

<https://api.parliament.uk/historic-hansard/sittings/1901/mar/23>

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Saturday, 23rd March, 1901.

The House met at Twelve of the clock.

BERWICKSHIRE COUNTY TOWN BILL [LORDS].

Order [22nd March] referring the Bill to the Examiners read, and discharged.

Bill to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 117.]

PETITIONS.

BEER BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Lolworth; Carlton; Swavesey; Great Bradley; West Wickham; Stetehworth; Horse-heath; Great Wratting; St. Ives; Haverhill; Little Bradley; Isleham; Warrington; Wickham brook; Cambridge; and Salop; to lie upon the Table.

COAL MINES (EMPLOYMENT) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Hornthorpes; Southgate; Barlborough; and Whitehaven; to lie upon the Table.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (HIGHER GRADE AND EVENING CONTINUATION SCHOOLS).

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

INHABITED HOUSE DUTY AND INCOME TAX.

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

MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Tipton; Whitehaven; Hornthorpes; Barlborough; Southgate; and Whitwell; to lie upon the Table.

PARLIAMENTARY FRANCHISE.

Petitions for extension to women, from Motherwell; Bloomsbury and other places; Personal Rights Association; and Llanfairnantgwyn; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Walsingham; and Wells (Norfolk); to lie upon, the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Heckmondwike (two); Morecambe (four); Bromley (five); Skerton; Iping; Galgate; Caerwys (three); Higher Broughton; Wigan (three); Atherton; Great Lever (two); Little Lever; Bolton (two); (Glasgow; Manchester; Ruabon; Brymbo; Edgworth (two); Aspull; Swinton (two); Llangoed; Edinburgh; Bodedern; Cardiff; West Ham (four); Llangefni; Holborn; Lancaster (seven); Eccles (two); Llandefan; Llandegfan; Llanerehymedd; Brockley; Sydenham; Birstall (two); Liversedge (two); Bedfordshire; Sunderland; Halton; Sunningdale; Tullyallan; Beckenham; Widmore; Stirling; St. (riles; Atherington; Wealdstone; Harrow Weald; Tweedmouth; Plaistow; Tynemouth; Wincanton; Liverpool (three); East London; Ilkeston; New Hirst; St. George's-in-the-East (two); Sheffield (twenty-two); Peckham; Dumbarton; Littleborough; Macclesfield; Upholland; and Eccleshall Bierlow; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Glasgow; Stirling; Lanark; Aberdeen; Lochmaben; Dumfries; Maxwelltown; Traquair; Aberfeldy; Lochans; Earlston; Shettleston;

Beith; Edinburgh (three); Dunoon; and Jedbergh; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

AMERICAN MAIL SERVICE.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 25th February; Sir John Leng]; to lie upon the Table.

SUPERANNUATIONS.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 16th March, 1901, declaring that for the due and efficient discharge of the duties of the office of Junior Inspector (Science and Art) in the Department of Agriculture, etc., in Ireland, Professional or other peculiar qualifications not ordinarily to be acquired in the Public Service are requisite [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

COMMITTALS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Returns from Clerks of the Crown and Peace of the number of persons Committed for Trial in the year 1900 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR; PEACE NEGOTIATIONS WITH GENERAL BOTHA.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Papers issued relating to the negotiations between Commandant Botha and Lord Kitchener contain all the information that has been received by His Majesty's Government as to the attitude of Commandant Botha throughout the negotiations; whether any specific objections were made by Commandant Botha to any of Lord Kitchener's terms: and, if so, what were their nature; and, whether any counter proposals were made by Commandant Botha; and, if so, in what terms.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): No specific objections were, so far as we know, made by Commandant Botha to any of Lord Kitchener's terms, and no counter proposals were made by Commandant Botha. As regards the first question, the only information which we have, besides what has already been published, was contained in a private telegram of Lord Kitchener in which he stated that in addition to the other matters which appeared on the Papers Commandant Botha had taken objection to Sir Alfred Milner.

MR. JOHN ELLIS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War when the Telegram No. 4 in the Papers relating to recent negotiations between Commandant Botha and Lord Kitchener was received at the War Office; and whether any communication was made to Lord Kitchener between its receipt and the despatch of the Telegram No. 6 from the Secretary of State for the Colonies to Sir A. Milner; and, if so, what were the terms of such communication.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): The Telegram No. 4 from Lord Kitchener to me dated Pretoria, 1st March, 2.20 p.m., was not received till 4th March, owing to a mistake in South Africa. The only communication made to Lord Kitchener on this subject after despatch of Lord Kitchener's telegram, 1st March, and before 6th March, was a telegram from me asking Lord Kitchener what had delayed his account of the interview.

