

<https://api.parliament.uk/historic-hansard/sittings/1901/jun/6>

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 6th June, 1901.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

BATH GAS LIGHT AND COKE BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

DUBLIN CORPORATION (MARKETS, ETC.) BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

ROYAL EXCHANGE ASSURANCE BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

SHEFFIELD DISTRICT RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, with an Amendment.

ALDEBURGH CORPORATION WATER BILL.

BURY CORPORATION BILL.

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

HUMBER COMMERCIAL RAILWAY AND DOCK BILL.

As amended, to be considered upon Monday next.

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (TRAMWAYS AND STREET WIDENINGS) BILL.

METROPOLITAN RAILWAY BILL.

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

SHIREOAKS, LAUGHTON, AND MALTBY RAILWAY BILL.

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

BARRY RAILWAY BILL.

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

BIGGLESWADE WATER BOARD BILL.

COWES FERRY BILL [Lords].

Read a second time, and committed.

MANCHESTER CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

MERSEY DOCKS AND HARBOUR BOARD BILL [Lords].

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

OTLEY GAS BILL [Lords].

Read a second time, and committed.

METROPOLITAN DISTRICT RAILWAY BILL.

Petition for additional Provision; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 4) BILL.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 5) BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL.

Third Reading deferred till to-morrow.

METROPOLITAN COMMON SCHEME (ORPINGTON) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

NORTH BRITISH AND MERCANTILE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

PETITIONS.

COAL MINES (EMPLOYMENT) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Shireoaks; Bradford; Sutton Heath; Sherdley; and Havannah and Southport; to lie upon the Table.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (HIGHER GRADE AND EVENING CONTINUATION SCHOOLS).

Petitions for alteration of Law, from Southampton; Tottenham; and Bristol; to lie upon the Table.

HOUSING OF WORKING CLASSES (REPAYMENT OF LOANS) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Richmond (Surrey); and Scarborough; to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC LOCAL VETO (SCOTLAND) BILL.

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

LOCAL AUTHORITIES OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION BILL.

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

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.

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

MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Shireoaks; Bradford; Sutton Heath; Sherdley; Havannah and Southport; Quarry Bank; Netherton; Old Hill; and Pearson's Colliery; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Oldham; Maidstone; Gloucester; and Battersea; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

Petitions in favour, from London; Oldham (two); Warminster; Birmingham; Portsmouth; Carlisle; Salisbury (ten); Deptford (two); Grangetown; Pallion; Bishopwearmouth; Monkwearmouth; Plymouth; Maidstone (two); West Kent; Salford; Walthamstow; Bath; Gloucester; Chilwell; Tamworth; St. Austell; Yazon; Portsmouth (four); Mansel Lacy; Devonport; Caldbeck; Shoreditch; Romsey; Hoxton; Cheltenham; Southsea (two); Stourton; Perth; Ardleigh; Blackpool; Nantcuredig; Kingston; Ledbury; Millfield (eight); Sunderland (ten); and Durham; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour; Dornoch; Kiltarlity; and Inchinnan; to lie upon the Table.

SOVEREIGN'S OATH ON ACCESSION BILL.

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

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS (WHITSUNTIDE RECESS).

The following Papers, presented by Command of His Majesty during the Whitsuntide Recess, were delivered to the Librarian of the House of Commons during the Recess, pursuant to the Standing Order of the 14th August, 1896;:

1. Trade Reports (Annual Series).; Copies of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Nos. 2609 to 2613.
2. Trade Reports (Miscellaneous Series).; Copy of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, No. 552.
3. Suez Canal (Commercial, No. 2, 1901).; Copy of Returns of Shipping and

Tonnage, 1898, 1899, and 1900 (in continuation of "Commercial, No. 1, 1900").

4. Workmen's Locomotion (Facilities) (Commercial, No. 3, 1901).; Copy of Reports from His Majesty's Representatives Abroad on Special Facilities for Locomotion of Workmen in Belgium, France, and Germany.

5. Africa (No. 4, 1901).; Copy of Correspondence respecting Slavery and the Slave Trade in East Africa and the Islands of Zanzibar and Pemba (in continuation of Africa, No. 3, 1900).

6. Gibraltar.; Copy of Report on Recent Improvements at Gibraltar in respect of Sanitary and other Matters.

7. Public Records.; Copy of Sixty-second Annual Report of the Deputy Keeper. Ordered, That the said Papers do lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) (TRAINING COLLEGES).

Copy presented, of Reports and Papers relating to the Training Colleges of Scotland for the year 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Return of the Population and Valuation of Counties, Burghs, and Parishes in Scotland [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

GLASGOW (EXPENDITURE ON VACCINATION).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 10th May; Mr. Thomas Bayley]; to lie upon the Table.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (RULES).

Copy presented, of Rules made by the Irish Land Commission under the Land Purchase Acts, dated the 17th May, 1901 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ARRESTS FOR DRUNKENNESS (IRELAND).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 16th May; Mr. William, Johnston]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 193.]

ALIENS.

Return presented, relative thereto [Address, 23rd April; Mr. Jesse Collings] to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 194.]

BOARD OF EDUCATION (GENERAL REPORTS).

Copy presented, of General Report for the year 1900 by the Chief Inspector of the Welsh Division [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ENDOWED SCHOOLS ACT, 1869, AND AMENDING ACTS.

Copy presented, of Scheme for the Management of the Grammar School of King Edward VI. and other Endowments in the borough of Stratford-on-Avon, in the county of Warwick [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 195.]

BOTANICAL WORK COMMITTEE.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 24th May; Sir Michael Foster]; to lie upon the Table.

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL.

Copy presented, of Returns relating to the Council up to 31st March, 1901, with Estimate of Expenditure for the year ending 31st March, 1902 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 196.]

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1884.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 22nd May, 1901, declaring that Henry Richards, Rural Messenger, Post

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.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 22nd May, 1901, declaring that Henry Lathen, Rural Postman, Hertford Post 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.

SINKING FUNDS.

Account presented, of the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt, showing the amount received and applied in the year ended 31st March, 1901, in respect to the Old and New Sinking Funds [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 197.]

NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS' (IRELAND) PENSION FUND.

Annual Accounts presented, of Receipts and Payments for the period to 31st December, 1900 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS (SUPERANNUATION) RULES (ISLE OF MAN).

Copy presented, of Draft Rules made under the Elementary School Teachers (Superannuation) Act, 1898, as extended by the Elementary School Teachers Superannuation (Isle of Man) Act, 1900 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

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

Union of Benefices Act (Saint Mary at Hill with Saint Andrew Hubbard, and Saint George, Botolph Lane, with Saint Botolph, Billingsgate).; Copy of Scheme for effecting an union of the Benefices of St. Mary at Hill with Saint Andrew Hubbard, and Saint George, Botolph Lane, with Saint Botolph, Billingsgate [by Act].

QUESTIONS.

RESERVE LANCERS;CANTEEN FUND.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that when the Reserve regiment of Lancers was disbanded on 25th March a sum of £;219 stood to the credit of the canteen fund; and whether, seeing that the men were charged barrack damages monthly, and that no clothes were given to them when disbanded, he can state how this sum to which the men were entitled has been disposed of.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): The total available credit on the 6th March, after deducting outstanding liabilities, was £;157 1s. 10d. Out of this sum an amount of £;125 5s. 4d. has been paid on camp, barrack, and saddlery damages and deficiencies, and rent of soldiers' boxes. The sum of £;31 16s. 6d. is therefore available for expenditure when the value of the stock has been realised.

DENOMINATIONAL SCHOOL SUBSCRIPTIONS.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can state who is responsible for the non-publication of the Return relating to subscriptions to denominational schools which was in the hands of the printers last August, and whether steps will be taken to expedite the printing of the Return.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire,

E.): My right hon. friend the Vice-President of the Council, who has asked me to reply to this question, informs me that the Return referred to will be issued very shortly. The printing of the Return, which is a heavy piece of work, is being pressed forward.

DESIGN OF NEW POSTAGE STAMPS.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether, before the commission for designs for the new postage stamps was given to an Austrian artist, the advice of the President of the Royal Academy and the leaders of the artistic profession was obtained.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH (Anglesea): May I at the same time ask the hon. Gentleman whether he can state who is responsible for entrusting the designs of the new postage stamps to a foreign artist, and whether an opportunity was afforded any other artist to submit designs; and, if not, what was the reason for such omission.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The responsibility for the designs of the new issue of stamps rests with the Postmaster General, who took the pleasure of His Majesty the King as to the portrait of His Majesty which should be used in the preparation of the designs. The portrait selected by His Majesty was executed only last year by a gentleman who has long been resident in London, and whose work deservedly enjoys a high reputation in this country. As the portrait was thought to be particularly well adapted for the purpose in question, it did not appear necessary to invite designs from any other artists. It was not thought necessary to consult the President of the Royal Academy or the leaders of the artistic profession on the subject, as the selection of the portrait to be used in the preparation of the designs was obviously a matter in which His Majesty's own wishes should carry most weight.

MOUNT PLEASANT SORTING OFFICE; MEDICAL ARRANGEMENTS.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that an accident happened at Mount Pleasant Sorting Office on 6th May to a sorter, causing him to faint; that, in the absence of an attendant medical officer and of an ambulance, this man had to be taken in a mail van to the Royal Free Hospital, Gray's Inn Road, nearly half an hour elapsing before he was attended to; and whether the Postmaster General, in view of this and other accidents, and seeing that over 2,000 men are employed at this office, will accede to the requests of the staff for a resident medical officer and give instructions for an ambulance to be kept on the premises.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The accident in question, which was due to a door swinging against the man's face, was not a serious one, and there is no record that the man fainted. It is reported to have happened at 8.2 p.m., and, cab could not be found at the minute, the man was conveyed in a mail van to the Royal Free Hospital, where he arrived at 8.15 p.m. His wound was dressed, and he started home in a cab at 8.30 p.m. It does not appear, therefore, that any time was lost. It is not considered necessary to have a resident medical officer at Mount Pleasant, but the question of providing an ambulance litter, which, however, would hardly have been used on the occasion in question, is

under consideration.

ROSS-SHIRE POSTAL FACILITIES.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that the inhabitants of the north side of Little Lochbroom, Ross-shire, recently made application for a daily post, and were informed in reply that the cost of the existing service (four days a week) absorbs nearly the whole of the postage on the correspondence delivered, and that, in these circumstances, the cost of a more frequent delivery would not be warranted; and will he explain the rule which guides him in sanctioning postal facilities for the Western Highlands and Islands of Scotland and other similar districts where the existing postal service does not meet the requirements of the people.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The answer to the first paragraph of the question is in the affirmative. In sanctioning additional postal facilities for country districts in England, Scotland, and Ireland, the Postmaster General is guided mainly by the amount of correspondence and the expense involved. It is the practice to provide as good a service as can be afforded at a cost which is considered to be warranted by the circumstances.

TEACHING OF IRISH IN IRISH COLLEGES.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that there are professors of Irish in the training colleges of Drumcondra and Baginbun Street, Dublin, and Waterford, and that no special grant is made to these colleges, or any of them, to meet the cost thus incurred; can he say whether the Marlborough Street (Dublin) College is at any disadvantage as regards its funds which would constitute a reason for its not having a professor of Irish as well as other training colleges; and is he aware that teachers in the Marlborough Street College are trained for the Irish-speaking as well as the non-Irish-speaking districts in Ireland; and seeing that the Marlborough Street College is under the uncontrolled management of the Commissioners, who for some years past have allowed the use of Irish by the teachers in schools in Irish-speaking districts and have recently advised it, whether the Government can take any steps to remove this inequality.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): There is a professor of Irish in St. Patrick's, Drumcondra. There is, I am informed, no official record of such professors in Baginbun Street, or in Waterford College; but in the latter it appears from correspondence that Irish is taught by a member of the staff. In reply to the second paragraph, all the recognised training colleges are on the same footing in respect of grants from public sources made on account of King's Scholars trained therein. Teachers are trained for Irish-speaking districts in Marlborough Street. In reply to the third paragraph, this matter is now the subject of inter-departmental correspondence between the Irish Government and the Board of Education.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I will repeat the question at a later period, especially with regard to the last paragraph.

MR. WYNDHAM: Perhaps the hon. Member will allow a week or so to elapse.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. VAUGHAN DAVIES (Cardiganshire): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether it is now practicable for him to introduce a Bill giving effect to the promise made on the 7th of December, 1900, to the effect that the Government will this session deal with the question of the wrongful dismissals of teachers in public elementary schools.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I shall have to make a statement on this subject, as well as on other matters relating to legislation, when I ask for further facilities for the conduct of Government business, and I propose to do that on Tuesday next.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Will the right hon. Gentleman make any statement as to the nature of the proposals he will then submit to the House?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I will put my motion on the Paper. The proposals will be of a character common at this time of the year.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): Will the motion appear on Monday's Paper?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, I will put it down on Monday.

MR. VAUGHAN DAVIES: Will the right hon. Gentleman make a clear statement as to what he is going to do on this subject of the wrongful dismissal of teachers?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I hope my statements are always clear.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet): What will be the business on Monday?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I would rather defer till to-morrow a statement of what Monday's business will be, as to-morrow, in the highly probable event of Supply not being finished tonight, I shall ask the House to consider Class 3 of the Civil Service Estimates.

MR. CHAPLIN (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he intends to make any definite statement in reply to the memorials addressed to him by the supporters of the movement in favour of pure beer, and whether he proposes to do so before he makes the motion for taking additional time from private Members, or at the time he makes such motion.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think it will be most convenient to make the statement in the course of a general statement on the business of the House.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Will the motion the right hon. Gentleman proposes to make on Tuesday for the taking of Tuesdays for Government business include that Tuesday?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Oh, yes.

MR. E. J. C. MORTON (Devonport): Can the right hon. Gentleman make any statement as to when the Navy Estimates will be taken?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, I think it would be premature to do so as yet.

NEW MEMBER MADE THE AFFIRMATION REQUIRED BY LAW.

Joseph Albert Pease, esquire, for the County of Essex (Northern or Saffron Walden Division).

NEW MEMBER SWORN.

George Ralph Charles Ormsby-Gore, esquire, commonly called the Honourable George Ralph Charles Ormsby-Gore, for the County of Salop (Western or Oswestry Division).

PRISONS (SCOTLAND) BILL [Lords].

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 206.]

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

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

SUPPLY.

[EIGHTH ALLOTTED DAY.]

Considered in Committee;;

(In the Committee.)

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

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1901–2.

1. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £15,977,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge for Transport and Remounts, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902."

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.) said he desired to draw attention to the extravagant expenditure which had taken place in connection with both the sea transport as regarded horses and the entire management of the Remount Department.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield), interrupting, said he wished to call attention to a matter which would be excluded by the motion of the hon. and gallant Member for West Newington. He wished to impress upon the Secretary for War the importance of not wasting money in moving Militia about the country. The South Staffordshire Militia were moved down to the neighbourhood of Portsmouth for a week or two before being sent to South Africa; it would surely have been better to keep them in their quarters at Lichfield. He wished to have an assurance from the right hon. Gentleman that he would not continue the policy of moving Militia battalions about more than is absolutely necessary.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.) moved to reduce Sub-head C by £1,000,000. The Government could not now shelter themselves behind the excuses they gave last year for not giving the House any information as to the sums of money paid for the transport of troops to South Africa. This question was raised last year when enormous Votes were asked for in order to convey troops and horses to South Africa, and when rumours, which were pretty well authenticated, were flying about the country that the shipowners had taken advantage of the necessities of the nation to put up their freights in order to put millions of the taxpayers' money into their pockets. What answer did the right hon. Gentleman give last year? He said that the necessities of the public service were so great that it was impossible to give any information as to the rates paid for the transport of men and horses to South Africa. That was an answer which, in those days of great emergencies, effectively closed the mouths of hon. Members on this side of the House. Such an argument, however, could not be successfully maintained this year, because that great public necessity had entirely passed away. He understood that freights were now inclined to fall, and

there was not the slightest difficulty about obtaining all the transports required for the purposes of the war in South Africa. The House of Commons was entitled to know whether there was any foundation for those rumours, and whether the shipowners did unduly put up their freights when the Government were "cornered," and when they were practically obliged to pay whatever price the shipowners asked.

They had heard a great deal of talk lately of conscription, and about the necessity of men making up their minds to make all kinds of sacrifices in the interests of the Empire. It was a matter, of very great importance that the country should know how those patriotic duties were interpreted by the very wealthy class of shipowners in this country. In the event of a great national crisis arising, such as did arise in the winter of 1899, his notion was that it was the duty of a great shipowner not to take advantage of that crisis in order to put up his freights. He thought shipowners ought to be prepared to carry troops and munitions of war to South Africa at the same rates as prevailed before the crisis arose. If it was true, as had been alleged, that when the crisis arose in 1899 the shipowners took advantage of it when they had practically the Government by the throat, then it was a gross act of want of patriotism on their part. Last year the sum asked for on this Vote was £10,600,000, and this year it is £9,550,000, or only about £1,000,000 less than the amount asked for last year. How were the Government going to justify this Vote unless they were expecting another surprise in South Africa? Was the war going to take a new development, which would render enormous reinforcements necessary? This demand for £9,550,000 for sea transport during the present year was calculated to give the impression that the Government were making preparations for another year of war at least on the same scale as in the year gone by. Last year they had to convey some 130,000 men to South Africa, and were they to understand from those figures that the Government were looking forward during the present year to sending another 100,000 men, remounts, and military stores upon a similar scale? If that was not the case, why did they ask for practically the same amount of money?

He gathered from the public press and the shipping returns that freights were falling and the boom was over. If the pressure had now been taken off, then the Government ought to get their freights at a very much lower rate than last year. It appeared to him that by this Vote the Government were making preparations for carrying on this war for another whole year, not only on the same but upon a larger scale.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item C (Sea Transport) be reduced by £1,000,000." (Mr. Dillon.)

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said there was one feature in this enormous amount which he really thought was very significant. There were several headings down, but there was no single item with respect to which any sum was named. He believed that it was unprecedented in the history of Estimates that a Vote of this nature, amounting to £9,550,000, should be asked for in a lump sum without the smallest detail being given. There were no fewer than seven heads to this Vote, every one of which was entitled to have its amount set down. In the case

of sub-head A the proper method had been pursued, for there were four sub-heads, each one of which had its amount set out. He was entirely unable to see why under Sub-head C £9,550,000 should be asked for without a single item being set forth, the lump sum only being given. This system of setting down lump sums was especially dangerous in Army and Navy Estimates, because in those Estimates if there was more taken than was needed on one item it could be taken and used for another purpose. That was not the case with the Civil Service Estimates, nor with the Estimates of the Revenue Department. If the Government desired to throw dust

into the eyes of the people and conceal from the country the particular way in which they wanted to spend the money, they might put down under the head of "sea transports" an enormous sum larger than they knew they would be able to spend, and in the course of the year they could apply part of that money to some other item.

