by comparatively small companies and individuals without any very large capital, competing against French coal-producers, and coal-producers in many other parts of Europe. This tax had been put upon this class of colliery owners and middle men, who by their tact in sending out agents to different ports abroad had been slowly building up a trade which had never been prosperous in the sense in which the great steam colliery trade had been prosperous. Now these men were face to face with a proposition which affected them and their capital invested in the business in a most vital way. Admitting, for the purposes of argument, that the coal tax was under the exceptional circumstances of the case justifiable, the Chancellor of the Exchequer was doing an injustice to these men by imposing the tax without due and adequate notice.

MR. JOHN WILSON (Durham, Mid) said that earlier in the evening he had endeavoured to raise the question of the position of the workmen with regard to this tax, and had endeavoured to show why the operation of the tax should be postponed. There could be no doubt that the fringe of the coal trade would be contracted, and he submitted that the proper test to apply to this question and to the hardship of this proposal on the community was not by its results on the monopoly trade, or the coal that would always be in demand whether there was a 1s. tax or not, but by the way it would affect the inferior coal and the fringe of the coal trade. There was as much demand for inferior as for superior coal, and it was a well-known fact that it took as many men to produce 100 tons in an inferior coal mine as in the superior coal mines. This was an aspect of the question which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had not taken into account. As to whether the foreigner would pay or not was not now his point. In his opinion he would not pay, as he was too keen a business man, and he knew the market would be regulated by the law of supply and demand. He would take his own county, and assume that what the Chancellor of the Exchequer had said with reference to monopoly was right as regarded two-thirds of the coal. But that left two million tons which would not be wanted, and not only the two million tons, but the men who produced it would not be wanted. According to Government returns, the number required to produce two million tons of coal was 6,300 men and boys, and if the right hon. Gentleman could look upon a state of things like that with composure

it was more than he could do. He was secretary of one of the largest trade unions in the country, and he could assure the right hon. Gentleman that from January to April last 1,200 men had been discharged in Durham simply because the markets were dislocated. They had to pay those men 10s. a week out of the hard-earned

wages of the miners who were working, and if 6,300 men were to be added to that number the position would be serious indeed. Not only would the miners not be wanted, but the men who trimmed the coal in ships would not be wanted, the men in locomotives and on board ships would not be wanted, and stagnation would fall on the trade of the whole country.; because trade was kept up not by the purchases of the few, but by the purchases of the workers. Then many whole communities depended on the miners. He knew villages in Durham and Northumberland which had not a single industry, and in which the whole of the shops and every tradesman depended upon the miners, and if collieries were stopped, as assuredly they would be stopped if a third of their coal was not required, then whole villages in Northumberland and Durham would be rendered desolate. He asked the right hon. Gentleman to pause before he imposed a tax of that kind. It was unique in its application and in its impingements, and, as he would find out before he was done with it, in its results also. They had been told that it was a matter of wages, and that when contention arose between the employers and the men, the men would be strong enough to look after themselves. The President of the Board of Trade said that the miners were strong enough to withstand the demands of the employers, and the Colonial Secretary urged them to keep their money in order to meet the employers. He wished to say that they had a better way than striking. The men needed no impetus to strike, but their leaders wanted to keep them on lines of conciliation. They wanted to avoid conflict, and not to have an internecine war between employers and workers, and he thought that statesmen who managed great departments of State should hesitate before suggesting that the workers should prepare themselves for a strike. He wished to say that they recognised the rise and fall of the markets, and that they would try and prepare the men to recognise that wages should follow the markets on lines of conciliation and arrangement. He saw in The Times newspaper that the miners had been receiving great wages, and that the capitalists had made large profits. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had said the same, and the President of the Board of Trade had issued a return, in which, however, there was a difference of five millions, between a statement in one part of it and in another. It was stated in one portion of the return that the increase of wages between 1897 and 1900 was £;16,000,000, whereas in another part the increase was given as £;21,000,000. If such a return could bear the mark of ignorance and show such a discrepancy there was need for closer inquiry and more careful scrutiny before the figures were launched forth to inflame the public mind. His two hon. friends the Members for Morpeth and the Wansbeck Division would be able to state their own case, and he ventured to state that their situation would be even worse than the position in Durham. Assuming that one-third of the coal now exported from Northumberland was not required, that would mean that 8,000 men and boys would not be required. He had never clamoured

for the war, but he was quite willing to bear his share. He would, however, advise the Chancellor of the Exchequer to turn in some other direction in order to get the money he required. Last year The Times newspaper, by anticipation, dealt with the coal tax in a very trenchant manner.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. Member has rather forgotten the Amendment now before the Committee. He is dealing with the whole tax, but that question will not arise until the clause is put as a whole. The question now is; when will the tax come into operation?

MR. JOHN WILSON said he apologised for infringing the rules of debate. He had tried to state the case from the workman's point of view, and also from the wages point of view. The tax might mean that instead of a man being able to work six days a week he might be only able to get work on two or three days. The average wages of the coal-getter in the best of times last year was only on an average 7s. 5d. per day, and he would respectfully urge on the Chancellor of the Exchequer that he should find some other means of obtaining the money he needed. He would suggest to him, if the coal trade of the country had to pay, to let the people who received profits for which they did not work pay.

*THE CHAIRMAN: These questions are not relevant to the Amendment now before the Committee. I must ask the hon. Member to confine himself strictly to the question of when the tax is to come into operation.

MR. JOHN WILSON said he trusted the Chancellor of the Exchequer would turn his attention to some other form of taxation. He would heartily support the Amendment which had been moved by his hon. friend.

MR. WILLIAM ALLAN (Gateshead) said he should like to direct the attention of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to the results that had already accrued from his Budget proposals, and he would give the right hon. Gentleman one reason why he ought to accept the Amendment and postpone the tax until he got more information, and knew exactly what the effect of it would be on one of the greatest industries in the country. When the Bill was introduced he himself came to the conclusion that it was conceived in ignorance and born in stupidity. He would tell the Committee one effect which had already been produced, and many others would follow. In Northumberland they had a large contract for coal to supply the Danish railways, but since the introduction of the Budget two-thirds of that order had been given to Westphalia, and the proposed tax did it. Was that the way to maintain the industries of the country? That was not the way to raise taxation. Taxation should be raised with a minimum of irritation, but that tax had been imposed, for a trifle of two millions, in a way which produced the greatest irritation throughout the country. The appeal of the hon. Member for Mid-Durham ought to go to the heart of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and cause him to agree to the postponement of the tax until he had more information as to the effect it would have. If the right hon. Gentleman mixed with the shipbrokers and miners of the North of England he would find that every word spoken by the hon. Members for the Mid-Durham and Wansbeck Division was absolutely true. Why, therefore, not accept the Amendment? It was not British business at all to resist it under the circumstances, as the tax was, in his opinion, unnecessary and unjust.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH pointed out that the arguments of the last two hon. Members who had spoken were against the tax altogether, and were not directed at all to the Amendment. The effect of the Amendment if accepted would be that the tax would commence on 19th October instead of 19th April. This would not meet the views of the hon. Member for Gateshead, because he objected to the tax in toto. In regard to the point raised as to the difficulty of the coal trade in Northumberland as compared with other parts of the country, he had been told that the particular contract named by the hon. Member for Gateshead had been lost by a difference of 8d. per ton, which was a clear proof that, although that class of coal might not be able to bear a tax of 1s. per ton, it could, at any rate, carry a tax of 4d. per ton. But it was perfectly absurd to suggest that from the fact that one contract had been made and another lost they could judge the general effect of a tax of this kind. He could quote instances in which contracts had been made on very good terms since the tax was imposed on the understanding that the foreigner would pay the whole of the tax. The strength of the case of the hon. Members who had just spoken was in respect of the cheapest kinds of coal, and when the Committee came to the Amendments relating to that class of coal he would be prepared to consider the subject.

MR. D. A. THOMAS, referring to the remark of the Chancellor of the Exchequer that the strength of the case against the tax was in regard to the cheaper coal, pointed out that the South American and other markets also were affected. The hon. Member for Mid-Glamorganshire, in moving his Amendment, said he was not interested in the coal trade. That was a most improper remark, because hon. Members were supposed to speak in Parliament not in their own interests, but as representing their constituents. He himself was not interested in the coal trade to anything like the extent generally supposed, and he spoke in the House only for his constituents in Merthyr Tydvil, the largest mining constituency in the United Kingdom. He desired to know whether

he would be in order in moving the Amendment he had handed in.

*THE CHAIRMAN said the Amendment the hon. Member had handed in was to omit the words "as from" and to insert the words "on and after." The Amendment under discussion was to omit the words "as from." If those words were struck out the hon. Member would be in order in moving to insert "on and after," but the question did not arise yet.

MR. D. A. THOMAS said he only desired to get the Chairman's ruling. He understood that if the present Amendment was carried it would be competent for him to move to insert the words "on and after"?

*THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. D. A. THOMAS was anxious to ascertain whether the Chancellor of the Exchequer was correct in his statement on a previous occasion that the words "as from" were the same in their effect as "on and after." The resolution upon which the clause was based provided that the tax should be imposed "on and after" 19th April, and the right hon. Gentleman had previously stated that it would be from the beginning and not the end of the 19th day of April. Legal gentlemen, however, appeared to differ as to the point, but a case somewhat parallel was decided in the courts in 1891. In the case of the South Staffordshire Tramways

Company v. the Sickness and Accident Assurance Association, it was held by Mr. Justice Day, Mr. Justice Lawrence concurring, that the effect of the word "from" a certain date excluded that date, and was not equivalent to "on and after." The case went to the Appeal Court and was decided in favour of the appellants, but not on that particular point. If there was any room for doubt, it was surely much better to make it absolutely certain by embodying the words as given in the resolution on the coal tax. Assuming his contention was correct, it would mean a difference of about £30,000 to the revenue, and it would certainly be much better to insert these words than to have to go to the law courts to get the matter decided. With regard to the argument of the hon.

Member for Mid-Glamorganshire, it would be more satisfactory to insert 31st December than October 19th, because contracts were not usually made from October to October, but they were made in October for the following year. Moreover, they were not by any manner of means always made in October. If the market was rising they would be made in August or September, while if the market was depressed they might not be made until November or December.

*MR. FENWICK said the Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated that he knew of a contract which had recently been made, under very favourable conditions, in connection with which the foreigner had agreed to pay the tax.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I mentioned more than one.

*MR. FENWICK said he had heard of one himself, and he would state to the Committee the conditions under which it was made, as it was more than likely that the contracts to which the right hon. Gentleman had referred were made under similar conditions. In the case of which he had heard it was agreed that if the foreigner paid the tax he should be supplied with the coal at 1s. per ton below the market price, or the exact value of the duty. It was rather to the advantage of the foreigner that, until the tax was disposed of, he should pay the duty, because the probabilities were that the duty would be reduced so far as North Country coal was concerned, and it was not at all likely that it would be increased. On the other hand, it was to the interest of the English coalowner when selling to sell it at the lower price, because the lower price would then be entered in his books as the realised selling price, and when the quarterly ascertainment, upon which wages were based, was made, the benefit would go to the employer, and not to the workman.

MR. ROBSON, while supporting the Amendment, could not agree with some of the reasons urged in its favour. He believed that for the next few months it was almost certain that a considerable portion of the tax would be paid by the foreigner, but after about six months the foreigner would be in a position to put the tax upon us, because he would then have increased the capacity of his pits, increased his output, and be able to supply coal in substitution for that which would no longer be taken from the English market. At present we exported about 49,000,000 tons per year, and the foreigner would have to pay practically any tax that was put upon it, because for a few months he could not possibly produce coal in substitution for our exported coal. But when once the foreigner had increased the number of places in his pits to which he could put his men he would be able to supply coal in the place of that which this tax would displace.

As soon as he had increased his output to that extent; which would be in a very short time; he would be able to throw the whole of this tax upon the English producer.

SIR JAMES JOICEY said that while it might be true, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer had said, that when Sir Robert Peel fixed a tax upon coal he gave four months notice, and that during the four months there was an enormous increase in the exportation of coal, he would point out that at that time the exportation of coal was extremely small. It could then be counted by tens of thousands of tons; in any case, it was not more than a few hundred thousand tons; whereas now it was counted by tens of millions of tons. Another important fact was that at that time collieries were worked only for about six months in the year, so that in case of emergency the output could be increased. The present state of affairs was altogether different. For the last two or three years the producers of coal had been doing their very utmost to increase the output, because prices were high and profits large; he had never denied that fact. But circumstances were altogether different now from those of 1842, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer need be under no apprehension that, if this Amendment were accepted, the coal producers of the country would be able to increase their output very extensively. If, say, six months notice of this tax were given, he felt certain the right hon. Gentleman would not find it seriously to his disadvantage.

SIR JOSEPH PEASE desired to call the attention of the Committee to the position of the exporter on the northeast coast, especially in the Hull and Grimsby trade with the Continent. Coal was only a part of their cargo. While many ships were fully loaded with coal, a large number went out with mixed cargoes, and they came back loaded with raw materials for the manufactures of Lancashire and Yorkshire. The tax had come so suddenly on this trade that nobody at present was able to say exactly where he stood. It was the outward and the homeward freights all put together which made the current rate, which was so important to the manufacturers of Lancashire, Yorkshire, and the north of England. He hoped that the six months provided for in this Amendment would be granted, in order that the regular trade of the country should not be damaged. The 40,000,000 tons of coal and the 10,000,000 tons of bunker coal was no small item in the large trade of this country, and if they by any means lowered that quantity they would damage the steam fleet, which was so vital to their manufacturing interests. This was a point to which he wished specially to call the attention of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. If they damaged in any way the steam fleet they would also damage the shipbuilding yards, and throw more people out of employment.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said the Committee had been put in a very difficult position by the way in which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had approached this question. His object in moving that Amendment was simply to postpone the operation of the tax for six months. He did so for two reasons: (1) to give the trade, and particularly the owners of the poor collieries, time to look about; (2) to endeavour to mitigate the severity of the tax as far as possible. If the right hon. Gentleman was going to deal with the contracts, they ought to know what he was going to do, and if he gave that information then he might probably withdraw

his Amendment. The right hon. Gentleman proposed dealing with the small collieries in a certain way, but he did not disclose it. He presumed that the right hon. Gentleman was willing to place an ad valorem duty upon some classes of coal. He thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer should at once place his whole scheme before the House with regard to existing contracts, and state how they proposed to deal with inferior coal and coal of the smaller size. He would therefore move the adjournment of the debate in order to enable the Chancellor of the Exchequer to tell the Committee what the Government proposals were.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I will put the motion, but I cannot allow the Chancellor of the Exchequer to make any such statement upon it. I cannot under the rules of the House permit a discussion of the Bill upon a motion for progress.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said that in that case he would not think of persisting in the motion.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said they were now discussing the postponement of a clause, and they were suddenly told that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was going to make some extremely important changes, which he had not yet disclosed to them, and which it was supposed would have some influence upon the discussion. What was going to be done with regard to contracts he did not know. They did not know what was going to be done with regard to small collieries or small coal, and these were very serious matters. He had very serious objections to this coal tax, as well as the sugar tax, on account of the interests of the borough he represented, where they imported nothing but sugar and exported nothing but coal, he did ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer to stand to his guns and continue to do what he had announced to the House that he intended to do. The right hon. Gentleman should not make concession after concession, departing from his scheme of taxation, whether in deference to the representations of hon. Gentlemen opposite or deputations that met him in his private room. That was not a wise thing for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to do. He thought it would be a most unwise thing to postpone the collection of the tax for six months. It would only result in a great run on exportation and the loss of a great portion of the tax. The exporters would have the bitter pill to swallow six months later, and it would not be made a bit less bitter by postponing it. Many of the different proposals with regard to contracts, and rates had been discussed, and now they were going to have some more suggested by the Chancellor of the Exchequer which had not yet been given to the Committee. He could not understand the hon. Member wishing to move the adjournment, but he hoped that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would make up his mind what he was going to do before the debate was resumed on another day.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: Of the many accusations which the hon. Member for King's Lynn has made against me, he has never made one which is more unfounded than that which he has just made. I have throughout the discussions on the Bill expressed my intention to give as far as possible liberal treatment to existing contracts, and I have made no secret of my willingness to consider the position of the cheapest kinds of coal. All I desire is to postpone a definite statement

on the subject until I can make it fully, in answer to a question to-morrow. I have made no other concession at all. I have always found the House ready when a Minister is anxious to discuss any proposal in a conciliatory tone to meet him and to discuss the matter fairly. Surely that is not a concession. All I desire is that we shall discuss the matter, in order to see what can be done. I can only say that if any attempt I make to meet the views of hon. Members is received with more lengthened debate, and with objections such as the hon. Member for King's Lynn has raised, I can make no concessions at all. I hope that after what has passed the Committee will be allowed to divide on the Amendment. MR. D. A. THOMAS asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer if he had considered the legal point of which he had given him notice.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I have consulted the Attorney General on the statement which the hon. Member has sent to me, and the opinion of the Attorney General is that the words in the Bill; words which have been in many finance Acts; amply cover the levying of the duty from the earliest period.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: Then there will be no necessity to go to a court of law?

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: No.

Question put.

The Committee divided:; Ayes, 223; Noes, 164. (Division List No. 272.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin

Macdonald, John Cumming

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart

MacIver, David (Liverpool)

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward

Maconochie, A. W.

Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.

Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst

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

Anson, Sir William Reynell

Finch, George H.

Majendie, James A. H.

Archdale, Edward Mervyn

Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne

Malcolm, Ian

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Fisher, William Hayes

Martin, Richard Biddulph

Arrol, Sir William

Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon

Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriesshire)

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Fletcher, Sir Henry

Melville, Beresford Valentine
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Flower, Ernest
Milton, Viscount
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Forster, Henry William
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Foster, Sir Michael (Lond. Univ.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Baird, John George Alexander
Galloway, William Johnson
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
Balcarres, Lord
Garfit, William
Morgan, Hn. Fred. (Monm'thsh.
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Maneh'r
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (City of Lond.
Morrell, George Herbert
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W (Leeds
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Morrison, James Archibald
Banbury, Frederick George
Gore, Hn. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Morton Arthur H. A. (Deptford
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Mount, William Arthur
Beckett, Ernest William
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury
Muntz, Philip A.
Bignold, Arthur
Greene, Sir E. W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Bigwood, James
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Nicholson, William Graham
Bill, Charles
Gretton, John
Nicol, Donald Ninian

Blundell, Colonel Henry
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Bond, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Percy, Earl
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Bousfield, William Robert
Hambro, Charles Erie
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Bowles, T. Gibson-(King's Lynn)
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Brassey, Albert
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry
Pretymann, Ernest George
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Purvis, Robert
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.)
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashfo'd
Pym, C. Guy
Bull, William James
Harwood, George
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Bullard, Sir Harry
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Rankin, Sir James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Butcher, John George
Helder, Augustus
Remnant, James Farquharson
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Henderson, Alexander
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Cautley, Henry Strother
Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotter
Rentoul, James Alexander
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lanes.)
Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampstead
Renwick, George
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire

Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Hogg, Lindsay
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Hope, J F (Sheffield, Brightside)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm)
Hoult, Joseph
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Wore'r
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham)
Rutherford, John
Chapman, Edward
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Jackson, Rt. Hon. Wm. Lawies
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Seton-Karr, Henry
Colomb, Sir John Charles R.
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Keswick, William
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Spear, John Ward
Cranborne, Viscount
Knowles, Lees

Stanley, Lord (Lanes.)
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Law, Andrew Bonar
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Lawson, John Grant
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Lecky, Rt. Hon. William Edw. H.
Stroyan, John
Crossley, Sir Savile
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S)
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Dalkeith, Earl of
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Davenport, William Bromley-
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Thornton, Percy M.
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Denny, Colonel
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Dickson, Charlet Scott
Lowe, Francis William
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Valentia, Viscount
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. E.
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E H (Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wylie, Alexander
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Wills, Sir Frederick
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

Wason, John C. (Orkney)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Webb, Colonel William George
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh, N.)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Hammond, John
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
Allan, William (Gateshead)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
O'Malley, William
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
O'Mara, James
Ambrose, Robert
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Helme, Norval Watson
Palmer, Sir Chas. M. (Durham
Atherley-Jones, L.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Partington, Oswald
Austin, Sir John
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol E.)
Pease, Alfred E. (Cleveland)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Holland, William Henry
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Horniman, Frederick John
Pease, Sir Jos. W. (Durham)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Blake, Edward

Jacoby, James Alfred
Price, Robert John
Boland, John
Joicey, Sir James
Priestley, Arthur
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Jones, David Brynmor (Swans'a
Rea, Russell
Boyle, James
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Reddy, M.
Brigg, John
Jordan, Jeremiah
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh
Joyce, Michael
Redmond, William (Clare)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Kearley, Hudson E.
Reed, Sir Edw. James (Cardiff)
Burt, Thomas
Kennedy, Patrick James
Rigg, Richard
Caine, William Sproston
Kitson, Sir James
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Caldwell, James
Lambton, Hon. Frederick W.
Robson, William Snowdon
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Langley, Batty
Schwann, Charles E.
Causton, Richard Knight
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Cawley, Frederick
Leamy, Edmund
Shaw, Chas. Edw. (Stafford)
Channing, Francis Allston
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Cogan, Denis J.
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Leng, Sir John

Shipman, Dr. John G.
Craig, Robert Hunter
Lewis, John Herbert
Sinclair, Capt John (Forfarshire
Crean, Eugene
Lough, Thomas
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Crombie, John William
London, W.
Soares, Ernest J.
Cullinan, J.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C R (Northants
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Stevenson, Francis S.
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
M'Dermott, Patrick
Strachey, Edward
Delany, William
M'Govern, T.
Sullivan, Donal
Dilke, Rt. Hn. Sir Charles
M'Kenna, Reginald
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Dillon, John
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Donelan, Captain A.
Mooney, John J.
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.)
Doogan, P. C.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gow'r
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Duncan, J. Hastings
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Edwards, Frank
Moulton, John Fletcher
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Elibank, Frank
Murphy, John
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.

Ellis, John Edward
 Nannetti, Joseph P.
 Weir, James Galloway
 Emmott, Alfred
 Newnes, Sir George
 White, George (Norfolk)
 Esmonde, Sir Thomas
 Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
 White, Luke (York, E. R.)
 Farrell, James Patrick
 Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
 White, Patrick (Meath, North)
 Fenwick, Charles
 Norman, Henry
 Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
 Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
 Norton, Capt. Cecil William
 Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
 French, Peter
 Nussey, Thomas Willans
 Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
 Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
 O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid)
 Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
 Flynn, James Christopher
 O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
 Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
 Gilhooly, James
 O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
 Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
 Gladstone, Rt Hon. Herbert John
 O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
 Yoxall, James Henry
 Grant, Corrie
 O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
 Grey, Sir Edward (Berwick)
 O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
 TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Mr. Samuel Evans and Mr. D. A. Thomas.
 Griffith, Ellis J.
 O'Dowd, John
 Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
 O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
 *MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.) moved to insert the words "until the first day of August, 1902," so as to limit the duty to one year. He thought it was not only constitutional, but reasonable on general grounds, that the House should reserve to itself the right of reviewing, year by year, the

situation created

by a duty like this. If this duty could be regarded as merely impounding a reasonable proportion of the gigantic profits of the coalowners during the last year or two, in order to meet a great national emergency, not so much could be advanced against it. They had, however, to regard the question in its broader aspect in relation to trade. The foundation upon which the right hon. Gentleman had based his proposal was unsound, for this tax not only did not fall upon the foreigner, but it fell unequally upon a very small portion of the coal industry. If such a tax as this was justifiable it ought to fall upon the coal interest in every part of the country. The policy upon which this tax was based was a sufficient justification for Parliament refusing to relax its constitutional hold upon this tax, and its right to review it year by year. This tax would ultimately fall upon the wage earners of the country, and that was a sufficient reason why they should have an opportunity of considering it every year. This return to export duties was a reversal of the sound doctrine of free trade. The fallacy of imposing export duty was exploded long ago. He understood that, on this Amendment, the Chancellor of the Exchequer was prepared to make a statement of the course which he intended to take, and as to the nature and scope of the inquiry he proposed to institute on all the questions relating to the coal supply and coal interests, and the probable effects of this duty on the trade of the country. By having recourse to this duty, which would act in restriction of trade, we were going back to the days of the Edwards and Henrys. To revive the system of blackmail on industry and commerce was a retrograde step. The Committee had a right not only to demand that they should have some assurance with regard to the future from the right hon. Gentleman, but that they should retain in the hands of the House the right to review and challenge this tax year by year.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 2, line 29, after the word 'paid' to insert the words 'until the first day of August, nineteen hundred and two.'"; (Mr. Channing.)

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

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: It must be perfectly obvious to the Committee that for the coal trade itself nothing could be worse than the uncertainty which the hon. Member proposes. In the days of Sir Robert Peel, when this tax existed, it was never imposed, as the hon. Member suggests, as a yearly tax. It was always amongst the taxes which permanently remained on the Statute-book. Therefore it is obvious that with a trade in which so large a portion of the business is done by contracts for forward delivery, it would be impossible to conduct business in the ordinary manner if every year there was uncertainty as to the tax. It is actually suggested by an hon. Member, who has placed an Amendment on the Paper in the interests of the mining association, that any duty on coal authorised by this Bill shall not be reimposed or continued beyond the year ending 5th April, 1902, nor shall any other duty be authorised on coal by Parliament, unless and until notice of imposition or continuance should have been published in the London Gazette not later than 31st November, 1901. Obviously, the intention of this was that the trade might have notice of what was proposed, in order to

arrange for contracts for delivery in the coming year, although for that purpose notice would be necessary at a date at which it would be absolutely impossible for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to decide whether he would require the tax to be continued, or what should be done for the finances of the coming year. I cannot imagine a proposal less suited to this tax than the proposal of the hon. Member. I am carefully considering the question of a full inquiry into the whole subject of our coal supply; but I am bound to say that my decision on that must be regulated by the proceedings in this Committee. I am not prepared to leave the continuance of this tax next year in the uncertainty which is desired by the hon. Member and by many hon. Members who represent the coal trade. I am sure that no conceivable inquiry could properly investigate the subject before it would be necessary to deal with the Budget of next year. Therefore the idea that this was merely a temporary tax imposed for one year, and that it would cease at the end

of that year, which would certainly be believed throughout the country if the hon. Member's Amendment were accepted, is one which I could not possibly sanction.

MR. M'KENNA said the argument which had been used against provisional Budgets was apparent to the mind of a predecessor of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Sir Stafford Northcote, speaking of the Customs duties proposed in the Budget so far back as 1861, used the following words;

"Strong as were his objections to provisional Budgets, he thought that the condition of trade afforded some reasons why the House ought to be content to vote some of the taxes for a period of only one year."

In that speech he proceeded to quote figures to show that there had been a considerable decline in trade in particular articles. The latest Return which had been issued showing the exports of coal from South Wales for May, 1901, as compared with the corresponding month last year, contained the following details: Newport, 257,169 tons this year, against 285,677 last year; decrease, 28,508; Cardiff, Penarth, and Barry, 1,366,987, against 1,535,327; decrease, 168,340; Swansea, 198,688, against 198,040; increase, 648; Port Talbot, 37,168, against 52,164; decrease, 15,996; Llanelly, 24,060, against 23,578; increase, 482.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: There has been an increase of 200,000 tons in May at Cardiff.

MR. M'KENNA said the figures he had quoted were issued by the Newport Chamber of Commerce, a body which was in favour of the coal tax, and in which the right hon. Gentleman's political supporters were strongly represented. He had not the least reason to doubt the accuracy of the figures. He believed that what was true of south Wales was also true of Northumberland and Durham.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: No.

MR. M'KENNA said the right hon. Gentleman would have an opportunity of answering him. If these figures were correct, they afforded a substantial reason, on the basis of the argument put forward by Sir Stafford Northcote, why this tax should be imposed for one year only. There was another strong financial reason why the tax should be for one year only. In the present Budget there was a contribution to the war expenditure amounting to £16,000,000. That was to

say, the Chancellor of the Exchequer would raise in taxation during the current year £16,000,000 more than was necessary for the ordinary expenditure. If they might reasonably anticipate that the war would be over in a year, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, on the same basis of taxation, would have a surplus in the ensuing year of £16,000,000. How was the Chancellor of the Exchequer to maintain the balance between direct and indirect taxation when he came to remit £16,000,000 of taxation? He would only have the duty on tea and that on coal so far as indirect taxation was concerned, for it was admitted that in part the coal duty was indirect taxation. If he reduced the whole of the tea duty it would only amount to £6,000,000. Was he going to remit £10,000,000 of the income tax and only £6,000,000 of indirect taxation? He ought to leave the coal duty open for remission next year.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH said it was perfectly possible for the Chancellor of the Exchequer of the day, if he desired it, to repeal the law by which the coal duty was imposed.

MR. M'KENNA admitted that the right hon. Gentleman was absolutely right, but there was a difference in the practice of this House between a tax which had not to be re-enacted and a tax which fell if not re-enacted. On the score of expediency, he still held that it was better to leave the tax open for immediate remission. The coal tax had been described as a popular tax. Why was it popular? Because it was believed that its effect would be to reduce the price of coal to the home consumer. He was not going to deal with the morality of such a tax, but there was the economic aspect of the question. He readily admitted that in its first effect the tax must reduce the price of coal, but the ultimate effect would be to reduce the output, because colliery owners would not go on indefinitely producing coal at a loss. Then this tax would be a new element in the cost of production, and would increase the price to the consumer.