*MR. CORRIE GRANT (Warwickshire, Rugby): May I ask a question of the right hon.

Gentleman as to letter No. 10. If he cannot tell me off-hand I will put down a question. March 20th is the date it purports to have been sent by Lord Kitchener to Mr. Brodrick, and I want to ask the date when that letter was sent by Lord Kitchener to Commandant Botha.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I have not got the Papers here, but if the hon. Member will put the question down for Monday, I will then give him the date.

MAFEKING SIEGETHEFT OF GOVERNMENT FOOD-STUFFS.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL (Armagh, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that Staff Sergeant-Major J. S. Loney who, during the siege of Mafeking, was tried by court-martial, pleaded guilty to the theft of Government food-stuffs, was sentenced to reduction, discharge with ignominy, and five years penal servitude; that, during the final attack on Mafeking, Loney was released and took a gallant part in its defence; and that he is at present serving his time at Portland; and whether, having regard to these facts and also to the fact that before joining Baden-Powell Loney was a warrant officer with an excellent character and fifteen years service, during ten of which he had no entry against him, a mitigation of the sentence may be granted.

MR. BRODRICK: This question only appeared on the Paper this morning, and I have not had time to look into the facts.

GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY COM-PANY OF IRELAND;STRABANE COMPLAINT.

MR. O'DOIIERTY (Donegal, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can state the cause of the delay in bringing to trial the complaint lodged by the Strabane (county Tyrone) merchants against the Great Northern Railway Company, Ireland; when this cause was first instituted; and when will the railway commissioners adjudicate on the complaint filed.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): I assume that it is for the parties themselves to bring on the case for trial when it is ready. If the hon. Member will refer to the Report of the Railway and Canal Commissioners, dated 11th February this year, he will see that it was stated that the pleadings were not completed.

MR. O'DOHERTY: Will the right hon. Gentleman request the Agricultural Department to put in force Section 17 of the Act of 1897?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I have no control over the Agricultural Department.

SUSPECTED PLAGUE CASE AT SOUTHAMPTON.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he can give any information as to the reported case of plague at Southampton, and what measures are being taken to prevent the spread of the disease.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER. LONG, Bristol, S.): The case referred to is that of a Lascar who was one of the crew of the "Simla," and came under the observation of the ship's surgeon when the vessel was two days out from Cape Town. Though regarded with some suspicion the case was deemed not to be one of plague, and on arrival at Southampton the man was sent to hospital for the local abscess to be opened. This having been done, and matter from the abscess having been bacterioscopically examined, the case was ascertained to have been one of chronic plague. The man is now convalescent. An Inspector of the Local Government Board has visited Southampton, and he reports that all

necessary precautions have been taken by way of disinfection and for keeping under observation the various persons with whom the man had been associated during the voyage and afterwards.
BALLYBOFEY (DONEGAL);SUB-POSTMASTERSHIP.

MR. M'FADDEN (Donegal, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he can state the name of the person appointed Sub-Postmaster at Ballybofey. county Donegal, the salary attached to the office, and if the office is to be removed from the main street of the town to a lane-way, which would cause inconvenience to the public.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): The Sub-Postmaster's name is Samuel Caldwell. His salary is £;29) a year in addition to commission. The office is to be removed, but it is not anticipated that any inconvenience will result from the change.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY.

*MR. O'DOHERTY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will grant the Return on the Notice Paper for Monday with reference to the Royal Irish Constabulary.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY not being in his place,

*MR. O'DOHERTY asked that the question be put down for Wednesday next.

*MR. SPEAKER: It is not usual to put questions down for Wednesdays.

*Mr. O'DOHERTY: As I have already stated, I am only following the example set by the present occupants of the front bench in 1893, and I must insist on my questions appearing on Wednesday's Orders of the Day.

WEDNESDAY AND SATURDAY SIT-TINGS;PRACTICE AS TO QUESTIONS.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): May I ask, Mr. Speaker, if there is any rule which exempts Wednesdays and Saturdays from questions? We have looked into the precedents and find that on the 11th March, 1892, when right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite were in Opposition they put down questions which filled fourteen pages of Hansard in order to bring Ministers down to answer them.

*MR. SPEAKER: I am not aware that there has been any refusal at the Table to put a question for to-day.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: No, but Ministers are not here to answer some on the Paper to-day.