There was another danger. He observed that the War Office proposed in future that in some respects the unexpended balances should be carried forward. That exposed them to a number of new dangers. If they voted this £9,550,000 without detail, the War Office would have the power to devote part of this money to other matters, such as the payment of men and officers; a policy which might be open to discussion. Whether this abuse would be permitted to continue was a matter for future consideration. He was simply pointing out the very serious financial considerations and dangers involved in this system; which to him appeared to be an abuse; of asking the House to vote £9,550,000 without giving the smallest detail, although the different heads were there. There was one other matter which had been raised by the hon. Member opposite. When the Government in a time of war put down £10,600,000 for sea transport and horses, and in the following year they asked the House for a sum which was almost equal to the previous year, undoubtedly there were grounds for the hon. Member for East Mayo's contention that, in the opinion of the Government, the war expenditure was going to continue for another year. If that was the opinion of the Government he was rather inclined to think that they were correct. If this Vote was to be taken as an indication that the war expenditure was going to be continued for another year at the same rate it was a very serious matter. He trusted that the Secretary for War would give some explanation, and a sufficient one, for the absence of all detail in this large Vote, and that he would be able to tell the House that the probability of the war continuing this year was not, in his opinion, as 9 to 10; the sum asked for last year being £10,600,000, while the amount asked for this year was £9,550,000.

*SIR ARTHUR HAYTER (Walsall) said he desired to ask the Secretary for War a question with regard to the transport of the Yeomanry last year, in which the screw steamer, "Lusitania," was engaged. The transport arrangements were carried out by the Yeomanry Committee, and they were not, therefore, inspected by the Transport Department of the Admiralty. The result was that when the transports were taken over by the War Office, in order to take the Yeomanry to South Africa, it was found that the "Lusitania" was entirely unfit to carry troops.

The result was that Lord Lansdowne had to pay £5,000, being one month's hire of

the transport, in order to get out of the difficulty. He wanted an assurance from the right hon. Gentleman that laches of that kind would not be committed again, because they had been called upon to pay £5,000 for absolutely no benefit whatever.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.) called the attention of the Secretary of State for War to the case of a steamship which had been used for the purpose of forming a hospital for the Boers, and for which a sum of £1,000 a month had been paid. His information was that the Boers stationed on the hospital ship were taken down from a comparatively healthy up-country station and put down at Colombo, the mean temperature of which was 83°; and on occasions rose to such a pitch that the medical officer in attendance had to recommend the ship to be sent to sea for cruises of six or eight hours at a time in order to save the lives of the patients. But it was infinitely worse from the point of view of economy, because close to the very stations from which the patients were brought were hill stations where English and Europeans lived in perfect health and comfort, and where the prisoners could have been put without going to the great cost of this absurd hospital ship. If the Secretary of State was not aware of the details of this transaction, he hoped he would look into the matter, and take such cognisance of it that such a state of things, which he could not describe as anything short of scandalous, should not be allowed to occur again.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) pointed out to the hon. Member for King's Lynn that it might be that the Government were taking this large sum of money in order to bring back the troops. Any hon. Member who desired to do his duty to his conscience and the country on such Votes as this had a good deal of difficulty to contend with. He regarded the money already spent as money which they were bound to provide, although he was opposed to spending any more money upon this war. They ought not to vote any further supplies so long as the Government told them that they intended to carry on this war until the Boers surrendered, and so long as they told them that they would not enter into negotiations with the Boers to try and discover under what conditions the Boers were prepared to enter the area of the British Empire. He wished the Secretary of State would tell them exactly how much of this money had been spent, how much it was intended to spend, and how much of it was for the bringing back and the sending out of troops. He would be ready to vote money for bringing the men back, but not for sending them out. They heard last year that the war was over, and a number of ships were sent to the Cape to bring back the soldiers. He wished to know what the Government were doing in regard to those ships. Were they still paying for them, and were the ships still waiting for the precise moment when the war would be over? That was too monstrous to believe. Those ships were sent out; an electioneering dodge; with great parade to bring the troops back, and to convey the idea to the country that the war was over in the true sense of the word, and from that moment to the present time those ships were being kept there, and the country had to pay for them. And still the Government would not enter into any reasonable negotiations with the Boers. He was sure that the Secretary of State for War did not wish them to vote against his views under a misapprehension of the figures, and therefore he should tell

the House what he was paying for demurrage at the present moment, and what amount he had included in the present Vote for further demurrage. How long was this state of things going to last? If the Government were so stiff-necked as to refuse to enter into reasonable negotiations, the war might last a year. Let the House be told how much of the money was to be spent in sending out more troops to South Africa. He did not want any more troops sent out until they had entered into negotiations, or until they had found that negotiations had failed. On account of the hugger-mugger manner in which this Vote was presented it was perfectly impossible for anyone to vote with a full knowledge of what he was doing. Under the present system the right hon. Gentleman might take the money voted for one purpose and devote it to another purpose. The War Office claimed the right to spend this money not only upon the particular item in the Vote, but upon any other item. So long as the Estimates were presented in that state, and so long as the Government claimed this right to ask for money for one object and spend it for another the granting of Votes would be a perfect farce.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.) said that the Government in the end would be bound to furnish the details of the enormous amount of money which had been spent upon remounts. He ventured to say that when such information had been furnished it would be found that the money spent upon this item was one of the most disgraceful transactions, and an expenditure which ought not to have taken place. He hoped that a court of inquiry would be the outcome of the deplorable mismanagement which had taken place in South Africa. He should support the motion of his hon. friend because he felt that the transports were not wanted, and because there had been much delay in the South African ports.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs) said that when certain transports were being sent out to convey horses to South Africa it was found that the fittings of certain vessels did not comply exactly with the Government regulations, and they were taken out, and fittings complying with the Government regulations were placed in their stead. In one particular case the Government fittings were not put in in a sufficiently substantial manner, and when the vessel got into a rough sea those fittings gave way and a large number of horses were very seriously injured. [An HON. MEMBER: One hundred and fifty.] A very large number of those horses had to be thrown overboard, and the vessel returned to Liverpool to be repaired. He wished to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether a full inquiry had been made into the circumstances of that particular case. The matter had been mentioned in the House more than once. He wished to know, first of all, why the ordinary fittings were taken out of the vessel at a moment when time was of the greatest importance? Why were the ordinary fittings replaced by Government fittings, and why were those Government fittings not of a sufficiently substantial character to stand the stress of weather? He agreed with the hon. Member for King's Lynn that the Government had not treated the House fairly in this matter. He would go further, and say that during the last five or six years, although there had in that period been many instances in which the Government had treated the House of Commons with contempt, he believed there was no case in which the Government had treated the House with more contempt than in

this particular instance. They were discussing now a Vote of £9,550,000. If they examined the Estimates for other Departments they would find the Votes properly classified under sub-heads and letters, and they would also find the amounts taken for the different items definitely stated. In this particular case they were asked to vote £9,550,000 with their eyes absolutely shut. The House of Commons, upon this particular Vote, ought to make a definite and distinct protest. He thought the time had now arrived when they should know the freights charged for the transports. He was not alluding to any transactions which had taken place within the last few weeks or months, for the Government might hold the opinion that in the interests of the public service it would not be right to give that information to the House. It was, however, a long time since these transactions were commenced, and with regard to the earlier stages of them, at all events, the time had long ago arrived when the House of Commons ought to be placed in posses-

sion of the facts. He would, therefore, ask the right hon. Gentleman to give them some information upon that point, and more particularly as to the case of the particular vessel to which he had drawn attention.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): The hon. Member who has just sat down says the Committee are being asked to vote £9,550,000 on this particular item with their eyes shut. The House of Commons has before it eloquent testimony to the great service which has been performed in conveying troops to South Africa in the various publications issued at different times in connection with the war in South Africa. The Government have embarked for South Africa and conveyed there over 300,000 men, without the loss of a single life, and over 260,000 animals in the course of the last eighteen months, an achievement to which I do not think the history of any other country can furnish a parallel. I think that no more eloquent testimony to the way this work has been conducted by the department of the Admiralty specially concerned can be found than the fact that the whole House of Commons has only brought forward some two or three instances upon which there is any question whatever as to the manner in which the work has been carried out.

The hon. Member opposite alluded to the fittings of a particular ship, but my noble friend, who has seen the vessel himself, is more competent than I am to deal with the question. I may say that the vessel met with an exceptional gale, in which a number of partitions were destroyed. In the rolling of the ship a great water tank became unshipped and did considerable damage. There is now, of course, greater experience to guide the authorities. Taking the general question of transports from first to last, I think it is wonderful that there are so few cases in which accidents have occurred.

The hon. Member for Walsall called attention to the "Lusitania." That vessel was engaged before my own time by the Yeomanry Committee, who, to that extent, acted as private individuals. The Yeomanry Committee did most excellent work in equipping the

large body of Yeomanry who first went out and in helping to equip the body of Yeomanry more recently sent out. I think it is an interesting commentary on the excellent service provided by the Government that the only case the right hon.

Gentleman had to bring forward was one of which a body other than the Government had the equipping of the ship.

Various questions were put to me by my hon. friend the Member for King's Lynn. First of all, he complains that, whereas under Item A we have given all the details under the various headings, we have not done so in the case of Item C. That information can be very easily obtained by anybody who has got the Estimates in his hands. Item A is for ordinary and smaller amounts and is only £;714,000, and includes a sum of £;414,000 which is on the normal Estimates, with regard to which the Government are able to give chapter and verse. The remainder alone is on the Estimates for war services which are less easy to calculate. Item C involves, as the hon. Member for East Mayo has pointed out, the whole question of the duration of the war. With regard to the particular transports which have been engaged, it is absolutely impossible to apportion the cost under the various heads, and we cannot make even an approximate estimate. I was not surprised to find my hon. friend the Member for King's Lynn hauling us over the coals for want of detail in this respect. In all matters connected with the Admiralty my hon. friend is a recognised corsair, and carries on piratical practices without the slightest regard to the ordinary rules. He challenges all sorts of details, and brings up subjects which other hon. Members of the House are hardly prepared to discuss, and he insists upon us giving the most minute details in the Estimates. When my hon. friend proceeded to follow in the wake of the hon. Member for East Mayo, and to declare that the size of this Vote indicated the probability that the Government intended or expected that the war would be continued up to the 31st of next March on the same scale as it has been continued up to the present moment, I thought for the moment that his mind was so set on financial purity

that he had forgotten what was surely the obvious deduction to be made from this Vote. The deduction from the Vote is that, having spent last year £;10,000,000 in taking out a large number of troops, we have had naturally to provide this year a large sum in view of the possibility; which I hope is more than a possibility; the probability of having to bring home a large number of troops. He, on the other hand, took the view that it was our intention to send out another 200,000 men and to land the country in a bill of £;9,500,000, and this particular item astonishes him.

What we have done is this. We have taken money to be used in completing the payments for ships already on hire. I have been asked for more details with regard to that. The Admiralty carry on this business for us, and I can only tell the House, not of individual cases, but of what is a typical case of the average we are paying. A typical infantry transport, with room for 1,250 men, costs £;5,000 per month for hire, and a horse transport for 400 horses costs about the same, coaling and messing forming an additional public charge in both cases. We have at present engaged something like forty-five transports, the greater number of which are employed on passages either one way or the other. We have at home five transports preparing, nine travelling outwards, and eleven travelling homewards. The others are either hospital ships, or employed at the Cape, or engaged in coast voyages, or awaiting contingencies that may arise at the Cape.

I am quite sure that, whether this is looked at from the point of view of the health of the soldiers who have to be removed from South Africa, or whether it is looked at from the point of view of the transport of prisoners, or from the point of view of as rapidly as possible delivering at the seat of war those reinforcements which the Government intend to send when they are necessary, it is a wise, a good, and indeed a humane expenditure that we should be fairly and properly provided in the matter of transports. I do not think that the taking up of ships which are not well fitted up for the work is a wise thing for us to embark upon at this period of the war, when we have 250,000 men engaged in South Africa. As regards the total amount of £;9,550,000; and I do not think that, compared with the expenditure last year, it can be regarded as excessive; we have to bring home at some time or another all the troops we have sent out. There is no doubt that the transport to and from has been admirably carried out, and it must be continued at its present level until there is some relaxation of the great demands upon us in South Africa. I think I have answered so far as I can all the points that have been put to me. MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE asked the right hon. Gentleman to give an answer in regard to the hospital ship at Ceylon.

MR. BRODRICK: I am not cognisant of what actually occurred in that matter, but I know that the health of the prisoners at Ceylon has, on the whole, been admirably maintained.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said he was amazed at the levity with which the right hon. Gentleman had answered the questions addressed to him by Members on both sides of the House. He was a member of the Public Accounts Committee, and was only too well acquainted with the laches of the War Office to allow a Vote of £;9,550,000 to pass without notice; but whether this question came from himself, who might be open to the objection of being too great a purist in finance, or from another, there had been a most reasonable request made for some details of the £;9,550,000. It was only during the last two years that these details had been omitted. Formerly each of these items had the proper amount put opposite to it. Why should the right hon. Gentleman, instead of offering some details, put them off with such statements as that there was eloquent testimony in the way the troops had been sent to Africa of the way the transport had been managed, and with such allegations as that he was a corsair? When the whole of the proceedings of the Admiralty in this matter were brought before the House they would be able to see who was the corsair, or rather who was the pirate. If the Committee did not get an answer giving the details asked for, he would vote for the Amendment. He was not prepared to see the House treated with contempt. It was useless to say that the Government did not know the details. The total of £;9,550,000 could only have been arrived at by adding up the different items. The right hon. Gentleman was in possession of every one of the figures which had been asked for. [Mr. BRODRICK shook his head.] If he continued to shake his head, how did he get the total? Did somebody on this side of the House go to him and say, "Put down £;9,500,000, and in order to make it exact add another £;50,000 to it"? The Committee had an absolute right to all the items. It was an outrage; well, not an outrage, but it was unusual for a Minister to make so light

and so contemptuous a reply.

MR. PIRIE said the reply of the Secretary of State for War had given increased cause for suspicion in this matter. There were two classes of transports; those which were hired right out for the time being, and the larger class which were simply taken for one or two voyages as the case might be. In a number of cases these transports were paying for weeks or months hundreds of pounds of demurrage at the ports. This showed a want of calculation and foresight on the part of the Government, and it was only natural that details of these matters should be asked.

SIR J. BLUNDELL MAPLE (Camberwell, Dulwich) asked for information as to the price of bringing back horses from South Africa. He understood that a transport carrying 400 horses cost £5,000 per month, which was equivalent to £12 per horse per month. If anything was required in South Africa it was horses, and it seemed to him an absurd proposal to bring back horses which would be useful in South Africa, and which would be more marketable there than here. He suggested that the Government should take into consideration the importance of leaving the horses in South Africa, and purchasing horses here for the use of the troops when they returned.

MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) said the question "How much has been spent in demurrage?" was very simple. Would the right hon. Gentleman inform the Committee what the amount was? He had had an opportunity of assuring the Committee that the miscalculation as to the termination of the war did not cost us much money. What he had told the Committee was an effort to evade the real issue, which was that at this moment there were fourteen ships under demurrage. The major part of the money spent on demurrage was money wasted. It was expenditure which might have been avoided by more careful calculation as to when the war would be over, and the Committee had a right to know how much the miscalculation had cost the nation.

MR. COHEN (Islington, E.) said he absolutely disagreed with what had been said by the hon. Member for North Monmouth. He did not think the right hon. Gentleman could tell them how many of these ships were at South African ports, but they were there in anticipation of the bringing home of the troops, which would be done at the very first day they could be returned. He was quite sure that the money laid out for the purpose of securing ships for that purpose was economically and humanely spent. He was a member of the Public Accounts Committee, and he could not call to mind a single instance in connection with these tremendous outlays where any charge could have been brought against the War Office of being lavish, careless, or improvident in the expenditure of money. But his right hon. friend gave an explanation which he was glad to hear, that this expenditure was for the transport of troops to and from South Africa. His right hon. friend; and, indeed, any responsible Minister; would have been imprudent, instead of being most cautious as the right hon. Gentleman had been, had he ventured to allocate the proportion of expenditure that was to be incurred for sending the troops out to South Africa and that for bringing them home. He would have given ground for a repetition of those constant reproaches made, sometimes with reason, against the Government about the expectations which

they held out that the war was not going to last so long as it unfortunately had done. His right hon. friend had given to the Committee an explanation as clear and satisfactory and as detailed as it was possible or wise for him to do.

MR. DILLON said that the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down might be a great authority on finance, but he would pardon him for saying that he had not met the point raised. The contention of the hon. Member for King's Lynn was, to his mind, unanswerable, and no attempt had been made to answer it. How was this Estimate of £9,550,000 arrived at? Was it put down at random, without any attempt to estimate the items which went to make up the total? He maintained that the Government were condemned by their own Paper, which put down no fewer than seven separate items, making up a total but fixing no amount for each Estimate. Did the War Office, in making this enormous demand to be presented to the Committee, calculate the separate items at all? If they did not, they were attempting most shamefully to deceive the Committee. And if they did calculate the seven separate items, why should they not be communicated to the Committee? It was a curious coincidence that all the dead walls in London were to-day placarded with bills announcing the Report of the War Office Committee. The Committee reported that there was "want of business method," "and that so great was the confusion in the War Office that it was impossible to bring home responsibility to any individual." They had a very good illustration of that in the present case; and when the hon. Member for King's Lynn, who, whatever his political views might be, was distinguished in the House for his knowledge of its rules; brought up this point, he was called a corsair, and accused of making incursions on the War Office and Admiralty without any regard to principle or rule. But it was not an answer to the main question as put by the hon. Gentleman to make an absurd and unsuited attack upon him. What they demanded to know was how this Estimate was made up. Was it an honest Paper under these seven sub-heads, and, if so, why were they not told the amount of the Estimate on each of the seven sub-heads?