MR. MCLAREN (Leicestershire, Bosworth) said that the Mining Association had loyally accepted the tax for this year, and all that was sought in the Amendment was to make its working as smooth as possible, and to avoid anything that would cause unnecessary friction. When the Chancellor of the Exchequer had more intimate knowledge of the working of the trade he was sure the right hon. Gentleman would feel that he was dealing with men who knew their business, and would not mislead him on a point of this kind. The Chancellor of the Exchequer appeared to think it unreasonable that they should ask that the tax should be limited to one year, and there should be notice in the Gazette, three months before the usual time for the Budget announcements, whether the tax was to be reimposed or not. He thought if the right hon. Gentleman would reflect on the difference between an article like coal, which was exported from the country, and such articles as wine, sugar, and currants, which were brought from abroad, he would see that it was impossible in the case of coal to do anything which would affect the produce of the trade by piling up large quantities of the article. The Amendment was brought forward in order to enable the coal trade to anticipate the course of events in the making of contracts, without feeling that in two or three months their calculations might be upset by the continuance or the repeal of the duty. The right hon. Gentleman said that the time for making

contracts was in the ordinary course three months, so that it was of no use that the coal trade should be told that the coal duty was to be continued or taken off. The coal trade had been so disorganised by this duty that contracts forward had, he would not say become impossible, but had largely fallen off. He went down to Yorkshire that morning to meet a number of representative coalowners and discuss this question with them. There was no doubt that it was almost impossible to sell coal in large quantities to buyers abroad on account of the condition of the trade, which required that contracts should be made long beforehand. Everybody was anticipating that this tax would knock down prices, and railway companies and other large consumers at home would not enter into contracts long in advance of their requirements. Some provision should be inserted in the Bill to enable the coal trade to restore confidence in the minds of their customers, and enable them to calculate what prices they would have to ask for in large contracts six or twelve months in advance. That was the reason why they asked on this occasion that the tax might be limited to one year. Notice could be inserted in the Gazette next January that the duty would be reduced, or otherwise, and they would know that the tax would run to the end of that period, although they would prefer that the period should be limited to 5th April. He therefore cordially supported the Amendment.

EARL PERCY (Kensington, S.) said that some of the supporters of the Government were placed in a difficult position in regard to the Amendment. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated that there was more justification for the Amendment in the case of the sugar tax. Whatever they might think of the principle of the sugar tax, they were all agreed that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had arranged that its incidence was perfectly fair. That was not the case in regard to the coal tax. Personally he had voted for all the Budget resolutions, and for the Second Reading of the Finance Bill, because he did not think this was a favourable opportunity for placing obstacles to the Government getting the money required, and partly;disagreeing therein from the hon. Member for Berwick;because he thought the coal tax was not, in itself, necessarily unfair. But the principle of the coal tax and the mode of its incidence were very different matters. They were responsible to the House for seeing that the tax should be spread as fairly as possible over the whole export industry in proportion to the capacity of the different sections of that industry to bear it. The Welsh coal, which fetched the highest price, and was of so peculiar a quality that the Chancellor of the Exchequer desired to retain it in the United Kingdom, and was of such superior quality as to be able to bear the tax and still defy competition, was to bear the same burden, and no more, than the Northumberland coal which fetched 6s. a ton. He thought that was unfair, although he would not enter at length into the question of graduation of the coal taxation.

He did not agree with the purpose of the Amendment, which was to limit the tax for one year. It was not worth while to raise all this tumult over a temporary tax, but on the other hand he did not think that the tax ought to be levied in a permanent form upon its now proposed basis. If an ad valorem principle was accepted, it might result in a deficiency of revenue, but that would be better

than an unfair incidence in the tax, and therefore he hoped that, before going to a division, the Chancellor of the Exchequer would be able to give the Committee some information as to the course he proposed to take in regard to graduation upon the cheaper coal.

COLONEL BLUNDELL (Lancashire, Ince) said that from very long experience his belief was that the common coal exported from Northumberland and Scotland could not possibly bear the burden of the tax over a long series of years, although it might very well bear it this year.

MR. D. A. THOMAS said he was much disappointed at the statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. They had understood that the right hon. Gentleman was going to make an important statement as to the scope and nature of the investigation into the whole coal question; but he gathered from what the right hon. Gentleman had said that the scope and nature of the investigation would depend on the discussions and deliberations in Committee. He ventured to say that the right hon. Gentleman had placed the cart before the horse, and thought that the discussions in Committee would depend very much on the announcement as to the nature of the scope of the inquiry. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had told the Miners' Association of Great Britain that there would be a full investigation either by a Royal Commission or a Select Committee. He himself believed a Royal Commission would be the proper body to make the inquiry. The right hon. Gentleman had stated in regard to this Amendment that there would be far more reason for limiting the sugar tax to one year than the export duty on coal. He could not understand how the right hon. Gentleman could possibly make such a statement. The sugar duty did not violate the principles of free trade, whereas, when the proper time came they would be able to prove up to the hilt that this export duty on coal was a violation of the principles of free trade. The Chancellor of the Exchequer loudly professed that he clung to the rock of free trade, on which the prosperity of the country had been built up during the last forty or fifty years. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to be riding two horses. At one moment he told them that this was to be a permanent duty, and at another moment he said that it could be revised or repealed by an Act of Parliament. The inclusion of the twentieth section of the Customs' Laws Consolidation Act into the Schedule would introduce, in his opinion, a very great deal of doubt into the minds of foreign buyers. They had a right to impose Acts of Parliament on British subjects, but the right hon. Gentleman had, by introducing that clause in connection with the export of coal, endeavoured to impose the law of this country upon foreign buyers in regard to the arrangements which they might make with British subjects. He wished to recur to one point raised by the hon. Member for North Monmouthshire, who referred to what he conceived to be the decrease in the exports of coal from Newport, Cardiff, Penarth, and Barry. Whether the exports had increased or decreased in May, or for a few months, did not signify one halfpenny. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had made the point that the exports had shown a great increase, but he had seen figures which seemed to show that the exports had decreased. These were published in Brown's Export List, the proprietors of which got the Returns from the Customs officers, and the Chamber

of Commerce of Cardiff relied upon these figures. Now, there was a difference of something like twenty-five per cent. between the Returns as published in Brown's Export List and the figures given by the Board of Trade. That required elucidation.

*MR. J. A. PEASE said that he knew in the north of England great efforts had been made on the part of coalowners, under contract, to export as much coal as possible in view of the imposition of an export duty. Therefore the figures for the

last few months were very fallacious, and could not be an accurate guide as to the way the tax would operate and affect the coal trade.

*SIR JAMES JOICEY said that any figures that might be given forth to show how this tax would affect the coal export trade one way or another would not be altogether reliable during the next few months. At present the trade was almost altogether under contract, and the quantity exported in the month of May compared with that imported in May, 1900, could not be attributed in any way to the coal tax. It would be two years at least before the full effect of the tax could be seen in our exports. At present the prices were very high, owing to the cost of production being very high. He knew that in the north of England the bulk of the coal from all the mines was sold up to the end of the year. The Chancellor of the Exchequer knew that pretty well, and therefore he must not be guided in any way by the exports during the next few months. The right hon. Gentleman said that one great objection to making this an annual tax was the uncertainty it would create in regard to contracts. That argument would have been much better if the right hon. Gentleman had said that he would not increase the tax next year. Was he to understand that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was going to remove that uncertainty?

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The hon. Baronet is rather hard on me in asking me to anticipate next year's Budget. The idea of increasing the tax had not occurred to me, but if the hon. Baronet thinks it would do good, I will consider it.

*SIR JAMES JOICEY said what he meant was that it was very difficult indeed to deal with contracts where there was uncertainty; and if the right hon. Gentleman could tell them that he would not either increase or decrease the tax three, four, or five months before 5th April, it would be a very great convenience.

Much of the coal sold in this country was sold under three years contract. Many of the largest buyers on the Continent, as well as the gas companies, steamship companies, etc., insisted on three years contracts, because they believed they were more likely to

get a normal price over a series of years than if they submitted to the fluctuations, of prices year by year. He confessed that he did not like this tax being made permanent. He knew that the tax had been put on under extraordinary ignorance on the part of the right hon. Gentleman. He did not blame the Chancellor of the Exchequer. It had taken many who had been long in the trade a considerable time to understand the question, and it could not be expected that the right hon. Gentleman would be familiar with all its complications. That was a reason why there should be an inquiry, and why the matter should be brought up next year when they knew all the circumstances. He believed that if the whole

facts in regard to this tax had been placed before the Government, the House, and the country, the country would not have allowed it to be imposed. There seemed to be almost a conspiracy of silence in the newspapers, which would not report the speeches on this subject. The result was that the public were ignorant on the question. The public were under the impression that they were punishing those who penalised them in the matter of high prices last year, but as a matter of fact this tax was not put on those who penalised the local consumer, but on those who exported coal, and who were now made the whipping boys of the whole coal trade. There was an impression that this was a prosperous trade and could bear any tax. He was not going to enter into the question of profits; but taking the figures of the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade, he had shown in a letter to The Times that during fifteen years, including the period of high prices, and calculating the cost of labour at 1s. 6d. per ton; although in some cases it had been 1s. 9d., 2s., 2s. 6d., and in some places as much as 3s. 2d.; the profits in the coal industry over these fifteen years only represented 6 per cent. per annum. He believed that the capital employed in agriculture in this country produced a larger profit than the capital employed in the coal industry. [Laughter from the Ministerial Benches.] Hon. Gentlemen might laugh, but he could prove that that was the case. [An HON. MEMBER: Shame!] An hon. Member said "Shame"; but would anybody say that 6 per cent., not allowing anything for depreciation or exhaustion of the coal, was a large profit? The hon. Gentleman knew nothing of the risk of coal-mining, but if he believed what he seemed to say he should get rid of his land at once, and go into coal mining. He saw it had been mentioned that Norway and Sweden, from which we got the bulk of our timber, were threatening to put an export duty on timber. If they did so he failed to see what objection there could be from their point of view. We put a tax on their coal, and he could not see that they would be far wrong if they put a tax on the wood they exported to us, The Chancellor of the Exchequer had shown to the deputation that waited upon him that he had not yet mastered the difficulties in connection with the question. The right hon. Gentleman did not seem to quite grasp the situation, and that was one strong argument in favour of putting on the tax for one year only. He was sure when the right hon. Gentleman came to understand the full difficulties of the export trade of this country; [Cries of "Divide!"] They were not going to divide until they had discussed
AYES.

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

Emmott, Alfred

Lewis, John Herbert

Allen, C. P. (Glouc, Stroud)

Esmonde, Sir Thomas

Lundon, W.

Ambrose, Robert

Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)

MacDonnell. Dr. Mark A.

Atherley-Jones, L.

Farrell, James Patrick
M'Arthur, Wm. (Cornwall)
Austin, Sir John
Fenwick, Charles
M'Dermott, Patrick
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
M'Govern, T.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Ffrench, Peter
M'Laren, Chas. Benjamin
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Mooney, John J.
Blundell, Col. Henry
Flynn, James Christopher
M'orley, Chas. (Breconshire)
Boland, John
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Boyle, James
Gilhooly, James
Murphy, John
Brigg, John
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. Herbt. J.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Grey, Sir Edward (Berwick)
Newnes, Sir George
Burt, Thomas
Griffith, Ellis J.
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Haldane, Richard Burdon
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Caldwell, James
Hammond, John
Norman, Henry
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Norton, Capt Cecil William
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Hayden, John Patrick
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Cawley, Frederick
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-

O'Brien, Kendal (Tipp'r'y Mid)
Cogan, Denis J.
Helme, Norval Watson
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Holland, William Henry
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Craig, Robert Hunter
Horniman, Frederick John
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)
Crean, Eugene
Joicey, Sir James
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Cullinan, J.
Jones, David Brynmor (Swans'a
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
O'Dowd, John
Delany, William
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Dillon, John
Joyce, Michael
O'Malley, William
Donelan, Capt. A.
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Mara, James
Doogan, P. C.
Lambert, George
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Douglas, Chas. M. (Lanark)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick W.
Palmer, Sir Chas. M. (Durham)
Duffy, William J.
Langley, Batty
Partington, Oswald
Duncan, J. Hastings
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Paulton, James Mellor
Elibank, Master of
Leese, Sir Joseph F (Accrington)
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Ellis, John Edward
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Pease, Sir Joseph W. (Durham)

the question properly. [Cries of "Divide!"] He was sure he was not in the habit of spending the time of the House, but on a question of this kind he represented his constituents. [An HON. MEMBER: Report progress.] He thought he had better move to report progress. A very good case had been made out for the further consideration of this matter twelve months hence. The right hon. Gentleman said he was going to have a Committee of inquiry into the question of the coal tax, and the resources of the coal supply of this country. Doubtless that would take some time, but he could not see why any Commission that might be appointed could not first consider the coal tax and give an Interim Report. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman, even at the last moment, would reconsider the proposal that the tax should be for twelve months, so that the country could judge whether it was a just tax or not.

Question put.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 142; Noes, 211. (Division List No. 273.)

Percy, Earl

Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)

Wallace, Robert

Power, Patrick Joseph

Soares, Ernest J.

Warner, Thomas C. T.

Priestley, Arthur

Spencer, Rt. Hn C. R. (N'th'nts)

Weir, James Galloway

Rea, Russell

Stevenson, Francis S.

White, George (Norfolk)

Reddy, M.

Sullivan, Donal

White, Luke (York, E. R.)

Redmond, J. E. (Waterford)

Taylor, Theodore Cooke

White, Patrick (Meath, North)

Redmond, William (Clare)

Tennant, Harold John

Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)

Rigg, Richard

Thomas, A. (Carmarthen, E.)

Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)

Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)

Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.)

Wrightson, Sir Thomas

Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)

Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)

Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)

Robson, William Snowdon

Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings)

Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Thomas, J. A. (Grm'rgan, G'wer
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;Mr. Channing and Mr. M'Kenna.
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Thompson, Dr E C (M'nagh'n, N.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
NOES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Dickson, Charles Scott
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Dickson-Poynder, Sir J. P.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.
Doughty, George
Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham
Anson, Sir Wm. Reynell
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Archdale, Edw. Mervyn
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Lncas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Fellowes, Hn. Ailwyn Edward
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. E.
Arrol, Sir William
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Macdona, John Cumming
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Finch, George H.
Maclver, David (Liverpool)
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Finlay, Sir Robt. Bannatyne
M'Calmont, Col. H L B (Cambs.)
Bain, Colonel Jas. Robt.
Fisher, William Hayes
Majendie, James A. H.

Balcarres, Lord
Fitzroy, Hon. Edw. Algernon
Malcolm, Ian
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Manners, Lord Cecil
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Forster, Henry William
Martin, Richard Bindulph
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds)
Foster, Sir Michael (Lond. Univ.
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Banbury, Frederick George
Galloway, William Johnson
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Garfit, William
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Beach, Rt Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir F. G.
Beach, Rt. Hn. W. W. B. (Hants.)
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Beckett, Ernest Wm.
Gore, Hn G. R. C Ormsby-(Salop
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Gore, Hn. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.
Montagu, Hon. J. S. (Hants.)
Bignold, Arthur
Goschen, Hon. George J.
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Bigwood, James
Gray, Ernest (Wet Ham)
Morrell, George Herbert
Bond, Edward
Green, Walford D (Wednesb'ry
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Greene, Sir E W (Bry S. Edm'nds
Morrison, James Archibald
Bousfield, Wm. Robt.
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptf'r'd
Brassey, Albert

Grenfell, William Henry
Mount, William Arthur
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Gretton, John
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Bull, William James
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Muntz, Philip A.
Bullard, Sir Harry
Hambro, Charles Eric
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Hamilton, Rt Hn. Lord G (Mid'x
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Butcher, John George
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nd'rry
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Carlile, William Walter
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robt. Wm.
Nicholson, William Graham
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Cautley, Henry Strother
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert W.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Cavendish, V C W. (Derbyshire)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Helder, Augustus
Pretymann, Ernest George
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Henderson, Alexander
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. (Birm.)
Hobhouse, Hry. (Somerset E.
Purvis, Robert
Chamberlain, J. Austen (W'rc'r
Hogg, Lindsay
Pym, C. Guy
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Hope, J. F. (Shem'ld, Brightside)

Rankin, Sir James
Chapman, Edward
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Hoult, Joseph
Reid, James (Greenock)
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Howard, John (Kent, Faversham)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Rentoul, James Alexander
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Renwick, George
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Keswick, William
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Charles T.
Cranborne, Viscount
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Knowles, Lees
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Law, Andrew Bonar
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Crossley, Sir Savile
Lawrence, W. F. (Liverpool)
Round, James
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Lawson, John Grant
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Dalkeith, Earl of
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Davenport, Wm. Bromley-
Leveson-Gower, Fred. N. S.
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)

Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Saunderson, Rt Hn. Col. Ed W. J.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Seton-Karr, Henry
Valentia, Viscount
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Warde, Col. C. E.
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Wason, John C. (Orkney)
Wylie, Alexander
Spear, John Ward
Webb, Colonel William George
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Stanley, Lord (Lanes.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M 'Taggart
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und Lyne
Stroyan, John
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Thornton, Percy M.
Wills, Sir Frederick

Committee report Progress; to sit again this day.

SUPPLY [21ST JUNE] REPORT.

Resolutions reported;

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES, 1901–2.

CLASS IV.

1. "That a sum, not exceeding £;713,881, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, for Public Education in

Scotland, and for Science and Art in Scotland, including a Grant-in-Aid."

2. "That a sum, not exceeding £;2,000, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, for a Grant to the Board of Trustees for Manufactures in Scotland in aid of the maintenance of the National Gallery, School of Art, and Museum of Antiquities, Scotland, etc."

CLASS III.

3. "That a sum, not exceeding £;58,193, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Prison Commissioners for Scotland, and of the Prisons under their control, including the Maintenance of Criminal Lunatics and the Preparation of Judicial Statistics."

Resolutions agreed to.

SUPPLY [14TH JUNE] REPORT.

Resolution reported;:

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1901–2.

Sec. 1. "That a sum, not exceeding

£;2,684,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expense of the Personnel for Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, etc., including the cost of Establishments of Dockyards and Naval Yards at Home and Abroad, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902."

Resolution agreed to.

SUPPLY [7TH JUNE] REPORT.

Order read, for further consideration of Third Resolution, "That a sum, not exceeding £;571,085, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, for the Expenses of the Post Office Packet Service."

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty) moved the reduction of the Vote by £;100. He said he had brought this matter forward in Committee, but the reply of the representative of the Postmaster General was extremely unsatisfactory. A subsidy of £;3,000 a year was paid to the owners of the steamer "Clydesdale," which carries the Stornoway mails, and which is upwards of forty years old and too slow, and not very safe in these stormy seas. When in Committee, the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Treasury had talked of the "Victory" being over one hundred years old, and yet quite safe, but the hon. Gentleman ought to have known better than to have talked such nonsense. If the late Postmaster General, the Duke of Norfolk, had remained in office, he was sure there would have been a satisfactory steamer for this service by this time. A Conservative Government had voted £;260,000 for the extension of the railway to Mallaig, on the ground that it would open up better communication with Stornoway and the Western Highlands. He asked a question on the 7th of this month on the subject of an improved packet service, and the Postmaster General's representative replied that it was not the duty of the Post Office to incur additional expense for the conveyance of passengers and goods, and that all they

had to do was to see that the steamers were suitable for the conveyance of mails. The hon. Gentleman the Financial Secretary to the Treasury had not been long in office; his predecessor would not have talked such nonsense. On the 9th June, 1899, the Surveyor General and Assistant Secretary to the Post Office stated that it must not be overlooked that the West Highland packet service was established for the conveyance of passengers and goods as well as for the conveyance of mails. There ought to be a better boat between the Island of Lewis and the mainland than the forty-year-old one which was at present employed. He hoped the hon. Gentleman representing the Post Office would give an assurance that a better boat would be provided. He had for months been led to believe that tenders would be invited for the Stornoway mail steamer service, but he was now told that there was no such intention. Seeing that so many Highlanders had gone to fight the battles of the country, he thought the people of the Highlands should receive more consideration. This was a matter which should not be treated in an airy and indifferent manner in this House. He was quite sure if the predecessor of the hon. Gentleman and the Duke of Norfolk had still been at the head of the Post Office it would not have been necessary to bring this matter forward again.

Amendment proposed;

"To leave out '£;571,085,' and insert '£;570,985,' instead thereof.";(Mr. Weir.)

Question proposed, "That '£;571,085' stand part of the resolution."

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.) said the hon. Member for Ross-shire was perfectly right in bringing forward this question in regard to the forty-year-old tub. But the point he wished to bring before the House had no relation to the forty-year-old tub, but to the latest ships

that had come from the dockyards. He meant the P. and O. liners. Subsidies were paid to the P. and O. Company to the tune of thousands of pounds a year. Their vessels employed a large number of men, and among the hands were numbered a large proportion of lascars. These lascars did the hardest and most difficult work on board the vessels, and he believed no white men were able, when the vessels were passing through the Red Sea, to stand the atmosphere and the temperature so well. These lascars had to work for their living, and for that reason it was all the more necessary that, looking to the circumstances under which they worked, they should have sufficient, wholesome, and proper accommodation. This was a matter that had come before the House on former occasions. It was a disgrace to the company that they should insist on these men living in over-crowded apartments, working fearfully hard, and receiving insufficient food. Everybody who knew anything about seafaring life knew that these lascars were treated in a way that no Christian employers would treat men, and no seaman of any European nation would put up with the treatment they received. The reason he brought it up on this Vote was not in connection with the case that was decided the other day. In that case he believed the Government did make an attempt to make the P. and O. liners amenable to British law. The P. and O. Company, in order to save the few pounds which would make these lascars fairly comfortable, had appealed against being made amenable to British law, and had appealed to Indian law. His intention in speaking of these matters was to

call attention to the fact that this House provided a subsidy every year of £;250,000 for these P. and O. boats. [An HON. MEMBER: £;330,000.] This was an enormous sum for carrying mails, and he would suggest that the Post Office, in paying this money, ought to insist that these men were carried under conditions that were wholesome and more Christian like than they were now. It was a short-sighted policy, from the company's own point of view, for the men could not be fit to work properly when they were treated in this way. It was a great shame that in this Christian land we should pay £;330,000 a year to a company that would treat human beings in the way these unfortunate black men were treated. He had much pleasure, therefore, in supporting his hon. friend the Member for Ross-shire in his Amendment to reduce the amount of this Vote. He thought they ought to have some promise from the Secretary to the Treasury that the matter would be looked into, and that another contract would not be given to the P. and O. liners until the conditions of the men had been ameliorated. He suggested that it should be put in the contract that the men in their employment would be treated in a right way.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): I think the hon. Member must have forgotten that it was stated when this matter was discussed in Committee that the P. and O. Company are carrying these mails for the Post Office under a contract in which the Postmaster has no power to interfere. [An HON. MEMBER: When does the contract expire?] Perhaps the hon. Gentleman will allow me to continue. The Postmaster General has no power to interfere during the currency of the contract. The hon. Member has expressed the hope that this matter will be considered before a new contract is made. I am perfectly certain this matter will be considered at that time, but as the present contract runs till 1905, the hon. Gentleman will see that it is not in my power to interfere in the matter at present. The hon. Member for Ross-shire raised a question, which he has several times raised in this House, as to the Stornoway mail service. He complained that the boat was a slow one; much slower than those engaged in other services; and that it was a very old boat. He suggested that it was not seaworthy. He accused the present Postmaster of extreme meanness in not providing a better service. I cannot help feeling interested in the compliments which the hon. Member paid to our predecessors in office. I hope that when we retire from our present positions he will have a kindly word to say of the services we have rendered. This boat is undoubtedly an old boat, and it does not provide so good a service as either the Postmaster General or myself would desire, but I am advised that it is a perfectly safe boat, and that there is no occasion for the fears hon. Gentlemen may feel in regard to it. The Post Office makes a profit, but it is not to be expected that out of the profit which is made every year we should be able to meet all the claims put forward for improved services. If the Postmaster General were to assent to every demand for better or increased services made upon him, that profit, amounting to between £;3,000,000 and £;4,000,000, would very soon fade away, and instead of there being that sum to go in the reduction of taxation there would be a fresh demand made for taxation. The Post Office does recognise that it has a monopoly, and that there is laid

upon it the necessity of giving services to the poorer and more scattered districts. I have already informed the House that the service referred to by the hon. Member is carried on at a cost of more than double the revenue received from it. I think that that is not an ungenerous arrangement. I cannot hold out any prospect that the Government will very largely increase the cost of the service until they can see some chance of a return for the services rendered. The hon. Gentleman inquires when fresh tenders will be called. At the present time there is no reason to believe that the result of calling for fresh tenders would be the obtaining of an improved service without an undue extra cost to the public. The hon. Gentleman complained of some inconsistency he had discovered between an answer given to him from the Department the other day, and an answer given to him a couple of years ago. I have not seen the latter communication, but so far as I understand it, there does not seem to be any inconsistency between the two. It is a fact that the primary duty of the Postmaster General is to deal with the mail service, and not to provide for the conveyance of passengers.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) said he did not follow the hon. Member for Rossshire in regard to this particular mail service in the highlands of Scotland, but he was bound to hold the opinion that, when a ship was forty years old, and the conditions were as described by the hon. Member, it was a reasonable request to make to the Post

Office authorities to put a new ship on the service. The hon. Gentleman said that the Post Office could not afford to increase the expenditure on this service but he must see that it was necessary there should be no accident, and that the mails should not be conveyed in a ship not thoroughly fit to perform the service. If he were a Scotch and not an Irish Member, he would press forward, in the strongest possible way, the reasonable demands of the hon. Member for Rossshire, but he supposed, from the attitude of the Secretary to the Treasury, that he would wait until this ship went to the bottom before any improvement was made in the service. He wished to draw the attention of the House to the subject, very properly brought up by the hon. Member for South Kilkenny, with reference to the subsidy paid to the P. and O. Company. In view of the fact that he had that very day a question on the Paper to the President of the Board of Trade with reference to the employment of lascar seamen, he was glad of this opportunity of asking what the Government intended to do in regard to the subsidy to the P. and O. Company. The hon. Gentleman had said that in 1905, when the present contract terminated, the Post Office authorities would consider what fresh conditions they would make with the P. and O. Company. He begged to say that that would not meet the case. Only two or three days ago a judgment had been given by Mr. Justice Mathews in the King's Bench Division that under British law seamen were entitled to the same treatment in regard to cubic space as European sailors. It was quite true that in answer to his question the President of the Board of Trade told him that the P. and O. Company had lodged a notice of appeal.

MR. DILLON: (Mayo, E.) They have asked permission to appeal.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said that whether the P. and O. Company appealed or not the

decision on this matter would be either set aside or upheld within the course of a very short time. In the meantime, the judgment given by Mr. Justice Mathews stood good; but they had this circumstance, that whereas it had been laid down by the King's Bench

Division that lascars seamen were entitled to the same space on board ship as European sailors, the representative of the Post Office said that the matter would not be considered until the conclusion of the contract in 1905. That was not reasonable. Did the Secretary to the Treasury tell him that the Post Office authorities would continue to pay a subsidy of hundreds of thousands of pounds to a company which was not giving these lascars the treatment to which by law they were entitled? That would be intolerable. The Government should insist now, instead of waiting until 1905, on these coloured seamen being given the same treatment as white seamen. He asked the hon. Gentleman whether he could not give some undertaking that if the decision of the King's Bench Division was upheld, some attempt would be made to get the P. and O. Company to give the same treatment to lascars as to European sailors. He understood that the subsidy to the P. and O. Company amounted to £330,000 a year, and he said it would be a monstrous thing that that subsidy should be given to a company which acted contrary to the law.

MR. DILLON said that this was a matter of very great importance. He went on the lines of the hon. Members for East Clare and South Kilkenny. The judgment given in the King's Bench division was only the last act in a whole series of events in a grave public scandal. Here they had a great, wealthy company, which for years had enjoyed the largest and most profitable contracts under the Government, which contracts had been renewed again and again in spite of the fact that the service had been scandalously bad in point of speed. His hon. friend said that the subsidy amounted to £330,000; he thought it was over £400,000; at all events, it was by far the largest given to any steamship company. Four or five years ago this matter was brought up before the House by his friend Mr. Wilson, then Member for Middlesbrough. The charge was made that the P. and O. Company had been violating the law for many years, and that the Board of Trade was overlooking that violation. That was a very serious charge to make, and had been indignantly denied by the then President of the Board of Trade. There was a very angry controversy between Mr. Wilson and the President of the Board of Trade, but afterwards Mr. Wilson did succeed in establishing the proposition to the satisfaction of the Board of Trade and the law officers of the Crown that the P. and O. Company were breaking the law. As he understood, the ordinary practice, and the practice prescribed by a section in the Merchant Shipping Act, was that for every seamen denied his proper accommodation on these steamboats the Board of Trade should proceed under summary jurisdiction to recover a penalty of £20. That would be the ordinary course of procedure with any other company, and why was it not taken with the P. and O. Company at once?

MR. BANBURY (Camberwell, Peckham): I rise to a point of order. Is it in order to discuss the action of the Board of Trade on this Vote?

*MR. SPEAKER: It is not the action of the Board of Trade that is being

discussed. It is the question whether under the circumstances subsidies should be given to this company. To discuss the action of the Board of Trade would not be in order.

MR. DILLON: I was avoiding discussion of the action of the Board of Trade. What I am discussing is that this subsidised company has been allowed persistently to break the law.

MR. HOULT (Cheshire, Wirrall): I think the hon. Member will only be in order if these ships are not properly equipped.

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt Sir A. F.

Bentinck, Lord Henry C.

Chamberlain, J. Austen (Wor'c

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Bignold, Arthur

Chapman, Edward

Anson, Sir William Reynell

Bigwood, James

Churchill, Winston Spencer

Archdale, Edward Mervyn

Blundell, Colonel Henry

Collings, Rt. Hn. Jesse

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Bond, Edward

Compton, Lord Alwyne

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-

Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge

Arrol, Sir William

Bousfield, William Robert

Cranborne, Viscount

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Brodrick, Rt. Hn. St. John

Crossley, Sir Savile

Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy

Butcher, John George

Dalkeith, Earl of

Bain, Col. James Robert

Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.

Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham

Balcarres, Lord

Cautley, Henry Strother

Dickson, Charles Scott

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

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

Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.

Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)

Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire)

Doughty, George

Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds

Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers

Banbury, Frederick George

Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)

Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin

MR. DILLON: Can the hon. Member not have common sense to listen to what I am saying, for that is the whole point I have been endeavouring to make. The ships are admittedly; and they have now been decided in the Court of King's Bench to be; illegally equipped, and sailing in every voyage in direct violation of the laws of the land. When we bring forward that statement we are met by the Secretary to the Treasury in a light and airy manner, who says that in 1905 the matter will be considered by the Post Office. Are we to be told that this enormous subsidy is to be paid to a company for a single steamer which is illegally equipped?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I do not know whether the hon. Gentleman misunderstood me. I did not say that this thing was to be allowed to continue. What I said was that the Post Office had no power to terminate the subsidy before the year 1905. What action is taken must be taken by the Board of Trade.

MR. DILLON: I shall not go further into the question now, because I believe I shall have an opportunity of raising it fully on the Board of Trade Vote. I had forgotten that. I stated at the beginning that the reason I proposed to debate the subject at this late hour was that I thought it would be the last opportunity. I shall simply give notice now that the matter will be raised on the Vote for the Board of Trade.

Question put.

The Committee divided:; Ayes, 142; Noes, 71. (Division List No. 274.)

Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.

Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.

Robertson, Herbert (Hackney

Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst

Llewellyn, Evan Henry

Rolleston, Sir John F. L.

Finch, George H.

Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.

Round, James

Fisher, William Hayes

Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)

Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-

Fletcher, Sir Henry

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

Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander

Forster, Henry William

Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)

Sandys, Lt.-Col, Thomas Myles
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. E.
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Gore, Hn. G. R. C. Ormsby-Salop
Macdona, John Cumming
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
M'Calmont, Col. H. L. B. (Cambs.
Stroyan, John
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Malcolm, Ian
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury
Manners, Lord Cecil
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry. S Edm'nds
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire)
Thornton, Percy M.
Grenfell, William Henry
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Gretton, John
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Tufnell, Lt.-Col. Edward
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.)
Valentia, Viscount
Hambro, Charles Eric
Morgan, David J. (Walthamst'w
Warde, Colonel C. E-
Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Morrell, George Herbert
Webb, Colonel Wm. George
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Morris, Hn. Martin Henry F.
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Morrison, James Archibald
Whiteley, H. (Aston-und-Lyne
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.)
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)

Hogg, Lindsay
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Hops, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
Wilson, A. Stanley (Yorks, E. R.
Hoult, Joseph
Nicholson, William Graham
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Howard, John (Kent Faversham)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Percy, Earl
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Pretymann, Ernest George
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Keswick, William
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Knowles, Lees
Purvis, Robert
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Reid, James (Glasgow)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Law, Andrew Bonar
Rentoul, James Alexander
Lawson, John Grant
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
NOES.
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
O'Dowd, John
Allen, Chas P. (Glouc., Stroud
Helme, Norval Watson
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
O'Malley, William
Boland, John

Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Mara, James
Boyle, James
Joyce, Michael
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Caldwell, James
Kennedy, Patrick James
Partington, Oswald
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Power, Patrick Joseph
Channing, Francis Allston
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Priestley, Arthur
Cogan, Denis J.
Lundon, W.
Reddy, M.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Crean, Eugene
M'Dermott, Patrick
Rigg, Richard
Cullinan, J.
M'Govern, T.
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Delaney, William
Mooney, John J.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Dillon, John
Morley, Chas. (Breconshire)
Soares, Ernest J.
Donelan, Captain A.
Murphy, J.
Sullivan, Donal
Doogan, P. C.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Duffy, William J.
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Thompson, Dr. E C Monaghan N
Elibank, Master of
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Norman, Henry

White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Farrell, James Patrick
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary Mid.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North
Ffrench, Peter
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary N.)
Gilhooly, James
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Mr. Weir and Mr. William Redmond.
Hammond, John
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Resolution agreed to.

SUPPLY [6TH JUNE] REPORT.

Order read, for further Consideration of Postponed Resolution, "That a sum, not exceedingly £;345,000, 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 21st day of March, 1902."

MR. WEIR said that in consequence of the closure being moved when this Vote was before Committee, he was unable to get the information he desired. He hoped to get it now. To put himself

in order he would move that the Vote be reduced £;100. He called attention to the proposed expenditure of £;12,000 to provide further accommodation for the manufacture of the new rifle. He could not understand why such accommodation could possibly be required. Surely there was ample space for the manufacture of the new rifle in the buildings in which the Lee-Metford and the Lee-Enfield rifles had been made. He thought it would be a great advantage if the representative of the War Office could arrange for one of the new rifles to be put in the Tea Room in order that Members might have an opportunity of inspecting it, Then there was the question of chaplains at Enfield. What were they required for in a rifle factory? This salary should be abolished.

Amendment proposed;

"To leave out '£;343,000,' and insert '£;344,900' instead thereof."; (Mr. Weir.)

Question proposed, "That £;345,000 stand part of the resolution."

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton) said he knew the hon. Member for Ross took an interest in a great many things, but he thought that the hon. Member did not understand that the Vote included not only the cost of the buildings, but of all the appliances necessary in making the alterations in the rifle. They were still at the experimental stage. One thing that came out during the last campaign was that they should try if possible to make a firearm to be used indifferently by both

infantry and cavalry. Then an improvement was necessary in the sights, and it was most essential to get a good clip loading for the rifle. For all that additional machinery had to be provided. He had dealt with the question as closely as he could, but he could not pitch his own opinion against that of the experts, who believed that these additions and improvement on the rifle were absolutely necessary, and should be made as soon as possible. He could assure the hon. Gentleman that it would be done with all due economy.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.) thought it was very reasonable that hon. Members should see this new rifle, and one should be placed in the Tea Room, as had been done in the case of the Lee-Metford rifle. He hoped if they agreed to this Vote that the House of Commons would not be taken as committed to the shortening of the rifle. That was a very big question. They might level up the cavalry rifle, but they should not shorten the infantry rifle.

MR. O'MARA said that there was no doubt that the old rifle wanted improvement in regard to its sighting.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member will not be in order in discussing the merits of the rifles.

MR. O'MARA said that the necessity for this new machinery was a curious comment on the Government boast that they had got the best rifle in the world.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND asked what reply the noble Lord had to make in regard to putting one of the new rifles in the tea-room. He believed it was not necessary that it should be loaded.

LORD STANLEY said he had not the slightest objection to place one of the new rifles, unloaded, in the tea-room. As to the chaplains, a duty was imposed upon them, when they employed an enormous number of men, to provide them with chaplains, and he, for one, would not consent to withdraw the Vote for their salaries.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Resolution agreed to.

YOUTHFUL OFFENDERS BILL.

Read a second time, and committed to the Standing Committee on Law, etc.

PUBLIC LIBRARIES BILL [Lords].

Read a second time, and committed for Thursday.

NATIONAL GALLERY (PURCHASE OF ADJACENT LANDS) BILL.

Mr. Akers Douglas, Lord Balcarres, and Mr. Paulton nominated Members of the Select Committee on the National Gallery (Purchase of Adjacent Lands) Bill, with two Members to be added by the Committee of Selection.:(Sir William Walrond.)

Adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Two of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 25th June, 1901.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

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

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

originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.;;

Central London Railway (No. 2) Bill [Lords].

Newport (Isle of Wight) Gas Bill [Lords].

Smethwick Corporation Bill [Lords]. Worcester Tramways Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS [Lords] (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, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.;;

Gas Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords].

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

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

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

Bristol Corporation (Docks and Railways, Etc.) Bill [Lords].

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

LEATHERHEAD GAS BILL.

Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to.

BARRY RAILWAY BILL. [NOT AMENDED.] (By ORDER.)

Considered; to be read the third time.

STALYBRIDGE, HYDE, MOSSLEY, AND DUKINFIELD TRAMWAYS AND ELECTRICITY BOARD BILL (BY ORDER.)

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

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 6) BILL [Lords].

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 10) BILL [Lords].

GAS AND WATER ORDERS CONFIRMATION BILL [Lords].

PIER AND HARBOUR PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL [Lords].

Read a second time, and committed.

STANDING ORDERS.

Resolution reported from the Committee, "That, in the case of the Elland Gas Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with; That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill."

Resolution agreed to.

RAILWAY BILLS (Group 8).

Sir JOHN KENNAWAY reported from the Committee on Group 8 of Railway Bills, that, for the convenience of Members, the Committee had adjourned till Thursday next, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to;

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

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill.

Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) Bill.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill, without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to enable the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the Borough of Salford to obtain from the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and citizens of the City of Manchester a further supply of water in bulk for the township of Salford." Salford Corporation Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill, intituled, "An Act to empower the Corporation of Leeds to make additional waterworks; and for other purposes." Leeds Corporation Water Bill [Lords].

And also a Bill, intituled, "An Act to empower the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the County Borough of Stockport to construct additional waterworks, and for other purposes." Stockport Corporation Water Bill [Lords].

SALFORD CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

LEEDS CORPORATION WATER BILL [Lords].

STOCKPORT CORPORATION WATER BILL [Lords].

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

PETITIONS.

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

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

EDUCATION BILL.

Petitions for alteration, from Weston-super-Mare; and Swansea; to lie upon the Table.

POLICE SUPERANNUATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

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

POOR LAW OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

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

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

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

Petitions in favour, from Chelsea; Thrupp; Tiverton (two); Shefford; Upper Norwood; Bradford; Westbourne

Park; Haggerstone; Paddington; Putney; Knaresborough; Hampstead; Sheffield; Forest Gate; Hyde; Greenwich (three); Blackheath (two); Thorne; Burnley; Millwall; Landkey; and Houghton-le-Spring; to lie upon the Table.

SCHOOL BOARD ELECTORATE (SCOTLAND) BILL.

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

TROUT FISHING ANNUAL CLOSE TIME (SCOTLAND) BILL.

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

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY.

Return [presented 13th May] to be printed. [No. 226.]

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND).

Return [presented 24th May] to be printed. [No. 227.]

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS.

Copy presented, of Returns of Accidents and Casualties as reported to the Board of Trade by the several Railway Companies in the United Kingdom in the year ended 31st December, 1900, together with Reports of the Inspecting Officers, of the Railway Department to the Board of Trade upon certain Accidents which were inquired into [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).

Copy presented, of Report, No. 324 (Sierra Leone, Annual Report for 1900) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

CIVIL SERVICES (SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1901–2).

Estimate presented, of the additional amount required in the year ending 31st March, 1902, to defray the Expenses of the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland in respect of Manual and Practical Instruction in National Schools [by Command]; Referred to the Committee of Supply, and to be printed. [No. 228.]

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICA;NATAL FARM OWNERS.

MR. CHAINING (Northamptonshire, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that British owners of farms in Natal are still being prohibited from re-stocking and re-letting their farms, on the ground of the proximity of the enemy; and whether he will consider the possibility of removing these restrictions.

The SECRETARY of STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): I have no information on this matter, which is one for the consideration of the Natal Government.

CAPE COLONY;FINANCIAL PROVISION IN LIEU OF TAXATION UNDER PARLIAMENTARY SANCTION.

MR. EUGENE WASON (Clackmannan and Kinross): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can say up to what date financial provision for the public service in Cape Colony has been made by the Cape Parliament, up to what date that Parliament has been prorogued, and how it is intended to authorise such expenditure for the public service as may be necessary during the prorogation of the Parliament.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: (1) Provision has been made up to 30th June, 1901; (2) Parliament is prorogued to 27th August. (3) This is a question for the responsible Government of the Cape Colony.

MR. JOHN MORLEY (Montrose Burghs): May I ask whether in the case of the Cape Parliament it is not the duty of the Governor to summon it if necessary, and is he not responsible to the right hon. Gentleman and consequently to this House?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The right hon. Gentleman had better put that question down on the Paper. It seems to involve constitutional matters of great importance.

BOERS IN CAPE COLONY.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can give the House any information as to the number of Boers (both invaders and rebels) now in Cape Colony.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guild-ford): From the latest information there would appear to be between 1,000 and 2,000 men in arms against us in Cape Colony.

WATER KLOOF AND COLESBERG ACTIONS.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can communicate to the House any particulars of the action fought at Water Kloof, in Cape Colony, on Thursday last, and as to the casualties sustained by our troops; and whether he can give any information to the House as to the circumstances under which 500 horses were captured by the Boers near Colesberg at the latter end of May.

MR. BRODRICK: No information on the matters alluded to in the question has reached the War Office.

COST OF THE WAR.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will state for how long a period he has the financial means to carry on the war in South Africa at the present pressure without appealing to Parliament for sanction of further expenditure.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): I am not in a position to make any statement of the kind the hon. Member asks for. It is a question, not of financial means, but of the Army Estimates.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will state what is now the approximate weekly cost of the war in South Africa, including the maintenance of the concentration camps in South Africa and the Boer prisoners in St. Helena, Ceylon, and elsewhere.

MR. BRODRICK: The approximate weekly cost to Army Votes is one and a quarter millions.

TYPHOID FEVER AMONG THE TROOPS.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state the number of cases of typhoid fever and the number of deaths among the troops in South Africa for the month of April.

MR. BRODRICK: For the four weeks ending 26th April, the approximate figures are: admissions, 1,484; and deaths, 187.

FLOGGING A SOLDIER.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that a soldier was flogged on board a transport ship carrying mules from Naples to Port Elizabeth, and whether he will inquire by what authority this punishment was given.

*MR. BRODRICK: I have made inquiry and find that in November, 1899, a driver of the Army Service Corps was given ten lashes for maliciously wounding a mule by stabbing it with his knife in the head. The officer in question, despite the bad conduct of the driver, acted wrongly in awarding this punishment, and he was severely censured, being informed of the grave displeasure of the Commander-in-

Chief at his conduct.

IRISH YEOMANRY.

DR. THOMPSON (Monaghan, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if it is the intention of the Government to allocate to Ireland a certain number of the proposed new Yeomanry regiments.

*MR. BRODRICK: This question has not yet been decided. If any proposal should be made to make the Irish Yeomanry who served so well in South Africa the nucleus of a permanent corps, it would be carefully considered.

INDIAN RELIEFS.

MR. YERBURGH (Chester): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state the total number of men in units now in India awaiting relief.

*MR. BRODRICK: The total number of men due for discharge or transfer to the Reserve up to the 30th September, calculation of this sort being always made in regard to the trooping season, is about 13,500.

MARK IV. BULLETS.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office if he will state how many expanding bullets were manufactured for the War Office in 1899 and 1900 respectively by the Government and by private contractors; how many were issued to home and foreign stations respectively; how many were withdrawn, at what date were they withdrawn, and for what reason.

*THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westthoughton): The hon. Member doubtless refers to the Mark IV. bullets, on which he has already asked numerous similar questions, and to the replies to which I have nothing to add.

MR. WEIR: Is the noble Lord aware that I have never put a question on these lines?

ARMY CLOTHING DEPARTMENT WRITERS.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will consider the advisability of placing the writers in the Army Clothing Department upon the same footing with respect to overtime as the storehouse men and ledger keepers.

*LORD STANLEY: The storehouse men receive overtime pay at the rate of 1s. 6d. per hour pay for each of the first two hours overtime, and 1s. 3d. per hour pay for any further overtime, but have to work 48 hours before receiving overtime pay. The writers receive ordinary pay for overtime, but have only to work 42 hours a week before receiving overtime pay. In all probability, therefore, the writers would lose by being put on the same footing as the storehouse men.

NEW ROYAL YACHT.

MR. HOULT (Cheshire, Worrall): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if the persons who designed and superintended the building of the new-royal yacht design and superintend the building of vessels for His Majesty's Navy, and whether he will consider the advisability of providing additional supervision.

*THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): The Director of Naval Construction designed the new royal yacht and superintended the building of the vessel. He has designed, and is superintending the building of, other vessels for His Majesty's Navy. The question of adding to the personnel of

the Constructors' Department is under consideration.

COAL DUTY EXEMPTIONS.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will state what proposals the Government have decided to submit to the House in Committee with reference to the exemption of contracts entered into before the Budget statement from the operation of the export duty on coal.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The only proposal I intend to submit to the House is the insertion of the date of the 1st January, 1902, in the clause relating to this subject. But I may state that, under the power granted by that clause, I propose to grant exemption from duty to post-Budget exports of coal under pre-Budget contracts, f.o.b. and c.i.f. alike, up to 31st December, 1901, provided that the contracts are shown to the satisfaction of the Customs to have been operative and binding subsequently to 18th April, 1901, that they specify the amount and price of the coal to be supplied, that they are bona fide covered by buying contracts for coal or by the ownership of coal, and that the quantities of coal exported are such as, in the opinion of the Customs, are properly exported between 19th April and 31st December, 1901, both inclusive, under the terms of the contracts. If the contracts specify only the price, not the quantity, of the coal to be supplied, exemption may be granted to them also under the foregoing conditions, in either case not beyond the period to which the cover extends, nor beyond 31st December,

1901, in any case. I may add, in explanation, that I have endeavoured to allow a liberal period of exemption for all contracts which are fair business transactions. When contracts are made for a long period they necessarily assume a more speculative character, and therefore have much less claim to exemption, and this is particularly true of uncovered contracts to supply an unlimited quantity at a named price, which seem to me purely gambling transactions.

An HON. MEMBER: What will be the effect on the Budget?

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: If the hon. Member will put a question on the Paper for Thursday, I shall be happy to answer it. It will, I have no doubt, have a considerable effect on the yield of the tax.

H.M.S. "CUMBERLAND"; BELLEVILLE BOILERS.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY (Yorkshire, W.R., Shipley): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he will state what rate of progress in construction has been reached with H.M.S. "Cumberland," building under contract on the Clyde, and how much of the 5,895 tons estimated to be built into the hull on completion has now been built in, and how far the Belleville boilers have been advanced, and whether the framework of this vessel is yet erected; whether the Admiralty at first decided to revoke the order for Belleville boilers, and afterwards rescinded such decision in favour of retaining Belleville boilers in the projected construction of the vessel; whether he can state if the "Cumberland" is expected to be finished earlier than 1904, and whether the Admiralty have in the case of this projected ship conformed to the recommendation of their Boiler Committee, that, as regards ships recently ordered, for which the work done on the boilers is not too far advanced, Belleville boilers be not fitted; and

whether he will state the number of ships recently ordered in which the above-named recommendation of the Boiler Committee has been acted upon by changing from Belleville to other types of boilers, and what definition as to rate of progress the Admiralty acts upon in determining in which case the work is too far advanced.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The "Cumberland" is partly in frame amidships. The exact weight of material worked into the hull cannot be given at present. Over 2,500 tons weight of material has been delivered upon the contractors' premises. At the time a change in the type of boilers was contemplated a large quantity of material had been delivered, and a considerable further amount was due for delivery. The value of this material, and of the labour expended upon it, represented three-tenths of the total cost of the installation. The Admiralty decided to revoke the order for Belleville boilers in the ships in question provided that the change could be made in accordance with the terms of the recommendation of the Boiler Committee. It has been found, however, that the change cannot be made without departing from the terms of the recommendation. It is expected that the "Cumberland" will be finished in 1903. The decision to retain the Belleville boilers in the "Cumberland" is in conformity with the recommendation of the Boiler Committee, as I am informed that it would not be possible to change to another type of boiler without delaying the completion of the ship. The following are the ships from which it was originally hoped that the Belleville boilers might be removed, but in which they are now to be retained, namely, "Prince of Wales," "Cumberland," "Donegal." The question of the boilers of the "Cornwall" is still under consideration. The reason why the change has been made in respect to these ships is that the cost of introducing the Babcock and Wilcox boilers would involve a very large addition to the original Estimates; that the contractors would not guarantee the designed horse power if the Babcock and Wilcox boilers were substituted for the Belleville; and that the change would involve a serious delay in the completion of the ships. In reply to the last paragraph of the question, I have to say that the recommendation of the Boiler Committee in favour of changing from the Belleville boiler to another type of water-tube boiler will be acted on in the case of four ships, namely,

"Queen," "Suffolk," "Berwick," and "Encounter." The Belleville boilers of the "Hermes" are also being removed, and will be replaced by Babcock and Wilcox. The determining consideration which has guided the Admiralty in applying the recommendation of the Boiler Committee has been, whether or not delay would be involved by making the alteration? I may add that the President of the Boiler Committee has informed us with regard to the three ships in question that, in making the change, we are acting in conformity with his view as to the interpretation which should be placed on the recommendation of his Committee. The hon. Member may be interested to know that we have ascertained that, in order to obtain the designed horse power with the cylindrical boiler, structural alterations in the ships would be necessary, owing to the serious alteration of weights involved.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY: Can the hon. Gentleman say how much money has been spent

and what delay has arisen in consequence of this change in connection with the "Cumberland"?

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The particulars as to the delay are very indefinite; in fact, in the most important case, that of the "Prince of Wales," we can get no definite date at all. We cannot give the exact extent of the delay in the case of the "Cumberland," but it will be serious.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport): Are we to understand that the alternative to the Belleville boiler is the Babcock and Wilcox boiler?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

PROPOSED INQUIRY INTO THE COAL QUESTION.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydfil): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he is now prepared to make any statement in regard to the proposed investigation into the coal question and the effect of the new coal duty on trade and shipping, and further as to the remission of duty he intends making on contracts entered into prior to the 19th April last, and the remission he proposes on small coal and patent fuel, if any.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I have already made a statement with regard to the remission on existing contracts, and I think any statement as to small coal and patent fuel should be reserved until the Amendment on the subject is moved. As to an investigation, I could not advise any such limited investigation as is suggested in the question. But I rather gathered, in the course of the debate last night, that hon. Members representing the districts specially concerned in the export coal trade, and especially those representing the miners, thought that the interests of their constituents were being unfairly dealt with on account of insufficient inquiry, and desired that the whole question of our coal supply and its probable sufficiency for the needs of our own country, should be considered by an impartial tribunal, as well as the effect of the duty on the trade primarily interested in the matter. The last thing that I should wish would be that any action of mine should afford ground for a feeling of unjust treatment on the part of a large and hardworking section of my fellow-countrymen, and if on further inquiry I find that a complete investigation of the whole subject, such as I have referred to, is really desired, I should certainly be disposed to recommend to my colleagues that such an inquiry should be initiated without delay. I must, however, say that in no case would it be possible for such a tribunal to make a report which would affect the next Budget. I agree with what the hon. Member for Chester-le-Street said last night, that it would probably take two years, and certainly one, before any opinion as to the effect of the coal duty could be formed.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: I placed no limit on the investigation. I want a full one.

CHINA; FRENCH SETTLEMENT IN SHANGHAI

MR. GRETTON (Derbyshire, S.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the French authorities are now acquiring at Shanghai control of a tract of land beyond the limits fixed by Lord Salisbury in his agreement with the French Government upon the question of the French settlement in that city; and, if so, under what

conditions they are acquiring it, and whether any claim upon their part to exclusive jurisdiction and control over such territory will be recognised by His Majesty's Government.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRANBORNE, Rochester): We were informed some time ago that the French were building quarters for their troops at Shanghai, but we have no definite information as to the site. We have no further information, but inquiries are being made.

CHINESE TREATY OBLIGATIONS.

MR. YERBURGH: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the concession to China of an effective 5 per cent. tariff has been made without obtaining some guarantee from her for the effective fulfilment of her various treaty obligations.

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: A proposal has been made to exact certain compensating advantages to trade in China in return for the concession of an effective 5 per cent. tariff. His Majesty's Minister at Peking has provisionally given his support to this proposal, and the matter is still under discussion.

MALTESE LANGUAGE QUESTION.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies when he intends to lay upon the Table Papers relating to the language question in Malta.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: As I stated in answer to a previous question on the 20th May, I am afraid that until the correspondence reaches a more complete form it will not be possible for me to fix any definite date for laying the Papers.

THE "SOUTH ESK"; CREW'S GRIEVANCES.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the complaint of the crew of the British barque "South Esk" that for over six months they were on a short allowance of provisions, and had to go without tea, sugar, flour, and pork, and that the beef supplied was unfit for human consumption; and whether, in view of the complaints by seamen regarding the provisions on board British ships, he will advise His Majesty's Government to appoint a Select Committee of this House or a Royal Commission to inquire into the provision scale contained in ships' articles of agreement and the quality of the food supplied.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): Yes, Sir, my attention has been called by the Seamen's Union to the case to which the hon. Member refers. I have been in communication with the owners of the "South Esk," and have received a statement made by the cook. It appears that the vessel left Glasgow in January, 1900, fully provisioned with inspected provisions for a twelve months voyage. This voyage was unexpectedly prolonged, and the master had to take in a fresh supply abroad and from two ships he met in the course of the homeward voyage from Chili, which occupied 146 days. Without accepting as entirely accurate the statement in the first paragraph of the question, it is admitted that in some respects the food was seriously deficient, and that some of it was bad, but according to the statement of the master it was the best he could get. In answer to the second paragraph, I am not prepared to advise the appointment of a Committee or Commission for the purpose of making an inquiry of

the limited scope suggested by the hon. Member, but as I stated yesterday in reply to the hon. Member for the College Division of Dublin, I am considering the advisability of instituting an inquiry of a wider character into questions affecting the general interests of the mercantile marine.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): Will the Committee be a departmental one?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I am not prepared to make any statement as to that.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): Can the right hon. Gentleman give any idea when he will be prepared?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I cannot say.

MERCHANT SHIPS; TONNAGE MEASUREMENTS.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether it is his intention to introduce regulations regarding the registered tonnage of coasting and cross-channel steamers, so that they should be rated upon the displacement system in force in His Majesty's Navy or in accordance with the Moorsam plan adopted in the Suez Canal; and whether he is aware that, owing to the prevailing method of rating, port and dock boards cannot supply the necessary trading facilities from the paucity of tonnage dues.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The Moorsam system for measuring the tonnage of merchant ships is the one in force in this country. There is no power, without legislation, to adopt the modifications in the system applicable to the Suez Canal, but as I have already stated in reply to the hon. Member's previous questions, I am doing what is possible by regulation to minimise the grievance of which he complains, and it is open to port and dock boards to seek authority to charge their dues upon a proportion of the gross instead of upon the net tonnage.

COAL TRADE STATISTICS.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can say when the Return relating to the production, consumption, and export of coal to the principal countries of the world in recent years, and ordered to be printed on the 17th instant, will be issued to Members.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The Return in question is now under revision, but I am unable to say when it will be ready for issue.

FOREIGN EXPORTS OF COAL FROM CARDIFF.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can explain the discrepancy in the figures relating to the foreign export of coal from Cardiff for May, 1900, and 1901, as supplied by the Customs to the proprietors of Brown's Export List and to the Board of Trade respectively.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The matter is being inquired into by the Customs, but I am informed that the investigation will occupy a day or two.

THIRD CLASS RAILWAY SEASON TICKETS.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, with a view to minimising the inconvenience to which persons of limited means are now subjected through being obliged to find house-room at a distance from their employment, owing to the congested state of central London, and seeing that the railway companies serving the suburban districts are unable without inconvenience to their general traffic to run a sufficient number of workmen's

trains, he will suggest to them as an alternative arrangement the advisability of issuing third class season tickets at the correspondingly low rate at which they now issue first and second class season tickets.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: As the hon. and gallant Member is no doubt aware, railway companies are not under any statutory obligation to issue season tickets, but I shall be happy to call the attention of the Railway Companies Association to his suggestion.

SCOTLAND YARD OFFICIALS' SALARIES.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will consider the advisability of raising the salaries of the staff generally throughout Scotland Yard, seeing that some departments have already been dealt with.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): It is the practice for the salaries of various sections of the staff at Scotland Yard to be considered as occasion arises in each case. I think this is the proper course, as it may well

be that there may be a claim for consideration in the case of one or two-departments when a general increase for all would be out of the question.

COLCHESTER MURDER CHARGE.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL (Armagh, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether His Majesty's Government propose to make any compensation to the man Lillywhite, who was arrested in New Zealand on a charge of murder and brought here for trial, and in whose case the Crown Prosecutor has now entered a nolle prosequi.

*MR. RITCHIE: I am not yet sufficiently in possession of the facts to be able to express any opinion as to what, should be done.

NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC LEAGUE; PROHIBITION OF MEETING AT BIRMINGHAM.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can explain upon what ground and by what authority the chief constable of Birmingham issued a notice recently prohibiting the holding of a meeting of the National Democratic League in the Bull Ring in that city.

MR. RITCHIE: I am informed that the chief constable objected to the use of certain language which he considered illegal and amounting to an offence, but that an interview subsequently took place between the promoters of the meeting and the chief constable, at which an undertaking was given that such language should not be repeated, and meetings have subsequently been held without interference by the police. No meeting was actually stopped.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Can the right hon. Gentleman tell us who this language was used by and what it was?

*MR. RITCHIE: It was used by one of the speakers at one of these meetings. It was language of a very gross character, which, in the opinion of the chief constable, and in mine, was likely to lead to a breach of the peace

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Was this speaker prosecuted, and was the language used by him a breach of the law?

*MR. RITCHIE: No, Sir, he was not prosecuted.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): Did the chief constable act on his own initiative

or did he refer to the right hon. Gentleman?

*MR. RITCHIE: He acted entirely on his own initiative.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Are we to understand that a person in the position of the chief constable is to be the judge whether the language used;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND did not resume his seat.

*MR. SPEAKER: I again call the hon. Member to order, and have to say that, if he persists in disregarding me when I call him to order, I shall have to direct the attention of the House to his conduct.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

*MR. SPEAKER (calling the next question): Mr. Gibson Bowles.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I rise to a point of order.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member, I repeat, is not in order in asking the question.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I claim, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of personal explanation;

*MR. SPEAKER: A personal explanation is not a point of order.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: A personal explanation, Sir. I trust you will allow me to say that I did not hear you call me to order at all, and I had not the slightest intention of disregarding your ruling. I thought I was putting a question which legitimately arose out of the answer as to whether the chief constable;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! That is the question which I ruled was not legitimate. I quite accept the hon. Member's statement.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I shall raise the subject on the Home Office Vote.
ALIENS AND CONTAGIOUS DISEASES.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if his attention has been called to the fact that all aliens suffering from dangerous contagious diseases are excluded from admission to the United States under the Immigration Laws of Congress, and that by a recent decision of the Washington Treasury tuberculosis of the lung is henceforth to be so regarded; and having regard to the importance of excluding such diseases, whether he will introduce the same or analogous regulations as those laid down by his predecessor at the time of the cholera epidemic at Hamburg to keep out that disease.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): The answer to the first paragraph of the question is in the affirmative. As regards cholera cases, the regulations require the isolation in hospital of persons who arrive in this country suffering from the disease and the supervision by the local authorities of other persons landing from an infected ship. It does not appear to me that similar regulations could be made with regard to such a disease as tuberculosis.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL LIBRARIES.