*MR. SPEAKER: In only one case, I believe. As regards Wednesdays, there is no Order of the House on the subject, but it is a general practice that questions shall not be put down for that day, and consequently Ministers are not expected to attend.

*MR. O'DOHERTY: In putting some questions which are on the Orders of to-day for next Wednesday I am only following the example of the present Secretary of State for India and other. right hon. Members now on the Treasury Bench who, on 11th March, 1893, being a Saturday sitting, had over fourteen pages of questions down for the Ministers who then formed Mr. Gladstone's administration in order to compel them to be in their places at the sitting of the House, and right hon. Gentlemen cannot now complain if they are beaten with the rod they themselves cut.

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

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

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1901–2.

A. Motion made, and question proposed, "That 118,625 men and boys be employed for the Sea and Coast Guard Services for the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, including 19,805 Royal Marines."

COMMANDER YOUNG (Berkshire, Wokingham) congratulated the Secretary to the Admiralty on his promise to use every effort to find out who was to blame for the delay in the shipbuilding programme. There had undoubtedly been great delay, and blame must attach to somebody; either the Admiralty or the contractors. He agreed with hon. Members who had declared that the amount of money put apart for shipbuilding was inadequate for the present year if we were to keep up the proportion which would enable our Fleet to meet two foreign fleets at sea. He did not go quite so far as the right hon. Baronet the Member for Forest of Dean, who held that our Fleet should be strong enough to hold its own against any three foreign fleets combined, but he believed that by the end of this year, when the money to be voted had been expended, we should not be in a position to meet even the combined fleets of two Great Powers at sea. We were especially deficient in battleships, only three of which were provided for in the Estimates, whereas we ought to be laying down twelve as compared with other nations.

He had to congratulate the hon. Gentleman also on his statement with regard to the Belleville boilers. The hon. Gentleman declared that the Admiralty would not bring the ships into the yards in order to remove the boilers, and probably most hon. Members would be satisfied by the remarks of the Member for South Antrim, that if proper stokers were employed we should be able to get good results from the ships with Belleville boilers, until the Admiralty could come to a conclusion as to which was the best boiler to adopt. There would have been a scare in the country if the Secretary to the Admiralty had not made his declaration last night. There was not the least doubt about it that for military purposes the water-tube boiler must be the boiler for the Navy in the future. We should not be able to blockade our enemies' ports in the same way as Nelson used to; we should instead keep our big battleships at convenient ports and maintain communication by means of wire and fast cruisers, which could be told off to watch the enemy. And it would consequently be necessary for our battleships to be able to raise steam at short notice, so as to go out and meet the enemy. He trusted and believed that the difficulties with regard to water-tube boilers would in due course be overcome.

He wished to ask the Admiralty to give serious consideration to the question raised by the hon. Members opposite with regard to the appointment of Roman Catholic chaplains to our flagships. While he could not support the Amendment that had been moved on Thursday, he certainly agreed with the principle embodied in it, namely, that there should be a Roman Catholic chaplain with every fleet. It might be argued that on many of our smaller ships it was impossible to carry

any chaplain at all. Well, he knew from experience the disadvantage of being without a chaplain, He had been a long time on small ships, and had to act as chaplain, and he was sorry to say he was a failure in that capacity: it was one of the instances where the "handy man" did not rise to the occasion. Complaint had been made by an hon. Member opposite that Roman Catholics in some of the ships anchored off the coast of Ireland had not been allowed to go ashore for religious ministrations. That probably was correct. But was not the refusal most likely due to the fact that the Naval Manœuvres were in progress, or that there was a fear that the men might fail to re-join their ships? He had seen men sent ashore on Sunday in very unsuitable weather. On board ships on that day it was customary to wear their best Sunday clothes, and when Roman Catholics and men of other denominations had to go ashore to obtain religious ministrations when it was blowing hard he very much doubted if the attendant circumstances put them in a proper frame of mind for listening to their chaplains. He could not see what objection there possibly could be to the appointment of Roman Catholic chaplains except one, and that was the difficulty of finding accommodation. But surely in our large battleships room could be found for one Roman Catholic chaplain, and he ventured to assert that if only a trial were made the difficulty as to accommodation would soon disappear.