What was the objection to letting the Committee know that? The hon. Member did not make the smallest effort to state any objection, or to insinuate that any public interest was at stake in giving to the Committee, the country, or even to the enemy the cost of the transports and other important details which it was important for the Committee and the country to know. They wanted to know how many transports were permanently employed, and how many on casual hire. When the right hon. Gentleman was asked to give some detailed information as to why such a large sum was demanded he gave two contradictory reasons. At the beginning of his speech the right hon. Gentleman said that the reason why so large a sum as 10½ millions was asked for was to send 250,000 troops to South Africa, with remounts, armaments, etc.; and that now it would take 9½ millions to bring them home again. There was a great deal of doubt as to whether they would be ever brought home again, considering that more than half of the whole cost of transport was for horses. Most of the horses were dead and buried in South Africa, and the remainder ought to be left there. Therefore, at one stroke half of the whole sum disappeared. The second reason given by the

right hon. Gentleman was that we had forty-five transports in the hire of the Government, and that we should have to keep that fleet up to its present strength as long as the war remained on its present footing. In other words, the right hon. Gentleman asked for this enormous amount of money on the ground that he expected that the war would go on for another year at its present magnitude. The right hon. Gentleman could not hop from one reason to another in that way. He must, or he ought to, base his Estimate, and justify it to the Committee, on some specific ground or on the forecast which was in the minds of the gentlemen in the War Office. They knew, from past experience, that the War Office was not very capable of making any accurate forecast, but they were entitled to get a simple statement of the forecast on which the Estimate was based. That they had not got, and the Committee was left completely in the dark. The right hon. Gentleman had not given a satisfactory answer to any of the points raised in the course of the debate.

MR. BRODRICK said he was rather surprised at the tone taken by the hon. Member for East Mayo because of the answer he had given to the hon. Member's query. He was very far from desiring to conceal anything from the House. There was nothing whatever to conceal. All those who were acquainted with framing Estimates; and no one more so than his hon. friend the Member for King's Lynn; must know that nothing was so easy as to divide up a total into definite figures, under such heads as those, but first they must have an exact knowledge of the amount of work to be done under each item. The question was how much they had precisely to spend on each item. He had told the Committee that a part of the Estimate was for bringing back a large number of troops from South Africa in the course of the year. But when the time came for these troops to be brought home, they could not all be brought away in transports which they had at command, or were at present engaged in travelling to and fro from South Africa. When the time came when Lord Kitchener could release troops home, it would depend entirely whether at the moment they could use their own transports, or be compelled to hire additional transports. Then as to the troops going out to South Africa, they could not always tell whether the troops would be ready by a given date, and as to whether they should not want their own transports, or extra transports. The total cost could not be estimated by any calculation of the number of men to be conveyed by their own fleet or by subsidiary vessels and therefore the observations of the hon. Gentleman the Member for East Mayo and the strong expressions from the hon. Member for King's Lynn fell to the ground. The hon. Member for Dulwich had asked a question as to whether the Government intended to bring back all the horses from South Africa. He was afraid that a great many of the horses had found a permanent home out there, but, apart from officers' chargers, there was no idea of bringing back ordinary troopers' horses.

SIR J. BLUNDELL MAPLE: Is it the fact that the Government are bringing back horses at the present time?

MR. BRODRICK said there might be isolated cases of officers' chargers being brought back, but he was not aware that troopers' horses were being brought back. On the contrary, they were sending out horses, which, when the war was at an end, would be useful for other purposes than remounts. As to demurrage, of

course a certain amount had to be paid. That was obviously the case when demands were made for the transfer of troops from the Cape to Durban or Port Elizabeth, or from these ports to Cape Town, and the ships had to wait until the troops arrived. He was not aware that these questions were going to be asked, and therefore he had not beside him all the details of the demurrage that had been paid. He could assure hon. Gentlemen who had raised this question that he was very far from taking lightly this large Vote for which he asked. He did not suppose that anyone alive had tried more than he had done to come at the details of the expenditure in regard to the transports. He had made most careful investigation into the necessities of the case, and he found it desirable to continue the employment of the forty-five vessels which the Government had at their command. The average cost of hiring additional transports was now 20s., or under, per ton per month, but at one time it was 25s., 30s., and at another period of great stress it was as high as 35s. He had told the Committee where the ships were at present employed. He had given the average cost of transport, both as regarded men and horses, and if it had been in his power he would have given further details, but he could not do so from the necessities of the case.

MR. WALLACE (Perth) said that during the course of the long struggle in which the country was engaged in South Africa he had never voted against supplies asked for by the Government; but he was not willing to vote money without understanding the purpose to which it was to be devoted. If he understood that the nine and a half millions asked for was for a particular purpose warranted by the War Office, he was perfectly prepared to vote for it, but, as far as he could understand the right hon. Gentleman, the Estimate might just as well be five millions or twenty millions.

MR. BRODRICK said that the Estimate was carefully based on the movements of troops and on detailed calculations.

MR. WALLACE said that the right hon. Gentleman had stated that the Estimate had been carefully worked out, and that the result had been arrived at by adding together detailed Estimates. What the Committee was asking for was that such details should be submitted to it. The right hon. Gentleman also stated, and he was perfectly willing to accept it, that during the last ten years he had been one of the most vigorous critics of the War Office, and that he had succeeded in cutting down details of expenditure. But was the right hon. Gentleman not to have any successors? The right hon. Gentleman could not have succeeded if Governments in the past had acted in the way in which he himself was now acting by putting down general Estimates and shutting out from the Committee particular details. They asked that the right hon. Gentleman should now do what all Governments did in the past, and that they should have some opportunity of criticising the Estimate in detail. They were asked to vote away a general sum of money to be placed in the hands of the Government, but he was not prepared to place such confidence in them, nor in any other Government. As an independent Member he insisted on his right to criticise in detail the Estimates, but he could not criticise them unless he was furnished with information, and on that ground he would feel constrained to vote against the Estimate.

*SIR J. BLUNDELL MAPLE said he should like to know whether the Government had

prepared any scheme whereby the Yeomanry and Militia now in South Africa might be allowed to remain there and to get employment in different avocations.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I do not see how that can arise.

*SIR J. BLUNDELL MAPLE said he wished to explain. It would arise if the men were given passes to return in a year hence if they did not get employment.

*THE CHAIRMAN: That is too remote.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER said he was reluctant to oppose the Vote in any way, as he did not wish to oppose the proper carrying on of the war, but he thought that some idea ought to be given as to what the items were. The right hon. Gentleman must have had items to make up the total, and if the items were fictitious, then the Estimate must be fictitious also. There must also be some proportion between the items. It was absurd to provide for such things as bedding, victualling, and forage when they did not know how many troops were to be embarked and where they were to be sent.

MR. BRODRICK said that the division between the items was fictitious.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER said that was the point. The division between the items of the War Office were generally fictitious, because sums were transferred from one to another with the leave of the Treasury. He thought the proportion of the different items should be given to the Committee. The right hon. Gentleman said that the whole Estimate had been very carefully drawn up, and that, therefore, they ought not to ask what the items were. That was not reasonable, and he did not think that such a large sum had ever been asked for before without some idea as to how it was to be divided up having been given.

*MR. CORRIE GRANT (Warwickshire, Rugby) suggested that, at the least, hon. Members were entitled to have the information which Ministers had. If that were a true proposition, who was wasting the time of the House? Members had now been engaged just two hours in trying to elicit information. Either the Secretary of State for War had information on the subject or he had not. If he had not, why did he not say so frankly? If he had information, he ought to give it to the Com-

mittee. Let him say that the amount was an estimate, and that he did not wish to be pinned to it. Why should not the Committee be treated honestly? He had listened to the debate, and, as a new Member, he was at a loss to know what it was all about. If the right hon. Gentleman had the information, he should give it to the Committee. If he had not, the Vote should not be allowed.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS asked why fittings had been taken out of transports chartered by the Admiralty, and replaced by Government fittings at considerable expense. He wished to know how many of the transports were horse transports. The right hon. Gentleman stated that a horse transport which would carry 400 horses would cost on an average £5,000 per month, and that if such transports were detained for several months the cost would be very considerable. He desired to know how many of them had been detained for long periods in South Africa. He wished to draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that although they had been debating a Vote of nine and a half millions for an hour and a half, not a single representative of the Admiralty had thought it worth his while to be present. That was treating the House of Commons with contempt. They were asking the right

hon. Gentleman questions, and the representatives of the officials responsible were not present to give him the information which he had a right to ask of them. He thought the Committee would be justified in voting for the reduction. THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton) said that with reference to the removal of the fittings there had been considerable discussion as to the best mode of conveying

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.

Bryce, Rt. Hon. James

Colville, John

Allan, William (Gateshead)

Burke, E. Haviland-

Craig, Robert Hunter

Ambrose, Robert

Burns, John

Crean, Eugene

Atherley-Jones, L.

Burt, Thomas

Crombie, John William

Bell, Richard

Caldwell, James

Delany, William

Blake, Edward

Cameron, Robert

Dewar, J. A. (Inverness-shire)

Boland, John

Campbell, John (Armagh S.)

Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles

Bowles, T. Gibson (King'sLynn

Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.

Donelan, Captain A.

Brand, Hon. Arthur G.

Causton, Richard Knight

Doogan, P. C.

Brigg, John

Channing, Francis Allston

Duffy, William J.

horses. There were two systems, one with long stalls and slings, and the other with short stalls and no slings. Both were tried, with a view to seeing which was the better. At first it was certainly thought that short stalls were not as good as long stalls, but he himself thought that after the experience of the war it would be found that the short stalls were better. The circumstances of the ship referred to by the hon. Gentleman had really nothing to do with fittings at all. She got into a tremendous gale, a big water tank got loose on the horse deck, and more horses were killed through that than by the breaking of the fittings. A question was asked as to the horse transports remaining at the Cape.

There were two ships kept at the Cape for emergencies. They would be used if it were suddenly found necessary to ship a regiment or a battery from a port in Cape Colony to a port in Natal, or vice versa. That had to be done as a military necessity.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS said the noble Lord did not answer his question as to why fittings had been taken out of transports.

LORD STANLEY said it was because the Admiralty plan was to have long stalls and slings, and the fittings were taken out and replaced with Admiralty fittings.

*SIR J. BLUNDELL MAPLE asked how many horses were being brought from South Africa.

MR. BRODRICK said he was not aware that any horses other than the horses to which he had already referred were being brought back.

Question put.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 122; Noes, 182. (Division List No. 214.)

Dunn, Sir William

Lloyd-George, David

Reddy, M.

Emmott, Alfred

Lough, Thomas

Redmond, John E. (Waterford)

Evans, S. T. (Glamorgan)

MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.

Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)

Fenwick, Charles

M'Arthur, William Cornwall

Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)

Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)

M'Dermott, Patrick

Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)

Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond

M'Kenna, Reginald

Roe, Sir Thomas

Flavin, Michael Joseph

M'Killo, W. (Sligo, North)

Shaw, Charles E. (Stafford)

Flynn, James Christopher

Mellor, Rt. Hon. John Wm.

Sheehan, Daniel Daniel

Fuller, J. M. F.

Mooney, John J.

Sinclair, Capt John (Forfarshire)

Gilhooly, James

Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)

Spencer, Rt. Hn. CR (Northants)

Gladstone, Rt Hn Herbert John

Moulton, John Fletcher

Sullivan, Donal
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Murpyh, J.
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Grant, Corrie
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Hayden, John Patrick
Norman, Henry
Wallace, Robert
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Walton, John L. (Leeds, S.)
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Holland, William Henry
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.
Weir, James Galloway
Horniman, Frederick John
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)
White, George (Norfolk)
Jacoby, James Alfred
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Joicey, Sir James
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.)
Whiteley, Geo. (York, W.R.)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
O'Malley, William
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Kay-Shuttleworth, RtHnSirU
O'Mara, James
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Labouchere, Henry
Palmer, Geo. Wm. (Reading)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)

Langley, Batty
Partington, Oswald
Woodhouse, Sir JT (Huddersf'd
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Paulton, James Mellor
Yoxall, James Henry
Leamy, Edmund
Perks, Robert William
Leese, Sir Joseph F (Accrington
Philipps, John Wynford
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Mr. Dillon and Mr. Pirie.
Leng, Sir John
Price, Robert John
Lewis, John Herbert
Rea, Russell
NOES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Hogg, Lindsay
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chath'm
Hope, J.F. (Sheffi'ld, Brightside
Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.
Denny, Colonel
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Howard, J. (Midd., Tortonham)
Bain, Col. James Robert
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred. D.
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Baldwin, Alfred
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J. (Manc'r)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds)
Duke, Henry Edward
Kimber, Henry
Banbury, Frederick George
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Knowles, Lees
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Lawrence, Joseph (Monmouth)

Beach, Rt Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Lawrence, Wm. F.(Liverpool
Beach, Rt. Hn. W. W. B.(Hants
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Lawson, John Grant
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Lee,ArthurH(Hants, Fareham
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Fisher, William Hayes
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Bowles,Capt.H.F.(Middlesex)
FitzGerald,SirRobertPenrose-
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Brassey, Albert
Fitzroy,Hon. Edward Algernon
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Flower, Ernest
Loder, Gerald W. Erskine
Bullard, Sir Harry
Forster, Henry William
Long,Col.CharlesW(Evesham
Butcher, John George
Galloway, William Johnson
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter(Bristol,S
Campbell,RtHnJA.(Glasgow)
Garfit, William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Carlile, William Walter
Gordon,Hn.J.E(Elgin&Nairn
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Gore, Hn. G. R C Ormsby- (Salop
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Cautley, Henry Strother
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.)
Macdona, John Cumming
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Maclver, David (Liverpool)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Maconochie, A. W.
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)

Graham, Henry Robert
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
M'Ixer, Sir Lewis (Edinb'gh W
Chamberlain, J. A. (Worc'r.)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
M'Killop, James (Stirlingsh.
Chapman, Edward
Gretton, John
Majendie, James A. H.
Charrington, Spencer
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Malcolm, Ian
Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.
Hamilton, Rt Hn. Ld. G (Midd'x
Manners, Lord Cecil
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'derry
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Hardy, Laurence (Kent Ashf'rd
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E (Wigt'n
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Heath, James (Staffs., N. W.)
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Heaton, John Henniker
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Cranborne, Viscount
Helder, Augustus
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Higginbottom, S. W.
Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir Fredk. G.
Crossley, Sir Savile
Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampst'd)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.
Richards, Henry Charles
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich)
More, Robt.Jasper(Shropshire
Rickett, J. Compton

Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Mowbray, Sir Robt Gray C.
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Muntz, Philip A.
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Stewart, Sir Mark J M'Taggart
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Stroyan, John
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Robertson, Herb. (Hackney)
Sturt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Myers, William Henry
Robinson, Brooke
Thornton, Percy M.
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
O'Neill, Hon. Robt. Torrens
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Round, James
Valentia, Viscount
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington
Rutherford, John
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Percy, Earl
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Seton-Karr, Henry
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Purvis, Robert
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn E. R. (Bath)

Rankin, Sir James
Shaw-Stewart, M.H. (Renfrew)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Reed, Sir Edw. James (Cardiff)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Rentoul, James Alexander
Spear, John Ward

Original Question again proposed.

MR. FULLER (Wiltshire, Westbury) said he desired to call attention to the extravagance of the present system under which remounts were purchased for His Majesty's service. The Committee was asked to vote a sum of £3,119,000 for this purpose, and he was of opinion that if a different system was adopted a considerable permanent saving might result to the national exchequer. The present process was extravagant to a terrible extent. The remount officer gave notice to a horse dealer that in a certain time he should require for the Remount Department a certain number of horses. The dealer then bought horses, very often considerably below the average of what was required, and on a particular day the remount officer went to the depot and purchased eighty or ninety horses an hour at an average price of at least £5 per head more than that at which the dealer had bought them.

It might be said that there was no other machinery which could be used for the purchase of remounts, but he ventured to suggest that the adjutants to the Yeomanry, who were to be reappointed under the Army reorganisation scheme, might be usefully employed in their own districts for this purpose. If a saving only of £2 a head was effected it would amount, on the sum the Committee was asked to vote, to no less than £200,000. The Government might also purchase a large supply of remounts

through the Yeomanry themselves. He was not speaking on this matter without experience, he himself having had to purchase large numbers of horses for the Imperial Yeomanry, and he was perfectly convinced, if such a system as he suggested were in force, it would result in a very great saving to the country. Another object he had for moving the Amendment which stood in his name was that a very large amount of the money paid for remounts went into the pockets of the wrong persons. Everybody knew that horse dealers throughout the country were making immense sums of money, and if that could be diverted so that it went into the pockets of the farmers and breeders of the horses which eventually found their way into the remount depots of the service a great benefit would be conferred on a struggling industry.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item D (Purchase of Remounts) be reduced by £;100.";(Mr. Fuller.)

*SIR J. BLUNDELL MAPLE wished to know whether the Government was still buying horses from abroad. There was no doubt whatever that during the last eighteen months or two years a great deal of rubbish had been bought from Austria-Hungary. He also wished to know whether the inquiry which had been promised with regard to the swindles which had taken place in South Africa in connection with horses purchased in

Buda Pesth and Vienna was being prosecuted. The difference in the prices at which those horses were purchased, and at which they were sold to the Government, left as much as £;10 or £;20 per horse, which was divided among those who purchased them. It was nothing less than a wicked robbery, for the horses sent to South Africa were of a most inferior class, and the use of such inferior horses had, no doubt, resulted in the death of hundreds and thousands of our men.

It was of no use the right hon. Gentleman shaking his head. He had supplied the right hon. Gentleman with evidence and letters upon the subject of the most reliable character, and it was perfectly well known that this swindle was being perpetrated. The reason he had asked for the inquiry to be held was that it was insinuated that certain officers in His Majesty's service were mixed up in the swindle, and that was a very serious matter. The Ministers of Agriculture, both at Buda Pesth and Vienna, were prepared to give every information, and were disgusted that no inquiry had been made upon the subject. The horses were purchased and sold to the Government at a profit of sometimes £;25 and the spoil divided, and were the worst horses that could be picked up off the streets. Was the same class of horse still being bought, and were the same people making the purchases? He believed that all the horses required for this purpose could be bred in this country and Ireland, but that was a question which might be discussed at another time; but with regard to the purchase of horses at Buda Pesth and Vienna he thought there ought to be a very strict inquiry.

MR. LOUIS SINCLAIR (Essex, Romford) said he quite endorsed what had been said in regard to the horses purchased from all parts. A great number of them came from America, Canada, and South America, and those horses were quite unfit to undergo a sea voyage or to mount our men in South Africa. They were subject to colds, and quite unfit for the service. Those horses often came over in ships which were not suitable for carrying them, and they suffered from all kinds of diseases, and

yet they were sold to the Government as good English horses, bred in this country. He thought the Government ought to have depots throughout the country to which farmers could bring their horses, and where they would get the full prices paid by the Government. The adoption of such a course would encourage farmers to breed horses. Certainly the present system of allowing the middleman to make all the profit was one which could not be for the benefit of the country at large. The farmers knew that prices had been paid for foreign horses that they would have been very glad to accept for their own horses, and they felt this very much. With regard to the question of colonial horses, Australian

horses were notably good. Our colonial troops had done effective service on colonial horses, which could be bought in Australia at from £;10 to £;20 each, which was just about half the price the Government had been paying. If the surplus horses of Australia were sent over here at the market price, and were purchased by the Government, that would also encourage colonial breeders. Then there was the question motor-cars. This country was very far behind other countries in providing motor-cars, which could be maintained at less cost than horses. For about £;80 they could obtain a motor of five horse power, able to carry two men and a small gun. By this means they would be able to bring their troops into positions into which they could not get on horseback. Upon motor-cars they would find that the soldiers would be able to get to places which it would be impossible for a horse to reach, and he thought motor-cars would enable them to deal very effectively with the war in South Africa. On horseback men were shot down very rapidly, but upon a motor-car with a small bullet-proof shield the men would not be so liable to be shot down as they had been in the past. Armies abroad were now using the motor-car, and they were largely used by France and Germany. Motor-cars would play a very important part in future warfare, because they would be able to carry a miniature gun and two men, who would be able to protect themselves in a way which would be absolutely hopeless on

horseback. He hoped this matter would receive the right hon. Gentleman's attention.