MR. GEORGE WHITE (Norfolk, N.W.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that whilst the Day School Code, 1900, in Footnote to Article 90, encourages elementary schools to establish libraries, and allows the school accounts to include expenditure upon libraries, auditors

are surcharging members of school boards for such expenditure, notwithstanding that in its Instructions

to Inspectors, issued by the Board of Education on 27th February, 1900, it is stated that a good library is considered as the necessary complement of an efficient school apparatus; and whether he will take steps to harmonise the action of the two Departments.

MR. WALTER LONG: I am aware that a surcharge has recently been made in respect of expenditure incurred by the Norwich School Board in connection with a library. On receiving a formal appeal from the Members surcharged, I will carefully consider the legality of the expenditure, and before arriving at a decision I will communicate with the Board of Education on the subject.

BOLTON POSTMEN'S GRIEVANCES.

MR. HARWOOD (Bolton): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if any decision has been come to respecting the matters named in the petition presented to the inspector by the Bolton postmen on 19th July, 1900, and whether he is aware that the more serious grievances therein complained of are still unremedied.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): The Bolton outdoor postal services are now being revised, and the duties of the postmen will be greatly improved.

BRITISH POST OFFICE AT CONSTANTINOPLE.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, having regard to the fact that British postal orders are on sale at the British post office in Constantinople, whether he can explain why the English Post Office has refused to supply postal orders to the British post office at Salonica.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General has had this matter under his consideration, but he is not in a position to make any statement upon it at present.

KEYHAM BARTON POSTAL STAFF.

MR. KEARLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether a recommendation has been made to increase the postal staff in the Keyham Barton, district of Devonport; and, if so, whether it is intended to give effect to it.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Yes, Sir; such proposals have been made, and they are now being considered.

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK RULES.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that it is the practice of the Comptroller of the Post Office Savings Bank to inform depositors that when a deposit is made by means of a cheque the usual acknowledgment is not despatched until a period of twelve days has elapsed, including the date of deposit of the cheque; will he explain why the Department requires a period of twelve days to clear a cheque; and will he say whether the rule applies to London as well as to provincial cheques.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The practice with regard to deposits in the Post Office

Savings Bank by means of cheques is as stated, and applies to London as well as provincial cheques. To keep a record of the clearing of each cheque would be unnecessarily expensive; and the rule has therefore been adopted to retain the acknowledgments of all deposits by cheque for a uniform period of twelve days, by which time notice of failure to clear any particular cheque will have been received by the Department. Experience has shown that a shorter period is not sufficient in all cases to guard against the risk of loss. For calculation of interest a deposit by cheque is treated as having been made on the date of deposit, and not on the date of the acknowledgment.

NEWTON ABBOT POSTMEN'S PETITION.

MR. SEALE-HAYNE (Devonshire, Ashburton): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he can without further delay reply to a petition from the Newton Abbot postmen, sent to the Postmaster General in August, 1900, which was in April last said to be in course of careful consideration in conjunction with other similar memorials, and to which a reply was promised as soon as practicable.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: A reply has been given to the memorial in question.

AMERICAN MAIL SORTING.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that on board the North German Lloyd and American lines of mail steamers from this country to New York there are post offices, with an official or officials who during the voyage sort all mails, so that its delivery in New York or forwarding thereon to the interior takes place three hours earlier than the mail matter from on board the steamers of the Cunard or White Star lines; and, in view of the inconvenience caused thereby, whether he will adopt such measures as will prevent this delay.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General is aware that there are post offices on board the steamers of the North German Lloyd and American lines, and the sorting of the correspondence on board of course admits of its earlier disposal in the New York Post Office, where, it is understood, the contents of unsorted mails arriving by sea cannot be so expeditiously distributed as in the case of mails reaching this country in such circumstances. The advantage, however, which would be gained if similar post offices were established on British steamers has not been thought sufficient to justify the heavy expense which such an arrangement would involve.

HOUSE TO HOUSE LETTER DELIVERY.

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

* The following is the Return alluded to;

"Return for the year March, 1900, to the 31st day of March, 1901, of the Seizures in Scotland by Revenue Officers, and in Ireland by Royal Irish Constabulary, for Illicit Distillation, in the following form and Summary;

District in which seizure occurred, townland, etc.

Person charged with illicit distillation.

Person or persons who discovered and reported.

Rewards paid for discovery.

Whether prosecution resulted.

Result of trial.

SUMMARY.

Number of cases.

Rewards paid.

Scotland

Ireland

Postmaster General, if he will state whether the house-to-house delivery of letters, authorised by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his Budget for 1897, is now effected throughout England, Scotland, and Ireland; and will he state approximately the number of letters per annum estimated to have thus been brought into the official delivery, and which, under the arrangements existing prior to 1897, would have been left at post offices or places of call.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The house-to-house delivery of letters is now effected throughout England, and practically throughout Scotland and Ireland as well.

There are a few places in the two latter countries at which it has not yet been possible to afford a delivery, but steps are being taken to provide a service in all cases where it is practicable to do so. From May, 1897, up to the end of September, 1900, it is estimated that about 57 millions of letters a year had been brought into the official delivery. Since that time it has not been considered necessary to keep a special record.

MR. WEIR: The hon. Gentleman has not answered the last part of my question.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Yes, I have answered that.

MR. WEIR: Then I beg to give notice;

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member must give notice in the ordinary way.

ILLICIT DISTILLATION.

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will grant the Return relating to Illicit Distillation standing on to-day's Paper.*

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: No, Sir. I am unable to consent to the Return asked for.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): Will the hon. Gentleman reconsider that answer in view of the fact that during the discussion on the Estimates a most extraordinary state of things was disclosed, and he was good enough to promise to make inquiries. If he does not grant this Return, we shall get no information until the Estimates come on again next year, and I would therefore respectfully ask him to consent to the Return.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): Can the right hon. Gentleman tell us what has been the result of his inquiries so far?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I have communicated with the Board of Inland Revenue, but I am not at present prepared to make any statement as to any steps I may propose to take. The matter is under discussion. I could not give a portion of the information asked for in this Return under any circumstances, but at the same time I hope that the steps to be taken will render it unnecessary to have any Return at all. I am unwilling to throw additional work on the Inland Revenue at the present time, and I will ask the hon. Gentleman to wait until I have been able to decide what steps shall be taken.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Will the hon. Gentleman undertake to make some statement as to the result of his inquiries, or must we wait another year?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I will communicate with the hon. Gentleman as soon as I am able to take any action.

NEWSPAPER POSTAGE TO THE COLONIES.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether it is contemplated to reduce the cost on the transmission of newspapers to Australia, and will the Canadian postage rates for papers be applied to the other colonies as well.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: No reduction of the postage on newspapers is in contemplation. The rate for newspapers to Canada and to Australia is already the same.

SASINE OFFICE, EDINBURGH; REGISTRATION FEES.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, as representing the Secretary for Scotland, whether he is aware that the registration fees imposed by the Sasine Office, Edinburgh, were increased in 1891 by the imposition of 5s. on each writ recorded; and that this presses on small proprietors, whose deeds form the main part of the register; and, in view of the fact that the net revenue of the Sasine Office shows a surplus for the year 1901 of £12,799, and that under Section 25 of the Land Registers Act, 1868, it is laid down that the fees to be drawn from the Department shall not be greater than may reasonably be held sufficient for defraying the expenses of the said Department, or the improvement of the system of registration, will he consider the expediency of rescinding the Order of 1891.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): I am informed by the keeper of the Sasines Office that the basis upon which the hon. Member's question is founded is entirely wrong. The scale of fees introduced in 1891 only increased the fees of the register to a very small extent. The uniform fee of 5s. for each writ instead of the former sliding scale was approved as necessary to cover the actual cost of registration. It is certainly extremely moderate, less than half the agent's fee for ingiving and uplifting the writ. There is no surplus revenue of £12,799 or any such sum. The hon. Member has omitted to take into account the expenditure in other branches than salaries. These are noted on page 281 of the printed Estimates, and include office accommodation, stationery and printing, and the non-effective class pensions, etc.

MUNICIPAL COUNCILS AND TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education

whether he will submit to the law officers of the Crown the question whether municipal councils may make subventions from the funds at their disposal, under the Technical Instruction Acts, to school boards in aid of the instruction of adult pupils at evening schools in the obligatory and standard subjects of the Whitehall code.

*THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): This question would be decided in the first instance by the local authority under the Technical Instruction Acts; then, by the Local Government

Board auditor; and finally by the Courts of Law. The Board of Education have no jurisdiction to interfere, and would not be justified in asking the opinion of the Law Officers merely to gratify their curiosity. I may add that, so far as I know, instruction of this kind is now given without objection being taken.

DR. MACNAMARA: Is it not the fact that the right hon. Gentleman has referred the Leeds School Board to the municipal authorities?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

EVENING CONTINUATION CLASSES.

MR. BATTY LANGLEY (Sheffield, Attercliffe): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether he will state what will be the position of evening continuation classes under the management of such bodies as Polytechnics and Young Men's Christian Associations in the event of the Education Bill of 1901 becoming law; and will it be allowable for the new local educational authorities, which are to be created under the Bill, to aid such classes as are now carried on under the management of these institutions and are in receipt of Government Grants under the Evening Continuation Code.

*SIR J. GORST: The Bill now before Parliament does not in any way affect these classes. The answer to the second part of the question is in the affirmative.

IRISH LAND PURCHASE.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can give the number of agricultural holdings sold to the occupiers under each of the Purchase Acts, namely, the Church Disestablishment Act, the Land Act of 1870, the Land Act of 1881, the Purchase Acts of 1885, 1888, 1891, and the Land Act of 1896, and the amount actually advanced on account of said purchases.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The numbers of tenant purchasers under the Acts mentioned, in the order stated, are 6,057, 877, 731, 25,368, and 29,208, making a total of 62,241 purchasers to 31st March last. The amount advanced under each of the Acts, to the same date, is £1,674,841, £514,536, £240,801, £9,992,640, and £8,759,450, making a total advance of £21,182,268.

POLICE PROTECTION IN SLIGO; CASE OF MR. PHIBBS.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Mr. Charles Phibbs, of Doobeg House, county of Sligo, has been under military and police protection during many periods between the years 1881 and 1893; whether he was in the habit of supplying cars for the conveyance of his own escort; and, if so, what has been the amount paid him on account of car hire for these years; and from what source has this amount been drawn.

MR. WYNDHAM: I will at the same time reply to the similar question of my hon. and gallant friend the Member for East Antrim. Mr. Phibbs received special police protection from 1880 to 1892. It does not appear that he was afforded military protection. The conveyance of his police escort was necessary from time to time; on such occasions his vehicles were employed as being the most suitable, and payment was made to Mr. Phibbs for their hire. The amount so paid cannot be ascertained at such short notice. The payments were made from the

Constabulary Vote. He has not been required to defray any portion of the cost of his protection.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): Will the right hon. Gentleman inquire as to the amount paid yearly to Mr. Phibbs for the use of his own vehicle?

MR. WYNDHAM: I should like to have longer notice.

COLONEL M'CALMONT (Antrim, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether Mr. Charles Phibbs, of Doobeg House, county Sligo, who has been under military and police protection during many periods between the years 1881 and 1893, will be called upon to pay any share of the expense incurred for this protection; and whether he is aware that such protection has been from time to time necessitated by his being denounced by the Land and Irish National Leagues in the past and by the United Irish League at the present time.

MR. O'DOWD: I wish to ask, Mr. Speaker, if it is competent for an hon. Member to copy almost verbatim a question of which another Member has given notice.

*MR. SPEAKER: The question seems to be different in some respects.

MR. WYNDHAM: I can only repeat to the hon. and gallant Member the reply I have just given to the hon. Member for South Sligo.

COLONEL M'CALMONT: Was not this man held up to odium at the instance of the League?

MR. WYNDHAM: I should say, generally, yes, because of resolutions purporting to come from local branches.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: Will the right hon. Gentleman particularise the kind of risk this man has been exposed to?

[No answer was returned.]

IRISH BOARD OF INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Board of Intermediate Education consists of an equal number of Protestants and Roman Catholics, with two paid assistant commissioners, one a Protestant and the other a Roman Catholic; that the principle has always been recognised that a due proportion of the Protestant members should be Presbyterians; and that the office of assistant, commissioner has been held for some twenty years by a member of the Church of Ireland; and whether, seeing that there were five Presbyterian candidates; possessing the highest qualifications for the recent vacancy, he can explain why their claims were again passed over in favour of a member of the Church of Ireland.

MR. WYNDHAM: The number of members on the Board of Intermediate Education was fixed at seven by the Act of 1878. The Board then consisted of three Roman Catholics, three Church of Ireland, and one Presbyterian. In 1880 the number of Presbyterian members was increased to two, and the number of Church of Ireland members reduced to two. This proportion was maintained down to last year when the strength of the Board was increased by Act to twelve members. The Board now consists of six Roman Catholics, three Church of Ireland, and three Presbyterians. The selection of a Church of Ireland candidate for the vacant assistant commissioner-ship was not made on the principle suggested in the second paragraph.

IRISH WORKHOUSES;COST OF PAUPER MAINTENANCE.

MR. DALY (Monaghan, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will cause an inquiry to be held as to the reason why the average cost per week per inmate for the past year has been 3s. 11½d. in Carrickmacross Workhouse, while in Clones 3s. 0½d. and Monaghan workhouses 2s. 10½d. suffices for the average cost per inmate per week.

MR. WYNDHAM: It is not the practice of the Local Government Board to cause an inquiry to be held into the differences in the cost of maintenance in various unions. These differences are attributable to the terms of the contracts for supplies in each case and the proportion of sick to healthy, and other similar causes. The average weekly cost of maintenance in the Leinster unions is 4s., and in the Ulster unions it is 3s. 5½d. It does not appear, therefore, that there is anything exceptional in the case of Carrickmacross.

UNSANITARY CONDITION OF DROMORE.

MR. MURNAGHAN (Tyrone, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the medical officer of health reported to the Dromore (county Down) Urban Council at its meeting on 4th March that several tenement houses in the town were in an unsanitary condition and in need of better accommodation, namely, houses in Meeting Street, houses in Gallows Street, and houses in Rampart Street; and that only as regards the houses in Rampart Street the sanitary law has been enforced, and will he state why the council has not compelled the other owners to carry out the recommendations of the sanitary officer; and will he direct the Local Government Board to hold an inquiry as to the alleged unsanitary condition of Dromore, with the view to the improvement of the housing accommodation in that town.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Urban District Council have taken steps to ensure that the premises reported on are put in a proper sanitary condition. The council have ordered their medical officer to make a street to street inspection of the township. No interference on the part of the Local Government Board is called for at present.

BAWNBOY HOSPITAL NURSE.

MR. M'GOVERN (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Bawnboy Board of Guardians elected for the union hospital, on the 21st January, 1899, at a salary of £;60 a year, a trained nurse who possessed all the qualifications prescribed by the Local Government Board to enable the county councils of the counties of Cavan and Leitrim, on behalf of this board of guardians, to get half of this salary refunded out of the Local Taxation (Ireland) Account, in accordance with the provisions contained in Section 58

of the Local Government (Ireland) Act, and will he state under what authority the Local Government Board on behalf of the Treasury refused to pay half the salary of this nurse while in the service of this board of guardians.

MR. WYNDHAM: The sum of £;60 was proposed by the guardians as remuneration, including both salary and rations, and was apportioned by the Local Government Board in the proportion of £;36 for salary and £;24 for rations. Recoupment is

allowed under the 58th Section of the Act of 1898 in respect of salary only.

MR. M'GOVERN: But was it done in accordance with Section 58?

MR. WYNDHAM: I understand so.

CAVAN OLD PRISON; TRANSFER TO MILITARY AUTHORITIES.

MR. M'GOVERN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the building which was formerly used as a gaol in Cavan, built at the expense of the ratepayers in the county Cavan, has been handed over by the General Prisons Board in August, 1900, to the War Department to be used as a military barrack in future, without any compensation to the County Council, who represent the ratepayers; and, if so, upon what grounds and by what authority.

MR. WYNDHAM: The building formerly used as a prison at Cavan was built by the Grand Jury out of county rates, but at what cost I am unable to say. Section 31 of the Prisons Act of 1878 authorises the Prisons Board, within twelve months after the closing of a prison, to allow it to be used for any public purpose, with the consent of the Treasury. Subject to this provision the prison was handed over to the military authorities in August last with all liability for rent and cost of maintenance. There is no power to award compensation, as suggested.

MR. M'GOVERN complained that part of his question had been struck out, and was proceeding to put another question

relating to that part when he was ruled out of order by Mr. Speaker.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION REPORT.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say when the Report of the Irish Land Commissioners will be presented to the House.

MR. WYNDHAM: Every expedition is being used to complete the work of printing this Report, which it is hoped will be laid on the Table this month.

BELFAST RATES.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, owing to the decision of the King's Bench regarding the rates struck for Belfast, there can be no municipal, harbour board, or jurors' lists prepared at the present time for the coming year, and whether, seeing that such complications do not arise in England, where the local authorities are the rating authority, he will consider the advisability of assimilating the Irish system to that in force in England.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): At the request of my right hon. friend I will reply to this question. I am aware of the decision referred to, which is now under appeal. I do not admit, however, that if the decision be upheld all the consequences mentioned will follow from it. I think it is generally admitted that the Irish system of valuation by a skilled central body is superior to that existing in this country. The reply to the last paragraph is, therefore, in the negative.

MR. FIELD: Can the right hon. Gentleman say if it is the intention of the English Government to assimilate the English system with that in Ireland?

MR. ATKINSON: That question should be addressed to the First Lord of the Treasury.

GIBRALTAR WORKS;COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether His Majesty's Government when laying upon the Table of this House Admiral Rawson's letter or Report to the First Lord of the Admiralty on the Gibraltar works, dated 30th March, intend also to present the letter of the hon. Member for Lynn Regis to the First Lord of the Admiralty on the same subject and dated on the same day.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I have not had time to consult my noble friend the First Lord of the Admiralty; but if my hon. friend will put his question down on Thursday I shall be glad to answer him. I do not think that in any case the letter of my hon. friend could be laid as part of the Papers embodying the Report of Admiral Rawson's Committee.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: In that event, will my right hon. friend consider whether he cannot publish this letter separately, and so avoid the necessity I shall otherwise be under of publishing it myself?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not know that there is any objection to my hon. friend's publishing the letter. There may be parts of it which it might be expedient to make public; but I daresay my hon. friend will exercise a wise discretion in that respect.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I shall be quite ready to omit any portion the publication of which may be contrary to the public interest.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY put a question the point of which was understood to be that there had been no debate whatever on Class 3 of the Naval Votes, which provided for an expenditure of over nine millions. He hoped the First Lord would make special arrangements for some discussion of it.

[No answer was returned]

MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can state when the promised Reports of the Gibraltar Committee will be laid upon the Table.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The Report has been laid, and I hope it will be in the hands of hon. Members by Thursday next.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can state on what day he proposes to make his promised statement of the decision of the Government as to the naval works at Gibraltar.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: If the hon. Gentleman will put a question to the Secretary to the Admiralty on Thursday, I think he will be able to make such a statement as can be compressed into the limits of an answer to a question.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON IRISH UNIVERSITY EDUCATION.

MR. NANNETTI: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he has received a communication from the secretary to the Irish Trades Congress urging that the minutes of evidence of the Royal Commission on University Education should be printed in Ireland; and whether, assuming the sittings of the Commission are held upon this side of the Channel, and seeing that the inquiry is one affecting Ireland only, he will undertake that the claim put forward on behalf of Irish printers will be favourably considered.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have received the communication to which the hon. Gentleman

refers. I have no doubt the Commission find it convenient to have many of its meetings on this side of St. George's Channel, but as it is an Irish Commission dealing exclusively with an Irish question I think, in all probability, the printing will be done in Ireland.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.): Can the First Lord of the Treasury say when the Votes will be taken for the salaries of the Colonial Secretary and of the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, as well as the War Office Vote? I think we ought to have some notice.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): And as to the Shipbuilding Vote?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is quite impossible for me to make a statement now as to when these various matters are to come up for discussion, but of course due notice will be given.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Mr. WODEHOUSE reported from the Committee, That they had added to the Standing Committee on Law, and Courts, of Justice, and Legal Procedure the following Fifteen Members in respect of the Youthful Offenders Bill:;Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Boland, Mr. Bond, Mr. Caldwell, Mr. Jesse Collings, Mr. Flower, Mr. Gray, Sir Brampton Gurdon, Sir William Harcourt, Mr. William Johnston, Mr. Lough, Mr. Mooney, Mr. Nicol, Mr. Orr-Ewing, and Mr. Yoxall.

Mr. WODEHOUSE further reported from the Committee of Selection, That they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures: Mr. Crombie; and had appointed in substitution: Sir Joseph Leese.

Reports to lie upon the Table.

NEW BILLS.

MARRIAGES LEGALISATION BILL [Lords].

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 225.]

RAILWAY (LABOUR DISPUTES) CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION.

Bill to make better provision for Conciliation and Arbitration in Railway Labour Disputes, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Bell, Mr. Tomkinson, Mr. Lawson Walton, Mr. Channing, Mr. Nannetti, Mr. Goddard, Mr. Colville, and Sir Fortescue Flannery.

RAILWAY (LABOUR DISPUTES) CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION BILL.

"To make better provision for Conciliation and Arbitration in Railway Labour Disputes," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 226.]

CANAL TRAFFIC.

Bill to provide for the better regulation of Canal Traffic, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Holland, Mr. Emmott, Mr. Field, Mr. Charles Hobhouse, Sir Alfred Hickman, Mr. Parkes, Mr. Joseph Walton, Mr. Whitley, and Mr. Wolff.

CANAL TRAFFIC BILL.

"To provide for the better regulation of Canal Traffic," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill

227.]

WAYS AND MEANS.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

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

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, the sum of £35,443,233 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom."

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.) asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer for some explanation as to what had necessitated the introduction of this resolution. Did the resolution cover a large amount of the Supplies voted for the continuance of the war in South Africa? If so, he would be entitled to raise the whole question of the conduct of the war. [Cries of "Oh, oh!"] Hon. Members might not like it, and indeed it was neither his desire nor his intention to do so; but he wished to raise a comparatively narrow point, but one of which had become a question of definite matter, of infinite public importance, seeing that it had attracted unfavourable comment, not only in what was called the pro-Boer press, but in newspapers which supported the Government. He referred to the plan of keeping the people of this country in the blindest ignorance of what was going on in South Africa. All the country was treated to was a series of telegrams from Lord Kitchener, some three or four lines long, which might be described as the weekly butcher's bill.

THE CHAIRMAN: How does the hon. Member connect that question with the Vote out of the Consolidated Fund?

MR. DILLON: This is an Appropriation Bill, as I take it.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): A Consolidated Fund Bill.

MR. DILLON: It is the same thing. This is a resolution in Committee of Ways and Means, which is to be followed by a Consolidated Fund Bill. I assume that the resolution is concerned with some of the large Votes granted for the use of the Army. If that is so, I am entitled to raise the question of the conduct of the war.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think that that follows as a matter of course. It depends upon the services for which the money is required.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis), on a point of order, suggested that this was a resolution on which it was intended to found a Consolidated Fund Bill. That Bill did not appropriate sums to specific purposes, but it authorised the Treasury to issue the sum named out of the Consolidated Fund for the expenses of the year. Was not that issue authorised by the Bill an act of Supply? If so, did it not come under the rule that grievance must precede Supply?

*THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think that the rule as to grievance preceding Supply is applicable. Under this Bill about £21,000,000 will be issued for the Army services. These Army services, which have been already voted, are military education, miscellaneous services, pensions, superannuation, ordnance factories, remounts and so forth. I was asking the hon. Member for East Mayo how he could

connect the conduct of Lord Kitchener in not sending fuller telegrams with any of the Votes to which this Bill applies.

MR. DILLON: The larger part of the sum is for miscellaneous effective services; in other words, for the conduct of the war, including the pay of Lord Kitchener.

*THE CHAIRMAN: There is no Vote for it.

MR. DILLON: What are the miscellaneous effective services?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The Second Reading of the Consolidated Fund Bill will come on on Thursday, and then the hon. Member will have before him exactly the Votes with which the Bill deals. There will be a full and much more convenient opportunity for debate then.

MR. DILLON said the First Lord of the Treasury had correctly defined the position. No doubt it would be a more convenient opportunity for a long discussion on the Second Reading. This, however, was a question of order, and it was not his intention to do what he was entitled to do; namely, to raise a general discussion on the conduct of the war. He wanted to call attention to the un-satisfactory character of the news placed before the public in regard to the conduct of the war generally, and the widespread dissatisfaction which existed in this country as to the insufficiency of the news sent from South Africa.

*THE CHAIRMAN: That is why I asked the hon. Member how he connected that subject with this resolution, and I still think that he has not answered the question. I have been endeavouring to find out how he can connect his observations with any of the Votes contained in the resolution, and they do not seem to me to be connected with them in any way. There is nothing about the salary of Lord Kitchener, and the pay of the Army is not borne on any of these Votes.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Is it not a fact that this sum is issued for the services of the Army, and that any portion of it may be by the direction of the Treasury diverted to any portion of Army service? If that be so, does not the issue of any sum for Army services cover any portion of the grievances connected with any portion of it?

MR. DILLON asked the Secretary of State for War, or the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, to say whether any portion of the £35,000,000 was to be used for the support of the Army in South Africa.

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): I think it is more than probable that that will be so, but this does not settle the point upon which the hon. Gentleman asked the ruling of the Chair. The hon. Member for King's Lynn has suggested that the debate might extend to services not included in the resolution, because the War Office in certain circumstances can allocate money voted for one service to another service. But it would not be possible in Committee of Supply to raise a debate on a Vote which was not before the Committee because of the power of the War Office to allocate the money in that way, but the discussion would have to be confined to the Vote actually before the Committee.

MR. DILLON said the Committee had not yet heard a definite statement as to whether any of the £35,000,000 was to be used for the purposes of the war in South Africa. He believed that a large portion of the Vote was for the expenses

of the war in South Africa, and therefore he was surely entitled to ask a few questions on the subject.

*THE CHAIRMAN: There is a Vote for transport and remounts, and that of course is applicable to the war in South Africa; but I do not think that on this question it would be possible to discuss the conduct of Lord Kitchener in not sending fuller telegrams. The same rule must apply now upon this resolution as would apply in Committee of Supply. On any particular Vote you must discuss a question connected with that Vote.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) asked whether for the convenience of the Committee the Chairman would read the Votes which were covered by this resolution.

*THE CHAIRMAN: "War Office Estimates; military education, miscellaneous effective services, pensions and other non-effective charges, superannuation, compensation allowances and gratuities, works, buildings, and repairs, transport and remounts, and ordnance factories."

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said that this was a very important point. Was he not right in saying that any one of the items of money allocated to these purposes might be by the direction of the Treasury diverted to the salary of Lord Kitchener, the salary of the censor, or to any other purpose connected with the war? That being so, was it not open to an hon. Member on a general issue like this Consolidated Fund, and considering the power of diverting such sums, to raise grievances before this kind of Supply?

*THE CHAIRMAN: It is true that with the assent of the Treasury money voted for one purpose may be used for another, but I do not think that opens the discussion upon all the other purposes to which the Treasury assent that the money might be applied, because, if so, all limitation would be futile. On any particular Estimate it would be open to any hon. Member while discussing the Estimate to say; "It is true that this money is to be devoted to a particular Estimate, but the Treasury may permit it to be devoted to another Estimate; therefore I do not propose to discuss the Estimate before the Committee, but some other subject not before the Committee." The same rule of relevancy must apply to a resolution which empowers the money to be devoted to its objects as to a resolution in Committee of Supply.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) asked whether the Government had any information as to 500 horses having been captured by the Boers from a remount station near Colesberg, at the latter end of May last.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): I have already answered the hon. Member's question. I have no information.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said if one could be perfectly certain of all the news which came from South Africa one could accept the statement of the right hon.

Gentleman with perfect equanimity, but in one or two cases certain items of news came from various sources, and the Government knew nothing about them. He would like to ask what was being done with regard to the remounts in Cape Colony, whether the horses there had been commandeered, or whether the horses were being left for agricultural purposes on the farms.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I think that the bewilderment in

the mind of hon. Members arises from the common practice of Parliament, founded upon a necessity of which I am not aware, of attaching a certain air of mystery to these proceedings in Ways and Means. The Committee is only told of the resolution; it comes upon us like a thunderbolt, and it seems to be a much more formidable and terrible proceeding than it really is, because of the mystery attaching to it. The Chancellor of the Exchequer moves a resolution in Committee of Ways and Means, but we never see the resolution; it is not put on the Paper for the information of the House until the House is called upon to "stand and deliver," and to pass the resolution. You, Sir, have been reading from a document which enumerates the Votes dealt with. Why should it not be given to the House? This is a matter for which I do not blame the Government in the least, but it seems to be a somewhat futile and anomalous proceeding that the House should be put in the position in which it now finds itself. The Leader of the House is right in saying that in the main this stage is purely formal, and that the proper time to raise any serious questions involved in the money voted is on the Second Reading of the Bill. But it is certainly anomalous that undescribed resolutions should come as it were from the blue sky, and should not be explained, except in the most general terms, by the Minister. The Committee generally is placed at a disadvantage. You, Sir, have ruled that any discussion must be confined to the subject actually involved, and I think you are undoubtedly right, but the Committee cannot exercise any intelligent confidence in your decision unless we know what are the subjects in the resolution. The Government are acting according to rule, but I think that the rule and practice are bad, and I hope that there may be some arrangement made to avoid this difficulty

in future. We quite understand that there is necessity for some kind of secrecy before the Budget is introduced, in order that there may be no premature disclosure of the terms of the Government's proposals. But there is no necessity in this case, and I think it would be a good thing if in the future a simpler method were adopted.