The hon. and gallant Member for Great Yarmouth brought forward the other night the question of the education and training of naval officers. He agreed with every word uttered by the hon. and gallant Gentleman, and he certainly held that a strong Committee ought to be appointed to deal with the question. His opinion was that we took youngsters into the Navy at too old an age. Their general education should be paid more attention to. Classics need not be insisted upon so

much, but a knowledge of foreign languages, especially. French and German, and of international law, should be imparted to all our officers. The hon. and gallant Member had referred to the differences of opinion which existed among naval officers on this subject. Undoubtedly there were differences. Sir M. Culme-Seymour on the one hand, and Admiral Nicholson on the other, entertained entirely different opinions, and it was, therefore, desirable that a Committee should be formed as soon as possible to go into the whole question. What was necessary was that our officers should master the details of gunnery and be able to handle their ships; that they should understand torpedo work and submarine boats, and, if that were done, a great deal of theoretical teaching might be dispensed with.

He had a few words to say with regard to the status of warrant officer's. He could approach this question in an impartial spirit, because he represented what was practically an agricultural constituency, and his views, as well as those of his shipmates in the Navy, on that particular question would not carry much weight with his constituents. These warrant officers were, in his opinion, the backbone of the Service. He knew that the Secretary to the Admiralty was willing to do all he possibly could for them. He had shown that willingness in the past. but of course, occupying the position he now did, he could scarcely be expected to act right up to his declarations. Still, it might be hoped that he

would be able to carry out many of those reforms he had so eloquently urged on the floor of the House. His suggestion was that a chief warrant officer, after three years service, should be given the honorary rank of lieutenant, and he believed that if that were done the effect would be to attract a better class of youngsters into the Navy, because they would realise that, after eighteen or twenty years service, they would get a chance of promotion to commissioned rank. He was of opinion also that it would be a good thing for the Navy if some of the junior warrant officers were promoted to the rank of lieutenant and put into ships to serve in that capacity. There were, he knew, great difficulties in the way of doing

that. But he believed they could be overcome if only admirals and captains of our Navy would recognise that in the young warrant officer there was good material, which justified raising him to the higher rank. These men should be picked out and sent to Greenwich, and should have opportunities afforded them of studying gunnery and torpedo practice. Such a policy would stimulate the wish of the parents to send their children into the Navy, and would thus do the Service great good. He had never heard any of his shipmates offer objection to such a proposal. There were other matters in regard to warrant officers upon which he proposed to speak when the Votes particularly affecting them were under consideration.

One other subject he should like to say a few words upon, and that was the question of the leave of officers. Officers who had been abroad a great number of years were only allowed, when they got home, a fortnight's leave for each whole year of service in, probably, some wretched climate. Now that was not sufficient, and he would urge that the period should be increased. But that was not the whole difficulty. It not infrequently happened that when an officer came home after three years foreign service, and started off on his six weeks leave, he was, at the end of a fortnight, appointed to another ship and at once sent out to a foreign station, thereby losing the month's leave to which he was entitled. He would ask that that leave should be allowed to stand to his credit when he came home from the next cruise, and added to the fresh leave which he had thereby earned.

He would like to ask further if it were not possible to make better arrangements for the watering of our battleships, both at home and abroad. Would it not be advisable that water tank ships should accompany a fleet, so that when the vessels came to anchor all the fires could be put out, and the engineers and stokers be given a free hand to devote their whole attention to the cleaning of the engines, instead of having to keep a certain number of boilers going for condensing purposes? There were other matters, especially in regard to naval engineers, upon which he hoped to say a few words upon some future occasion, but he would not now further detain the Committee.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick) said he had listened with great pleasure to the speech which had just been delivered. The hon. and gallant Gentleman had spoken about the disabilities of Roman Catholic seamen, and he hoped that the officials of the Admiralty would take cognisance of his remarks, based as they were upon practical experience. The time had arrived when the Admiralty should get rid of

the disabilities under which Roman Catholic sailors suffered, and should appoint at least one priest to every squadron. He wished to say a few words in regard to the claims of Ireland to enjoy some share of the expenditure of the Royal Navy. He came from a harbour which could shelter the whole British Navy; he referred to the Shannon. He was not proposing to put forward any claim on behalf of the Shannon for the establishment of a dockyard there, because he doubted if any practical good could result therefrom. But he did intend to advocate the claim of the fisheries of Ireland to be protected against poaching. It had often been reported that in various places on the Irish coast, and in the estuaries of the rivers, poaching was largely carried on, especially by French mackerel fishermen, and surely it was not asking too much that a sufficient number of small gunboats should be detailed to patrol the coast of Ireland, in order to put a stop to those illegal practices. During the past ten or twelve years the salmon and trout fisheries of Ireland had deteriorated very seriously, and the cause of the deterioration was undoubtedly the poaching carried on by steam and sailing trawlers and French mackerel fishermen. Was it not time that such a large, hardworking and deserving class of the community, such as the Irish fishermen undoubtedly were, had their interests protected as much as possible by the Navy, towards the maintenance of which Ireland undoubtedly paid more than its fair proportion. He hoped they would have some assurance from the representative of the Admiralty that that protection would be afforded, and that some gunboats, of which there were plenty, should be detailed to patrol the Irish coast. It could not be denied that that was a most reasonable suggestion.