MR. PHILIPPS (Pembrokeshire) said he did not know what view the Government took in regard to accusations of corruption, but it seemed to him that this was a somewhat serious matter. They had just heard an accusation made, not by a person below the gangway or a pro-Boer, but by an hon. Baronet sitting on the Tory side, who did not make rash accusations every day. The hon. Baronet the Member for Dulwich said that he had got this information in his possession.

*SIR J. BLUNDELL MAPLE said he had handed the letters over to the Government.

MR. PHILIPPS: Then the Government had in their possession evidence that British officers had been taking bribes. Officers were not in the House of Commons to defend themselves, and the honour of the Army was in the hands of the right hon. Gentleman opposite. The Secretary for War had in his possession evidence that British officers had taken bribes, and yet he did not get up and answer the charge, and he allowed hon. Members to rise one after the other without even answering them.

MR. BRODRICK: It would be quite impossible for me to intervene after every individual speech. Anything that has occurred which it is desirable to have cleared up I am perfectly ready to clear up, and either my noble friend or myself will answer it.

MR. PHILIPPS said that an hon. Baronet on the Ministerial side had accused British officers of taking bribes, and now the right hon. Gentleman stated that he did not think anything had occurred to justify him answering the accusation.

MR. BRODRICK: I said nothing of the kind. What I said was that I did not think anything had occurred which rendered it necessary for me to trouble the House with a reply at the moment, before other Members had spoken.

MR. PHILIPPS said he understood the right hon. Gentleman to say that he considered that up to the present nothing had happened to induce him to intervene in the debate, and that he intended to deal with the question at some other time. Upon an important matter like this they found the Secretary of State for War, who was the guardian of the honour of the Army, actually stated that an accusation of this nature was a thing which he might talk about at some other time.

MR. BRODRICK: I wish to point out to the hon. Member that the hon. Baronet has not made a statement with which it would be possible for me to deal at the present moment. I have not seen the Papers referred to, but I shall be perfectly ready to deal with the matter in the course of this discussion, and either my noble friend or myself will deal with it.

MR. PHILIPPS said the Papers on this subject had been handed over to the War Office, and the right hon. Gentleman had not taken the trouble to read them. It seemed to him an extraordinary thing that a Tory baronet should accuse officers of the Army of accepting bribes, that the Papers should be communicated to the Government, and that the Secretary of State should pay no attention to the matter. It was time the House should pay attention to it. It was high time that there should be an inquiry held into this matter, because it was very difficult for a private Member to bring before the House questions which must be largely matters of gossip and inference. There was no doubt that there were many men in this country to-day in possession of large sums of money who were very badly off when this war began. He knew of a case where a man was reported to be well off; worth £50,000. "How did he make it?" was the question. "Oh, buying horses for the Government." He was now living like a rich man, and he had no ostensible means of making his wealth except by buying horses for the Government. The class of horses sent out to South Africa had been a very bad class.

MR. BRODRICK: Certainly not.

MR. PHILIPPS: Would the right hon. Gentleman call it a good class of horse which died on the roadside? He did not know who bought horses in the Argentine for the Government, but they had bought a good many straight from the grass. If they bought a horse from the grass he had to be fed on corn and hay, and exercised for at least three months before he had muscle enough to do his work. [Ministerial cries of "No, no."] Hon. Members cried out "No, no," but let them ask their coachmen about the matter. If they had had a coachman at the War Office he would have known this. A horse which had been fed on nothing else but grass would take three months to get into condition.

MR. BANBURY (Camberwell, Peckham): No, no.

MR. PHILIPPS: The hon. Member has evidently not consulted his coachman.

MR. BANBURY: I beg the hon. Member's pardon, for I have consulted my coachman.

MR. PHILIPPS said everybody knew that a horse imported from Australia very rarely got into condition before something like six, nine, or twelve months. If they took a horse from grass and carried him over the sea to South Africa it would be little short of a miracle if he got into condition in four or six months. Argentine horses, as a rule, were good animals, if the right ones were obtained, and they were celebrated for their endurance. Many Argentine horses

had been sent straight from grass to the front without any condition upon them, and they died off like flies. Was that good management? Was he stating too much when he said it was a pity that the right hon. Gentleman did not consult his own coachman? What were the arrangements for horse purchasing which were being made to-day? They had got down £3,100,000 for horses, and what arrangements had been made to guard against these mistakes in the future? He wished to know how many horses were at the front now, and how many were at the base being brought into condition. For every two horses at the front there ought to be one kept in reserve at the base. They were told just before the last General Election that the war was over, but it had gone on, and was still going on. And why was it going on? Was it because English soldiers were worse fighting men than the Boers, or that English officers were worse than the Boer officers? It was nothing of the kind, for this was simply a question of horseflesh. If a man on a grass-fed horse was sent to chase a man on a horse in good condition he would not catch him in twelve months. He thought it was about time that this matter was attended to. Anyone who was conversant with the way horses had been bought for the War Office, either in Great Britain or abroad, knew that somebody had been buying horses whose hands were not clean. A serious accusation had been brought forward by the hon. Baronet opposite, who had asked for an inquiry, and who had accused British officers of taking bribes. Was it not time that such an inquiry was granted, and was it not time that the Leader of the House was present to hear this discussion?

MR. BRODRICK: No.

MR. PHILIPPS said that apparently the right hon. Gentleman thought that this was not necessary.

MR. BRODRICK: I assure the hon. Member that I know as much about horses as he does.

MR. PHILIPPS said if it was true that the right hon. Gentleman had been sending grass-fed animals to South Africa, he had not been giving the country the benefit of that knowledge of horses of which he was boasting so freely. He thought it was a somewhat cheap sneer for the right hon. Gentleman to say that he knew more about horses than he did, but that was immaterial to the question. The horses had been badly bought, and the right hon. Gentleman was responsible. The Secretary for War was the person they had to call to account for those transactions. Here was a serious accusation made before the House by a responsible Member on the Government side, and they were amply entitled to press the demand for an inquiry, and ask that the Government should put on the Table the necessary Papers. They had a right to insist that allegations of corruption which had been made by the hon. Baronet opposite should be probed to the very bottom, in the interests of the taxpayers of this country.

LORD STANLEY: I will first deal with some of the more milder criticisms. In regard to the provision of remounts, I feel it rather difficult to say what would be possible in the future, as we are just about to appoint a Committee which I hope will lay before the country definite plans as to the best way of obtaining horses in the future, not only in this country but also from our

colonies. It is impossible that we should always have enough horses actually on the spot to meet our requirements in cases of emergency, and in some form a retaining fee must be paid to owners for the use of their horses. How that scheme can be developed it is impossible for me to say; but I am glad to say that all the colonial Governments are prepared, as far as I can judge, to meet us as well as they can. I hope we shall be able to evolve some scheme which will prevent in the future our having to pay, what I admit we had to pay during the late crisis, panic prices for horses. The hon. Member for the Westbury Division put forward a proposal that we should purchase horses through the adjutants of Yeomanry regiments direct from the owners and breeders. That is a suggestion well worthy of attention, although I am not quite sure myself that we should not do better by taking advantage of agricultural shows, and employing local authorities. That is a question for us to consider in the future. I entirely agree with the hon. Member when he says that as far as possible we should get horses direct from the breeders. Of course we must make some arrangement by which private breeders should bring their horses up to a certain point, and then we can send down officers to select what we require. It would be perfectly impossible to have remount officers going all over the country picking up a horse here and there. Earlier in the session my right hon. friend asked me to look into the question of dealing directly with the breeders, and I confess it has not been a gigantic success. In one case an officer was sent down to a place in England to buy horses from breeders who were asked to bring the horses up to a certain point. Every

sort of rubbish was brought to him, and the result was that he went away with only two or three horses, pursued by a shower of stones from those people whose horses he had not bought. But if local committees were appointed to weed out the horses before the officer was sent down, I think that would be a feasible plan, and I hope to see it in operation.

The hon. Member for the Romford Division has mentioned motor-cars as remounts. A Committee of which I am chairman has gone into the question of motor-cars for transport purposes. They have issued a prospectus in which they offer very large prizes, and they hope to get types of vehicles which at all events would be available for transport. They have not gone into the question whether motor-cars should be used for remounts. The spectacle of a regiment of motor-cars charging, no doubt, would be inspiring; but I do not think such a scheme would be likely to prove any permanent advantage to the Army.

With regard to the accusations of the hon. Baronet the Member for Dulwich, the hon. Baronet has given me privately certain letters containing insinuations with regard to the buying of horses in Austria. These letters, I think he will admit, were handed to me privately, to make any use I could of them. These letters make accusations of corruption, but against no particular individual. After seeing some gentlemen whom the hon. Baronet brought to my room, I communicated the substance of the letters to my right hon. friend, who told me to go into the question thoroughly, and to probe the accusations to the bottom. I went at once to the Commander-in-Chief, and the House will understand that, if anything is going wrong, proclaiming it on the housetops is not the best way to find it out.

That very day inquiries began, and are still going on; inquiries are being made, and shall be made, and the House may rest assured that if any accusation that has been made can be brought home to any individual it will undoubtedly be done. But the accusation was not made against any particular individual; I think the hon. Baronet will bear me out in that?

*SIR J. BLUNDELL MAPLE: There

was no name definitely mentioned. These letters were handed over six months since, and all I have asked is that inquiries should be made and the matter thoroughly investigated, because insinuations are made against people even if names are not mentioned.

LORD STANLEY: Quite so; but most; I might almost say the whole; of the accusations contained in the letters refer to a time when we had not a single Government buyer in Austria. The Imperial Yeomanry at that time bought their own horses; they undertook to do so. These officers were not under us in any way whatever, and therefore the Government can hardly be held responsible for the purchases of these officers. At the same time, inquiry is being made; not on the house-top, but privately; and if anything can be done to bring home any failing on the part either of Government buyers or Yeomanry buyers the House can rest assured that the Commander-in-Chief and my right hon. friend will be the first to wish to see it done. I must apologise for not having risen directly after the hon. Baronet had spoken. It must not be thought for one moment that I was going to allow accusations to be made against the honour of officers in the Army without desiring at once to reply. I had no such intention. I am confident, notwithstanding all the accusations which have been made, that we shall be able to prove that there is not one word of truth in the theory of corruption which has been brought forward. Various accusations are always being made against buyers of horses. ["Sellers."] Yes, and buyers also. Anonymous letters are continually being sent saying "this buyer came down; he did not buy my horse, which was a good horse, but bought my neighbour's horse, which was a bad one." One person made a most violent accusation against the man from whom we bought most of our horses in Austria, but by the same post there arrived; although it was not posted at the same time; an application for this person to take the place of the man whom he had been traducing. In nearly all these matters there is a certain amount of personal animus, but I will undertake; and my right hon. friend will bear me

out in that undertaking; that if any definite accusation is made against any particular individual every possible endeavour shall be made to bring that officer to judgment.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE expressed his satisfaction with the account given by the Financial Secretary to the War Office of the inquiries being and to be made in regard to these purchases of Hungarian horses. Reference had been made to payment by the War Office for the registration of horses in the future. Within the last two or three weeks a memorandum had been issued from the War Office asking the Volunteer forces to provide themselves with transport. For the services of the transport they were to receive £;1 per day, although the cost would certainly not be less than 30s., and no fee was allowed for registering

the horses to be used on active service whenever necessary for the purposes of transport. It was hopeless for the War Office to attempt to get horses for these purposes unless the Volunteers were allowed a certain sum for registration. He believed the Government were on the right track in this most important matter, but they could not expect big contractors to put horses at the disposal of the Volunteers unless some such allowance was made.

In the various arguments which had been advanced on the one side or the other a very serious financial aspect of this Vote had escaped attention. No less than eight millions of money were being voted for the services of remounts, and everybody admitted that at the beginning of the war the system was wasteful in the extreme. It was, therefore, very unsatisfactory to find that as late as June 3rd of this year a letter appeared in The Times from a correspondent in South Africa, according to which the horses were at the present moment being wasted almost to the same extent; certainly in the same proportion. The writer pointed out that horses were put into requisition before they had had time to recover from the voyage. Much of the waste of horses in the war had been due to the want of skilled veterinary services. A great number of the horses which had had to be shot or abandoned would have been saved if they had had proper treatment, and the troops would have been given greater mobility than they had had during the whole course of the war.

Another point in connection with the Vote was that the Committee had had no indication as to how much had been spent on horses, mules, and trek oxen respectively. The right hon. Gentleman had casually mentioned that 260,000 animals had been sent to South Africa, but the Committee had been kept in ignorance of the amount paid per head. According to the consular reports the average payment for mules worked out at about £;20. Why should this absurd secrecy continue? Accusations; which he did not believe; had been made with regard to money going into the hands of officers, but the possibility of such accusations would be avoided by a statement of the exact amount paid by the War Office and the precise number of animals purchased. It was also desirable that the Committee should know what had been the expenditure of horse flesh and mule flesh by the cavalry, the artillery, and the transport services.

LORD ALWYNE COMPTON (Bedfordshire, Biggleswade) was not aware whether this question of remounts would form a part of the inquiry to be held at the close of the war, but certainly the lamentable waste of horses had been one of the blots of the campaign in South Africa. As to the horses sent out, his opinion was that they were not of a very good class. A little experience was worth a great deal of theory, and from his experience of Indian and Australian horses he firmly believed that English horses were the best in the world. He had always been a great believer in English and Irish horses, and in that belief he bought in London most of the horses upon which his corps were mounted. He had no difficulty in getting good sound horses, and he bought them at the regulation Government price. As far as South Africa was concerned, he was fortunate in that his horses had had a few days to recover from the effects of a bad passage, and they also had the advantage of grass-feeding on the march from Bloemfontein. From that time the hard work began, and until they reached Pretoria the horses

had probably the same sort of hammering as other horses in South Africa, but upon their arrival the horses of his company were in better condition than those of any of the other troops with whom they were brigaded. Many of the other troops had had remounts, and one cavalry regiment had been remounted three times with horses obtained from various parts of the world; and his experience in South Africa confirmed the opinion he had formed after experience in Egypt and India; that if an English horse had a few days to recover after landing he was worth two or three horses from any other country. The whole subject of obtaining remounts for the Army generally was a most important one, and he was glad to hear the possibility of getting our own horses in England and Ireland was to be inquired into. The present system was essentially bad, and, tested by the war, had absolutely broken down. In the interests of the Army and of the country at large, particular weight should be given to this question when the full investigation at the close of the war was made. We had learnt by bitter experience that we particularly wanted men to ride horses, and therefore the horses to carry those men were a most important factor. He suggested the adoption of a system of breeding farms and the laying down of some definite plan by which the supply of horses for the Army should be kept up.

LORD STANLEY: I must ask the Committee to pardon me for intervening again so soon, but I must answer my noble friend's remarks. He has spoken of the horses he bought in London, and he gave us to understand that we might have bought many more. He also says that his horses lasted better than those we bought. I happen to know something about the company the noble Lord was in, because my brother was not only in it then, but he is still out there. As to the work those horses had to do, they did not join us until we reached Princetown, which must have been about the 18th of May; they had a rest of some days at Bloemfontein, and joined headquarters at Princetown. They went on to Johannesburg, where, again, they had, I think, three days rest. They then went into Pretoria, and about the 16th or 17th June came back to Johannesburg. From that time until the noble Lord came home the corps did not leave Johannesburg, although I admit they were doing arduous outpost work at that place.

LORD ALWYNE COMPTON did not wish there to be any mistake. He referred in his remarks to the time they reached Pretoria, and his point was that his horses marched in the same time and under the same starvation conditions between Bloemfontein and Pretoria.

LORD STANLEY: I wish to assure the noble Lord that the horses had less work, as a matter of fact, than most of the other horses in the Colony. Can the noble Lord tell us the percentage of his horses that died?

LORD ALWYNE COMPTON: About 50 per cent.

LORD STANLEY: My information is that it was a little higher than that. But I do not think we can judge the matter by any individual case, and the Committee must not be led into thinking that all the horses sent out were of a bad class.

MR. PHILIPPS: Could you tell us the total number sent out?

LORD STANLEY: I am afraid I could not state the total number of horses sent out.

From the commencement of the war until the 31st May, 172,985 horses and 80,733 mules were sent out. In the next figures that I have horses and mules are not separated; on the 11th May, 1901, there were being fed a total of 185,000 animals, excluding oxen, so that out of 253,708, plus any horses that were bought in the colony, there were left on the 1st of May a total of 185,000.

MR. MILD MAY (Devonshire, Totnes) agreed that English horses beat almost any other horses in South Africa, although the native horses there ranked very high.

It was unfortunate that advantage was not taken earlier of local supplies by taking horses from the Boers. That that was not done was due to a desire to treat the Boers very well, as undoubtedly we had done. He did not agree in condemning the class of horses sent out because of the percentage of deaths. Owing to the necessities of the case, horses were sent up country directly they were landed; they were then not adequately fed, and consequently they scarcely had a fair chance. He was not favourably impressed with the Argentine horses; they appeared to have no heart in them. Hunting men knew the importance of horses being in condition, but these unfortunate horses had no condition at all, because directly they arrived they were rushed up to the front and given to the troops at once. Moreover, the horses were inadequately fed. The column he was with had great difficulty in getting supplies at all. Their English horses were sometimes on two pounds of oats a day, and at one time they had nothing but a handful of mealies. Under these circumstances the horses dropped out very rapidly, and it was often a matter of anxiety whether one would be able to get his men home at night with their horses, or whether the horses would not have to be left, and the men get home as best they could. It had been said that the mortality amongst the horses was greatly due to the Yeomanry being bad horse-masters. He did not think that was so at all. A great many of the Yeomanry went out with very little knowledge of horses, but they were most anxious to learn. The horses were inspected every night, and he maintained that the men, who were a very intelligent class, became excellent horse-masters in their own interest before very long.