MR. DILLON said that he was in agreement with the views of the right hon. Gentleman. Except in the case of the Budget resolutions, there was no reason for not giving notice of all resolutions to be moved in Committee of Ways and Means. He hoped that in future reasonable information would be given to the House.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton) asked the Secretary of State for War how long the Government could carry on the war without coming to Parliament for further funds. He also asked whether the Second Reading of the Consolidated Fund Bill would be the first Order of the day.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Member's first question does not come within the terms of any of the Votes included in the resolution. As regards his second question, the Second Reading of the Bill will be put down as first Order.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND remarked that, even after the interchange of views that had taken place, they were still in the dark as to the Votes covered by the resolution.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: All the Votes that have been taken in Committee of Supply and agreed to on Report will be included.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND observed that if that information had been given at first it would have saved this discussion. He hoped a division would be taken in order to indicate the view held on the question of remounts. It had been abundantly proved that in regard to that subject there had been more incompetency and more blundering by the War Office than in regard to any other matter in the whole of the South African campaign.

It had been shown that on the question of buying remounts, and getting horses suitable for the campaign in South Africa, the officials had been guilty of the greatest blunders. It was notorious that horses had been sent out which, when they arrived in South Africa, were found to be wholly unsuitable. Having regard to the fact that the war was being carried on in such a fashion, he hoped the discussion upon its general conduct would be taken at an early date. With regard to transport arrangements, he too might say he had received a number of letters from private soldiers which said that on some of the ships the men had been treated most disgracefully, and the accommodation provided for them was grossly insufficient.

*SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): There has been a good deal of misapprehension in regard to the procedure that has been adopted. The Secretary to the Treasury was quite right when he said this is not an Appropriation Bill. It is a Consolidated Fund Bill. Money for the public service is voted in Supply, and the Vote is sanctioned by the House on Report. But that is not sufficient to get the money out of the Treasury. Sir Erskine May said with reference to that procedure;

"Until a grant in Supply has been appropriated by statute to the service and object for which the grant is destined, the Treasury, unless otherwise ordered, is not capable of making the issue of the sum so granted from the Consolidated Fund. The introduction of the Appropriation Bill cannot, however, take place until all the grants have been voted for the service of the current year, a process usually ranging over a period of six months. A more prompt issue must therefore be made of the money granted from time to time for the current service of the Crown, and accordingly from time to time Bills are passed during each session known as Consolidated Fund Bills, which empower the Treasury to issue out of the Consolidated Fund for the service of the Departments for whose use the grants are voted such sums as they may require in anticipation of the statutory sanction granted by the Appropriation Act."

There is no statutory sanction until the Appropriation Act is passed for the expenditure of the year. By the Bill now to be brought in, the Treasury is authorised to issue the money, but it will not be an Appropriation Act. Sir Erskine May goes on to explain that the first Consolidated Fund Bill of the session

must be passed during the month of March. That Bill finally appropriates the amount of the Supplementary Estimates and of the expenditure which has taken place between the close of the last session and the end of the financial year.

Then;

"the remaining Consolidated Fund Bills are passed, during the progress of the session, at such times as may be requisite for the maintenance of the public

service."

The Committee will see from that that this is a simple form of procedure to authorise the Treasury to sign cheques and the Paymaster General to pay them, which until this Bill is passed they cannot do. But the final appropriation of the money voted this year will be made at the proper time by the Appropriation Act which will be passed during the last week of the session.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) asked for information as to the sufficiency of the supply of remounts in South Africa. Very little news had been published as to what was being done by the War Office in this direction. A month or two ago an assurance was given that Lord Kitchener had sufficient horses for his requirements. Since then comparatively few horses had been imported into South Africa, while, according to private information he had received, the colonial stock; the horses in South Africa; was now running short, and there would be some difficulty in finding remounts unless a large number were imported. The only notice he had seen of fresh remounts going to South Africa was that of a shipload of about 1,000 horses from South America the other day, and those, he believed, were not considered to be of the best description for the purpose. Statements had repeatedly been made that the great difficulty in South Africa was not the scarcity of rifles or of ammunition, but the question of horses. The war would be decided by our being able to outlast our enemies in the matter of horseflesh, and that could only be done by keeping up a good supply of remounts. He therefore hoped an assurance would be given that the supply of horses was not running short, and that the Government were fully alive to their responsibilities in this matter.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: May I respectfully repeat that this has invariably been regarded as a purely formal stage of the procedure, and, because I understood that it would be again so regarded, I promised to put the Bill down as first Order on Thursday. Of course it is impossible that we should have a discussion to-night and another on Thursday. I earnestly hope, therefore, that the Committee will treat it on this occasion as it always has been treated before, as a formal stage, and I will then put the Bill down as first Order on Thursday.

MR. LAMBERT desired to know of whom he should ask a question with regard to the period for which the war could go on without pressing the Treasury.

*THE CHAIRMAN said that that question hardly arose on the resolution before the Committee.

MR. LAMBERT pointed out that the subject of remounts could be discussed on the present occasion, and his question would naturally arise on that. But he did not want to discuss it; he merely wished to know to whom he should apply for the information.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think that it is relevant to the Votes which have been put from the Chair.

*MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) regretted the First Lord of the Treasury had not made some response to the appeal of the Leader of the Opposition. A great deal of time had been lost owing to the Committee not knowing exactly the business that was coming on. All would acknowledge that in one sense the present was a formal stage, but in another sense it was not. The

House of Commons had now to watch very jealously every opportunity of discussing matters, and naturally, when Members saw that a resolution was to be moved in Committee of Ways and Means, they snatched at the idea that certain discussion might take place. They all understood that nothing could be brought up other than the matters contained in the Votes covered by the resolution put from the Chair, but everything contained in those Votes could be discussed, and, although the Secretary to the Treasury had attempted to draw a distinction between a Consolidated Fund Bill and an Appropriation Bill, there was no distinction in respect of the discussion which might ensue. Everything arising under the Votes which made up the sum of £35,443,233 in the resolution could be discussed; that was the point he desired to make good. He also wished to press on the Leader of the House the desirability of most seriously considering whether he could not respond to the appeal of the Leader of the Opposition, so that Members might know in every case, except that of the Budget, the business that was coming on. Such an arrangement would save a great deal of time, and he hoped the matter would be seriously considered.

MR. PHILIPPS (Pembrokeshire) said that in a recent debate the Secretary of State for War quoted a portion of a telegram from Lord Kitchener to the effect that he had plenty of mounted men and ample remounts. That telegram

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.

Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-

Craig, Robert Hunter

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn)

Cranborne, Viscount

Allan, William (Gateshead)

Boyle, James

Cripps, Charles Alfred

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

Brigg, John

Crombie, John William

Anson, Sir William Reynell

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John

Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)

Archdale, Edward Mervyn

Brookfield, Colonel Montagu

Cross, Herb. S. (Bolton)

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.)

Crossley, Sir Savile

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson

Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)

Arrol, Sir William

Bullard, Sir Harry

Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Thomas
Denny, Col.
Austin, Sir John
Butcher, John George
Dewar, T. R. (T'rH'ml'ts, S. Geo.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Dickson, Charles Scott
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Caldwell, James
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph C.
Bain, Col. James Robert
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Gl'sg'w
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Baird, John George Alexander
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Balcarres, Lord
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Douglas, C. M. (Lanark)
Baldwin, Alfred
Cautley, Henry Strother
Doxford, Sir William T.
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Dunn, Sir William
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G.W. (Leeds)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Edwards, Frank
Balfour, Maj K. R. (Christch'ch)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Elibank, Master of
Banbury, Frederick George
Chamberlain, J. A. (Worc'r)
Emmott, Alfred
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Bartley, George C. T.
Chapman, Edward
Fardell, Sir T. George

Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Cochrane, Hon, T. H. A. E.
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Coddington, Sir William
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Bell, Richard
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Fenwick, Charles
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Fergusson, Rt. Hn Sir J. (Manc'r
Bignold, Arthur
Colville, John
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Bigwood, James
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Finch, George H.
Bill, Charles
Corbett, A. C. (Glasgow)
Finlay, Sir Robt. Bannatyne
Blundell, Col. Henry
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Firbank, Joseph Thomas

had not been laid on the Table, and as only a portion of it had been quoted he thought the Committee were entitled to press for it on the present occasion. He therefore asked whether the right hon. Gentleman proposed to give Members the full telegram, so that they could judge of Lord Kitchener's statement for themselves. If he would not do that, could he repeat the assurance that Lord Kitchener was still amply satisfied with the number of horses and mounted men generally that he had in South Africa.

MR. BRODRICK: I do not think it is very convenient to lay isolated telegrams in the way the hon. Member proposes. I quoted the exact words of Lord Kitchener, and there is no change whatever in his attitude as regards either mounted men or remounts. I am in constant communication with him, and he is absolutely satisfied at the present moment with the supplies he is receiving from England. Question put.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 330; Noes, 66. (Division List No. 275.)

Fisher, William Hayes
Langley, Batty
Rankin, Sir James
FitzGerald, Sir Robt, Penrose-
Law, Andrew Bonar

Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool]
Reid, James (Greenock)
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Lawson, John Grant
Renwick, George
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Lecky, Rt. Hon. Wm. Edw. H.
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Flower, Ernest
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Rigg, Richard
Forster, Henry Wm.
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Foster, Sir Michael (Lond. Univ
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Leng, Sir John
Robson, William Snowdon.
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Roe, Sir Thomas
Fuller, J. M. F.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Galloway, Wm. Johnson
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Garfit, William
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Gibbs, Hn A. G. H. (City of Lond.
Long, Rt Hn. Walter (Bristol S.)
Russell, T. W.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Lowe, Francis William
Sackville, Col. Sir G. Stopford-
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Lowther, Rt. Hn. James (Kent)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander

Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Gore, Hn G. R. C Ormsby- (Salop
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Grant, Corrie
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. E.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Macdonald, John Cumming
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Green, Walford D. (Widnes)
MacLver, David (Liverpool)
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew
Greene, Sir E W (Bury St Edmunds)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Shipmen, Dr. John G.
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Maconochie, A. W.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Gretton, John
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Sinclair, Capt. John Forfarshire
Greville, Hon. Ronald
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Grey, Sir Edward (Berwick)
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
Smith, James P. (Lanarks.)
Groves, James Grimble
Majehdie, James A. H.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand
Gunter, Sir Robert
Malcolm, Ian
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Manners, Lord Cecil
Soares, Ernest J.
Hain, Edward
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Spear, John Ward
Hamilton, Rt Hn Ld. G (Midd'x.

Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry
Mather, William
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Stevenson, Francis S.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent Ashford
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John Wm.
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Mitchell, William
Stroyan, John
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Heaton, John Henniker
Morgan, David J (Walth'mst'w
Tennant, Harold John
Helder, Augustus
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Helme, Norval Watson
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose
Thomas, Dv. Alfred (Merthyr)
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Morrell, George Herbert
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Henderson, Alexander
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotter
Morrison, James Archibald

Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Hoare, Edw Brodie (Hampstead
Morton, Arthur HA. (Deptford)
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Hoare, Sir Samuel (Norwich)
Mount, William Arthur
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Vincent, Col. Sir CEH (Sheffield
Holland, William Henry
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute
Wallace, Robert
Hope, J. F (Sheffield, Brightside
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Horniman, Frederick John
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Newnes, Sir George
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Hoult, Joseph
Nicholson, William Graham
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Norman, Henry
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Jackson, Rt. Hn. Wm. Lawies
Norton, Captain Cecil Wm.
Webb, Col. Wm. George
Jacoby, James Alfred
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Weir, James Galloway
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Welby, Lt-Col AC. E. (Taunton
Joicey, Sir James
Palmer, Sir Chas. M. (Durham)
Welby, Sir C. G. E. (Notts.)
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Parker, Gilbert
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd

Jones, William (Carnarvons.)
Partington, Oswald
White, Luke, York, E. R.)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Paulton, James Mellor
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Pease, J. A (Saffron Walden)
Whiteley, H (Ashton und. Lyne
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Pease, Sir Joseph W. (Durham)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Kenyon, James (Lancs. Bury)
Percy, Earl
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Perks, Robert William
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Kimber, Henry
Philipps, John Wynford
Williams, O. (Merioneth)
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Pierpoint, Robert
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(Bir.)
Kitson, Sir James
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col Richard
Wilson, A. S. (York, E. R.),
Knowles, Lees
Pretymann, Ernest George
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Lambert, George
Priestley, Arthur
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Purvis, Robert
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, William
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yoxall, James Henry
NOES.
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)

Ffrench, Peter
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Field, William
O'Doherty, William
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Blake, Edward
Gilhooly, James
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Boland, John
Hammond, John
O'Dowd, John
Boyle, James
Hardie, J. K. (Merthyr Tydvil)
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Broadhurst, Henry
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon N.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Malley, William
Caine, William Sproston
Joyce, Michael
O'Mara, James
Cameron, Robert
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Lewis, John Herbert
Power, Patrick Joseph
Carew, James Laurence
Lundon, W.
Reddy, M.
Cogan, Denis J.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
M'Fadden, Edward
Redmond, William (Clare)
Crean, Eugene
M'Govern, T.
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Cullinan, J.
Mooney, John J.

Sheehan, Daniel Daniel

Daly, James

Murphy, John

Sullivan, Donal

Delany, William

Nannetti, Joseph P.

White, George (Norfolk)

Dillon, John

Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)

Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)

Doogan, P. C.

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

Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)

Duffy, William J.

O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'ry Mid

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.;

Esmonde, Sir Thomas

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

Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

Farrell, James Patrick

O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.

Resolution to be reported to-morrow; Committee to sit again to-morrow.

FINANCE BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

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

Clause 3.;

MR. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid) said his Amendment raised the question whether an export duty ought to be levied upon small coal as well as large. This in South Wales and other parts of the country was a very Important matter. He proposed to insert the words "large or through and through." The effect of this would be that the duty would be taken off small coal, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer would have the opportunity of telling them whether in dealing with small coal he proposed to put upon it a smaller duty than upon the larger and more valuable kind of coal. He would like to see this duty restricted to large coal, but at any rate he hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would be able to meet the owners of small collieries with respect to the exemption of small coal from the duty. The effect of putting the same duty on all kinds of coal would be very serious. Speaking broadly, large coal was sold f.o.b. at 12s. per ton, while the price of small coal would be about 6s. per ton. When coal was at 12s. a tax of 1s. became a duty of 8 per cent. upon large coal. A duty at the same rate upon small coal at 6s. per ton amounted to 16 per cent. It was not fair to impose twice the percentage on small as upon large coal. In some collieries the proportion of large to small coal was very great; whilst in others there was a very much bigger percentage of the smaller coal. Take as an illustration a colliery producing four tons of large to every

one of small, and suppose that amount was 1,000 tons. According to that percentage of large and small coal they would have 800 tons of large and 200 tons of small. The value of 800 tons at 12s. per ton would be £;480 and 200 tons at 6s. would be worth £;60. The price of 1,000 tons in that proportion would be £;540, and upon that they levied a duty of £;50 at 1s. per ton. Take another colliery further west, in Glamorganshire, where out of 1,000 tons only 300 were large and 700 small. Those 300 tons at 12s. would produce £;180, and 700 tons at 6s. would make a total of £;210. From this colliery 1,000 tons only produced £;390, upon which was levied £;50 duty, and yet upon a commodity worth £;540 only the same amount of duty was imposed. That was a very important matter. He gave those two illustrations to show how the inequality would work in cases where the collieries were not so valuable, and that was the reason why they should be treated much more mercifully. If they put this large duty upon the small coal it must have a tendency to destroy the market for small coal. The result would be that, in many cases where the small coal was now brought to the bank, it would be left underground. That was a very important matter, affecting the safety of the men, for if the small coal was left in the mine there was a greater danger of explosions occurring. Therefore, from the point of view of the safety of the miners, it was important that they should not discourage the raising of small coal to the bank. If they imposed this large duty upon the small coal, then the tendency would be that three-fourths of the people who worked collieries would be encouraged rather to keep the coal inside the pit rather than deliver it on the bank. A great deal had been said about the large fortunes made by coalowners, and he had no objection whatever to see them taxed. If they had ample time to go into the figures with regard to these collieries they would find, even with regard to those mines producing the best coal, that the average return to the coalowner was not so large as had been represented by the right hon. Gentleman. He knew of one colliery employing between 800 and 900 men where the interest paid on the capital sunk in the colliery was not more than one and a half to two per cent. The small collieries depended to a large extent upon the small coal which they were able to sell in order to make a profit, and with this tax they would not be able to sell it in bad times. It was perfectly true that if these collieries were unable to dispose of their small coal at a profit they would have to close their collieries altogether. Therefore, from both these points of view, he hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer was convinced that the duty ought not to be placed on small coal at all. He hoped, at any rate, that the right hon. Gentleman did not propose to make the duty payable at the same rate for both small and large coal. It appeared to him to be a very hard thing that one colliery producing small coal, and exporting it to Belgium, France, or Italy, should have to pay this duty, while a colliery in the same district producing the same coal for home consumption would contribute nothing in the shape of duty. Those were the considerations which had induced him to put down this Amendment, and the right hon. Gentleman was not able to meet them to that extent; he hoped that when they came to a quality of coal which was worth only 6s. a ton he did not propose to make the duty payable 1s. a ton.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 2, line 29, after the word 'on' to insert the words 'large or through and through.'";(Mr. Samuel Evans.)

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

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The hon. Member for Mid Glamorgan will perhaps forgive me for saying that I think he has been rather prolific in Amendments upon this particular matter.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS: They are all, good Amendments, and there is no harm, in them.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The hon. Member has made three proposals. In the first place he suggested a graduated duty of 6d. on large coal, 4d. on through and through coal, and 2d. on small coal, without reference to value. Then he proposed a similar scale of duty-based on the value as well as the description of the coal. These proposals appear to me to be entirely impracticable, and either of them would absolutely destroy the yield from the duty which I have proposed. The third proposal, which he has just laid before the Committee, was that, while the duty should be 1s. a ton on large and through and through coal, small coal should be altogether exempt from any duty. But then comes the difficult question of what is small coal. I have been endeavouring to ascertain that for some time past. I have communicated with many authorities on the subject, in different parts of

the country, and with several Members of this House. I am aware that the subject has been discussed by the Mining Association, but many different views were expressed, and no decision was arrived at. The difficulty of defining small coal is clearly shown by the various Amendments which have been placed on the Paper with a view to arriving at a definition. I am sure that hon. Members acquainted with this subject will be ready to admit that there is a great deal of small coal of a low value, and it is that which, I think, the hon. Member opposite has in his mind. But there is also a good deal of small coal of a higher value than some large coal. I am informed that the bituminous small coal, which goes through a very small sieve, is of as high a value as the large coal from the same district. So that any attempt to differentiate between large and small coal would be absolutely unfair, and would not secure what I believe the hon. Member opposite desires. There are Amendments on the Paper prescribing the size of the mesh through which small coal should pass, with the view of arriving at a definition of small coal. But, in my opinion, it would be absolutely impossible to legislate on such a basis as that. It would be troublesome to the trader to attempt to stereotype in an Act of Parliament the size of the mesh which should differentiate between the coal. I am informed, too, that it is not only a question of the size of the mesh when settling what is small and what is large coal, but that the angle at which the screen is placed has a very material effect on the process of screening. At many ports there are practically no facilities for screening, and although there would be a screen, I suppose, at every colliery, the Customs officers could not attend them. Again, a good deal of coal is sold without being screened at all. I think I have now dealt with the Amendment of the hon. Member, and I contend that I have shown that it would be impossible and unfair for the Committee to exempt small coal, as such, from the

operation of a duty which would apply to large coal of less value than some kinds of small coal. I observe on the Paper Amendments attempting to graduate the duty on an ad valorem basis. There is a great deal that is taking in that proposal, but I do not think it is likely to commend itself to hon.

Members from those parts of the country where the most valuable coal is produced, because it is perfectly obvious that, if we attempt anything of the kind, I shall have to ask the Committee to sanction a rate of duty higher on the more valuable coal than that which has been already sanctioned. I am not quite sure that that would be fair in all cases, for some of the very valuable coal is, I imagine, produced at a cost, owing to the depth of the pits and a variety of reasons, which make the profits to the owners not greater, at any rate, than those on some of the inferior kinds of coal which are produced at much less cost. Further, any attempt at an ad valorem duty would, I cannot help thinking, entail so many chances of fraud and so many cases of dispute between the Custom House officers and the persons interested, and so much continual trouble to the trade as to render it almost impracticable.

Having gone through the different proposals I come to what the hon. Member seems to me to have really in his mind, and that is what I alluded to last night; namely, the more favourable dealing in point of duty with the cheapest class of coal. That is a point on which I am prepared to meet the hon. Member and hon. Members on this side of the House, who are equally interested in the subject. There are two ways in which it might be met, but in either case it would be by a rebate of the duty in the Bill. We might either give a rebate of part of the duty on coal below a certain price f.o.b., or we might give a rebate of the whole of the duty on lesser priced coal. I have been personally rather inclined to the former course, but I have reason to suppose that the latter course would be more agreeable to hon. Members who are interested in this matter, and who desire some amelioration for this kind of coal. This particular point of the Bill is not, however, the point at which an Amendment of that kind can properly be moved. If hon. Members will look at the wording of the Bill, they will see that we will come to that point later in the clause, probably at the end of line 31, and I hope I shall be able by the time we get there to suggest definite proposals to the Committee, which may deal with this matter in one or other of the ways I have mentioned.

I may say that I have also examined the case of patent fuel, and I feel that, having regard to the interests of our manufacturers of patent fuel, we must treat patent fuel in the same way as we treat small coal, and therefore any proposal I will make on the subject will apply to patent fuel also. I hope the hon. Member will not now press his Amendment.

MR. MCLAREN (Leicestershire, Bosworth) said he was very glad to hear the favourable view the Chancellor of the Exchequer had taken of the representations addressed to him, and after what the right hon. Gentleman had said he would suggest that the Amendment be withdrawn. Before the Chancellor of the Exchequer submitted to the Committee the exact terms in which he was prepared to allow small coal to go out of the country he ought to carefully consider the effect of railway rates on the price of coal f.o.b. He had had various figures suggested

to him, such as 5s. and 6s., but although they might suit Durham and Northumberland very well, where the collieries were near the sea, any hard and fast line would operate very hardly in collieries in South Yorkshire, Derbyshire, and Leicestershire, and also in South Wales, where some of the most prolific collieries, not the very best collieries, had a rate to the sea of 2s. or 2s. 6d. He could state from personal knowledge that, unless collieries in South Wales got a fair return for their small coal, it would be impossible for them to pay. He was not addressing the Committee as a colliery proprietor, but as the representative of a constituency which contained a large number of miners, who would feel the direct effect of cutting down profits by the unfair treatment of small coal. In South Wales the sliding scale would operate to reduce wages next month; already a reduction of wages was in operation in Durham, and a reduction was freely talked of in the Midlands in the autumn. That seemed to him to be the very worst time to try an experiment which would affect wages without the most prolonged and most careful consideration. He had not the least doubt that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would give the subject that consideration, because the right hon. Gentleman now saw the intricacies of the question

and the complications which every step involved. The coalowners were willing to bear their share of the national burden; all they asked was that the duty should be put on in such a way as to cause the least friction in carrying out their obligations. If there was one thing which a coal owner abhorred and feared more than another, it was the question of a wages dispute with his workmen. He hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would take into account the various burdens which the colliery owners had to bear, and if, in fixing the limit of the abatement of the duty, regard were given to the price at the pit's mouth, and not to the price f.o.b., or by some combination which could be arrived at without any difficulty, the gift which it was proposed to give to the coalowners and miners would be doubly valuable. He felt sure the Chancellor of the Exchequer appreciated the importance of the question, and he sincerely hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would be able to meet them in South Wales and the Midlands on as favourable terms as he had met Members from the North of England. MR. BRYNMOR JONES (Swansea District) said he was very glad indeed to find that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was prepared to some extent to meet the demands that had been made on him from different parts of the country with regard to the coal duty. He confessed that he did not fully understand the purport of the concession which the right hon. Gentleman was prepared to make, but at the same time he did not think that it went nearly as far as the demand which they in West Glamorganshire thought they had a right to make. The Amendment of his hon. friend in effect would secure the total exemption of what was called small coal. Of course, the words "small coal" and "large coal" were technical terms, but they were fairly well known in the trade, and contracts were made and carried out every day in respect of them. So far as the Chancellor of the Exchequer based his argument against the Amendment on the difficulty of drawing a distinction between the different classes of coal he would respectfully point out that that was really a matter of language to be

determined by a definition in the Bill. The Chancellor of the Exchequer referred to the questions of the mesh and the angle, but it would be quite easy to find a form of words which would put beyond all doubt what was the meaning of "large coal" as opposed to "small coal." He was informed that the ordinary screen which separated large coal from small coal had 1½ inch mesh. If that were taken as the basis for distinction, the angle could also be determined. He did not, however, desire to enter into detail. What they in West Glamorganshire wished was the total exemption of small coal from the duty. The matter was from the point of revenue a very small one indeed. The amount of small coal exported from Swansea, except for coasting purposes, did not exceed more than two or three cargoes a year. What, then, was the meaning of putting a duty on small coal for revenue purposes? What was really the important factor was the question of manufactured fuel, and he confessed that the answer of the Chancellor of the Exchequer regarding it was entirely unsatisfactory. One of the largest manufacturers of patent fuel in West Glamorganshire had sent him a communication stating that before the manufacture of that fuel small coal was practically wasted, and remained in huge quantities at the collieries. It was by the energy of a former member of the House that the great patent fuel industry was started, by which small coal was utilised instead of being thrown aside at the mouth of the pit. The reason why they had taken such a great interest in the question was that if the manufactured article were to be taxed, an industry which, notwithstanding obvious advantages, was not at present in a very flourishing condition, would be practically destroyed. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, in his promised concession in regard to small coal, had lost sight of the fact that it was not merely small coal compressed into blocks. It involved not only the use of most expensive machinery, but the introduction into the article in the course of its manufacture of a substitute called pitch, which was highly expensive. He should say, indeed, that from 10 to 15 per cent. of the substances in the manufactured article, which he proposed to treat as small coal, was pitch. In some instances this very substance had been imported into Glamorganshire in order to carry on the patent fuel manufacturing business. If that was the case, surely the concession of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was wholly inadequate to meet the case. He ought not to treat the article as small coal at all, but to put it into a category by itself.

MR. ABEL THOMAS (Carmarthenshire, E.) said that until he had received an idea of the full extent of the proposed concessions he should support his hon. and learned friend's Amendment. In fact, the Amendment was not inconsistent with the position taken up by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, because the Amendment simply aimed at the exclusion of small coal altogether. He was surprised to hear the Chancellor of the Exchequer say that there was no definition of small coal. He (Mr. Thomas) supposed a lease was never granted of a colliery in Wales in which there was not a difference in the percentage of royalties charged on small coal as compared with large coal. He ventured to say that there were thousands of contracts made in the course of every year in Cardiff and Wales generally in which they specified for through and through and small coal only. There should be no difficulty in formulating the distinction between these coals. They were

dealing with a tax which this year seemed to be reasonable enough, and which last year was reasonable enough. But in 1876, 1877, and 1878 practically the whole of the small coal delivered and sold free on board never reached six shillings a ton, and was often as low as three shillings. One would see, therefore, that a shilling tax during bad years was an impossible tax, although it was true that in a year like this and last year it very likely was a small matter. The whole idea of taxing coal was a leap in the dark. It was a very dangerous experiment, and still more dangerous when the Government were dealing with such substances as small coal, the price of which in bad times sank to an insignificant figure.

*SIR JOSEPH PEASE (Durham, Barnard Castle) thought that those hon. Gentlemen who were in the House when the right hon. Gentleman made the statement which he made must have felt that the difficulty of defining coal was very great indeed. If the right hon. Gentleman made any concession at all it should be a full and free concession. He thought that the only definition of small coal on which the Chancellor of the Exchequer could act was that which its value afforded. But it would much facilitate discussion if the right hon. Gentleman would give particulars of the concession he proposed.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydfil) took rather a different view of the concessions which had been given by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He thought the concession which was promised to the patent fuel manufacturers would be no concession at all. The right hon. Gentleman was going to tax small coal according to its value and put patent fuel upon the same basis, but inasmuch as the cost of manufacture of patent fuel was about double the price of small coal he could not see how that was to be done. The price of patent fuel never went down to anything like the price of small coal. The proper definition of small coal was that, whatever its size, so long as the price remained below 6s. it was small coal. When the coal duties were in operation in 1842 and 1845 the duty was 2s. a ton on the large coal and 1s. a ton on the small. The right hon. Gentleman was adding to the uncertainty of the revenue by this means; a year or two hence all coal might be shipped at only 5s. a ton. The right hon. Gentleman had no idea what proportion of coal shipped was small coal and what was large coal, yet notwithstanding his lack of knowledge upon that point he was going to make a leap in the dark by undertaking to remit duty altogether, or to charge a very small duty, on coal that was below the value of 5s. a ton. Such a thing would make a difference to the right hon. Gentleman of one-fourth or one-fifth of his revenue. He was glad the right hon. Gentleman had consented to consider the question of patent fuel. He thought the argument of the manufacturers was unanswerable, but he would point out that once the right hon. Gentleman made any remissions he accepted the principle of an ad valorem duty, and he could not tell where it would lead him to.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I cannot say more than I have on the Amendment before the Committee. It is an Amendment which I have said I cannot admit, and therefore I think I must ask the Committee to come to a decision upon this matter.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said the question was an important one for South Wales. Everybody in business there understood what small coal was. He was glad the

right hon. Gentleman had made these concessions, and he was grateful to him for them.