MR. PENN (Lewisham) said he wished to congratulate his hon. friend on the appointment of a Committee to see whether the work of naval construction could in any way be accelerated. He understood that the hon. Gentleman had invited the contractors for both ships and engines to attend before the Committee, and to give it their views, so that it might be enabled to suggest to the Admiralty officials some mode by which the work could be pushed forward. He believed the result would be largely to get over the difficulty which now prevented our shipbuilding progressing so rapidly as in former years. It appeared to him that a somewhat false standard had been set up in regard to this matter of the construction of ships, on account of the racing against each other by certain dockyards. Although one ship might be turned out at great speed it was possible that other ships in the same dockyard were delayed for the purpose.

With regard to the Report of the Boilers Committee, there were many suggestions in it which appeared to him to be exceedingly valuable, and there was one point which he believed had not been touched upon by any previous speaker. The Committee recognised the possibility of a combination of boilers in the same ship. In many foreign navies, and notably the German, that combination already obtained. The Committee pointed out that it might be desirable to combine two types of water-tube boilers in the same vessel. That was a very valuable admission. Reference to the Report showed that the small tube boiler was not that very fragile or short-lived thing which it was supposed to be. The "Pelorus" was referred to in the Report of the Committee. It had been in

commission for three years, doing duty with the Channel Squadron. The "Pactolus," too, which was fitted with small tube boilers, was commissioned at Christmas, 1898, and, after serving one commission again resumed active duty with the Fleet after only a very slight overhaul. He believed it had been found that the small water-tube boilers in these vessels had given very satisfactory results, and that they were not so liable to trouble as boilers of the Belleville type, because the circulation was infinitely quicker and the risk of damage from deposits to the tube infinitely less. He saw that the Committee had recommended a trial of the Yarrow large tube boiler, and he certainly should watch with the greatest interest trials with boilers of this type. It had been suggested that the Admiralty should take out the Belleville boilers already fitted in His Majesty's ships, and replace them with cylindrical boilers. That appeared to him to be a very dangerous and retrograde policy, because in order to do that they would have to take up the decks and to interfere with machinery specially designed for working those boilers. The results obtained would inevitably be less satisfactory, and for this reason; the machinery was designed to carry steam at 250 lbs., and if they put in cylindrical boilers he very much doubted if they would be able to get them to run at that pressure. They would also find that the space occupied by the boilers would be so great that it would inevitably reduce the steaming value of the ship. He would suggest, as an alternative, that they substituted the small tube boiler for the Belleville type, instead of introducing the cylindrical type. This was a question, however, with which the Committee were thoroughly competent to deal. The Report which had been issued was only an interim report, and he believed that the final Report would be of the greatest possible value to the Navy. He had never been a friend of the Belleville boiler, but he had always held that some kind of water-tube boiler would have to be used in the future, and he believed that the Committee would be enabled to decide upon the best type.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick) said he had no intention of debating Belleville boilers, construction or discipline, but he desired to direct the attention of the Committee to certain points which affected Irish interests. Having some knowledge of and taking an interest in the fishing industries, he supported the view of the hon. Member for Limerick, and could substantiate his statements that the steam trawlers encroached within the legal bounds, interfering with spawning grounds and destroying young fish by the million. Gunboats for protection were placed around the coasts of England and Scotland, but although frequent applications were made, it was difficult, if not impossible, to obtain them for Ireland. He had made several applications, and asked questions regarding Dublin and Galway, but little practical result followed. In this connection, too, it might be useful for the Committee to know that it was also very hard sometimes to obtain the co-operation of the coastguards, who should be further utilised for the protection of fisheries around the Irish coast. But if gunboats could not be obtained for the protection of fisheries, they were available to assist evictions. Some years since a gunboat was sent to an eviction in the west of Ireland. She was wrecked upon the expedition; possibly a