MR. PIRIE said the chances which the horses got on reaching South Africa fully justified the extraordinary mortality which took place. With regard to the charges of swindling brought forward by the hon. Member for the Dulwich Division, he was sure the Committee would be thoroughly relieved by the statement of the noble Lord the Financial Secretary to the War Office. He thought very few Members believed that there had been any corruption. Although he had heard of large fortunes being made, these fortunes were made by contractors who had supplied horses for the troops, but he had not heard that British officers were suspected of making money in that way, and he did not believe it. One reason for the extraordinary mortality of the horses was the absolute want of fairplay which they received, a great many of them being sent to the front within twenty-four hours of their disembarkation. The orders from the Chief of the Staff were, however, imperative, and had to be obeyed. Another reason was to be found to some extent in the composition of the irregular corps; for it was not to be expected that engineers, stokers, waiters, and riff-raff, men with no knowledge of horses,

could be turned into horse-masters even in a few weeks. He blamed the Government for their want of foresight in regard to the Remount Department, which in June, 1899, consisted of but one depot in England and one in Ireland, with a total, he believed, of only six officers. The war had not lasted many months before that Department had to be greatly enlarged. He must say that the work done by the Department had been unprecedented and most praiseworthy. He trusted that an inquiry would be made into all these matters. He was in favour of free trade in the breeding of horses rather than of Government breeding establishments, and thought that breeders of horses should obtain more encouragement from the Government. He believed we should follow the example of Canada and Australia, where horses were bred by private gentlemen.

MR. SCOTT-MONTAGU (Hampshire, New Forest) said he would like to impress on the Government what had already been done in France and Germany with respect to the use of motor-cycles for military purposes. He thought the Government might well devote a little attention to this subject. Cyclist corps had already proved to be extremely useful, and if equipped with motorcycles would be even more effective. Motors, too, were necessary for transport and commissariat if we were to hold our place in any war in this or in other civilised country.

COLONEL PILKINGTON (Lancashire, Newton) said that after listening to the speeches which had been made they could only come to the conclusion that the remount system in South Africa had been conducted on a most wasteful principle. The question of remounts was most important. The field army of the future must be to a very great extent

a mounted army. Every cavalry regiment ought to have a large number of remounts, so that we could send out, without delay not raw animals, but trained, tried, and selected animals. The most perfect scheme for remounts would be one by which in the wild parts of the south of England, some parts of Scotland, and in Ireland horses bought cheaply and selected carefully should be kept ready to remount each of the cavalry regiments at the brigade centre. Our remount system needed revolutionising. He believed, indeed, that every department in the Army wanted revolutionising. We must have an ample reserve of horses as well as an ample reserve of men.

MR. BRODRICK: We have listened to some interesting speeches. It is assumed, somewhat hastily, I think, that there has been some very considerable breakdown in the whole question of remounts for South Africa. My hon. and gallant friend who has just sat down is under the impression that we started this war without any reserve at all. We had a reserve of 14,000 horses. These horses were available the moment the war broke out. The difficulty lay in the distance of the seat of war. I do not, however, wish to put a *couleur de rose* statement before the House. I quite admit that when it came to be a question of sending out an enormous number of horses from all parts of the world some horses were sent that did not prove altogether satisfactory. The hon. Member for Pembroke stated that a large number of horses were sent which ought never to have been sent at all. I demur a little to that statement, and also to the imputation he made.

MR. PHILIPPS called attention to the speech of the noble Lord opposite, who

stated that he had made inquiry on the subject. He thought a Parliamentary inquiry would be better. He made no imputation.

MR. BRODRICK: I do not wish to bandy words with the hon. Gentleman. He made a vehement attack upon me and upon my noble friend who dealt with that question. I can only say, with regard to imputations of corruption in the matter of horse-dealing, if any come before me, that I shall always act in the most stringent manner consistent with justice in order to ensure that there shall be no waste of public money in that way. The Government has not the slightest desire to shield anybody who may be guilty. As regards the Argentine horses, the hon. Gentleman endeavoured to saddle me with the responsibility for all the bad horses that were bought there. The purchase of horses in the Argentine was stopped before I came into office, and consequently that accusation is wholly unfounded. I have been asked what are the prices of horses bought in various countries. I have no objection to give the Committee generally the prices which we have had to pay for horses. It is said that our horses from home are the best horses. I think that is probably to a large extent true, but they are also the most expensive horses. The Government pay for cavalry and artillery horses at home on an average about £72; the horses obtained from Canada cost on the spot about £30; and those obtained in Australia, the United States, and Hungary vary from about £20 to £25. We have had, of course, to consider the class of horses which could be obtained and the rapidity with which they could be brought together.

It has been asked why we did not take all the horses in the Orange Free State and the Transvaal. Lord Roberts told me that he had seen very few left in the Orange Free State and the Transvaal, as they had been cleared away by the enemy as they retired. As to Cape Colony, I would remind the Committee that without martial law you may buy, but you cannot requisition, horses. When martial law was put into operation horses were requisitioned, and, in point of fact, Lord Kitchener bought 41,000 horses in the month of January in South Africa, and we have been supplying horses at the rate of 10,000 a month for the last six months. I have received during this discussion a telegram from Lord Kitchener, who cannot have anticipated the debate, in which he mentions that his mounted troops are well and suitably mounted. The Government are quite aware of the necessity of putting the remount establishment on the best possible basis, but it is impossible for the

cavalry when at home to have two horses apiece, as the drill would not permit of a man looking after two horses. We will see that a suitable reserve of horses is established, and we are carefully considering the sources of supply which the experience of the war has shown to be the best. My noble friend, who has some knowledge of horseflesh, has undertaken the charge of a Committee which is investigating the matter. I believe that when the record of the war comes to be written and the inquiry of which we have heard so much takes place it will be found that the mortality among horses was chiefly due to the fact that they had to be used before they had sufficiently recovered from the sea voyage. That is accountable for the greater part of the expenditure on horses in South Africa.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER said that what they complained of was that there had not

been a sufficient reserve of horses during the war, and that even at the present moment there was not a sufficient reserve. He asked the Secretary of State for War what the reserve was in South Africa at the present moment, besides the horses actually in use.

MR. BRODRICK said that he had asked Lord Kitchener whether he desired more horses to be sent in order to form such a reserve, and Lord Kitchener replied that he was satisfied with the present supply.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER said that that authority was the highest and best, and it was quite sufficient for him; but there was a letter in Monday's Times in which it was stated that;

"unless a large reserve camp of remounts is formed from which horses are never to be disturbed until perfectly fit to perform the work they are called upon to do, and unless officers concern themselves more directly with the care of the horses ridden by their men, our operations will always be seriously handicapped."

That was the statement of The Times principal correspondent in South Africa with Sir Bindon Blood's column, and it surely afforded ground for the uneasiness on the part of Members in all parts of the Committee as to the state of the remounts even now. They had been assured by the Government over and over again that sufficient horses were

being sent out, but each time that assurance had proved illusory. In spite of what had been said on behalf of the Government, one did feel that the remount department had broken down. He wished also to direct attention to the cost of the horses coming from such great distances as the Argentine and Canada.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton) said he wished to ask a question with reference to the inquiry which the Secretary of War was now holding as to the allegations of corruption made by the hon. Member for Dulwich. As he understood it, the Papers had been in the hands of the Financial Secretary to the War Office for six months.

LORD STANLEY said, although he could not remember the exact date, the Papers were only placed in his hands during the Easter holidays.

MR. LAMBERT said that when this matter which concerned the honour of British officers, which it was everyone's wish to jealously guard, had been probed to the bottom, he hoped the noble Lord would publish the result of the inquiry.

MR. BRODRICK said that allegations of criminal corruption had been made, but they had not been specified in individual cases. But he would take care that the whole business should be brought forward and investigated. The allegations extended over a considerable period of time.

MR. LAMBERT said what he wanted to make sure of was that if there was any foundation for these allegations of corruption, they should be publicly stated, and the responsibility should be brought home to the right people.

*SIR H. MEYSEY-THOMPSON (Staffordshire, Handsworth) said there was another point which he wished to raise that had not yet been mentioned. A great deal of the expense and waste which had occurred in connection with the horses in South Africa had been caused not so much by the want of quality as by the enormous weights which they had to carry on their backs. He had reliable information from

many friends in South Africa that the horses had to carry 18, 19, or even 20 stone. The experience of many generations in the employment of jockeys, hunt servants, postillions, and second horsemen, had taught them that if you want to get the best work out of horses in the way of pace and endurance you must put light men on their backs, but the wisdom of the War Office had absolutely excluded the light men from the Army. There were two disadvantages in the existing practice. One was that they did not get the men best fitted for the work; and the other was that they quite unnecessarily restricted the field of recruiting. They calmly and deliberately excluded from the Army enormous numbers of men who could do everything that a soldier was required to do. He thought the attention of Parliament and the country ought to be called to the fact that they had been systematically and habitually overweighting their horses, and that they were systematically and designedly excluding light-weight men from the Army.

*SIR ARTHUR HAYTER wished to emphasise the fact that neither he nor the hon. Member for Westbury desired to exclude horses from Canada or Australia. What they did wish was that purchases should be made locally. The War Office should give notice that officers to purchase would attend fairs, and they would buy direct from the farmers at £28 instead of giving £40 to the dealers. He hoped that after the satisfactory speech of the right hon. the Secretary of State for War his hon. friend would withdraw his motion.

MR. DILLON said that the answer of the Secretary of State for War was perfectly unsatisfactory. The Government had instituted an action for the refund of enormous sums paid for remounts. He was not aware whether the case was sub judice.

MR. BRODRICK: Yes, it is.

MR. DILLON said that in that case he would not pursue that point further. The right hon. Gentleman had just read out a telegram from Lord Kitchener declaring, that his mounted troops were now satisfactorily, mounted. But he had in his hand a statement by one of the

chief correspondents of The Times at present with Sir Bindon Blood's column, dated from the headquarters at Middelburg, 6th May, in which he said;

"Owing to the difficulty experienced in securing fresh horses, the efficiency of the columns hurried from place to place is seriously impaired. The troops are for the most part pitifully mounted. Horses are put into requisition before they have had time to recover from the effects of the sea voyage, and after being admitted to the sick lines, have to be given out again while still in an unfit condition."

They knew perfectly well that a good deal more weight was to be attached to the statements of The Times correspondents who were allowed to go with columns like those of Sir Bindon Blood than to the statements of the ordinary correspondents at the beginning of the war, and they had the specific statement that the troops were for the most part pitifully mounted. And the very system which had been indicted in the course of this debate by experts in this matter was apparently in full swing at the present moment, and still they were asked to vote these three millions of money. He should certainly divide the Committee on the

reduction which had been moved.

SIR SAVILE CROSSLEY (Halifax) pointed out that after Cape Colony was put under martial law, in some districts the commandants had taken the trouble to secure every horse, so that none were left for the Boers; but there were many districts in which that work had not been

AYES.

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

Goddard, Daniel Ford

Norton, Capt. Cecil William

Allan, William (Gateshead)

Grant, Corrie

O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)

Bell, Richard

Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton

O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)

Blake, Edward

Hardie, J. K. (Merthyr Tydvil)

O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)

Boland, John

Hayden, John Patrick

O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N)

Bolton, Thomas Dolling

Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-

O'Malley, William

Boyle, James

Holland, William Henry

O'Mara, James

Brigg, John

Jones, William (Carnarvons.)

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.

Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson

Kennedy, Patrick James

Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)

Burke, E. Haviland-

Lambert, George

Philipps, John Wynford

Burns, John

Langley, Batty

Power, Patrick Joseph

Burt, Thomas

Leamy, Edmund

Price, Robert John

Caldwell, James

Lewis, John Herbert

Reddy, M.

Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)

Lloyd-George, David
 Redmond, John E. (Waterford
 Colville, John
 Lough, Thomas
 Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
 Crean, Eugene
 MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
 Schwann, Charles E.
 Delany, William
 M'Dermott, Patrick
 Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
 Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
 M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
 Sinclair, Capt John (Forfarshire
 Dillon, John
 Mooney, John J.
 Soames, Arthur Wellesley
 Doogan, P. C.
 Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
 Sullivan, Donal
 Duffy, William J.
 Murphy, J.
 Taylor, Theodore Cooke
 Flavin, Michael Joseph
 Nannetti, Joseph P.
 Thomas, David Alfred (Merth'r
 Flynn, James Christopher
 Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
 Weir, James Galloway
 Gilhooly, James
 Norman, Henry
 White, George (Norfolk)

done, and it was clear that if the horses were not taken they might fall into the hands of the Boers. He hoped that steps would be taken to prevent the continuance of that evil. He fully concurred with the remarks of previous speakers as to some of the horses having to carry too much weight.

MR. FULLER said he was quite satisfied with the assurance that had been given him by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War, and begged leave to withdraw his motion.

MR. BATTY LANGLEY (Sheffield, Attercliffe) asked what size the horses were that were now being bought for remounts. He understood that they were expected to carry 16 to 18 stone weight and that they were only 14½ to 15 hands high.

LORD STANLEY said it was not possible to answer the hon. Member. It did not follow that because a horse was small it was unable to carry a certain weight.

MR. BATTY LANGLEY said he wished the Committee to understand that the country was paying from £40 to £50 for ponies only 14½ to 15 hands high.

Question put.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 78; Noes, 154. (Division List No. 215.)

Whiteley, George (Yorks, W.R.)

Wilson, Henry J. (Yorks, W.R.)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)

Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)

Whittaker, Thomas Palmer

Yoxall, James Henry

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Fuller, J. M. F.

Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Garfit, William

Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.

Parker, Gilbert

Allhusen, Augustus Hy. Eden

Gray, Ernest (West Ham)

Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

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

Pemberton, John S. G.

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

Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs

Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard

Balfour, Rt. Hon. Gerald W. (Leeds

Guthrie, Walter Murray

Platt-Higgins, Frederick

Balfour, Maj. K. R. (Christch.)

Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord G. (Mid'x

Powell, Sir Francis Sharp

Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin

Hamilton, Marq. of (L'd'nd'r'ry)

Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward

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

Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert W.

Purvis, Robert

Beach, Rt. Hon. W. W. B. (Hants.

Harris, Frederick Leverton

Pym, C. Guy

Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.

Harwood, George

Randles, John S.

Bigwood, James
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Heath, James (Staffs., N.W.)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Heaton, John Henniker
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Bousfield, William Robert
Helder, Augustus
Rentoul, James Alexander
Bowles, T Gibson (King's Lynn)
Henderson, Alexander
Renwick, George
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Higginbottom, S. W.
Rickett, J. Compton
Bullard, Sir Harry
Hoare, Edw Brodie (Hampstead
Ridley, Hn. M. W (Stalybridge)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Hope, J.F. (Sh'ffield, Brightside
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Cautley, Henry Strother
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
Kearley, Hudson E.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)
Chapman, Edward
Keswick, William
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Charrington, Spencer
Kimber, Henry
Spear, John Ward
Clare, Octavius Leigh

Knowles, Lees
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Lawson, John Grant
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Lee, Arthur H (Hants, Fareham
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M. Taggart
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Cook, Sir Fredk. Lucas
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Cranborne, Viscount
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Crossley, Sir Savile
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Macdonald, John Cumming
Valentia, Viscount
Duke, Henry Edward
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Wallace, Robert
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Maconochie, A. W.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
M'Arthur, Chas. (Liverpool)
Warner, Thos. Courtenay T.
Emmott, Alfred
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W

Warr, Augustus Frederick
 Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
 M'Killop, Jas. (Stirlingshire)
 Webb, Colonel William George
 Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
 Maple, Sir John Blundell
 Willox, Sir John Archibald
 Finch, George H.
 Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriesshire)
 Wodehouse, Rt. Hon. E. R. (Bath)
 Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
 Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
 Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
 Fisher, William Hayes
 Mildmay, Francis Bingham
 Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
 Fison, Frederick William
 Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir Fredk. G.
 FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
 Molesworth, Sir Lewis
 TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
 Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
 Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
 Forster, Henry William
 More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
 Foster, Sir Michael (Lond. Univ.)
 Murray, Rt. Hon. A. Graham (Bute)
 Original Question again proposed.

CAPTAIN NORTON contended that the action of the Government in connection with the supply of horses for the South African war had been at fault from top to bottom. With regard to the transport of horses, the loss in horseflesh had been extravagant from every point of view. No fewer than fifteen transports left this country at the outset of the war carrying on an average 294 horses each; seventeen transports started out from Australia with a total of 8,383 horses, and thirty two from Buenos Ayres with a total of 25,872. One would have supposed that at least the fifteen transports from this country would have carried a veterinary surgeon. One would have thought that at least that precaution would have been taken when sending valuable horses across the sea; because the horses sent from this country were the most valuable; they averaged £40 per head, when purchased at three and four years old, and when they had been trained were valued at £70 apiece. It might be said that the Government were not aware of the fact that they would require so many veterinary surgeons. But he himself drew attention on the Estimates previously to the war to the deplorable state of the Army Veterinary Department, which had only sixty-three executive veterinary officers at the outbreak of the war. With

regard to the seventeen ships from Australia and thirty-two from Buenos Ayres, men known as cattle runners were placed on board sixty-four ships, to take care of 38,665 horses. Up to June, 1901, 70,784 reached South Africa from North and South America, Australia, and Hungary. Of the number transported, 3,119 died. That was, he admitted, not a large proportion; but of that number a considerable portion would have been saved if veterinary surgeons had been carried by the ships. Of mules there were 70,769 transported, of which 2,471 died on route. This was a very large proportion indeed. To show the loss which had occurred through, as he contended, want of proper supervision, he quoted the case of the M. battery of the Royal Horse Artillery. That battery was created at New Bridge, but it had not its proper complement of horses. The horses were brought out from England without proper inspection, and pink eye broke out among them, and the whole Battery was infected. Again, scratch teams were sent from England which picked up the battery at New Bridge. They were untrained and unknown to the men for service, and that in his opinion was not the proper way to send a battery into action. Then there was the case of the "Rapidan," on which glanders broke out with most deplorable results. His contention was that the Remount Department ought to be controlled by the Army Veterinary Department, and that all purchases and shipments of horses should be under that Department, which would give us a definite Department upon which responsibility could be saddled. In the case of all great carrying companies; omnibus and the like; in this country all the horses were bought by the veterinary surgeons, and the results in these cases were fairly good. Another point

to which he wished to draw attention was the fact that, out of the 250,000 animals which were used in the early stages of the war in South Africa, only 20,000 were purchased in South Africa. In other words, proper advantage was not taken of the opportunity to purchase properly seasoned horses on the spot. The system of station hospitals in India for horses acted admirably, and the Government were obliged to send for some of the staff of those hospitals for service in South Africa, and they were the only hospitals which had done any really satisfactory work. The loss of so many horses in South Africa was due to the fact that the veterinary surgeons had nobody to give an order to, the farriers and shoeing smiths being under the officers of their own regiments. The wastage of animals had been stated by the right hon. Gentleman to be some 10,000 a month, but this was very greatly under the mark. A few months ago it was about 7,500 a week; between 400,000 and 500,000 animals had been used up during the first seventeen months of the war. The casualties among those animals; he included mules and trek oxen; was 15 per cent., whilst from mismanagement, starvation, and abandonment on the veldt it was 35 per cent. Most people had read the details which had appeared in the press of the terrible sufferings of the horses which were left to die. It was said that they could not be despatched, because firing in the rear of a force would be a dangerous thing; but many of these poor beasts might have been despatched with ease with a small pole dagger, such as was used in Spanish bull-fights. England, which ought to be the first country in the world in matters regarding the welfare of dumb animals, was the most backward. The number of veterinary surgeons required when an army

took the field was in Germany one for 200 animals; Russia, one for 120; France, one for 313; Italy, one for 180. In Austria he had not got the figures for an army on a war footing, but in time of peace they had one veterinary surgeon for 450 animals. We in South Africa had only had one veterinary surgeon to 1,200 animals, and it was not surprising that we had these immense losses. In the Transvaal and Natal

there were 169 veterinary surgeons, and of these only 38 were Army veterinary surgeons. Thus there was only one Army veterinary surgeon for between 6,000 and 7,000 animals. It would be of small value to buy them carefully and to transport them successfully if, when these animals arrived at the seat of war, they were not taken care of. There were many ailments in horses which were of a purely military origin, such as sand cholic and acute rheumatism, and other ailments caused by starvation, wrong feeding, overwork, exhaustion, and want of water, and which seldom came within the purview of a civil veterinary surgeon, whose dealings were with horses properly fed and housed. There was one case of an officer's valuable charger which was being led along, and which suddenly lay down and could not be induced to move, which might have been saved had there been proper veterinary assistance. The veterinary surgeons who were sent out upon an emergency; although he did not wish to say anything derogatory to the civil vets.; were the worst class of veterinary surgeons.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order; The hon. and gallant Member is now, I think, dealing with the Veterinary Department, the Estimate for which appears on Vote 1. He must now confine himself to the question of the horses.