MR. ATHERLEY-JONES (Durham, N.W.) recognised the value of the principle of the concessions made, and was inclined to think that at this stage it was unnecessary to go to a division on the subject. But at the same time he desired to point out that it would be a relief to the north country Members if as soon as possible some indication were given as to the point which the right hon. Gentleman regarded as the point at which the duty should be remitted. In Durham not more than 5 per cent. of the coal exported was small coal, but in Northumberland it was something like 20 per cent. of the total export, and Northumberland would be put at a disadvantage if a permanent charge, partly payable in royalties and partly payable to the State, of 1s. 8d. a ton were made. English coal was already heavily handicapped in competing with foreign coal. The German competition, which was most keen of all, came from Westphalian coal, and if the price of English coal were increased the radius in which the competition of Westphalian coal was felt would be extended. He submitted that the Chancellor of the Exchequer should choose a low figure as the price at which duty on small coal should be remitted f.o.b., and if he did that he believed great satisfaction would be felt in the north.

Question put, and negatived.

MR. D. A. THOMAS moved an Amendment providing that the duty should be levied on "smokeless steam and Durham gas coal." He said he did not intend to press this Amendment to a division; his only object was to confine the duty to the coal which the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his Budget speech assured the House we had a practical monopoly of. There was no strong objection to imposing an export duty on such coal, because it in no way affected the principle of free trade, but if it could be shown that there was no monopoly, then he submitted it was a violation of the free trade principles upon which this country had prospered for fifty years. So far as South Wales was concerned there was no such monopoly; in all parts of the world competition with Welsh coal was increasing, and in the last ten years they had lost some great markets altogether. He therefore asked the right hon. Gentleman to confine this duty to such coal as had a monopoly.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 2, line 29, after the word 'on,' to insert the words 'smokeless steam and Durham gas.'"; (Mr. D. A. Thomas.)

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

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): said the hon. Member could hardly expect the Chancellor of the Exchequer to accept the Amendment, which would destroy the yield of the duty.

MR. JOHN WILSON (Durham, Mid), while admiring the self-sacrifice of the hon. Member for Merthyr, was not prepared to be laid with him on the same altar. If the hon. Member would exclude Durham, then he would vote for the Amendment.

MR. ROBSON said that though the Amendment might be moved in humour, it had great argumentative merits on the general principle; he pointed out that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had himself instanced smokeless Welsh and Durham gas

coal as the two kinds that could hold their own in spite of competition. The Amendment would confine the right hon. Gentleman's duty to his argument, and if it was not

accepted they would know that this was a trade tax imposed to the detriment of the English producer and for the benefit of the foreigner. Even if the Amendment were not accepted now and its principle conceded, a discussion might be raised upon that question later on.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I have attempted in more than one way to meet the reasonable views of hon. Gentlemen opposite, and in return I am met with an Amendment that would absolutely destroy the tax. If the hon. Gentleman does not agree with the tax let him vote against the clause; but the Committee will discuss it in a businesslike way.

Question put, and negatived.

MR. D. A. THOMAS next proposed that the duty should be charged on "the fixed carbon as indicated by analysis" in the coal. He pointed out that in small coal there was a percentage of ash to the extent of 15 per cent. on incineration, and in most of the contracts for the export of small coal it was expressly provided that the percentage of ash should not be larger than a certain amount, otherwise a penalty had to be paid.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 2, line 29, after the word 'on,' to insert the words 'the fixed carbon as indicated by analysis in.'";(Mr. David Thomas).

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put and negatived.

*MR. LAW (Glasgow, Blackfriars) admitted that the concession which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had intimated his intention of granting would be a great advantage to the coal trade of the country, especially that of Scotland; but he felt very strongly that the only proper way of levying the duty was on the price f.o.b., and, therefore, he desired to place before the Committee very briefly the case for an ad valorem, versus a specific, duty. If this question were now being considered for the first time, he was certain there would be no difference of opinion whatever that the Draper and only fair way, as between the different districts of the country

and the different collieries in those districts, would be to levy the tax in proportion to the price which could be obtained for the coal. There was a great difference in value between the various qualities of coal exported. There was still exported a considerable quantity of cannel coal which, although not large in comparison with the total amount exported, yet amounted to several hundred thousand tons per annum, was worth about £2 per ton. Then came the Welsh coal, of the value of 18s. 6d. or 19s. per ton, after which there was the Scotch coal, worth only one half the value of best Welsh. That meant that coal of one kind was taxed at only 2½ per cent., another kind at only 5 per cent., while Scotch coal was taxed at more than 10 per cent., and Northumberland coal at nearly 10 per cent. But the case for an ad valorem duty was even stronger than those figures indicated. The Chancellor of the Exchequer when introducing the Budget urged as his strongest argument in its favour that the tax would be paid by the foreigner. The right hon. Gentleman was probably not so sure of that now,

and, at all events, to whatever extent it was true it applied only to coal in which we had a monopoly; more especially to Welsh coal, which had a monopoly absolutely in our own Navy and, to some extent, in other navies. If, therefore, Welsh coal could not pay its proportion of the tax according to its value, the main argument of the right hon. Gentleman fell to the ground. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated that the Welsh Members would not approve of an ad valorem duty, but surely that could hardly be the case. The hon. and learned Gentleman opposite, in discussing a previous Amendment, had spent the whole of his time in proving that it was absolutely unfair to tax Welsh coal of a low quality at the same rate as Welsh coal of a higher value. If that was the view of the Welsh Members, how could they possibly maintain that it was fair to tax Scotch coal at the same rate as Welsh coal, seeing that the former had only half the value of the latter? On the question of expediency he admitted there was much to be said. There were difficulties with regard to the imposition of an ad valorem tax, but they were not

insuperable. There was no commodity upon which it would be easier to levy an ad valorem duty than would be the case with coal. But it was not necessary to argue the question, because, according to the public press, the right hon. Gentleman himself had intimated to the representatives of the coal trade that if they were unanimous in desiring an ad valorem duty he would be prepared to concede it.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH said he could not admit the accuracy of that statement.

*MR. LAW said that whether or not the Chancellor of the Exchequer admitted it, he was perfectly certain that if the right hon. Gentleman believed it was the right way of levying the tax, and consulted the people concerned, he would find a way of overcoming the difficulties. The difficulties in this matter were not half so serious as those which the right hon. Gentleman had already overcome in regard to the graduated tax on sugar. A great advantage of an ad valorem duty was that when the coal trade suddenly passed from a period of depression to a period of prosperity the revenue would get the advantage of the change, and it would get the benefit at a time when the coal trade would not feel the higher tax. All would admit that a year or two ago a tax of 2s. 6d. a ton would not have done half the harm to the coal trade that a tax of 1s. a ton would do at a time when the trade was depressed, profits were disappearing, and miners' wages had been reduced to the lowest level. The Chancellor of the Exchequer in conducting this Bill had shown great patience and courtesy, and if he adhered to his proposal of a specific duty, it would be felt that he had manifested that most difficult of Christian virtues; love to his enemies, politically. Wales returned to the House of Commons Members who were almost unanimous in their opposition to the Government, whereas Scotland, especially the part affected by the coal trade, and the North of England returned a large part of the majority which kept in power the right hon. Gentleman and the Government of which he was a Member; and yet, by levying the tax in the manner proposed, the right hon. Gentleman would impose upon Scotland a tax exactly twice as heavy as that imposed upon Wales, and upon the North of England a tax nearly twice as heavy. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had said that the question of profits came in, that it cost very much more to obtain the higher priced coal,

and that, according to his information, the profits per ton were not greater on the Welsh than on the Scotch coal. That was a statement which anybody could make but nobody prove. On the face of it it was obviously absurd. It implied that to extract Welsh coal cost 8s. per ton more than to extract Scotch coal, which was hardly probable. But it was not a question of profits. There was the same difference between different collieries in the same district as between one district and another, and the only way to vary the tax would be to levy it on the profits themselves. Under the circumstances, he had stated the case very briefly, and not as strongly as he could have wished, for the case was a very strong one, and he believed that even yet the Chancellor of the Exchequer would find it easier in practice to carry out an ad valorem duty than a tax which varied from nothing to a shilling, in the manner at present proposed.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 2, line 30, to leave out the words 'a duty of one shilling per ton,' and insert the words 'an ad valorem duty of seven and a half per cent. on the price "free on board," but not exceeding one shilling per ton.'";(Mr. Law.)

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I am very grateful to my hon. friend for the kind way in which he has referred to myself, and I can assure him that I am far from wishing to complain either of the Amendment which he has thought it necessary to place before the Committee, or of the manner in which he has proposed it. He has put forward, I frankly admit, a number of good arguments in favour of an ad valorem duty, and there is no doubt that in the case of an export duty there is more to be said in its favour than in the case of an import duty, and that the difficulties are not so great. But I hope my hon. friend will not wish me to embark on any comparison of the respective interests in this matter of the different coalfields of the United Kingdom. He has given me credit, at any rate, for impartiality in the manner in which I have dealt with this tax, and he has suggested that I have proposed the tax in such a way as to inflict greater burdens on my political friends than on those who are not supporters of the Government. Well, Sir, if that subject were followed to its conclusion I am afraid we should be led into a comparison of the national rights of Scotland and Wales, not to say the North of England, which might rather detract from the harmony of our discussion, and not lead to any satisfactory conclusion. There is one point on which I think I may, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, take praise to myself. My hon. friend has said that an ad valorem duty in a year such as last year would have produced much more to the Exchequer. That is so, but I have been anxious in this, as in other proposals, whatever the merits or failings in principle might be, at any rate to give as little trouble as possible to the trade affected. I feel quite certain that any attempt to graduate this tax by an ad valorem duty would lead to such trouble in the trade and such disputes that it would be an unwise proposal. I trust that hon. Members will be reasonably satisfied with the concessions I am about to propose, which will certainly be a great advantage to the districts which produce the cheaper classes of coal, and not prolong the debate on this particular mode of levying the duty, or press the Amendment to a division.

Amendment negatived.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: In accordance with the intention I have indicated I beg now to move the insertion of the following words;

"That a rebate of duty shall be allowed on any coal, the value of which free on board is proved, to the satisfaction of the Commissioners of Customs, not to exceed 6s. per ton, and on any fuel manufactured from coal ingredients which are so proved not to be of a higher value."

I have already sufficiently explained the matter, and I would only add that this Amendment places manufactured fuel on precisely the same footing as coal. I would remind the hon. Member for Swansea, who takes a very natural interest in the matter, that it is under precisely the same conditions; the imposition of no duty on either; that the trade in manufactured fuel has grown to its present proportions. Therefore I do not think I can be charged with doing anything that will really injure that industry. I think the hon. Member will see that by my proposal all kinds of fuel manufactured from coal under the value in question will be free from duty, and I cannot think that fuel manufactured from coal of higher value should be free.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 2, line 21, to insert the words, 'That a rebate of duty should be allowed on any coal the value of which free on board is proved to the satisfaction of the Commissioners of Customs not to exceed 6s. per ton, and on any fuel manufactured from coal ingredients which are so proved not to be of a higher value.'"; (The Chancellor of the Exchequer.)

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

SIR EDWARD GREY (Northumberland, Berwick): Speaking for my hon. friends who have more intimate knowledge of the coal trade than I have, I desire to express their sense of the value of the concession which the Chancellor of the Exchequer has made. Having previously dwelt very strongly on the sense of injustice created by this tax in the minds of those who were most severely hit by it, and having said that the injustice would be greatest in the case of those parts of the country which produced the cheaper kinds of coal, I desire to say that, while the concession of the Chancellor of the Exchequer does not remove my objections to the tax; I still think it will be bad in practice, and that there will be hardship connected with it; I do recognise that, in making this concession, and in the trouble, attention, and close consideration which the right hon.

Gentleman has given to the subject before coming to the conclusion that he could make the concession which is now before the Committee, the Chancellor of the Exchequer has been animated by a genuine desire to do all that he could, at any rate, to mitigate the apprehensions of injustice which his proposals had excited. Though I must leave it to my hon. friends who are specially connected with the trade to express their own sense of the exact value of the concession, I think it would be ungracious on my part not to express at once my sense of the desire to relieve injustice which the Chancellor of the Exchequer has shown by the Amendment he has moved.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES entirely agreed with the observations of the hon. Baronet with regard to the concessions made and the general good spirit displayed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, but there were one or two practical points he

desired to place before the Committee. Below the 6s. rate, manufactured patent fuel was placed on the same basis as coal. That might be so from the purely legal point of view, but, practically, it was no good at all. No patent fuel could be made at 6s.;

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The ingredients.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES said that even taking into account the ingredients it was not possible to send out patent fuel under 12s. or 13s. per ton.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The hon. Member I think is under a misapprehension. The 6s. is the price, not of the patent fuel, but of the coal ingredients.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES was inclined to think that even then the concession was not a large one from the point of view of those for whom he spoke. He was not a practical man in these matters, but he understood that the cost of the production of patent fuel was now so high that, even with the concession, the tax would operate disastrously to the trade.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH said that, of course, the matter was a very technical one, and if, after consulting his advisers, the hon. Member desired to make any representations on the subject, he would be perfectly ready to hear them.

MR. J. ACRON THOMAS (Glamorganshire, Gower) said that in the making of patent fuel two qualities of coal were used.

Some of the coal would, no doubt, be of a less value than 6s. per ton, but the bulk of it would cost more. He therefore desired to know whether the duty would have to be paid on the whole of the coal, or would it be paid on the proportion of the higher class coal used, the remainder of the coal ingredients being free.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH said that if the manufacturers of patent fuel used, say, half a ton of coal at 8s. or 9s., and half a ton at, say, 4s. 6d., he would consider whether the two prices could be added together and averaged, so that in cases where the average came out at under 6s. the fuel would be free of the duty.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS asked whether the Commissioners of Inland Revenue would have it in their absolute discretion to decide in this matter, or would there be an appeal from their decision. He also desired to know how the Commissioners would deal with the question. There would be no difficulty when the coal was sold f.o.b., because the contracts could be produced. He assumed, however, that the rebate would apply also to coal not sold f.o.b. If coal was sold c.i.f., it would have to be ascertained whether, if that coal had been sold f.o.b. at Cardiff, it would have been of the value of 6s. or not. This Amendment would show as much as any other portion of the Bill how hard this tax was as a whole. The fact was two counties out of the fifty-two in England and Wales would contribute far and away the largest proportion of the total duty. According to their shipments, Glamorganshire and Monmouthshire would contribute more than half of the amount raised for taxation purposes from this export duty, and that proportion would be increased as the result of this Amendment. With this present concession and the question of the contracts the benefit of the duty for this year would be to a great extent given up, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer would find that it would have been better for him and his Government if they had never departed from the principles hitherto professed by the right hon.

Gentleman, and had not attempted to impose a coal duty at all.

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): In the debate on the Second Reading of the Bill I ventured to point out to the right hon. Gentleman on behalf of that part of Scotland which I have the honour to represent with what extreme hardship and inequality the tax as originally proposed would weigh on the less productive and less conveniently situated coalfields from which coal was exported abroad. I do not think any coalfields in the country would have suffered more from the tax than the coalfields of Fife. The hon. Member opposite, in a speech to which we all listened with interest and attention, ingeniously suggested that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in a spirit of excessive quixotry, had scourged the coalfields represented by political friends in order to do an act of more than Christian charity to the coalfields represented by political opponents. I am not sure, if the facts were analysed, that that theory could be in any way supported, but, at any rate, I am glad to think that the Chancellor of the Exchequer has recognised, not a quixotic standard, but the strict standard of justice and equality so far as it can be applied to so complicated a subject as this. There are many arguments to be urged in favour of the proposal for an ad valorem duty which, if worked out in a practical scheme, would work out perhaps more strictly in accordance with abstract justice, but that being a scheme which presents great practical difficulties, it appears to me that the Chancellor of the Exchequer adopted the only possible alternative when he fixed in this Amendment a minimum figure below which the duty should not be imposed. I am not able to say, even as regards my own county, to what percentage of the total exports this modified proposal will apply, but I am quite certain that it will be an enormous relief as compared with the original project of the Government. I desire, therefore, in common with several of my hon. friends, to recognise the spirit of fairness and the desire to adjust the tax; a tax which we still think objectionable; so far as possible to the special requirements of the trade, which the Chancellor of the Exchequer has shown.

*SIR JOSEPH PEASE said he believed that this concession would be of very great service to the whole community. But although they approved of the concession, and thanked the right hon. Gentleman for making it, it did not alter their view as to the inexpediency of the tax from a national point of view. Later on they would have an opportunity of making some observations upon the merits of the clause. It would have been very difficult indeed to have adopted any system of taxation based on the size of coal, or any other standard but that of value. The very best coal produced in his constituency was often crushed for the purpose of making first-class coke into small coal, and any arrangement as to the screening of coal would fail altogether. There would be no end to difficulty in the practical working of any standard of screening. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had now simplified his Bill, and he had also simplified the work of the Custom House officials in asking that there should be a declaration that the coal was not worth more than 6s. per ton, and that the invoice should be produced. He felt sure that the working of this clause would be very much modified and made more easy by the concession which had just been made.

*MR. FENWICK (Northumberland, Wansbeck) said he appreciated fully the concession

which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had made, and the anxiety he had shown to meet them as far as possible without giving up the duty altogether. But, while he made this acknowledgment, he desired to assure the right hon. Gentleman that he was not yet satisfied with the concession made, for reasons which he should have to state when they came to the question "that the clause stand part of the Bill." In times of low prices in the North of England they would no doubt feel the advantage of the concession made. He thanked the right hon. Gentleman for the generous way in which he had endeavoured to meet them, although he thought it only fair to state that he was not satisfied with the concession. It would be ungracious on their part, after all the labour and anxiety which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had passed through, not to acknowledge the concession he had just made.

EARL PERCY (Kensington, S.) thought they ought not to pass from the Amendment without one word of gratitude being offered the Chancellor of the Exchequer from that side of the House for the manner in which he had met their views. The right hon. Gentleman had made a very considerable concession, which he imagined would involve a large loss to the Revenue, but whether that loss was large or small he did not think the Chancellor of the Exchequer would have any cause to regret it, for it would be more than counterbalanced by the removal of a sense of injustice.

MR. D. A. THOMAS said he wished to join in the chorus of congratulation to the right hon. Gentleman for the concession he had made. In good times this concession would mean nothing at all, although in bad times it might mean a good deal. It seemed to him to be the first step towards an ad valorem duty, to which he objected; indeed, he thought this concession was more unsound in principle than an ad valorem duty. One effect of this concession would be that the class of coal between 6s. and 7s. per ton would be practically abolished. By making this concession the right hon. Gentleman was, in bad times, doing away with the duty upon certain classes of small coal, and he was not carrying out his professed policy of widening the basis of taxation.

SIR JAMES JOICEY (Durham, Chester-le-Street) did not think the concession would be of the same value to the county of Durham as it would be to the county of Northumberland. The bulk of the coal produced in Durham did not realise very high prices, and the result would be that in all probability a very small proportion of the coal produced in Durham would ever be below the value of 6s. a ton. The right hon. Gentleman had given a concession to patent fuel, and he wished to know whether, in cases where, say, some of the inferior coals of Durham were used for coke-making, a similar concession would be given to the coke as representing coal of the value of less than 6s. a ton.

MR. JOHN WILSON (Durham, Mid) thought the concession just made was in the way of mitigating the evils complained of, and it also showed that the tax had been imposed without due consideration beforehand. He did not think that it would affect the position of Durham very much. He believed that only about 5 per cent. of the six million tons exported from Durham would benefit by the exemption. He desired to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he would exempt from duty coke made from small coal which, if shipped f.o.b. as coal,

would not realise 6s. a ton. Such an exemption would be of greater benefit to Durham than the exemption of small coal from duty.

MR. ABEL THOMAS said the concession was really much bigger and broader than it looked at first sight, for what it meant was that from henceforth there would be no coal sold between 6s. and 7s. a ton f.o.b. in any port in Great Britain. The person selling the coal would not sell it at 6s. 11d. per ton, but he would sell at 6s. and put the 1s. per ton in his own pocket, and perhaps promise the buyer a goose at Christmas. He agreed that in bad times this concession would be a very great benefit.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I am very grateful to the Members of the Committee for the manner in which they have received the Amendment and for what they have been pleased to say with regard to myself. There has been apparently only one dissentient, the Member for Merthyr Tydvil, who really, I think, was the original author of the proposal. I quite recognise that my proposal does not remove other objections to the tax in principle, and we can debate that later on. Two or three questions have been put to me. The hon. Member for Mid Durham has asked me whether coke would be treated as it was proposed to treat manufactured fuel. I must reserve that point. I feel the force of the argument of the hon. Member, but I am informed that manufactured fuel is made of very cheap stuff, and that coke is made out of valuable coal. I will consider the matter with the view to dealing with coke fairly. I have been asked as to the effect of this concession on the Budget. I will frankly tell the Committee that I do not think it will be large this year. I

agree with hon. Members who have spoken that in a bad year this concession will be a considerable sum, and that is precisely why I have made it. When an industry suffers by bad trade, that is just the time when it ought to be relieved. As to the question with regard to an appeal and with whom the discretion rests, the Committee might rest satisfied that the discretion of the Commissioners of Customs will be fairly exercised.

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS (Glasgow, Camlachie) thought the concession which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had made would be cordially accepted. He hoped, however, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would not allow himself to be involved in questions affecting the composition of fuel, or he might find that fuel would be made in such a way and prepared from such material that it would be perfectly impossible to tax it. He thought this was a wise tax, and he should be very sorry to see it whittled away.

Question put, and agreed to.

*MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) then moved;

"In page 2, line 31, after the words last inserted to insert the words 'whereof one-fourth shall be paid by the landlord or royalty owner, being the person for the time being in receipt of any royalty or rent in respect of the coal on which the duty is charged.'"

He said this Amendment raised the question of the person upon whom the duty was to fall. Ordinarily in levying Customs duties on commodities they took care by means of equivalent Excises that the final incidence of the duty should be upon the consumer, but in the case of an export duty they had no hold upon the

foreigner, and they could not compel him to buy in the English market. This tax had been defined by the Chancellor of the Exchequer as a small toll on their mineral wealth made in the interest of the country at large. The question they had now to consider was, Who was going to pay this small toll? Was it to fall exclusively upon the exporter, or was it to be borne by all the persons engaged in the trade, from the person who first sells the coal, the royalty owner or landlord, down to the person who exports it? If a toll was to be paid by those concerned in the export of the coal, that was a burden to which the original owners ought to contribute as well as those whose capital was engaged in bringing the coal to the surface and preparing it for sale. It had been admitted that this tax would to some extent fall upon the coal trade. He was not going to discuss the conjectures as to how far it would be paid by the foreigner, but he would take his stand on the solid ground of agreement. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated that he thought the foreigner would bear a very considerable portion of this tax, although he entirely admitted that how much he would bear depended upon the state of the market at the time. The degree to which the tax would fall on the trade was uncertain, but the fact that it would do so was not denied. He submitted that the very definition given of this tax was a sufficient argument in favour of the justice of his proposal. Those immediately concerned in the ownership of the national wealth were the only ones absolutely certain of getting a profit. The colliery proprietor risked his capital and gave the initiative in business organisation. The miner risked life and limb and gave his labour. The royalty owners risked nothing and were secure of profit. Was it equitable that they should be the only class who did not contribute to this new toll on the national wealth in minerals? The second reason why this Amendment should be accepted was that the tax would to some extent restrict the sales of coal. It was true that the First Lord of the Treasury concluded the only speech he had made on this subject by saying that;

"so trifling an alteration as will be produced by the imposition of a shilling duty would have no effect upon the trade."

The right hon. Gentleman asserted that with all the parade of confident declamation in the hearing of many hon. Members on both sides of the House who were concerned in the coal trade, and who knew from personal experience that a 1s. duty would have some effect on the trade. In the same speech, however, the First Lord made use of this observation;

"I cannot regard with perfect equanimity the enormous reductions of our coal supplies

for the benefit of foreign manufacturers which we see going on under our eyes."

That observation would have been wholly irrelevant if the right hon. Gentleman had not contemplated, as a result of this tax, that to some extent our sales would be restricted. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, also, used these words;

"If the duty restricts to some extent the increase in the coal exports, that is so much to the advantage of the country at large."

It was, therefore, admitted on the Treasury Bench, at any rate by implication, that the effect of this tax would be to some extent to restrict the sales of

coal. That was put forward as the argument of public policy in favour of the tax as distinguished from the financial argument that the foreigner would pay. He would now call the attention of the Committee to the system under which our coal was raised. Our coal was almost entirely raised under a system of mining leases. Under these leases; and this was very important; the lessee was under obligation to work the coal. The colliery proprietor was bound to pay a penalty of dead rent if he did not work the coal. He had entered into that arrangement under a system of unrestricted sales of coal at home and abroad, and if there was any statutory interference with that freedom of sale there ought at the same time to be statutory interference with the conditions of the contract as between the lessor and the lessee of the mines. It was declared to be a public purpose that these sales ought to be restricted. The colliery proprietor's capital interest was annually depreciating, and if Parliament interfered and restricted his sales he was entitled to compensation. The hon. Member submitted that under these circumstances the fairest way for him to recover compensation for the restriction which he suffered was as against the lessor. The lessee should be allowed to deduct some portion of the tax from the royalty which he had to pay to his landlord. There was still another reason why the Amendment should be accepted. This tax had been declared to be a popular tax, because its effect was going to be to reduce the price of coal. He had argued on the previous day that while the immediate effect of the duty would be to reduce the price, the ultimate effect, once the output had been diminished, would be to raise the price, because a new element was brought into the cost of production. The cost of production of any article could not be increased without the price being ultimately increased. If the duty was to any extent put upon the royalty owner there was exactly the contrary effect. The charge levied by the royalty owner was an element in the cost of production, and therefore in the price at which the coal was sold. If part of the duty were put on the royalty owner, instead of the producer, they would to that extent reduce the cost of production and introduce a permanent factor in reducing the price of the coal to the consumer. If, then, there was any serious argument underlying the proposal that sales should be restricted as an advantage to the nation, the Amendment ought to be accepted.

He was not going to argue the question whether the foreigner would or would not pay the tax. Out of 46,000,000 tons of coal exported only 38,000,000 went to Europe, and it was only as to the European market that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had alleged that there was any monopoly for British coal. The right hon. Gentleman had admitted; not directly, in so many words, but in reply to questions; that in the east and west, at Colombo, and in Canada and the West Indies, wherever freights raised our coal to something like competition prices with Japanese, or with American, or Australian, or Indian coal, we had to meet competition, and in these cases the duty would fall, not upon the foreigner, but upon the coal trade. Therefore with regard to 8,000,000 tons of the exports we should certainly have to bear the brunt of the tax. As to a large part of the 38,000,000, he admitted we should not immediately have to meet competition, but no one familiar with the details of the coal trade could deny that in the port

of Hamburg we should have to meet with serious rivals. It could not be said that in Germany we were free from competition with German coal. It might be said that he was

putting the figure too high when he said that a quarter of the tax should be borne by the royalty owner. That was his own personal estimate, but if the Chancellor of the Exchequer accepted the principle of the Amendment, he would be only too anxious to agree with him upon some figure which he or his advisers might think fair in the circumstances. He reminded the Committee that the annual value of the royalties in this country was at least £4,000,000. That was according to the latest official figures published, but the amount now was probably a good deal higher. The actual figure might be taken as representing an average of 6d. per ton, and if a toll was to be charged on the mineral wealth of the country the royalty owners, who had embarked no capital and exercised no industry in the production of the coal, should be the first to contribute to the toll. If the Government were really serious in the principles they had advocated, and if this tax was not merely to be a partial, even a punitive tax, they ought to accept the Amendment, which distributed the burden of the toll equitably over the whole of the persons concerned in the trade.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member's Amendment will require a little alteration, in this way;

Amendment proposed;

"In page 2, line 31, after the words last inserted to insert the words 'one-fourth of the said duty shall be paid by the landlord or royalty owner, being the person for the time being in receipt of any royalty or rent in respect of the coal on which the duty is charged.'";(Mr. M'Kenna.)

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

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I do not understand how the hon. Member reconciles this Amendment with any justice to the owners of royalties. The owner of a royalty is a person who, at any rate, is by law the owner of the coal under his land. He has leased his rights to the coalowner on certain fixed terms, these terms being that the coalowner should pay a certain royalty without any deductions, work the mine, and make what profit he can out of it. The State chooses to impose a tax on the coal taken out of the mine for export, and the hon. Member himself has admitted that, in some cases at least, the tax will be paid by the foreigner. He differs from me in his view as to the extent to which the foreigner or the producer will pay the tax, but everybody feels that it will to some extent be paid by the consumer abroad. The hon. Member's argument in this matter goes very much further than he imagines. I do not admit his argument, but, assuming that the tax will fall upon the foreigner, what equitable right has the coalowner, on whom not a penny of the tax has fallen, to deduct a portion of it from the royalty which he has agreed to pay? The hon. Member cannot contend that that is doing justice to the owner of the royalty; it is, of course, contrary to the agreement between them, by which the royalty has to be paid free from taxation or any deductions of that kind. Then the hon. Member said there is a considerable portion of the coal exported on which the consumer abroad will not pay any tax, and that the tax will fall on the exporter in this country, I think

the hon. Member will admit that we have done something to diminish that portion; but is it equitable, even in regard to that portion, that a part of a tax should be imposed on the royalty owner while the coal owner pockets all the gains? The royalty owner let his property on fixed terms, and whatever the increase in the price of coal may be he could not win by it. I think that this proposal would be most inequitable.