CAPTAIN NORTON desired respectfully to point out that when he attempted to deal with this matter under Vote 1 the Chairman had advised him to deal with it under the present Vote.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is in error.

CAPTAIN NORTON (continuing) said his whole point was that out of the £36,000,000 which Parliament was called upon to vote last year and this, millions might have been saved if the suggestion he formerly made had been carried out; namely, that the Army Veterinary Department should be enlarged and developed. The success of the entire campaign had been frustrated by the fact that there had not been at disposal a proper supply of properly-seasoned and cared-for horses. The delay of seven weeks after the occupation of Bloemfontein was entirely owing to the want of horseflesh, while General French in the ride of his cavalry division from the Modder to Kimberley had 1,000 horses unfit for further duty. The cause of all this was insufficient care in purchase and shipment, and also as regards preparation and training, and the want of station hospitals and staff.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) said he desired some explanation as to the reduction of this Estimate. Last year the Estimate was £19,000,000 odd, and this year it was £16,000,000, showing a decrease of nearly £4,000,000. He thought the Committee ought to know the reason for this decrease. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer had said that the total estimated for this year was practically the same as last year, but that did not appear to be so in the case of this Vote, and the Committee ought to know on what basis the

Government arrived at this Estimate. With regard to remounts, the Estimate was something like £6,000 less than last year, that was to say, there were 22,000 horses fewer. Why should that be so? The area of operations had considerably increased. There was a considerable waste of horseflesh. 100,000 to 200,000 square miles had been added to the area of operations, and all the previous Estimates had had to be doubled, and now the Government asked for a less amount than was expended last year. He would certainly like to know how the Estimate was arrived at; there were more mounted troops in the field, there were less remounts asked for; Nobody thought the campaign in Natal would last as long as it had done. With regard to that matter there had been a very great miscalculation. Was the noble Lord now prepared to say that he adhered to the Estimates, or was he prepared to admit that the Estimate was rather an under estimate?

LORD STANLEY said he believed the Estimate would be sufficient to cover the expenditure up to the conclusion of the war, which, he hoped, was not so far distant as some supposed. It was only a matter of opinion, and he candidly confessed that when, on his return in January, he first saw the Estimate he thought that all operations in Cape Colony were ended. The position was a difficult one to deal with, although it was not war.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that last year the House was told that provision for the war at full pressure was being made up to September, and at half pressure up to February. What was the basis of calculation now?

LORD STANLEY said he thought that the Estimate was based on "full pressure" up to the end of August, after which it diminished. With regard to the question put by the hon. Member for West Newington, the hon. and gallant Gentleman had approached the subject from two points of view, recrimination of the past and advice for the future. He was perfectly ready to admit that there had been failures, and would consider any advice which was tendered to prevent any such failures in future. He might, however, say that those failures had only been proved by the war, and could not have been proved until a war had taken place. In reference to the remount department, there was no doubt it would have to be entirely reorganised, and when those who were at present in South Africa returned, they would no doubt be able to give admirable advice in that matter. The hon. and gallant Gentleman had said there were no veterinary surgeons on board the ships, but only cattle runners; he did not know the practice of shipping cattle, but the hon. and gallant Member would find that the so-called cattle runners had all the technical knowledge required. He quite agreed that there would be a decided advantage in having veterinary surgeons on board ships, but it was impossible to keep such an establishment in times of peace as would ensure veterinary surgeons to go, not only with the forces, but with the ships also. With regard to the "Rapidan," the ship on which glanders had broken out, he might say that nothing was more difficult to detect, and that no inspection would prevent such a thing occurring. With regard to the number of horses purchased in South Africa, the farmers in that country were very loth to part with their horses, and attempts to purchase horses in Cape Colony showed very poor

results until martial law was put into force, and horses were requisitioned at a fair price, when the Government was able to obtain the number of horses required. He did not agree that the stoppage at Bloemfontein was due to any want of horses; the real difficulty was getting up the forage necessary for the horses there.

CAPTAIN NORTON asked whether the noble Lord suggested that if the forage had been at Bloemfontein they had sufficient horses there to remount the whole of the mounted troops?

LORD STANLEY replied in the negative, but explained that a sufficient number of horses could have been sent up, had it been possible to get up sufficient forage to feed them. The hon. and gallant Gentleman had also said that if his horses had been in good condition General French would not have lost so many as he did on his march. As a matter of fact great difficulties were encountered, and water places were far apart. If General French's horses could have been rested at Kimberley no doubt they would have recovered, but when they arrived at Kimberley a telegram arrived ordering them to come out at whatever cost and cut off Cronje, and it was then that they suffered. The veterinary department would have to be improved, but the fact of there being a lot of camps, and sick camps, in the remount department would show that that improvement had commenced. There were seventeen farms or camps where horses were being treated, and kept thoroughly well. There were 7,268 men employed on these farms, and he hoped by the institution of these establishments to reduce the horse mortality. The observations of the hon. Member with reference to the veterinary surgeons would not be lost sight of.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE called attention to the estimated proceeds from the sale of cart and other animals. There had been a lengthy and costly expedition to China, in the course of which a large quantity of property and war-like material, including mules and transport animals, had been acquired. Some of those mules had been transferred to South Africa for the purposes of the Army, and therefore they must be added to the number purchased in connection with the war there. Although £8,000,000 had been spent on the purchase of animals, and a large number had been acquired by warlike operations, the amount estimated to be realised by the sale of these animals at the close of the war was only £135,000. The amount ought surely to be much more than that, especially in view of the large reduction of the military force foreshadowed in the Secretary of State's Army scheme. This was not only a serious financial transaction, but it was closely wrapped up with the administration of the remount department, and the Committee should have some explanation upon the subject.

MR. BRODRICK was understood to reply that the amount in question was the minimum sum it was estimated would be received, but if a larger number of animals remained than would produce that amount there would be no difficulty in disposing of them. Horses would be required for the constabulary, and many of the transport animals would be applied to local purposes. It was extremely likely that if the war came to an end to-morrow a much larger sum would be realised, but the estimate was based on the assumption that provision would have

to be made in this direction after the war was actually over, because there could be only a gradual reduction of troops, and a considerable period would have to elapse before we should have a small force as a permanent garrison in South Africa.

MR. PIRIE was about to refer to the discrepancy between the number of AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Bowles, T. G. (King's Lynn)
Colston, Chas. Ed. H. Athole
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Allan, William (Gateshead)
Bullard, Sir Harry
Cranborne, Viscount
Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.
Burt, Thomas
Crossley, Sir Savile
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Caldwell, James
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Cautley, Henry Strother
Denny, Colonel
Balcarres, Lord
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Balfour, Maj K R (Christchurch)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm)
Duke, Henry Edward
Banbury, Frederick George
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r)
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Chapman, Edward
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edwd.
Bigwood, James
Charrington, Spencer
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Blundell, Colonel Henry

Clare, Octavius Leigh
Finch, George H.
Bond, Edward
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Finlay, Sir Robert B.
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Fisher, William Hayes

officers and the number of men who were not invalids returning from South Africa when;

*THE CHAIRMAN pointed out that the item on which the question could be raised had been passed.

MR. PIRIE explained that he was about to move a reduction of the whole Vote.

*THE CHAIRMAN ruled that the hon. Member could not discuss an item already passed on a motion to reduce the whole Vote.

MR. PIRIE: Very well; I will bring up the matter on the Report stage.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES, referring to a sum of £;181,500 for appropriations in aid, pointed out that that was an item over which the Committee had absolutely no control. It might be thought that if the Committee had no power of dealing with these appropriations in aid there was no use in discussing them, but that was not the case. Sums amounting to £;10,000,000 a year were annually granted without the Committee having the slightest power over them. It would not be in order for him to suggest any other method by which these appropriations in aid should be dealt with, but undoubtedly the day must come when the Committee would have that power, which it did not now possess.

Question put.

The Committee divided::Ayes, 159; Noes, 60. (Division List No. 216.)

Fison, Frederick William
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Renwick, George
FitzGerald, SirRobertPenrose-
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (BristolS.
Rickett, J. Compton
Flower, Ernest
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Ridley, HonM.W.(Stalybridge
Forster, Henry William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Ritchie, RtHonChas. Thomson
Foster, Sir Michael(Lond. Uni.
Lucas, ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
Rothschild, Hon.LionelWalter
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Garfit, William

Macdona, John Cumming
Seton-Karr, Henry
Gore, HnGR.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Maclver, David (Liverpool)
Sharpe, Wm. Edward T.
Gorst, Rt.Hon.Sir John Eldon
Maconochie, A. W.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
M'Arthur, Charles(Liverpool)
Smith, HC.(North'd., Tyneside
Greene, W. D. (Wednesbury)
M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Greene, SirEW(B'rySEdm'nds
M'Killop, James(Stirlingshire)
Spear, John Ward
Hamilton, RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robt. Wm.
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Stewart, SirMarkJ.M'Taggart
Harwood, George
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Heath, James(Staffords., N.W.
More, R. Jasper (Shropshire)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Heaton, John Henniker
Morrell, George Herbert
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Helder, Augustus
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Henderson, Alexander
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Higginbottom, S. W.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Hoare, Edward B. (Hampst'd)
Nicol, Donald Ninian

Valentia, Viscount
Hobhouse, C.E.H. (Bristol, E.)
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Holland, William Henry
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Hope, J.F. (Sheffield, Brightside)
Pease, Herbt. P. (Darlington)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Horniman, Frederick John
Pemberton, John S. G.
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
Webb, Colonel William George
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Weir, James Galloway
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Knowles, Lees
Price, Robert John
Wilcox, Sir John Archibald
Langley, Batty
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Lawson, John Grant
Purvis, Robert
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Hudders'fd)
Lee, A. H. (Hants, Fareham)
Randles, John S.
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Yoxall, James Henry
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Reid, James (Greenock)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES.; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.

Rentoul, James Alexander
NOES.
Abraham, William(Cork, N.E.)
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Mara, James
Ambrose, Robert
Gilhooly, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Bell, Richard
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Power, Patrick Joseph
Blake, Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Priestley, Arthur
Boland, John
Hayden, John Patrick
Reddy, M.
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Kennedy, Patrick James
Redmond, JohnE.(Waterford)
Boyle, James
Leamy, Edmund
Schwann, Charles E.
Brigg, John
Lewis, John Herbert
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Lloyd-George, David
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Burke, E. Haviland-
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Sullivan, Donal
Burns, John
M'Dermott, Patrick
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Thomas, DavidAlfred(Merth'r
Colville, John
Mooney, John J.
White, George (Norfolk)
Craig, Robert Hunter
Morgan, J.Lloyd(Carmarthen)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Crean, Eugene
Murphy, J.

Whiteley, George(York, W.R.)

Delany, William

Nannetti, Joseph P.

Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)

Dillon, John

Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)

Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)

Doogan, P. C.

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

Duffy, William J.

O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

Emmott, Alfred

O'Kelly, James(Roscommon,N

Flavin, Michael Joseph

O'Malley, William

2. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £;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 31st day of March, 1902."

CAPTAIN NORTON said that until the year before last this Vote had been merely a token Vote of £;100, but last year the Estimate was drawn up in a different manner, The sum then put down was

£;63,000, while this year it was £;345,000. He failed to see how the amount was arrived at, and perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would explain the reasons for the departure from previous practice. The Vote was of special importance this year in consequence of the recent statement of the First Lord of the Treasury with regard to the very small reserve;only 3,300 rounds;of small arms ammunition. This Vote was for the very establishment that produced that ammunition. The Hague Conference, which concluded on 29th July, 1899, condemned Mark IV;.

*THE CHAIRMAN ruled that the quality or character of the ammunition should be discussed on Vote 9 of the Army Estimates. All that could now be discussed were the items to be found in Vote A;establishments.

CAPTAIN NORTON asked why only £;28,450 was to be found under Vote A, while the present Vote was for £;345,000.

MR. GODDARD (Ipswich) said that last year the Comptroller and Auditor General called attention to the irregularity of commencing expenditure under this head in anticipation of the Vote of Parliament. It was now the beginning of June, and, therefore, the same thing was being done this year. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would explain why the Vote or, at any rate, a Vote on Account, was not brought forward at an earlier period. He also desired an explanation as to why the different superintendents received such various rates of pay.

CAPTAIN NORTON asked, on a point of order, whether he was not at liberty to deal with the question of small arms ammunition, seeing that new machinery was

specially charged in this Vote, and the question of the productive power of the ordnance factories bore directly on the remarks he had been making.

*THE CHAIRMAN understood that the hon. Member desired to refer to the number of rounds and the quality and

character of the ammunition. Vote 9 was clearly the Vote under which those points should be dealt with; the matter appeared in the present Vote only as an appropriation in aid.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty) asked whether the Superintendent of Ordnance Factories or the Chief Mechanical Engineer was not responsible for the proper quality of the work done. He understood that a large number of bullets were produced at these factories under the superintendence of one of these officers, and if he did not raise the question on this Vote he would have no possible chance of saying a word on the subject. The Superintendent of Ordnance Factories might not be directly responsible, but he was in charge of the factories, and was responsible if bad work was done.

MR. BRODRICK said the Vote contained nothing which had to do with the subject the hon. Member desired to discuss.

MR. WEIR said that on page 7 nearly two and a half millions of money were asked for materials and stores, and more than that sum for wages. Were not these bullets made out of those materials, and were not the men who made them paid out of the sum asked for for wages?

*THE CHAIRMAN: Even if that were so, the proper place to discuss the point is when the Committee is asked to pay for those bullets, and that is on Vote 9. It would be improper to take the same discussion in two different parts of the Estimates, and it has always been the custom; and it is the proper place; to discuss this matter on Vote 9.

MR. WEIR: But on Vote 9 these sums for materials and wages will not appear;

*THE CHAIRMAN: I must ask the hon. Member to abide by my ruling.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER said the quantity of stores used in war time was enormously increased, and he wanted to know whether there was such a reserve of manufacturing machinery as to enable them to cope with the increased output required.

MR. BRODRICK said the War Office wanted to make provision that there should be a proper reserve, and the amount in the present Estimates was to enable such a reserve to be provided.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said he wished to call the attention of the Committee to the character of this Vote. It was not a Vote of an ordinary kind. The Government had set up an establishment with a capital value of over £2,000,000 for the manufacture of arms and the munitions of war. It was a most notable example, not of municipal, but of Government trading. But, while the munitions supplied to the Army and Navy could be discussed on the proper Votes in the Army and Navy Estimates, there was no other opportunity of discussing the munitions supplied to India and the colonies. The Committee had no control over any part of the production beyond the value of £345,000, and no control over the appropriations in aid, which amounted to over £5,000,000.

MR. BRODRICK said he believed there never was a more absolute concession made to

the idea of Parliamentary control than in setting up this Vote. He thought the experience of the last twelve years showed that this Vote had had an admirable effect in giving Parliamentary control over every item.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs) said there was one thing puzzled him in connection with this Vote. It was originally purely a token Vote of £;100, merely for the purpose of bringing all the charges in the arsenals and manufacturing departments under the cognisance of Parliament, but now it was a Vote of £;345,000.

MR. BRODRICK replied that in former years the amount for the depreciation on machinery and buildings corresponded exactly with the amount set down for new machinery and buildings, but the time had come when they must provide not only for depreciation,

but also for the increased service which the country required in order to give the proper reserve power.

MR. DILLON asked whether it would be in order on the present Vote to discuss the salary of the Chief Superintendent of Ordnance Factories. He had been watching for years for the opportunity of discussing this question of manufacture. He wished to be sure that he would not on this occasion miss his opportunity of bringing home to the right person the responsibility for the manufacture of this ammunition, which was undoubtedly one of the main reasons for the crisis in the supply of ammunition alluded to by the First Lord of the Treasury.

MR. BRODRICK said that none of this ammunition was being manufactured at the present time. With deference to the Chair, he would imagine that any such ammunition manufacture would be properly discussed under Ammunition Vote 9, or on the salary of the Secretary of State for War in the year in which it had been manufactured.

MR. DILLON submitted that in voting the salary of the Chief Superintendent of Ordnance Factories the Committee ought to know whether they were not entitled to question the quality of his work.

MR. BRODRICK said he did not think the manufacture of two or three years ago could be properly discussed.

*THE CHAIRMAN said he had pointed out two or three times that the proper place to discuss the nature and character of the ammunition was when the ammunition was to be paid for.

MR. DILLON said it was not the character of the ammunition, but the workmanship of the Chief Superintendent he wanted to discuss. Were they not entitled to discuss that on this Vote?