SIR EDWAED GREY said he recognised the force of the Chancellor of the Exchequer's statement that there would be certain cases in which the colliery owner would recoup the tax entirely from the foreigner; but the royalty owner would not have a chance to recover from the foreigner. His position all through had been that, do what they would, with this tax there would be cases of hardship and injustice. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had laid great stress on the fact of the foreigner paying the tax, but it had not been defended solely on that ground, and that was not the reason why it was popular. The real force behind the Chancellor of the Exchequer

was the belief that there were certain very wealthy people who would be able to pay this tax. If that was so, then why was the royalty owner omitted? The Colonial Secretary said the other day, "they would not discuss the question whether the tax would fall on the coal-owner or the foreigner," and added that "he did not care whether it fell on the coal owner or the foreigner." If it came to that, certainly some part of it ought to fall upon the royalty owner. The royalty owner was in a very peculiar position, and he thought he escaped very lightly just now. The Colonial Secretary had stated that part of the reason for this tax was that coal sent out of the country was a consumption of the national wealth, and that the country ought to take some toll on it. The owner of land had this to say, that, by using his land, although he got an increased profit he added to the national wealth, whereas the owner of the royalty was drawing a large income not only without adding to the national wealth, but he was contributing to the waste of the national wealth. The position of the royalty owner was therefore really akin to the position of the owner of land which had exceptional value, but which value had accrued without any exertion or any expenditure on his part. He quite agreed with the Chancellor of the Exchequer that there would be a certain amount of injustice if part of the tax were imposed on royalty owners; but injustice there must be in some cases. But now that the question had been raised, it was important that the case of the royalty owner should be proved, and he thought his hon. friend had done well in bringing forward the Amendment.

MR. JOHN WILSON (Durham, Mid) said he would support the Amendment, because he believed that, under the circumstances, this was a subject for careful consideration. He had never been able to see how the foreigner would pay the tax at all. He could show that not only the men but the women in the north of England discussed this question of the tax. He would like to tell the Chancellor of the Exchequer of a discussion he overheard between the wives of two miners. One argued that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was a very wise man, who knew all about the circumstances and ramifications of this tax, and as to who should pay, and that he must have made himself perfectly

acquainted with the facts and the truth of the assertion that the foreigner would pay the 1s. The other one said, "We are going down Silver Street. If you saw an article cheaper in one shop than another you would buy it where it was cheapest, if you wanted it. The foreigner is just like ourselves, he buys in the cheapest market." The foreigner would not pay the 1s., there was no doubt about that. It would fall on the coal trade in one form or another. Let them put the question of the wage-earner alongside of the royalty receiver. The royalty owner would never have done anything to develop the national wealth, but the capitalist came along, he sank his pit and then employed the miners; the men who risked their lives for not over high pay. The miners of the country, he felt confident, would be called upon to bear a very large share of the brunt of the tax. It was clear that the Chancellor of the Exchequer put on the tax because he found himself short of money; to put the matter in blunt English; and he turned to the men who were making what he considered large profits; making money by the million, in fact. They admitted that the coalowners were making money, but there were other gentlemen who were making money out of the coal trade, and if it was to be a matter of justice, why should they not pay a share? About 1889 there sat a Commission which found that the output of the coal of the country was roundly 177,000,000 tons a year, and that the royalty rents paid were slightly over £4,000,000. But the increase in the output of coal since that time, taking last year as their comparison, was 225,000,000 tons, and they found that the average royalty rent of the country was sixpence per ton. On that calculation the royalty rents would yield nearly £6,000,000. If the coal trade, on account of its prosperity and great profits, was to pay a large share of this taxation; not because they were politically Liberal or Radical; why should the men who "toil not neither do they spin" be left out? That phrase was formulated or applied at Birmingham.

In his younger days he used to sit at the feet of the Birmingham Gamaliel; he received a large part of his Radical training from the Colonial Secretary. Yes, but he had not followed him into Egypt. He had more regard for consistency and truth. He did not profess one thing and do another. He had considered the right hon. Gentleman the guide, counsellor, and friend of all reformers, but he would withdraw all that now that the right hon. Gentleman had become the friend and counsellor of those "that toil not, neither do they spin." The royalty owners had no risks to run, and they had no financial responsibility. They received their royalty rents without employing their brains, and without in any way adding to the wealth of the country year after year, in bad times and good, and when men were out of work and starving. They knew that mines had been stopped for the sake of a reduction in the price of coal of 2d. or 3d. per ton; and yet the royalty owners had not to bear any share in contributing to the necessities of the country in one of the darkest times and national emergencies that had ever fallen upon us. In the county of Durham they had had old age pensions since 1875, and his hon. friends the Members for Morpeth and the Wansbeck Division with himself formulated that scheme. They had paid old men 4s. 6d. a week, and they had arranged a scheme whereby every old man should have a free house and coal after sixty years of age. They did that out of the generosity of the

miners; but the royalty owners, for whose benefit the miners worked, and who made money while they slept, never contributed the smallest iota to the relief of aged miners. Yet they were told that it was not equity or justice when they asked that these men should be called upon to pay their share of the burden. He submitted that if the royalty owners were called upon to pay a penny per ton it would not be unjust. It might be unjust tested by the laws of man, but it would not be unjust tested by the laws of God. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer could modify his position, and call on the royalty owners to pay a penny a ton, the result would be that he would receive a million of money. He was not going to get a million sterling out of the coal tax during the present year. He recognised that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had appreciated the position they had tried to put before him, and that he had tried to meet them, but in his opinion the right hon. Gentleman was not going to get anything like a million out of the coal tax, and therefore he would suggest a tax on royalty owners until the reign of peace and prosperity enabled the coal tax to be removed. The President of the Board of Trade had stated that the average wages of the miners, who worked as hard as any men could work, in a state of half nudity and in semi-darkness, was on the average 35s. a week. He denied that from his own knowledge. Men were often absent through sickness, and were lying idle for months together on account of injuries. The Amendment raised one of the questions that would come to the front and have to be settled. The schoolmaster was abroad, the minds of men were being touched, and he believed sincerely that eventually the royalty owners of the country would have to pay their just share. He cordially supported the Amendment. COLONEL BLUNDELL (Lancashire, Ince) said that when the mines were first opened the royalty owner had a share of the profits. He afterwards became a debenture holder, and received the same amount whether times were good or bad. The proper way to deal with the problem was to combine the royalty owner with the coal owner; to regard their interests as identical. The feeling expressed by hon. Gentlemen opposite was, no doubt, to a certain extent, entertained by many people in the country, but it was an opinion which cannot bear the test of careful examination.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) said he intended to support the Amendment, because in his opinion it laid down a principle of taxation which was based on pure justice, and which before long would have to be introduced into the taxation of the country. It seemed to him that all natural monopolies; and coal royalties were surely one; ought to be, not the last, but the very first, subject of taxation, if real justice were done. He understood that the State claimed a right over precious metals found in the country. When gold was discovered in Wales an emissary of the Chancellor of the Exchequer immediately appeared on the scene to claim a share of it, and in Edinburgh a short time ago, when there was a peculiar find of precious metals, the agent of the State also claimed a right to it. He held that coal was not different from gold in that respect. He thought that the Chancellor of the Exchequer might follow to a small degree what had been done in Rhodesia, where not 1 percent., nor 5 per cent., but 50 per cent., was put on the mineral resources of the country. He could quite understand that

the Amendment would not be accepted; but nevertheless it was based on essential justice. It would introduce the greatest amount of benefit to the country, because it was the only kind of taxation which would not interfere with the furtherance of trade. In that respect it was very different from the tax on sugar or the tax on coal, and for these reasons he would cordially support the Amendment.

MR. COLVILLE (Lanark, N.E.) said that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, when he attempted to answer the arguments of his hon. friend, made an appeal to justice and equity. On those grounds he thought they had a very substantial reason for supporting the Amendment. The common sense of a very large proportion of the people realised that in equity there was a substantial right on the part of the nation to have some share of the mineral wealth of the country, which was being extracted, and could not possibly be replaced. The taxation of mining royalties had been advocated on many platforms, and he thought many hon. Members opposite had given certain promises, more or less, that, should an opportunity arise in Parliament for the consideration of a proposal to tax mining royalties, they would not themselves oppose it. He could not imagine any proposal on the part of Parliament which would be more just or equitable than that the enormous income received by royalty owners should bear their just share of the national burden. A large proportion of the minerals of the country were held either by hereditary landowners, who never bought them, or else by owners who obtained possession of the land without any regard to the value of the minerals. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer had the courage to propose, when money was needed to meet increasing national burthens, that the tax on coal should be levied, not on the colliery owners, and thereby indirectly on the wages of the miner, but on mining royalties, he would have done an act of justice, and would have clothed himself with such honour as became a man occupying his high position. He would support the proposal of his hon. friend, and he trusted every Radical who had expressed himself favourably on the matter before his constituents would also vote for the Amendment.

*MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydfil) said that the matter under discussion raised a very important point, and there was one fact which would, perhaps, not be within the knowledge of the House, and which had a direct bearing on the question under discussion. The mining laws of Scotland, passed more than 200 years ago, specially reserved the right to tax minerals, not only for the benefit of the State, but for the well-being of the aged workers in the mines, and to insure a proper inspection of the mines. These laws had never been repealed. The discussion to-night was only assimilating the law of England to what had been the law of the Continent for over 100 years. Under the mining law of Scotland 10 per cent. of the net value of the output belonged to the King, and 10 per cent. was set aside to provide for the aged workers, and a smaller percentage for the proper inspection of mines. On the Continent the State claimed a portion of the profit of the mines for the relief of the burden of taxation. In 1880 a Return was made showing what was the practice in various countries in regard to the payment of mineral royalties, and from that document it would be seen that in France, since 1789, the minerals in that country belonged to the State. At the

beginning of last century, however, coal owners in that country were, under the Napoleonic Code, entitled to a certain rent, and also to certain royalties, but the State claimed 5 per cent. of the net income from the mines; in the north of France the whole

of the royalties were paid into the Exchequer. In Prussia the same law obtained, the owners there being obliged to obtain the permission of the Government before they could sink a shaft, and when minerals were discovered the State claimed 2 per cent. on the gross profits. It was the same in Austro-Hungary, where the State claimed 5 per cent. of the net income on the sale of coal or other minerals, in addition to which a very heavy municipal tax was levied on royalties. In Belgium 5 per cent. was charged on net profits; in Portugal, 1½ per cent.; and so on. In every country in Europe the State claimed as its own a part of the wealth derived from the exhaustion of its minerals, and as a result mining in those countries and the production of iron ore could be carried on much more profitably, and at much less cost, than in this country. He submitted that there was one point which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had overlooked. Last year was an abnormal year for the coal trade, but this tax was not intended to deal with an abnormal period, but was intended to be a permanent tax. It was the fact that the royalty owners, taking one year with another, received a much higher profit from minerals extracted than the capitalist, but these people were not taxed in any way. Ironstone in Scotland was practically unworked, because of the heavy penalties imposed in the form of royalties. The figures worked out with regard to iron ore in this way. On the Continent the average royalty paid on one ton of pig-iron was 2s., in this country it was 6s. 6d., and if the small royalties of the Continent could afford to pay a percentage to the State and still receive a profit for landload and mineowner, much more surely could the royalty owners of this country afford to pay their share. The argument of sacredness of contract was worn out; it might be that the land owner had a sacred right to the minerals, in his land, but the right of the nation to free itself from the intolerable burden of taxation was greater and more sacred, and if it was true that the right of the whole was greater than the right of the few, the contract right of the few must give way. It was a scandal and a shame that the colliers should be called upon to pay their part of the increased

cost, and that the landlord, who risked neither life nor money, should escape scot free. The Chancellor of the Exchequer would do not only a just act, but a wise one, if he insisted upon the royalty owners paying their share. The day had come when the bulk of the taxation should be paid by unearned incomes, whether from royalties or otherwise, and this would have been a good beginning, and he trusted therefore that the right hon. Gentleman would see his way in going still further towards meeting the demands of that side of the House, which he was sure would prove to be the demand of the country as well.

MR. MONRO FERGUSON (Leith Burghs) regretted that the tax did not extend to the mining royalties, which came to their owners with as little trouble as their ground rents on building areas. He did not know whether the effect of the Amendment, as moved, would throw the entire burden on the royalty owners, and so

he could only regret that some part of the burden did not fall upon them. The right hon. Gentleman had made some concessions in the course of the evening which would be of very great value in his part of the country, but he would suggest that the right hon. Gentleman should go further and add to them a tax which would throw some portion of the burden on royalty owners. He did not think that if that were done the tax would be less popular than it was now.

MR. WILLIAM ALLAN (Gateshead) heartily supported the Amendment. There was nothing which appealed to the business side of his nature more than the mere fact that what was in the bowels of the earth for the benefit of humanity should be taken out of the earth and taxed by the men who claimed to own the land. As a business man he objected to that proposition. These men did nothing for the benefit of their estate, but taxed those by whose labour the minerals were taken out of the earth. That was not just or equitable, and was entirely opposed to the advancement of the age. These men, moreover, ran no risk whatever. Yet, when a lease expired, what did they do? They confiscated everything, and re-leased that

portion of their estate at an increased rental. He hoped the day would soon come when the House and the country would look at the incidence of taxation from an honest, from a just, and from an equitable point of view.

*MR. FENWICK said he did not think that the argument which the Chancellor of the Exchequer gave in refusing to accept the Amendment was very conclusive, having regard to all the circumstances of the case. He was not sure that the right hon. Gentleman was aware that there were some parts of the country where the contract between the mine owner and the coal producer contained a provision that a certain level of production should be kept up from year to year, and if that production, from any cause whatever, was not maintained the coal owner was compelled to pay under his contract up to the level agreed to between him and the landowner, even when he has been unable to produce by many thousands of tons, from causes over which he had no control, the amount which he ought to have produced under his contract. The Chancellor of the Exchequer was aware that in 1887 a Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into this question of wayleaves and royalty rents. That Commission, which sat for two years, came to an almost, if not absolutely, unanimous conclusion, but its recommendations had never been carried out. It was found that the charges upon the industry at that time amounted in the shape of royalties to over £4,000,000, and the wayleaves were about another £500,000. Taking the average rent per ton then charged, and applying it to the production of the present day, it gave a total of nearly £6,000,000, not one sixpence of which was getatable so far as local purposes were concerned. The colliery owners and the workmen themselves were taxed for the sanitation of the colliery villages and the lighting and paving of the streets, but the only way in which the profits of the royalty owners were touched was by the income tax and the death duties. He submitted that if a portion of the coal industry was to be taxed, the burden should be extended to the landlord or royalty owner, whose wealth accumulated without any effort or risk on his part, and even in his absence from the country altogether. A great deal had been said about the grievances of the Uitlanders.

One of their grievances was that they worked the gold mines under a concession from the Transvaal Government, and that royalties, which in their opinion were excessive, were levied on the industry. But in their case the complaint against the royalties was not for the purpose of relieving the industry, but to increase the dividends of the company. The Chancellor of the Exchequer in this case is simply asked to put a tax on royalties in order to reduce the general taxation of the country, or, at all events, to provide for the general expenditure of the nation. Because he believed this to be a reasonable and honest Amendment he should have the greatest pleasure in supporting his hon. friend in the division lobby.

MR. JOSEPH WALTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley) said he should support the Amendment because he believed that the true principle upon which taxation ought to proceed was that of every man being taxed according to his ability to pay. If the colliery-owners, by reason of the large profits they had made from the working of the collieries during the last two or three years, could reasonably be called upon to bear a special and extra tax, it was only equitable that the royalty owners also should have a fair share of the additional burden. Royalty owners derived a large revenue from the working of the coal, even in years of depression, when the colliery-owners were working the pits at an actual loss. Moreover, many royalties were on a sliding scale, so that during the recent years of inflation many royalty owners had been receiving largely increased revenues. Therefore, if the colliery-owners, in consequence of their increased profits, were to be called upon to pay an extra tax, surely the royalty-owners ought to bear a portion of the additional burdens of the country. The hon. Member for Gateshead had suggested that the minerals under the surface ought really to be the property of the State rather than the property of the surface owners. That was a very vexed and difficult question, but very few persons would deny that in a large number of cases those who acquired the surface did not pay a single farthing in respect of the minerals under the surface. There was not the slightest doubt that if we could go back far enough, and start again, the State would claim, as was done in many other countries, that the minerals should belong to the State, and be leased by the State for the national benefit. There was, however, no utility in raising that question at the present moment, except for the purpose of recalling the fact that many royalty-owners were receiving enormous revenues from the working of the minerals in their land in respect of which neither they nor their forefathers paid a single penny. That fact constituted a strong argument in favour of their being called upon to bear a fair share of the burden which the Chancellor of the Exchequer was now imposing upon the coal trade, especially as the tax was to be a permanent one. The right hon. Gentleman was advised that the coal trade could bear this extra burden permanently. It was perfectly true that colliery-owners had made large profits during the last two years, but cycles of prosperity were invariably followed by cycles of depression, and it was practically certain that the country to-day was face to face with a cycle of commercial depression in which, in all human probability, many collieries, if they continued to be worked at all, would be worked at an actual loss to the colliery-owner. When that

condition of affairs was reached, the injustice of the tax would be intensified if the royalty-owner was allowed to go scot-free, because he would still be receiving large revenues. He should therefore support the Amendment, and he earnestly hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would give his serious consideration to the matter.

MR. THOMAS SHAW (Hawick Burghs) desired to point out the extreme simplicity of the problem before the Committee. A tax was being imposed upon an industry, to the great surprise of that industry. They were not endeavouring to reduce existing taxation; they were working upon an absolutely clean slate. He submitted, therefore, that all, and not some only, of the parties to that industry should have been convened. In this, as in all other industries, there were three parties. The first was the royalty owner, who was indeed the true owner. The second was the coal-owner, who was really not an owner at all, but simply a long lessee. The third was the labouring man. No one could have listened to the debates on this question without coming to the conclusion that the two interests hardly hit by the tax would be the working-man and the coal lessee. Why had the Government adopted a process of selection and exclusion? The owner, whose position was fortified by every ingenuity of the law, had a three-fold claim, which he usually presented, whether north or south of the Tweed. He had a claim to a fixed rent, be the colliery successful or unsuccessful; he had a claim in the event of assured success of a royalty on the output; and, in the third place, which was better than all, he not uncommonly had a claim to a minimum royalty rising by a sliding scale according to the prosperity of the industry. His security for this claim was of the most absolute kind known to the law. He had the security of the stuff, the plant, and the whole of the buildings connected with the work. In the name of equity, therefore, why should he not render some help in the matter of this tax? But that did not end the case. What was the position of the miner and the coal lessee? If adversity overtook the industry the miner was at the point of starvation and the capital of the coal lessee was imperilled, his returns dwindled away, or perhaps were converted into a loss. These three parties being interested, why should the bee be taxed while the drone was excluded? When the Agricultural Rates Act was under discussion it was pointed out that it would raise more questions than it settled, namely, the large question of land values. Similarly this tax upon coal would raise more questions than it settled, namely, the question of a tax upon mining royalties. In the matter of agricultural rates there was much discussion as to the exact person upon whom the burden fell, but in this case there was no such difficulty, because the mines of the country were mostly let on long leases of from thirty to sixty years. It might be taken that the un-expired mining rights of the lessees in this country averaged a quarter of a century. The situation, therefore, was quite clear. There could be no adjustment

by the coalowner to throw the tax upon the shoulders of some other person. He was disappointed that, notwithstanding the fact that many speeches had been delivered, raising, as it appeared to him, a large point of social economics, trenching almost upon national ethics, there had been no reply but one, and that

was the reply of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, when he stated that the royalty owner would have no chance of recouping himself from the foreigner. All he would say in regard to that was that the foreigner was guided in trade by pretty much the same principles as other people; he bought in the cheapest market; while the coal lessee, like other people, sold in the dearest market. The coal lessee had hitherto obtained his price irrespective of the royalty. That price was fixed by the economic law of supply and demand, and it was a phantom to expect that the foreigner would ever contribute to the taxation of this country in that form. He ventured to suggest that the Amendment ought to be accepted, at any rate in principle, but apparently the attitude of the Government was to tax labour and capital, and not to tax the owners of these royalties whom the law so amply protected.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I have already addressed the Committee upon this Amendment, but I must venture to trouble them for another two or three minutes, after the speeches to which we have listened. I think it is a little hard that in the course of a debate upon an Amendment to this Finance Bill we should be asked to discuss what the hon. Member who has just sat down has very fairly described as a large point of social economics, trenching on national ethics. In fact, the matter involves large issues affecting the whole social fabric of the nation;
AN HON. MEMBER: It is a question of taxation.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: No; it is far beyond a question of taxation. There is really involved the question of whether the land of the country should be owned by private persons or by the State. That really is the point of the speeches of two of the hon. Members who have just spoken. ["No."] Oh, yes, it is. I do not intend to attempt to address the Committee upon that subject. I take the law as it stands. At the present moment it is the law of this country that private property in land is to be respected, and private property in land has for centuries carried with it the right to the minerals under the surface. What happens? The owner of the land and the minerals it contains leases the minerals to a third party; a capitalist, or an association of capitalists; in order that the minerals may be worked. Both sides make that bargain with their eyes open; they are perfectly free to make it or to reject it. If the persons taking the mines from the owners of the land choose to agree that in return for the profit they expect to make from the coal they should sink a shaft, erect buildings, put up machinery, build cottages, and so on, and at the end of the lease when the mines are worked out all these things should revert to the landlord, is that a thing with which you need interfere? Is not each side free to make its own bargain? ["No."] At any rate, that is the law and the practice, and, as I have said, the arguments used in favour of this proposal go far beyond the question of whether you should or should not impose a part of this duty on coal upon the owners of royalties. I would only venture to add that nothing could be more unfair than the suggestion of the hon. Member opposite that we are taxing labour and the capital of the coal-owner, while we refrain from taxing the royalty owner. I have never proposed this duty as a tax upon a special industry, as the hon. Member contended throughout his speech. I absolutely deny that that is the

fact. I have asserted all through, and I have proved, that this tax will fall largely, and in good years entirely, on the foreigner. That is the basis upon which we have proposed it, and I trust the Committee will not pursue the discussion of the larger subject of the rights of property, but that they will, after reasonable discussion of the Amendment which the hon. Member for Monmouthshire has brought forward, in a perfectly fair way, come to a decision on the matter.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I rise mainly to correct what I believe to be a misapprehension of the right hon.

Gentleman as to the real argument of my hon. and learned friend the Member for the Border Burghs. The right hon. Gentleman described almost with pathos the fate of the owner of the soil who entered into a contract with the capitalists, either singly or in company, and who authorised them to sink shafts and erect the necessary buildings for the purpose of working the coal. And, he asked, did they mean to interfere with that, or to prevent that from being done? My hon. and learned friend had no such intention in what he said. What he said was; "Let the owner who has done nothing except assent to this arrangement with the capitalists bear his share of this tax when it is put on a commodity with which they are all dealing." And then the right hon. Gentleman fell back on his argument that the tax is to be paid by the foreigner. But we dispute his argument. We believe that to a very great extent, if not to the greatest extent, it would be paid by those at home who were engaged in the trade; from the shipowner and the merchant and the colliery proprietor, down to the workman who got the coal out of the soil. And we say it is almost a scandal, certainly I think it is an economic scandal, that the one sole person who has not to contribute to a tax of this sort is the man who does the least in producing the coal, and who therefore, I think, may very well pay at least a share of the burden that is put upon it.

MR. MANSFIELD (Lincolnshire, Spalding) said he had heard a very strong case made out for the taxation of mining royalties, and he had heard from the Chancellor of the Exchequer nothing in favour of leaving that source of revenue alone. It had been argued that the taxation of mining royalties was the introduction of a system of land nationalisation, but he might just as well argue that the income tax was the beginning of a system under which the whole of the incomes would eventually be taken. According to this method of arguing, by imposing an income tax of 1s. 2d., a tax of £00BD;d. per pound on sugar and 1s. per ton on coal, the Chancellor of the Exchequer would go down to history as the greatest confiscator which the nation had ever known. There were three classes of persons affected by this tax,

namely, the miner, the colliery proprietor, and the mineral owner. He did not want to go into the question of the ownership of minerals, although that might be a very interesting discussion. It would no doubt open up a very wide field of research. It was a fact that the law had given to the mine owner what was known as the minerals, which meant everything that was underneath the soil. He wished to know why the miner, who was hit by the sugar and other taxes, and the capitalist, who was hit by this shilling a ton and the income tax, should pay

income to the country, while the mineral owner, who belonged to the extensive class which toiled not, neither did they spin, was let off absolutely. His own impression was that the mineral owners had expected a tax for many years past. It might be used as an argument against the Amendment

AYES.

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

Evans, S. T. (Glamorgan)

Mooney, John J.

Allan, Wm. (Gateshead)

Farrell, James Patrick

Murphy, John

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

Fenwick, Charles

Nannetti, Joseph P.

Ambrose, Robert

Ferguson, R.C. Munro (Leith)

Newnes, Sir George

Austin, Sir John

Ffrench, Peter

Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)

Barry, E (Cork, S.)

Field, William

Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)

Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)

Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond

Norman, Henry

Bell, Richard

Flynn, James Christopher

O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid

Boland, John

Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)

O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)

Boyle, James

Gilhooly, James

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

Brigg, John

Grey, Sir Edward (Berwick)

O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.

Broadhurst, Henry

Griffith, Ellis J.

O'Doherty, William

Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)

Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton

O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)

Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson

Hammond, John

O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Burke, E. Haviland-
Hardie, J. K. (Merthyr Tydvil)
O'Dowd, John
Burt, Thomas
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Buxton, Sydney Chas.
Harwood, George
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.)
Caldwell, James
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Malley, William
Cameron, Robt.
Helme, Norval Watson
O'Mara, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Paulton, James Mellor
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Jones, David B. (Swansea)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Cawley, Frederick
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Price, Robt. John
Cogan, Denis J.
Jordan, Jeremiah
Priestley, Arthur
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Joyce, Michael
Rea, Russell
Colville, John
Kennedy, Patrick James
Reddy, M.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Kinloch, Sir John George S.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Craig, Robt. Hunter
Lambert, George
Redmond, Wm. (Clare)
Crean, Eugene
Langley, Batty
Rickett, J. Compton

Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Rigg, Richard
Cullinan, J.
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Daly, James
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Lough, Thomas
Roche, John
Delany, William
Lundon, W.
Roe, Sir Thomas
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Dillon, John
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Donelan, Capt. A.
M'Dermott, Patrick
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Doogan, P. C.
M'Fadden, Edward
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Duncan, J. Hastings
M'Govern, T.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Dunn, Sir William
M'Kenna, Reginald
Soares, Ernest J.
Edwards, Frank
M'Laren, Chas. Benjamin
Sullivan, Donal
Ellis, John Edward
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Mather, William
Thomas, A. (Carmarthen, E.)

that the burden would fall upon the person who found the capital to work the coal. He believed that the House could arrange to cancel such a clause, and make the burden fall where it ought to fall, upon the people who were not paying anything except the income tax, and who ought to be brought in and compelled to

pay their fair share of taxation. He hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would modify his views on this subject, or, if he did not, some other Government at an early date would take the question in hand and see that the burden and incidence of taxation was put on the shoulders of those best able to bear it, but who had up to the present largely escaped.

Question put.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 144; Noes, 172. (Division List No. 276.)

Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)

White, Luke (York, E. R.)

Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)

Thomas, JA (Gl'morgan, Gower

Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)

Wrightson, Sir Thomas

Thompson, Dr E C (M'nagh'n, N.

Whittaker, Thomas Palmer

Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)

Warner, Thomas C. T.

Williams, O. (Merioneth)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES;

Weir, James Galloway

Wilson, F.W. (Norfolk, Mid.)

Mr. Causton and Captain Sinclair.

White, George (Norfolk)

Wilson, Hy. J. (York, W. R.)

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Fisher, William Hayes

Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)

Aird, Sir John

Fitzroy, Hon. Edward A.

Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)

Anson, Sir Wm. Reynell

Fletcher, Sir Henry

Myers, Wm. Henry

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Flower, Ernest

Nicol, Donald Ninian

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Forster, Henry William

Orr-Ewing, Chas. Lindsay

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Garfit, William

Parkes, Ebenezer

Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy

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

Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley

Bailey, James (Walworth)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
Bain, Col. James Robt.
Goschen, Hon. George J.
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Baldwin, Alfred
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Plummer, Walter R.
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)
Pretymann, Ernest George
Balfour, Maj K R (Christchurch
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Banbury, Frederick George
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Purvis, Robert
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Reid, James (Greenock)
Beach, Rt Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)
Hain, Edward
Rentoul, James Alexander
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Renwick, George
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Mid'x
Richards, Henry Charles
Bignold, Arthur
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert W.
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. T.
Bigwood, James
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Robertson, Herbt. (Hackney)
Blundell, Col. Henry
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Bond, Edward
Heaton John Henniker
Ropner, Col. Robert
Boulnois, Edmund

Helder, Augustus
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alex.
Brookfield, Col. Montagu
Hoare, Edw. B. (Hampstead)
Seely, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Brown, Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Hoare, Sir Samuel (Norwich)
Seton Karr, Henry
Bull, Wm. James
Hope, J. F. (Sh'ffield, Brightside)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Bullard, Sir Harry
Hoult, Joseph
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Butcher, John George
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Smith, James P. (Lanarks.)
Cautley, Henry Strother
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir J. H.
Spear, John Ward
Cavendish, V C W. (Derbyshire)
Kenyon, Hon. G. T. (Denbigh.)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)
Stroyan, John
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Keswick, William
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Law, Andrew Bonar
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Lawson, John Grant
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. M.
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie

Tritton, Charles Ernest
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Leveson-Gower, Fred. N. S.
Tufnell, Lt.-Col. Edward
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Valentia, Viscount
Cox, Irwin Edw. Bainbridge
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Lowe, Francis Wm.
Wason, John C. (Orkney)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Webb, Col. William George
Dalkeith, Earl of
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Whiteley, H. (Aston-un. Lyne)
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chath'm
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Denny, Col.
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison
Wills, Sir Frederick
Dickson, Charles Scott
Maclver, David (Liverpool)
Wilson, A. S. (York, E. R.)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Maconochie, A. W.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph C.
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Wilson-Todd, W. H. (Yorks.)
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinb., W.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Doughty, George
M'Killop, Jas. (Stirlingshire)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn W. F.
Wylie, Alexander
Doxford, Sir William T.
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Younger, William
Fardell, Sir T. George
Morgan, David J. (Walthamst.)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn E.
Morrell, George Herbert
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Fielden, Edward B.
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Finch, George H.
Morton, Arthur H A. (Deptford)
Finlay, Sir Robert B.
Mount, Wm. Arthur

MR. D. A. THOMAS said the object of the Amendment he rose to move was to exempt contracts from the operation of the coal duty made prior to the introduction of the Budget on April 19. He asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer what difference would it make in the amount of the revenue if he remitted the duty on all contracts made up to December 31 or longer, prior to 19th April. At all events, it was not a question of principle, it was a question of degree. These contracts had to be made by middlemen and they often had to be made for more than one year. He knew of a case where a contract was made for two years and it only came into operation in May, though it was made last November. That contract had to be carried out; it could not be broken, though the right hon. Gentleman suggested that contracts might be broken. So far from the contract being unusual, it was practically the continuation of a contract made previously for three years. He had received a telegram from one firm stating that upon the contracts they had entered into this tax meant to them about £7,000. The right hon. Gentleman took a different view of commercial ethics, and he argued that it was a very easy thing to break contracts. The Chancellor of the Exchequer stated that the law should be so framed as to enable a person to break his contract unless the person abroad was willing to pay the duty. He confessed that he was very much surprised at that statement, for it was a suggestion which no honest business man would ever dream of adopting. Perhaps he knew more about contracts than the right hon. Gentleman; and when business men in Cardiff made contracts they would not dream of breaking them. They carried them out.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 2, line 32, to leave out the words 'may if they think fit in any,' in order to insert the words 'shall in every.'";(Mr. D. A. Thomas.)

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

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I think I need hardly notice the latter part of the remarks of the hon. Member. I have never suggested that anybody should break contracts. What I suggested had reference to the application to the coal duty of the

existing law which permits persons who have contracted, for example, to sell sugar at a certain price before the sugar duty was imposed, to add the amount of that duty to the price agreed on in their contracts, and not that contracts should be broken. As to the Amendment, it is a perfectly impossible one, for there must be a judge of what a contract is; whether a contract is a real contract. Under the proposal of the hon. Member there can be no discretion as to what is a contract or what is not; and I know, if the hon. Member does not know, the great variety and difference of detail in contracts which are made by the exporters of coal. I have gone as far as I think I ought to go in the interest of fairness to all concerned. It is not fair for the hon. Member to read a telegram from Cardiff sent under the impression that the exemption would cease on September 30th. I have received a telegram from the same place in which the 31st of December, which I have adopted, is suggested. With regard to the question whether contracts made with foreigners only or with British subjects abroad as well as foreigners are to receive exemptions from the duty, I at first proposed that these should extend to foreigners only, for the reason that it would be impossible for a coal owner who had a contract with a foreigner to make the foreigner pay the duty. But I found on inquiry that in the foreign or colonial ports where these contracts had been made with foreigners there were also British firms who had made similar contracts, and it was perfectly clear it would not be fair to give foreigners an exemption from a duty which British firms at the same port had to pay, and therefore I decided that it was necessary the exemption should be extended to all persons abroad, whether foreign or British. The hon. Member asked what this exemption was likely to amount to. I think it will be seen when I state the amount that practically the case is covered by what I have stated. I am convinced that the sum which will be lost by it this year will be more than £650,000. That is a large sum, and I am sure it will be admitted that I have acted liberally. In the circumstances I cannot accept the Amendment.

SIR JAMES JOICEY said he regretted extremely to hear the statement of the right hon. gentleman. No one recognised more than he did the generosity which the right hon. Gentleman had shown in dealing with those contracts, and he would be the last to complain when he had dealt so liberally with the question raised at the present time. But after all there was something more to be said on that question, and he thought he should say a word or two in the hope that he might influence the right hon. Gentleman to some extent, for he felt sure from the course pursued that the right hon. Gentleman was anxious to be just and reasonable in dealing with this matter. It seemed to him that the sub-section gave a Minister power which this House should hesitate to give. Was this House prepared to put into the hands of a Minister the power of saying that one person should pay the tax and that another should not? It was an unwise discretion to give to any Minister, whatever his position might be. He had no reason to complain of the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Treasury at the present time, but it was proposed to set up a dangerous precedent, which hereafter might be used by a Minister with serious disadvantage to the country. The right hon.

Gentleman said there would be £650,000 lost by the exemption.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I ought not to have named a figure. I stated earlier in the evening that I used the figure quite roughly.

SIR JAMES JOICEY said that all who knew anything about this question knew that the right hon. Gentleman had given a very large exemption, but still he fancied it would be found that the exemption represented roughly about two-thirds of the tax which would be due on these contracts. Was it wise for the sake of the other third to debar it from the principle which, he thought, was a very proper one?

If it was just to exempt contracts up to the end of December, it was certainly equally just to exempt for the same reasons all contracts entered into prior to 19th April last. After the Spanish-American War Spain put an export duty on iron ore. What was the action of Spain in the matter? He was informed on good authority that she respected not only the contracts of

Spanish merchants but those of English shippers in some cases for three years.

Surely what was possible and just for the Spanish Government ought not to be impossible or unjust for the English Government. There were many gas companies abroad which had to make arrangements with their municipalities in fixing the price of gas, and these companies had to arrange for a supply of coal. The Paris Gas Company bought for three years. Some of the contracts applied to coal intended for the Paris Gas Company. When they considered that an exporter entered into these contracts in a bona fide way, simply in the ordinary course of business, he thought it was scarcely just that they were not to be exempted. He was sure that if the right hon. Gentleman really understood those questions as people did who were brought into contact with the transactions, he would not hesitate for a moment to exempt those contracts. He represented one of the largest firms of coal exporters in this country, and whatever might be the action of the Government in this matter; and he felt that his partners would agree with him when he put it before them; he could not conscientiously ask anyone who had contracts with them to pay the tax. He thought it would be unjust to do so. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would consider the point again before he came to a final conclusion.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I am surprised at the speech of the hon. Baronet. I have done my best to be fair and even generous to the great interest which he with many others in this House represents. I have given a very large concession, according to my promise, in this matter of contracts. Sir Robert Peel on a similar occasion gave four months for a similar object. I have given nine months. What I have done has been acknowledged by those who represent the coal industry in this House. That this great concession should be made an excuse for asking more is not fair. I have made my statement and I cannot depart from it.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said that so far as the trade was concerned there ought to be no uncertainty at all with

respect to the exemption the right hon. Gentleman was going to make. The proposal now made allowed the Treasury absolute discretion to give exemption in the case of one contract and not in another. The question was whether the word "shall" should be inserted. If the conditions were fulfilled, why should the Treasury be allowed discretion to say whether the exemption would be given? If

the conditions were not fulfilled, the sub-section would not operate at all.

MR. MCLAREN said it was rather hard that in the case of contracts entitled to exemption the trade should have to apply to the Commissioners of Customs for relief from the duty. If a contract was made by telegram it was exceedingly awkward that the exporter should have to go to the Government officials in order to have the price adjusted. It seemed to him that the Amendment now before the Committee was the logical corollary of the concession which had already been given.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said if no explanation was forthcoming it might

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Chapman, Edward

Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon

Anson, Sir William Reynell

Clare, Octavius Leigh

Fletcher, Sir Henry

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Coghill, Douglas Harry

Flower, Ernest

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse

Forster, Henry William

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Compton, Lord Alwyne

Galloway, William Johnson

Bagot, Capt. Joceline FitzRoy

Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas

Garfit, William

Bailey, James (Walworth)

Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)

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

Bain, Colonel James Robert

Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)

Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon

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

Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge

Goulding, Edward Alfred

Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds

Cranborne, Viscount

Gray, Ernest (West Ham)

Banbury, Frederick George

Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)

Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury

Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)

Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)

Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S. Edm'nds

Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Crossley, Sir Savile
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Beach, Rt. Hon. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Gunter, Sir Robert
Bignold, Arthur
Denny, Colonel
Hain, Edward
Bigwood, James
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Hambro, Charles Eric
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Dickson, Charles Scott
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Bond, Edward
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry
Brassey, Albert
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Hardy, Laurence (Kent Ashford
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Doughty, George
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Bull, William James
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Bullard, Sir Harry
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Helder, Augustus
Butcher, John George
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampstead
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Fardell, Sir T. George
Hoare, Sir Samuel (Norwich)
Cautley, Henry Strother

Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Hoult, Joseph
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire)
Finch, George H.
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Finlay, Sir Robert Rannatyne
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'
Fisher, William Hayes
Johnston, William (Belfast)

not be unreasonable to suppose that there was some object, unknown to the Committee, in inserting the discretionary words, "may if they think fit in any case."

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: In this case there must be some authority to interpret what is or what is not a contract coming under the exemption. I think the hon. and learned Member has a natural predilection for the law courts, and if the word "shall" were adopted, and it were left to the courts to interpret what is such a contract, I believe it would be infinitely worse for the parties concerned.

MR. MCLAREN said these were not speculative or gambling transactions. The colliery owner could not know what the coal was going to cost him for twelve or fifteen months. He did not know what would be the cost of labour, or the nature of the strata he had to pass through.

Question put.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 206; Noes, 148. (Division List No. 277.)

Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Morton, Arthur H A. (Deptford)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Mount, William Arthur
Stroyan, John
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)
Murray, Rt. Hn A Graham (Bute
Strutt, Hn. Chas. Hedley
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Keswick, William
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Myers, William Henry
Thorburn, Sir Walter

Law, Andrew Bonar
Nicholson, William Graham
Thornton, Percy M.
Lawson, John Grant
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Parkes, Ebenezer
Valentia, Viscount
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Peel, Hn. Wm. Rbt. Wellesley
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Percy, Earl
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Lock wood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Lowe, Francis William
Plummer, Walter R.
Webb, Colonel William George
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Pretymann, Ernest George
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Purvis, Robert
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W.G. Ellison
Reid, James (Greenock)
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Macdonald, John Cumming
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
MacIver, David (Liverpool)

Rentoul, James Alexander
Willox, Sir John Archibald
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Renwick, George
Wills, Sir Frederick
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Richards, Henry Charles
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Robertson, Herb. (Hackney)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh, N.)
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E. (Wigt'n
Ropner, Col. Robert
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Maxwell, WJH. (Dumfriesshire
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Seton-Karr, Henry
Wylie, Alexander
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Wyndham, Rt. Hn. George
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks)
Younger, William
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
Morrell, George Herbert
Spear, John Ward
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Morrison, James Archibald

Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Cullinan, J.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Allan, William (Gateshead)
Daly, James
Higginbottom, S. W.
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Joicey, Sir James
Ambrose, Robert
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Delany, William
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert H.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Jordon, Jeremiah
Austin, Sir John
Dillon, John
Joyce, Michael
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Donelan, Captain A.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Doogan, P. C.
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Bell, Richard
Duncan, J. Hastings
Lambert, George
Boland, John
Dunn, Sir William
Langley, Batty
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Elibank, Master of
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Boyle, James
Ellis, John Edward
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Brigg, John
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Broadhurst, Henry
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)

Lough, Thomas
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Farrell, James Patrick
Lundon, W.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Fenwick, Charles
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Burt, Thomas
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Caldwell, James
Ffrench, Peter
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Cameron, Robert
Field, William
M'Dermott, Patrick
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Flynn, James Christopher
M'Fadden, Edward
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Forster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
M'Govern, T.
Carville, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Gilhooly, James
M'Kenna, Reginald
Causton, Richard Knight
Grey, Sir Edward (Berwick)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Cawley, Frederick
Griffith, Ellis J.
Mooney, John J.
Channing, Francis Allston
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Moulton, John Fletcher
Cogan, Denis J.
Hammond, John
Murphy, John
Colville, John
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Harwood, George
Newnes, Sir George
Craig, Robert Hunter
Hayden, John Patrick
Nolan, Col. John. P. (Galway, N.

Crean, Eugene
Helme, Norval Watson
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Priestley, Arthur
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Rea, Russell
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, G'wer
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
Reddy, M.
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Thompson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)
Rickett, J. Compton
Weir, James Galloway
O'Doherty, William
Rigg, Richard
White, George (Norfolk)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
O'Dowd, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
O'Malley, William
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
O'Mara, James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham

Sinclair, Capt John (Forfarshire)
Yoxall, James Henry
Paulton, James Mellor
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Soares, Ernest J.
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Pease, Sir Joseph W. (Durham)
Spencer, Rt Hn C.R. (Northants)
Mr. D. A. Thomas and Mr. McLaren.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Sullivan, Donal
Price, Robert John
Taylor, Theodore Cooke

*MR. WARR (Liverpool, East Toxteth): The Amendment I now move is directed to cases in which contracts are entered into in this country by owners of coaling stations abroad, and dealers for the supply and delivery of coal at these coaling stations. In these cases the seller covers his contract by purchases made here, and exports the coal to the coaling station in order that he may fulfil his contract. But it is doubtful whether he can be said to export the coal in pursuance of any contract with his buyer, for the buyer is only concerned with the supply to him at the coaling station, and so far as he is concerned the seller may buy the coal afloat or export it at any time he pleases. Under these circumstances a question might arise as to whether the terms of the clause as it stands would enable the Treasury to remit the duty, and yet it would be fair and reasonable that it should be remitted.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 2, line 34, to leave out 'in pursuance of,' and insert 'for the purpose of fulfilling.'";(Mr. Warr.)

Question proposed;"That the words 'in pursuance of' stand part of the clause."

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH said that this was a technical point, and he thought the words in the clause as it stood were sufficient for the hon. Gentleman's purpose. He would be very glad, however, to communicate with his hon. friend on the matter.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS formally moved the Amendment standing in his name in order that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who said that his great object was that foreigners should pay this tax, might inform the Committee why he proposed to exempt from the duty bunker coal which was shipped on a foreign ship.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 2, line 36, after the word 'any' to insert the word 'British.'";(Mr. Samuel Evans.)

Question proposed, "That the word 'British' be there inserted."

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH said that if the privilege of shipping bunker coal free of duty were confined to British ships, one result would be that foreign ships would not call at British ports for bunker coal, and these ports would lose

considerably in consequence. But a more important objection to the Amendment was that it would impose unequal treatment on foreign ships, and would thus be a breach of our treaties with foreign nations. The result would be retaliation on our ships in their ports, which would be very much more to our injury than to theirs.

MR. D. A. THOMAS said that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had made a great deal about the question of retaliation; but he could not see how the right hon.

Gentleman could consistently carry out his policy of making the foreigners pay unless he accepted the Amendment. Without the Amendment the result would be that a foreign vessel would obtain bunker coal in this country free of duty, while a British vessel coaling at any port outside this country, even in British possessions, would have to pay the tax.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS believed his hon. friend was perfectly right; and it seemed an extraordinary thing that whereas a foreign ship could coal here, and have their coal free of duty, a British ship bunkering in, say, Colombo, had got to pay the duty.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH said that for many years past we had treated foreign ships the same as British ships in our ports, and it would be unwise in the interest of the trade of this country if another rule were adopted.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said that as he was against the duty altogether he would not press his Amendment; but he had thought it necessary to point out the anomaly.

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS said that grievances might arise from the rule in consequence of ships taking bunker coal and trading coal at the same time. In Glasgow they had had trouble in this way in regard to coal dues.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: Arrangements have been made in regard to that point. Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS moved to leave out Sub-section (5). He said that this Amendment really raised a question which had not yet been determined by the Committee.

Sub-section 5 denned what the term "coal" included for taxation purposes. It said that for the purposes of this Act coal included culm, coke, cinders, and manufactured fuel. He was not sure what culm was, but he was perfectly certain that he did not know what cinders were. It was true that the Chancellor of the Exchequer in dealing with manufactured fuel; which he understood was patent fuel; said he was willing to take into consideration the price of the coal which was used in manufacturing this fuel, and that if the price was less than 6s. per ton, then the patent fuel entirely escaped taxation. But the right hon. Gentleman had not made a similar declaration in regard to coke, or culm, or cinders. He thought it was bad enough to impose this extra duty on coals, but it was worse to impose it on manufactured articles.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 3, line 1, to leave Sub-section (5)."; (Mr. Samuel Evans.)

Question proposed, "That Sub-section (5) stand part of the clause."

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH said he had found this definition in the original Coal Act. To some extent these articles were manufactured, but they were valuable articles, and there was no reason why they should not be taxed.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said they had had no information yet in regard to cinders,

although of course he knew what cinders were in the ordinary meaning in English. Where was culm manufactured, what was the price of culm, and where was it exported to? The right hon. Gentleman had confessed that he had put this subsection in the Bill because he had found it in some Act of Parliament passed fifty or sixty years ago. The right hon. Gentleman must have some reason for the faith that was in him, and surely he could tell what was the average price of culm, and coke, and cinders.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH said he could not carry in his mind all these petty details as to the prices of these articles and the countries to which they were exported. Culm was, he believed, a mixture of coal and clay, and it was exported to some extent. On the report he might amend the words, but he hoped they would now be passed as they stood. The tax to be placed on manufactured fuel would depend on the value of the coal used in making it, and he would see how far that principle could be applied to the others.

MR. D. A. THOMAS asked if the right hon. Gentleman could give a rough estimate of the amount of revenue he expected to derive from these articles.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: No; I have to inquire about their value.

*SIR JOSEPH PEASE said that these Words had different meanings in different districts. In his district the large ashes that came from the engine boiler fires Were generally called cinders, and with coke breeze were often used for ballasting railways, and would not be subject to duty under the Chancellor of the Exchequer's proposed remission of articles under the value of 6s.

Question put, and agreed to.

MR. DAVID MACIVER (Liverpool, Kirkdale) moved in page 3, line 2, at end, to add "Nothing in this section shall apply to coal exported from Great Britain or Ireland to the Channel Islands or the Isle of Man." He knew that the Isle of Man had already been exempted; but, if so, why not the Channel Islands? He thought the Channel Islands had a much stronger claim than the Isle of Man, and the chambers of commerce of Guernsey and Jersey had petitioned in favour of the exemption. The Channel Islands were the most ancient possession of Great Britain, and had always been considered as part of the United Kingdom. By a charter of Queen Elizabeth, which confirmed all the rights and privileges of the islanders, provision was made to the effect that they should be exempted from all tributes, tolls, customs, subsidies, and contributions of any kind whatsoever towards the general expenses of the realm of England, and that the liability of the islands to taxation was thereby confined to their own internal necessities. Those privileges were confirmed by Orders in Council on the 21st May and 17th December, 1679, and the islanders were given the right to import goods from any part of England or Wales free of duty, provided such goods were used on the islands, and it was worthy of remark that in the latter Order mention was specially made of coals. Those charters still remained in full force, and the islanders

respectfully submitted that the privileges which had been granted to them should not be ignored in the present instance. He thought there were other grounds also on which the Channel Islands were entitled to exemption. It was the greatest mistake to treat the islands as if they were foreign countries. The people were

most loyal to the Crown; they had been given a certain measure of Home Rule, but they had no one in the House of Commons to speak for them. He thought that they should not be placed at a disadvantage on that account, but that their request should receive favourable consideration. The reason why he had ventured to say a word for the Channel Islands was that for many years he had been a director of one of the great railway companies which served the Channel Islands, and naturally and properly he had taken a keen interest in them. He went frequently to the islands, and understood something of their trade. On both islands there was a fine race of people. Jersey largely supplied England with early potatoes, and both islands, but more particularly Guernsey, sent us grapes and tomatoes.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member must treat the question more seriously.

MR. DAVID MACIVER submitted that fruit growing was relevant to the coal question, and went on to say that the grapes and tomatoes were grown under glass by artificial heat, which required coals. The islands needed revenue for the maintenance of their harbours and other local charges, and in Guernsey coals already had to pay half-a-crown a ton. The shilling export duty would bring these imposts up to three and sixpence. The coal tax would be regarded as a great hardship, and he thought it was not worth the while of the Imperial Government, for the sake of so little money as this tax would yield, to burden the trade of these islands, and to inspire a loyal people with a sense of wrong and injustice. He did not regard the coal tax as a war tax, but nevertheless, in pleading the cause of the Channel Islands, he thought he might venture to point out that in proportion to their population they had in a larger measure than any other portion of the British dominions given of their best to help the mother-country in the South African struggle. It should also be remembered that the inhabitants of Jersey and Guernsey, possessed of no great wealth, had given more than any in proportion to their means to help the various funds in support of those who had suffered owing to the war, and that each island had presented the mother-country with a battery of artillery, each costing £7,500. They had never been sufficiently thanked, and it was a poor reward for such loyalty to come down upon the Channel Islanders now and ask them to pay a shilling a ton upon coal. He thought he had shown good reasons why the islands should be exempted, and he hoped their case would not suffer before the Committee from the imperfect manner in which he had presented it.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 3, line 2, at end of clause, to add, as a new sub-clause, the words, 'Nothing in this section shall apply to coal exported from Great Britain or Ireland to the Channel Islands or the Isle of Man.'";(Mr. David MacIver.)

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

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The hon. Gentleman has given somewhat curious reasons, such as the growing of grapes and tomatoes, why the Amendment should be accepted, but I will endeavour briefly to take a serious view of his arguments. He contended in the first place that owing to some ancient charters the Channel Islands had a claim to this exemption. I have had this matter carefully investigated, and I find that those charters and Orders in Council only promised the islanders such exemptions from Imperial taxation as were enjoyed by the self-governing colonies

of the Crown, and that their existence does not constitute any obstruction to the imposition of duty on goods imported from this country. On the contrary, while our colonies in the time of William III. and Queen Anne were treated in a specially indulgent manner in regard to the duty on coal, the Channel Islands were treated as a foreign country.

The hon. Member has told us that the Channel Islands have their own import system, and that they impose a duty of 2s. 6d. a ton on coal, and yet he asks us to give the Channel Islands the special favour of being exempted from this tax. What would be the consequence, supposing we did so? The Channel Islands would simply become a depot for supplying France with English coal, which, as we have no control over their Customs service, our officers could not possibly check. I think that is a sufficient answer.

*MR. D. A. THOMAS said he listened to the right hon. Gentleman with some surprise. He thought that what had been said with regard to the Channel Islands reshipping coal would also apply to the Isle of Man.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: We have a special arrangement there.

MR. D. A. THOMAS said it had been found necessary to make a special arrangement with the Isle of Man, but surely it would be very easy also to make an arrangement with the Channel Islands, by which they would undertake not to reship coal. The right hon. Gentleman stated that when the coal tax was in operation formerly, the Channel Islands were regarded as a foreign country. That was true enough, but the right hon. Gentleman should remember that the whole position of things had changed since then. The right hon. Gentleman also referred to grapes and tomatoes, but either he was very inconsistent or his memory was very short. Only a few weeks ago, in reply to representations from the Channel Islands, he gave as a reason for not making a remission in their favour that the islands were able to produce early potatoes or green peas. If that were going to be an argument he would ask the right hon. Gentleman to exempt the Scilly Islands. The serious point was;and it showed one of the many anomalies which arose from that very absurd tax;that when coal was put on board a vessel running to Jersey at Southampton it was free of duty, whereas coal supplied at the same price and for the same firm put on board at Jersey for the return voyage was charged

duty. A ship running to the Isle of Man had coal free of duty at both ends, and why should not a similar exemption be applied to a vessel running from Southampton to Jersey?

MR. DAVID MACIVER said he desired leave to withdraw his Amendment.

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.

Horniman, Frederick John

O'Mara, James

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

Joicey, Sir James

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.

Ambrose, Robert

Jones, David Brynmor (Swans'a

Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Atherley-Jones, L.
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Paulton, James Mellor
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Jordan, Jeremiah
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Joyce, Michael
Pease, Sir Joseph W. (Durham)
Boland, John
Kennedy, Patrick James
Power, Patrick Joseph
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Lambert, George
Price, Robert John
Boyle, James
Langley, Batty
Priestley, Arthur
Broadhurst, Henry
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Rea, Russell
Burke, E. Haviland-
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Reddy, M.
Burt, Thomas
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Caldwell, James
Lundon, W.
Redmond, William (Clare)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Rigg, Richard
Causton, Richard Knight
M'Dermott, Patrick
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Cogan, Denis J.
M'Faddon, Edward
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
M'Govern, T.
Robson, William Snowdon
Crean, Eugene
M'Kenna, Reginald
Schwann, Charles E.

Cullinan, J.
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Daly, James
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John Wm.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Mooney, John J.
Soares, Ernest J.
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Morton, Edward J. C. (Devonp't
Sullivan, Donal
Delany, William
Moulton, John Fletcher
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Dillon, John
Murphy, John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Donelan, Captain A.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Thomas, JA (Glamorgan, Gower
Doogan, P. C.
Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.)
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Esmonds, Sir Thomas
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan
Norman, Henry
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Farrell, James Patrick
Norton, Captain Cecil Wm.
Weir, James Galloway
Fenwick, Charles
Nussey, Thomas Willans
White, George (Norfolk)
Ffrench, Peter
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Field, William
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)

O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Gilhooly, James
O'Doherty, William
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Griffith, Ellis J.
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Hammond, John
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Dowd, John
TELLERS TOR THE AYES; Mr. MacIver and Mr. D. A. Thomas.
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Chas. H.
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Holland, William Henry
O'Malley, William
NOES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bullard, Sir Harry
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)
Burns, John
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Butcher, John George
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Bell, Richard
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Bignold, Arthur
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bigwood, James
Cawley, Frederick
Austin, Sir John
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy

Bond, Edward
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Brassey, Albert
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manc'r)
Brigg, John
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Channing, Francis Allston
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds)
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Chapman, Edward
Banbury, Frederick George
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bull, William James
Clare, Octavius Leigh
The leave of the Committee not having been given,
Question put.
The Committee divided:;Ayes, 116; Noes, 233. (Division List No. 278.)
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Pretymann, Ernest George
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Purvis, Robert
Cranborne, Viscount
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Kenyon, James (Lancs, Bury)
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)
Rentoul, James Alexander
Crossley, Sir Savile
Keswick, William

Renwick, George
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Lambton, Hn. Frederick Wm.
Rickett, J. Compton
Dalkeith, Earl of
Law, Andrew Bonar
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Lawrence, Wm. P. (Liverpool)
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Lawson, John Grant
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Doughty, George
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Lough, Thomas
Seton-Karr, Henry
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Loyd, Archie Kiakman
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)

Elibank, Master of
Macartney, Rt. Hon. W. G. E.
Spear, John Ward
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Macdona, John Cumming
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Finch, George H.
M'Calmont, Col. H. L. B. (Cambs.
Stanley, Lord (Lancs)
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
M'Crae, George
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Fisher, William Hayes
M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.)
Stroyan, John
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Majendie, James A. H.
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Flower, Ernest
Malcolm, Ian
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Forster, Henry William
Manners, Lord Cecil
Tennant, Harold John
Fuller, J. M. F.
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Thornton, Percy M.
Galloway, William Johnson
Massey-Mainwaring, Hon. W. F.
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E. (Wigt'n
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Maxwell, W. J. H (Dumfriesshire
Valentia, Viscount
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)

Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S. Edm'nds
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Gretton, John
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John L.
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Morrell, George Herbert
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne)
Groves, James Grimble
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Morrison, James Archibald
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Gunter, Sir Robert
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Gordon, Sir W. Brampton
Mount, William Arthur
Wilcox, Sir John Archibald
Hambro, Charles Eric
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Wills, Sir Frederick
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Myers, William Henry
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh, N.)
Hardy, Laurence (Kent Ashford
Nicholson, William Graham
Wodehouse, Rt. Hon. E. R. (Bath
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Nicol, Donald Ninian

Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Harwood, George
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Wylie, Alexander
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Parkes, Ebenezer
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington)
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Helder, Augustus
Peel, Hon. Wm. Robert W.
Helme, Norval Watson
Penn, John
Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotter
Percy, Earl
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampstead
Pierpoint, Robert
Hoare, Sir Samuel (Norwich)
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Hoult, Joseph
Plummer, Walter R.

Question proposed, "That Clause 3, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said that the clause with all the changes proposed would require a certain amount of debate which could hardly begin at that time of night. He suggested that progress be now reported.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH admitted that the clause would require a reasonable amount of discussion.

Motion made and Question, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again"; (Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer); put, and agreed to.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Thursday.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACTS AMENDMENT [EXPENSES].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Question again proposed, "That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of any Expense incurred by the Secretary of State in any inquiry under the provisions of any Act of the present session to amend the Factory and Workshop Acts."; (Mr. Secretary Ritchie.)

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved, That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of any expense incurred by the Secretary of State in any inquiry under the provisions of any Act of the present session to amend the Factory and Workshop Acts.

Resolution to be reported this day.

NATIONAL GALLERY (PURCHASE OF ADJACENT LAND) [EXPENSES].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

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

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of all Expenses incurred by the Commissioners of Works under any Act of the present session for the acquisition of certain land, near the National Gallery in London, and for other purposes connected therewith.";(Mr. Akers-Douglas.)

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): I object.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): This is only a matter which has already been agreed to by the House.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE: I am aware of that, but some time ago I asked for information which was not given.

It being after Midnight, and objection being taken to Further Proceeding, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again To-morrow.

GAS AND WATER ORDERS CONFIRMATION BILL,

Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill.";(Mr. Gerald Balfour.)

GAS ORDERS CONFIRMATION BILL.

Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Gas Orders Confirmation Bill.";(Mr. Gerald Balfour.)

WATER ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 1) BILL.

Copy ordered, of "Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Water Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill.";(Mr. Gerald Balfour.)

WATER ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 2) BILL.

Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Water Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill.";(Mr. Gerald Balfour.)

KING'S SCHOLARSHIP EXAMINATION.

Return ordered, "of Statistics of the King's Scholarship Examination, Christmas, 1900, in respect of Pupil Teachers from Rural Schools.";(Mr. Llewellyn.)

Adjourned at ten minutes after Twelve of the clock.