MR. BRODRICK said that could be discussed on the salary of the Secretary of State for War. To discuss the salary of the Chief Superintendent of Ordnance Factories now would, it seemed to him, not be in order. It would give rise to great abuse if work which was not contained in the Estimates for the year were to be discussed.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said that unless the quality of the workmanship was discussable now it could not be discussed at all. It could not be discussed on the salary of the Secretary of State for War, because one half of the munitions were supplied to the Department presided over by the First Lord of the

Admiralty.

*THE CHAIRMAN said it was perfectly clear that the time to discuss whether the ammunition was good or bad was when Vote 9, Sub-head C, was brought before the Committee. That was the time to discuss it and refuse to pay for it. He would certainly rule that matters connected with the quality of the work should be discussed when the work was asked to be paid for.

AYES.

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

Grant, Corrie

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

Ambrose, Robert

Griffith, Ellis J.

O'Malley, William

Bell, Richard

Harwood, George

O'Mara, James

Blake, Edward

Hayden, John Patrick

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.

Boland, John

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

Power, Patrick Joseph

Bolton, Thomas Dolling

Holland, William Henry

Priestley, Arthur

Boyle, James

Horniman, Frederick John

Reddy, M.

Brigg, John

Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.

Redmond, John E.(Waterford)

Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson

Kearley, Hudson E.

Rickett, J. Compton

Burke, E. Haviland-

Kennedy, Patrick James

Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)

Burns, John

Lambert, George

Roe, Sir Thomas

Burt, Thomas

Langley, Batty

Sheehan, Daniel Daniel

Caldwell, James

Leamy, Edmund

Soames, Arthur Wellesley

Cameron, Robert
Leng, Sir John
Sullivan, Donal
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Lewis, John Herbert
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Colville, John
Lloyd-George, David
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Craig, Robert Hunter
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings)
Crean, Eugene
M'Dermott, Patrick
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan)
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Delany, William
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Weir, James Galloway
Dillon, John
Mooney, John J.
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Doogan, P. C.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Duffy, William J.
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Murphy, J.
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Huddersfield)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Yoxall, James Henry
Flynn, James Christopher
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Norman, Henry
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.
Gilhooly, James
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Goddard, Daniel Ford
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
NOES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Balcarres, Lord
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds)
Bigwood, James
Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.
Balfour, Maj. K. R. (Christchurch)
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Banbury, Frederick George
Bond, Edward
Bain, Col. James Robert
Bathurst, Hon. Allen B.
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith.

MR. DILLON said that he would be driven to the unpleasant course of moving the reduction of the salary of the Chief Superintendent of Ordnance Factories by £;800. It appeared to be the desire of the Secretary of State for War that this Vote should be passed sub silentio. He desired to bring under the notice of the Committee the question of the sighting of rifles. A whole lot of those turned out were six feet wide of the proper gauge.

*THE CHAIRMAN: That must be discussed when the rifles are asked to be paid for.

MR. DILLON moved the reduction of the salary by £;800, on the ground of the Chief Superintendent's incompetence for the work.

Motion made, and Question put, "That Item A (Establishments) be reduced by £;800, in respect of the Salary of the Chief Superintendent of Ordnance Factories." (Mr. Dillon.)

The Committee divided: Ayes, 83; Noes, 169. (Division List No. 217.)

Bowles, T. G. (King's Lynn)
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nd'r'y)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert W.
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Purvis, Robert
Cautley, Henry Strother
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.)
Randles, John S.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbys.)
Heaton, John Henniker
Rasche, Major Frederic Carne

Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Helder, Augustus
Reid, James (Greenock)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Henderson, Alexander
Remnant, James Farquharson
Chamberlain Rt.Hon.J.(Birm
Higginbottom, S. W.
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Chamberlain,J Austen(Worc'r
Hoare,Edw.Brodie(Hamstead
Rentoul, James Alexander
Chapman, Edward
Hogg, Lindsay
Renwick, George
Charrington, Spencer
Hope, J. F. (Sheff.,Brightside)
Richards, Henry Charles
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Ridley, Hn.M. W. (Stalybridge
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Ridley,S.Forde(BethnalGreen
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Lawson, John Grant
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. C. Thomson
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. A.
Lee Arthur H(Hants,Fareham)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Leese, Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel W.
Corbett, A. Cameron(Glasgow)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Rutherford, John
Cranborne, Viscount
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Crossley, Sir Savile
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Seton-Karr, Henry
Dairymple, Sir Charles
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Skewes-Cox, Henry
Denny, Colonel

Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Smith, H. C. (Northumb, Tynesd
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Lowe, Francis William
Smith, James P. (Lanarks.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Spear, John Ward
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Stanley, Edward J. (Somerset)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Lyttleton, Hon. Alfred
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M. Taggart
Emmott, Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn, Edw.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
M'Calmont, Col. H. L. B. (Cams.
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Finch, George H.
M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
M'Killop, Jas. (Stirlingshire)
Thornton, Percy M.
Fisher, William Hayes
Majendie, James A. H.
Tomlinson, Wm. E. Murray
Fison, Frederick William
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Tuke, Sir John Batty
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose-
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Valentia, Viscount
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Maxwell, Rt. Hn. Sir H. E. (Wigt'n
Walker, Col. William Hall
Flower, Ernest
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriesshire)

Wanklyn, James Leslie
 Forster, Henry William
 Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
 Warr, Augustus Frederick
 Foster, Sir Michael (L'nd'n Uni.
 Molesworth, Sir Lewis
 Webb, Col. William George
 Garfit, William
 More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
 Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Ta'nt'n
 Gladstone, Rt. Hon. Herbert J.
 Morgan, David J (Walthamst'w
 Wentworth, Brace C. Vernon-
 Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby- (Salop
 Morrell, George Herbert
 Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
 Gore, Hn. S. E. Ormsby- (Linc.)
 Morrison, James Archibald
 Willox, Sir John Archibald
 Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
 Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
 Wilson, John (Glasgow)
 Goulding, Edward Alfred
 Newdigate, Francis Alexander
 Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
 Graham, Henry Robert
 Nicol, Donald Ninian
 Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
 Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
 Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
 Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
 Green, Walford D. (Wednesb'y
 Parker, Gilbert
 Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
 Greene, Sir E. W. (B. St. Edm'ds
 Pease, Herbert Pike (D'rtingt'n
 Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
 Pemberton, John S. G.
 TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
 Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.
 Percy, Earl
 Gretton, John
 Pilkington, Lieut.-Col Richard
 Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Ld. G. (Mid'x
 Platt-Higgins, Frederick
 Original Question again proposed.

MR. DILLON said there was an item in this Vote which, if he correctly understood the Secretary of State for War, he was entitled to discuss. That was the item, "Accommodation at Enfield and Birmingham for the manufacture of the new pattern rifle." He would like to know what that meant. Did it mean that the Army was to be armed with a new rifle?

*THE CHAIRMAN: That question ought to be raised on the Vote asking for the payment for the rifles.

MR. DILLON said that the Secretary of State for War had put this Vote down specially to enable discussion to take place on all questions relating to machinery and buildings. This item was for buildings. What was the object of setting up this Vote at all when they were told that every question which they raised must be discussed on some other Vote?

*THE CHAIRMAN: If the hon. Gentleman wishes to discuss the policy of rearming the Army, or the character of the new rifle, he cannot do so under this Vote. He may discuss the character of the machinery or the buildings in which the new rifle is to be made. That is all that is contained in this Vote.

CAPTAIN NORTON said that last year this Vote was a token Vote of £;100; but this year it had been put down at £;345,000 for new buildings and new machinery. Surely all that pertained to the buildings and machinery could be discussed under the Vote.

*THE CHAIRMAN: It is quite clear that the hon. Gentleman can discuss the character of the new buildings proposed to be set up, but the character of the work to be turned out in these new buildings cannot be discussed under this Vote.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE wished to know whether there was in this Vote any provision for machinery for making cordite. Then he should like an explanation in regard to Appropriations in Aid, and as to the production of cordite for the Colonies and the Indian Government. How was the price fixed? Was it fixed by the Chief Superintendent of the Ordnance Factory, and on what principle was it fixed? Was it fixed on such a method as to recoup the Factory for the expense of turning out the cordite, or was an attempt made to make any profit out of it?

*MR. GODDARD said he noticed there was an amount of £;15,200 down on the Vote "For contribution in lieu of rates on War Office property." This is in addition to another sum of £;154,000 voted for the same purpose in another estimate. Now, they paid the large salary of £;1,200 a year to a gentleman called the Treasury Valuer and Inspector of Rates and Property, whose duty it was to fix the amount of these payments in lieu of rates on Government property. He always thought that this official was overpaid, and, indeed, the President of the Board of Agriculture, in his Opposition days, used to protest against this Vote.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): I do not think I ever attacked this Vote at all. Certainly, during the five years I was at the Treasury I never came across a more capable man or more deserving official than the Property Valuer.

*MR. GODDARD said that there was an increase of over £;1,000 in the Vote, and he wanted to ask for what buildings this extra sum was asked, and who assessed the amount.

MR. BRODRICK said that the sum was paid for War Office buildings. As to the question of the hon. Member for East Mayo about the new pattern rifle, this was merely a provisional arrangement for shortening the rifle, which was found to be too long. As to the question about Appropriations in Aid, the charge for cordite to the Colonies and India covered the outlay and a share in the depreciation of buildings and machinery, but no profit was made.

MR. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam) asked whether the foundations for the hydraulic forging press at the Royal Gun Factory at Woolwich had yet been laid, when the work would be completed, and whether any change had been made in the policy of this particular structure. Could the right hon. Gentleman also tell him what amount of pressure this particular machine was capable of exercising.

*MR. TAYLOR (Lancashire, Radcliffe) said there was a Vote for Chaplains in the Royal Arsenals. He wanted to know to what denomination these gentlemen belonged. Were they canons or otherwise? So far as he was concerned he was prepared to move the omission of that item; he did not believe in voting salaries to chaplains in ordnance factories.

LORD STANLEY said he was afraid he could not give the hon. Member any definite information on the point, but there had been no change in the attitude which the Government had adopted.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item A (Establishments) be reduced by £350, in respect of the salary of a supplementary clerk."; (Mr. Nannetti.)

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question again proposed.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport) said that a concession had been made to the Metropolitan Police of 1s. 6d. per week for lodging allowance, and he wished to know why those Metropolitan Police employed in outside factories, such as Devonport and Birmingham, had not that concession extended to them. He did not want to debate the matter, but he thought that the rental conditions prevailing in Devonport and Birmingham were as high as in London. He did not see the equity of denying to a man

in the provinces a concession granted to a man living in London. He would ask the Home Secretary whether he was prepared to make a statement with reference to the matter.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon) said that one would hardly expect that this question would arise on that particular item, but he was quite ready to state very shortly the principle which regulated his action. There did unquestionably exist in London a hardship with regard to certain police who had to find their own lodgings. Rent in London, as was well known, was in certain quarters very high, and there was much over-crowding, and the difficulty of obtaining lodgings was extremely great. He therefore thought it a right and proper concession to give the extra 1s. 6d. for lodging allowance. The hon. Gentleman asked why should not that be extended to the provinces. Taking the provinces generally, it could hardly be contended that they were in the same position as London so far as over-crowding and rent were concerned. The hon. Gentleman said that rent in Devonport was as high as in London, but the hon. Gentleman must have been aware that the work of the police

serving in the dockyards was not by any means so onerous as the ordinary work of the London policeman, and that employment in the dockyards was a service which was very much desired by the police. He was satisfied that if the police who were employed at Devonport and other dockyards were dissatisfied with their positions a large number of London police would only be too glad to exchange with them. Under all the circumstances, he did not think it right that the Metropolitan Police Fund should be called upon to pay such an allowance to men serving under very advantageous circumstances in the provinces.

CAPTAIN NORTON asked whether police serving in the dockyard at Woolwich would be entitled not only to the 1s. 6d. additional pay, but also to the 1s. 6d. lodging money.

*MR. RITCHIE said the 1s. 6d. lodging allowance was to be paid to all constables in all the boroughs of the Metropolitan Police area.

CAPTAIN NORTON said that being so, he assumed that the constables at Enfield would not receive the allowance, seeing that they were not within a Metropolitan borough; neither would the men at Waltham Abbey or Birmingham. He wished to know why men doing precisely the same work at Enfield, Waltham Abbey, and Birmingham should not receive the increase in wages which was given to the men at Woolwich. It was well known that a man doing duty outside a Metropolitan borough did not receive the extra 1s. 6d., although the constable on the other side of the street did. The police as a body felt very strongly on the question. They considered that even-handed justice had not been meted out to them, and that every man in the Metropolitan police force, no matter where he was doing duty, ought to be given the increase. The police also felt strongly that the extra 1s. 6d. should have been given in the particular form it was, in order that it might not rank for pension. Whereas the City police were given 3s. extra pay, the Metropolitan police only received 1s. 6d. extra pay and 1s. 6d. lodging allowance. By a decision of the courts, it was held that anything in the shape of an allowance should not rank for pension, and the men therefore looked upon the manner in which the allowance was given as an attempt to defraud them out of its pension equivalent.

*MR. RITCHIE said that the hon. Gentleman was entirely and absolutely wrong. As one who had taken great interest in the question, the hon. Gentleman must have known that the question of the lodging allowance had been raised again and again. When he came to consider the whole question, he felt that there was a fair ground for an increase in wages to be given to the police, and also a fair ground for the claim made for the lodging allowance. If the hon. Gentleman thought that the lodging allowance was given with the idea of defrauding the police he was entirely under a misapprehension. The claim was separate and distinct, and was put forward separately and distinctly. He had endeavoured to meet both demands, and he believed he had met them in a satisfactory manner. There was no body of men in the kingdom that he would rather give proper satisfaction to than the Metropolitan police, who did their work in a most admirable manner. The grievance was twofold, and it had been met in a twofold way. When the hon. Gentleman said that a man on one side of a street might receive more than a man on the opposite side, of course, wherever

the area was drawn, exceptions were certain to arise. There must always be a dividing line. It was absolutely necessary to draw that line, and he believed that it had been drawn in a proper way, and to the satisfaction of the police. At any rate, he could assure the hon. Gentleman that he did not intend to make the smallest departure from the decision he had arrived at.

CAPTAIN NORTON said that the right hon. Gentleman had rather misrepresented the case. What happened was that when the City Police received a rise of 3s. there was a great outcry on the part of the Metropolitan Police. They were given an advance, not of 3s., but of 1s. 6d., and there was no information given to the men that they were to have a lodging allowance in any shape or form. He wrote two letters to The Times, and following them an article, evidently inspired, appeared, stating that it was the intention of the Home Office to give the police another 1s. 6d., and that it would be given in the shape of a lodging allowance. It was an afterthought on the part of the Home Office when they found the position in which they were placed. The Metropolitan Police felt it keenly that the allowance had been given in that form. When it was found that the 1s. 6d. rise in pay did not satisfy the police, another order was issued, weeks afterwards, stating that a lodging allowance would be given, but that it would be confined to men within the boroughs of the County of London. There was now an outcry on the part of the men living outside the boroughs. Such men, although they paid slightly less rent, paid more for provisions. The right hon. Gentleman knew London well, and he would agree that a man living in Walworth, although he had to pay 8s. for his rooms, could walk out and buy fish and cheap meat, known as "block ornaments";[laughter];at a very low figure. Hon. Members might laugh at the term "block ornaments" and turn it into ridicule, but it was well known in the East End. "Block orna-

ments" meant scraps and pieces of meat which the poor were obliged to buy.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Gentleman is going a very long way from this item.

CAPTAIN NORTON said the question was whether the men employed at Enfield, Waltham Abbey, and Birmingham should receive the lodging money granted to other members of the Metropolitan Police.

*MR. RITCHIE said the hon. Gentleman had made one statement to which he must give an absolute and flat contradiction. He said that the 1s. 6d. increase in wages was given without any intimation that anything further was to be given, and that it was only some letters of the hon. Gentleman in The Times which awoke them to the necessity of giving something more. The Committee might hardly believe it after the hon. Gentleman's statement, but it was a fact that at the very time when the announcement was made that 1s. 6d. would be added to the wages, and in the same paragraph, it was stated that the Home Office had under consideration details of a lodging allowance, which had not then been definitely settled, but which would be intimated to the police shortly.

CAPTAIN NORTON said that what he stated was that when the men were given an intimation that they would have an increase of pay they were not given any intimation that they were about to receive a lodging allowance.

*THE CHAIRMAN: This has nothing whatever to do with the Vote before the Committee.

CAPTAIN NORTON said he was merely replying to the right hon. Gentleman.

MR. E. J. C. MORTON said with regard to the Metropolitan police employed outside London, it was assumed that they paid less rent than police employed in London, but he wished to point out that the Metropolitan police employed outside London were much worse off than Government employees generally. They were limited to taking lodgings within a certain distance of their work, and they were forbidden to take lodgings in the houses of people employed in a Government factory. Therefore, the number of houses in which they could obtain lodgings was very limited, with the result that their rental conditions were far higher than the rental conditions of other Government employees in the same places. That was a reason why special consideration should be given to their case.

*MR. RITCHIE said his impression was that in a place like Devonport the police lived under better conditions than police in London. The London police-constable had to live within a limited distance from his work, but in Devonport that was not so.

MR. E. J. C. MORTON asked what about the men who were forbidden to take lodgings in the houses of other Government employees.

*MR. RITCHIE said he thought that was an excellent condition, but apart from that there was a very great choice.

MR. E. J. C. MORTON said that as a matter of fact it had the effect of raising rent.

*MR. CORRIE GRANT said that when his hon. friend the Member for Ipswich was referring to the Treasury valuer the President of the Board of Trade interrupted him and said that he had never severely criticised that official or said that his office was a sinecure. He now wished to read a passage from
AYES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N.E.)
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)
Ambrose, Robert
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
O'Malley, William
Blake, Edward
Holland, William Henry
O'Mara, James
Boland, John
Horniman, Frederick John
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Boyle, James
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Partington, Oswald
Brigg, John
Kearley, Hudson E.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Burke, E. Haviland-
Kennedy, Patrick James

Priestley, Arthur
Caldwell, James
Lambert, George
Reddy, M.
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Langley, Batty
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Channing, Francis Allston
Leamy, Edmund
Rickett, J. Compton
Colville, John
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Craig, Robert Hunter
Leng, Sir John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Crean, Eugene
Lewis, John Herbert
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Lough, Thomas
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Delany, William
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Sullivan, Donal
Dilke, Rt. Hn. Sir Charles
M'Dermott, Patrick
Thomas, David Alf. (Merthyr)
Dillon, John
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Donelan, Captain A.
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Doogan, P. C.
Mooney, John J.
Weir, James Galloway
Duffy, William J.
Morton, Edw.J.C. (Devonport)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Murphy, J.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Flynn, James Christopher
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)

Fuller, J. M. F.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Gilhooly, James
Norman, Henry
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Huddersfield)
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Mr. Taylor and Mr. Lloyd-George.
Grant, Corrie
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Griffith, Ellis J.
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
NOES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Bain, Col. James Robert
Banbury, Frederick George
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Balcarres, Lord
Bathurst, Hon. Allen B.
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manchester)
Beach, Rt. Hon. Sir M. H. (Bristol)
Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Balfour, Maj. K. R. (Christchurch)
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.

Hansard, in which the right hon. Gentleman had done so.

*THE CHAIRMAN: That does not seem to me to be relevant.

*MR. CORRIE GRANT said that he would, then, hand the volume to the right hon. Gentleman, and ask him to read his own speech, after having done which, perhaps, he would offer some information to the Committee.

*MR. TAYLOR said he desired to move to reduce the vote by £425, being the salaries of the chaplains at the Royal Arsenal, Enfield, and Waltham Abbey. He observed there was no chaplain at Birmingham, and he did not know whether one was needed there. As one who did not approve of the salaries of clergymen as ingredients in the manufacture of ordnance, although he was along with other hon. Members quite willing to pay his subscription to such gentlemen if their services were needed, he objected on principle to that part of the Vote.

Motion made, and Question put, "That Item A (Establishments) be reduced by £425 in respect of the Salaries of Chaplains." (Mr. Taylor.)

The Committee divided: Ayes, 79; Noes, 173, (Division List No. 218.)

Bigwood, James
Gretton, John

Pease, H. Pike (Darlington)
Blundell, Col. Henry
Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord G. (Mid'x
Pemberton, John S. G.
Bond, Edward
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Percy, Earl
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robt. Wm.
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Bull, William James
Heath, James (Staffords, N.W.)
Purvis, Robert
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Pym, C. Guy
Cautley, Henry Strother
Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampstead
Randles, John S.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Hogg, Lindsay
Remnant, James Farquharson
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Renwick, George
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Richards, Henry Charles
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc.
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalyb'dge
Chapman, Edward
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)

Charrington, Spencer
Lawson, John Grant
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chs. Thomson
Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.
Lee, A. H. (Hants. Fareham)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Rutherford, John
Cranborne, Viscount
Long, Col Charles W. (Evesham
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Crossley, Sir Savile
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (Bristol, S.)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Dairymple, Sir Charles
Lowe, Francis William
Smith, H C (N'rth'mb. Tyneside
Dewar, T.R(T'rH'mlets, S.Geo.
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Lucas, Col.Francis(Lowestoft)
Spear, John Ward
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Lucas, ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth
Stanley, EdwardJas.(Somerset
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Macdona, John Cumming
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst

Maconochie, A. W.
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Finch, George H.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Finlay, Sir Robert B.
M'Calmont, Col. H L. B(Cambs
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUni.
Fisher, William Hayes
M'Killop, J. (Stirlingshire)
Thornton, Percy M.
Fison, Frederick William
Majendie, James A. H.
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Fitzgerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Malcolm, Ian
Valentia, Viscount
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield
Flower, Ernest
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Walker, Col. William Hall
Forster, Henry William
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Webb, Colonel William George
Garfit, William
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Fred. G.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A C E (Taunton
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Gordon, Hn. J. E (Elgin & Nairn)
More, R. Jasper (Shropshire)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Gore, Hn. G. R C Ormsby- (Salop
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.)
Morrell, George Herbert
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Morrison, James Archibald

Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Graham, Henry Robert
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Green, Walford D. (Wednesb'ry
Newdigate, Francis Alex.
Greene, Sir E. W (B'y S. Edm'ds)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Mr. William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
Parker, Gilbert
Original Question put.
AYES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh)
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Bigwood, James
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich
Allhusen, Augustus H. Eden
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Chamberlain, Rt Hon. J. (Birm.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bond, Edward
Chamberlain, J. Austin (Worc'r
Bain, Col. James Robert
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Chapman, Edward
Balcarres, Lord
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Charrington, Spencer
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Brigg, John
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds)

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Balfour, Maj. KR (Christchurch)
Bull, William James
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Banbury, Frederick George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Cautley, Henry Strother
Colville, John
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Corbett, A. C. (Glasgow)
The Committee divided: Ayes, 203; Noes, 52. (Division List No. 219.)
Craig, Robert Hunter
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Pym, C. Guy
Cranborne, Viscount
Langley, Batty
Randles, John S.
Crossley, Sir Savile
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Lawson, John Grant
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Dewar, John A. (Iverness-sh.)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham)
Renwick, George
Dewar, T. R. (T'r H'mlets, S Geo.)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Richards, Henry Charles
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Rickett, J. Compton
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Leng, Sir John
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin

Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Long, Col. C. W. (Evesham)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Finch, George H.
Lowe, Francis William
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Rothschild, Hn. Lionel Walter
Fisher, William Hayes
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Fison, Frederick William
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Shaw, Chas. Edw. (Stafford)
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Macdonald, John Cumming
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Forster, Henry William
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Smith, HC (North'mb Tyneside)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Maconochie, A. W.
Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
M'Arthur, Chas. (Liverpool)
Spear, John Ward
Garfit, William
M'Calmont, Col. H. L. B. (Camb.)
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Gordon, Hn J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Majendie, James A. H.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Gore, Hn GR. C. Ormsby- (Salop)
Malcolm, Ian

Strachey, Edward
Gore, Hon.S.F.Ormsby-(Linc.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Graham, Henry Robert
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Talbot, RtHn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Grant, Corrie
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn.W.F.
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfries.
Thornton, Percy M.
Green, WalfordD(Wednesbury
Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir Fredk. G.
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Greene, SirEW(B'rySEdm'nds
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Tufnell, Lt.-Col. Edward
Greene, HenryD.(Shrewsbury)
More, Robert J. (Shropshire)
Valentia, Viscount
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Vincent, Col. SirCEH(Sheffield
Gretton, John
Morrell, George Herbert
Walker, Col. William Hall
Griffith, Ellis J.
Morrison, James Archibald
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Hall, Edward Marshall
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Hamilton,RtHnLordG.(Mid'x
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Webb, Col. William George
Hamilton, Marq.of(L'nd'derry)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Weir, James Galloway

Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert Wm.
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Welby, Lt.-Col. ACE(Taunton
Hardy, Laurence(Kent, Ashfd.
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Norman, Henry
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Higginbottom, S. W.
Parker, Gilbert
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Hoare, E. Brodie (Hampstead)
Partington, Oswald
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.
Hobhouse, Henry(Somerset, E.
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington)
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath
Hogg, Lindsay
Pemberton, John S. G.
Woodhouse, SirJT(Huddersf'd
Holland, William Henry
Percy, Earl
Wortley, Rt.Hn.C.B.Stuart-
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield, Brightside
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Horniman, Frederick John
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Hutton, John (Yorks. N. R.)
Priestley, Arthur
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Kearley, Hudson E.
Purvis, Robert
NOES.
Abraham, William(Cork, N.E.
Duffy, William J.
M'Dermott, Patrick

Ambrose, Robert
Flavin, Michael Joseph
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Bell, Richard
Flynn, James Christopher
Mooney, John J.
Boland, John
Gilhooly, James
Murphy, J.
Boyle, James
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Burns, John
Hayden, John Patrick
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Caldwell, James
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Channing, Francis Allston
O'Connor, J. (Wicklow, W.)
Crean, Eugene
Lambert, George
O'Malley, William
Delany, Wiliam
Leamy, Edmund
O'Mara, James
Dillon, John
Lewis, John Herbert
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Doogan, P. C.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Reddy, M.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. CR (Northants
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Redmond, J. E. (Waterford)
Sullivan, Donal
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)

Resolutions to be reported To-morrow; Committee to sit again To-morrow.

SUPPLY [24TH MAY].

Resolution reported;

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1901–2.

"That a sum not exceeding £3,281,000 be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge for the Staff for Engineer Services, and Expenditure for Royal Engineer Works, Buildings, and Repairs, at Home and Abroad (including Purchases), which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902."

Resolution read a second time.

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

MR. STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.) said that he wished to know what the Secretary of State for War was doing with reference to providing rifle-ranges. Great difficulty had arisen in many parts of the country in connection with the matter. In his own constituency a Volunteer battalion had succeeded in getting the owner and occupier of the land to grant them a range, but they were informed that they would have to build an enormous wall forty feet high behind the butts, at an estimated expenditure of £750, and that the War Office might contribute £300. The House would see the utter impossibility of local Volunteers being able to provide such a sum. The result would be that the Volunteers, if they wanted rifle-shooting, would have to travel fifteen miles, and men could not be expected to give up a whole day's work, as well as pay their expenses in travelling that distance. He had been told that that Volunteer battalion, which was at present very strong, would, as a result, be reduced in numbers, and that rifle-shooting would be discouraged. He knew the enormous difficulties which confronted the Secretary of State for War in the matter, but he asked whether it was not possible that something more should be done, and that a larger sum than £300 out of £750 should be granted. It was absolutely prohibitive to tell Volunteers that they could not have a rifle-range unless they were prepared to spend £750, with the probability of the Government refunding £300.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central) said he desired to join in the appeal of the hon. Gentleman opposite to the Secretary of State for War. The matter was one which affected the whole of the Volunteer forces, and it was quite impossible that they could be properly trained unless the Government took urgent steps to provide rifle ranges. The War Office was doing all it could to increase the efficiency of the auxiliary forces, especially in the matter of musketry, and the requirements were becoming every year more and more strict. But, as requirements became more and more strict, the facilities for rifle shooting became less, owing to the absence of ranges. The London Volunteers had at present the greatest difficulty in fulfilling the requirements of the War Office

with regard to rifle practice. The Secretary of State had sent a Committee to Switzerland to examine into the manner in which in that country this difficulty was met, and he hoped that an announcement would be made shortly that the War Office was doing all it could to provide facilities for the proper training of the auxiliary forces.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER said he wished to support the appeal. The want of ranges was causing enormous extravagance owing to not only Volunteers but Regular troops and Militia, having to be sent great distances, enormous sums being spent on railway journeys. They had been pressing the question for years, and, as far as he could understand, the Government up to the present had done practically nothing. In his own constituency

a range was decided on about five years ago, but nothing had yet been done. It was, however, true there were certain difficulties in the way of getting the land. The matter was a very serious one, and not only interfered with the efficiency of the Volunteers and Reserve forces, but also occasioned great extravagance.

MR. TOMLINSON (Preston) said, with reference to his own constituency, that there was some idea of having a rifle range at Fleetwood, but that would entail a journey for Preston Volunteers. There was also another rifle range nearer Preston, but it was six or seven miles from a railway, and it was almost impossible for Volunteers to get there and do their shooting in a day. He hoped the question of improving the facilities for shooting would be taken into consideration.

MR. BRODRICK said that the appeal made on behalf of ranges was a natural one, and one to which the War Office lent a very sympathetic ear, but hon. Gentlemen who represented their regiments and who had made appeals to the War Office should also appeal to certain Members of the House to give the Government necessary assistance. Last session, as in previous sessions, they had endeavoured to get over some of the difficulties which beset the subject by asking the House to pass a short Bill which would have empowered local authorities to take land for ranges.

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F

Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)

Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyn

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

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

Fisher, William Hayes

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r

Fison, Frederick William

Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.

Chapman, Edward

FitzGerald, Sir R. Penrose-

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Charrington, Spencer

Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.
Forster, Henry William
Balcarres, Lord
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Fuller, J. M. F.
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Colston, Charles Edw. H. A.
Garfit, William
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds)
Colville, John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Balfour, Maj. K. R. (Christchurch)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Banbury, Frederick George
Craig, Robert Hunter
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & N'n.)
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir. M. H. (Bristol)
Cranborne, Viscount
Gore, Hn. G. R. Ormsby- (Salop.)
Bigwood, James
Crossley, Sir Savile
Gore, Hn. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.)
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Bond, Edward
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Dewar, T. R. (T'r H'mlts, S. Geo.)
Graham, Henry Robert
Brigg, John
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)
Bull, William James
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Greene, H. D. (Shrewsbury)
Caldwell, James
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Gretton, John

Cautley, Henry Strother
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Griffith, Ellis J.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Hall, Edward Marshall
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Finch, George H.
Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Ld. G. (Midd'x)

He was then and was still of opinion that the local authorities were the proper channels through which to proceed in the matter, as they had local influence and local knowledge, which they could bring to bear on it; but one or two Members of Parliament took a very strong view about the measure, and he did not notice that strong consensus of opinion which he should have hoped for to assist the Government in passing the measure. They had since 1895 done a very considerable amount of work in the direction of providing ranges, and he hoped to be able to pursue the policy which had been carried out since that time still further. The London Volunteers actually got a range from the London County Council on most favourable terms, the Government supplying half the capital; but the whole affair was thrown up because certain persons were not prepared to go into anything in which the County Council was concerned. He mentioned that to show that the War Office should not be asked to bear the whole brunt of the matter. They could only work quietly forward, and whenever they had an opportunity with local assistance of providing rifle ranges they were doing their level best to supply them. A large number of ranges had been already provided at Salisbury Plain.

Question put.

The House divided:; Ayes, 175; Noes, 37. (Division List No. 220.)

Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nd'ry)
Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir Frederick G.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robt. W.
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Smith, HC (N'rth'mb Tyneside)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Heath, Jas. (Staffords, N.W.)
Morgan, David J. (Walthamst'w)
Spear, John Ward
Higginbottom, S. W.
Morrell, George Herbert
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)

Hobhouse, H. (Somerset)
Morrison, James Archibald
Strachey, Edward
Hogg, Lindsay
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightsd.)
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. Graham (Bute)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Horniman, Frederick John
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Thornton, Percy M.
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Lawson, John Grant
Norman, Henry
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Valentia, Viscount
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H. (Sheffield)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Parker, Gilbert
Walker, Col. William Hall
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Partington, Oswald
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Pemberton, John S. G.
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Penn, John
Webb, Col. William George
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Priestley, Arthur
Weir, James Galloway
Lowe, Francis William

Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Welby, Lt.-Col. ACE (Taunton)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Purvis, Robert
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Pym, C. Guy
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Lucas, R. J. (Portsmouth)
Randles, John S.
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Macdonald, John Cumming
Reid, James (Greenock)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Maconochie, A. W.
Renwick, George
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks)
M'Calmont, Col. H. L. B. (Camb.)
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
M'Killop, J. (Stirlingshire)
Ridley, S. F. (Bethnal Green)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Huddersfield)
Majendie, James, A. H.
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Malcolm, Ian
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Manners, Lord Cecil
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriesshire)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Gilhooly, James

O'Mara, James
Ambrose, Robert
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Boland, John
Kennedy, Patrick James
Power, Patrick Joseph
Boyle, James
Leamy, Edmund
Reddy, M.
Burke, E. Haviland-
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
M'Dermott, Patrick
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Channing, Francis Allston
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Sullivan, Donal
Crean, Eugene
Mooney, John J.
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Delany, William
Murphy, J.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Dillon, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Doogan, P. C.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.
Duffy, William J.
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Malley, William

OUT-DOOR RELIEF (FRIENDLY SOCIETIES) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. GRANT LAWSON (Yorkshire, N. R., Thirsk) in the Chair.]

Clause 1.;

Amendment proposed;

"In page 1, line 9, to leave out from the word 'be' to the end of sub-clause (1), and insert the words 'extended to all persons receiving money from any source,' instead thereof.";(Mr. Banbury.)

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

clause."

MR. STRACHEY said he hoped that the hon. Member would not persist in his Amendment, as it would practically destroy the Bill.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again" (Mr. Banbury), put, and agreed to.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Wednesday next.

CORONERS' INQUESTS (RAILWAY FATALITIES) BILL.

Order for resuming Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [1st May] read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn.

SUBMARINE TELEGRAPH CONTRACT (CHEFOO AND WEI-HAI-WEI).

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Agreement made the 23rd day of April, 1901, between His Majesty's Government and the Eastern Extension, Australasia and China Telegraph Company, Limited, for the provision and working of a Submarine Cable between Chefoo and Wei-hai-wei be approved.;" (Mr. Austen Chamberlain.)

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said the Agreement merited the attention of the House, and he should like to have some information regarding it. In the statement which had been circulated to Parliament it was stated that the need of telegraphic communication with Wei-hai-wei having become urgent, the Eastern Extension Company was approached as to the terms on which they would establish it. The whole matter appeared to have proceeded from the Government. In the report of the annual meeting of one of the two Companies concerned, namely, the Great Northern Company, commonly known as the Russo-Danish Company, it was stated that the company had arranged with the Chinese Telegraphic Administration and the Allied Governments for the submarine cables between certain ports, and had also met the special requirements of Great Britain, Germany, and Russia. In the document laid before Parliament it was stated that an Agreement was made to the effect that no other party was to be allowed without the consent of the "said parties," that is, the Eastern Extension Company and the Russo-Danish Company, to land cables on the coast of China or the islands belonging thereto or to work such cables, and the British Government bound themselves to use their best endeavours to secure the due observance and fulfilment of the terms and conditions of that Agreement. The effect appeared to him to be that the Government had bound themselves to the two companies mentioned to use their best endeavours to retain for them a monopoly of telegraphic communication with China. The practical point he wanted to put was that they knew that the policy of the Government of the United States was to enter into direct telegraphic communication with China, and the Agreement to which he had referred seemed to bind the British Government to support the two companies in resisting any attempt on the part of the United States to enter into cable communication with China. It seemed to him to be in accordance with the interests of this country that the Government of the United States should start their own cables, as in view of a possible war it would be of the greatest advantage to have a neutral Government like the United States able to supply fresh lines of communication. He should be glad to have some explanation from the Government on the matter.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.) said that the position in which the Government found themselves was that they were anxious to have the cable constructed as soon as possible. There were reasons making it desirable to have it at the earliest possible moment. They found that the Chinese Administration had already pledged themselves under a previous Agreement to give no landing rights to any companies except the Russo-Danish Company and the Eastern Extension Company. Those two companies were for the purpose of the British Government one company, because they were working in common. Therefore, it was only to them they could look for the construction of the cable, and they were obliged in the circumstances to make the best terms they could, and he thought the terms they did make were very satisfactory. The right hon. Baronet referred to the parties to the Agreement as being the two cable companies; but he thought the right hon. Baronet misapprehended the matter. The parties were on one side the Chinese Administration, and on the other the two cable companies. The companies were already in possession of the Agreement, and part of the conditions put before the British Government was that they should use their influence to maintain the rights which the companies already possessed, and to secure them for a period of thirty years, which period the companies obtained in their Agreement with the Chinese administration. Question put, and agreed to.

Adjourned at twenty-eight minutes before One of the clock.