just retribution, and a lesson to the Admiralty. He therefore hoped that no more gunboats would be employed at evictions, but that they would be obtainable for the protection of Irish fisheries. He entirely agreed with the hon. Member for Wokingham that Roman Catholic chaplains should be granted in the Navy. From every point of view the demand was reasonable, and its necessity obvious. But his main object in rising was to express the opinion of the Irish people upon the vital and important issue in this matter. Ireland was overtaxed, as the Report of the Financial Relations Commission proved, and as a member of the Irish Financial Reform League he was aware that a strong feeling existed amongst all sections of politicians on this over-taxation grievance. Part of this Irish taxation was levied to support the British Navy, which was used to defend this country, and to protect the British Mercantile Marine. Now, what were the functions of the British Mercantile Marine? They were to pour into Great Britain from all parts of the world food products, to enter into competition with Ireland, an agricultural country, under what is called free trade; which is really a policy of free imports; that is to say, Ireland is taxed to maintain competition with her products. He always argued that taxation was not in itself an evil, provided always it returned in some way to those who paid it: but in this instance the money was exported from Ireland, and never returned, through any channel whatever. English and Scotch Members could vote this money with a light heart, because it came back somehow to their respective countries, but Ireland was a notable exception. Let the Committee examine the facts. The proposed expenditure amounted to thirty-two millions, or a sum almost equal to that expended on the navies of France, Germany, and the United States. Of this thirty-two millions Ireland, under existing fiscal arrangements, would have to provide about three millions sterling. What were the Irish taxpayers to receive in return? Almost nothing. In the victualling and clothing department £2,390,000 were to be spent. How-much of it would go to Ireland? Very little, if any, money or contracts. If he was correctly informed, the pork contract was for Danish pork, and the beef contract for American beef, for the greater portion of the supplies. There were no biscuits supplied from Ireland, although Jacobs, in his own constituency, was one of the largest biscuit manufacturers in the three kingdoms. No clothing nor outfit of any kind whatever. No construction; Belfast and Londonderry were ignored. No repairs. Even from Haul-bowline ships were towed away to be repaired in the south of England. Some time since he asked questions about a disabled vessel which arrived at Queens-town, and almost foundered when being towed across the Channel. This was Admiralty practice in Ireland. He had been lately to Castletown, Berehaven, one of the finest harbours in the world, where the Fleet often anchors. Had there been any local expenditure? No, not as much as a boat-slip or pier was constructed. Fortifications had been dug out and guns concealed, but the work was done by the Army Sapper Corps, and the native residents were not much employed. As the Irish producers; manufacturers and labourers; were almost entirely excluded from this Naval Vote, he most emphatically was against this enormous and increasing expenditure, as opposed to Irish interests, because neither custom, nor money, nor labour came to Ireland. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman

would definitely reply to the points he had raised. In conclusion,. he suggested that at least three million pounds be expended during the current year in Ireland for produce and labour, as a recoup for the over-taxation extracted from an already impoverished country.

MR. PLATT-HIGGINS (Salford, N.) desired to call attention to the inadequate number and position of the engineering branch of the Navy. From the Memorandum just issued by the Admiralty, it appeared that they had this year appointed 287 additional officers, but of that number only twenty-one were engineer officers. The question arose; was that increase of twenty-one even adequate in proportion to the increase in horse-power? From a Return issued in 1898 it appeared that in 1888 the Admiralty complement of engineer officers was 662, but that was previous to the introduction of the water-tube boiler, and it might be considered that in that year the engineers had few duties connected with the stokehole. The indicated horsepower of the Navy to-day was about three times that of 1888, therefore three times as many engineer officers were required, but instead of there being 1,986 engineer officers, as there should be, we had only 962. a deficit of 1,000 according to the Admiralty standard of 1888 It might possibly be argued that the increase of horse-power did not necessarily imply a corresponding increase of engineer officers, but that contention was entirely upset by the introduction of the water-tube boilers, which placed a large amount of extra work upon the engineer officers.

The present complements of engineer officers were quite inadequate, as was shown on the trials of large cruisers, when it was found necessary to largely supplement them. Much the same thing might be said with regard to the stokers. He had ascertained that the number of stokers required to man the Navy on half-boiler power, according to the Admiralty scale, was 29,000 and what proportion did that scale bear to the number of stokers required in time of war? The "Formidable," with a complement of 143 stokers, had no fewer than 197 stokers on her trial trip, or an increase of 40 per cent., and the "Cressy," with a complement of 182, had 258 stokers on her trial trip. It almost seemed to show that 40 per cent. must be added to the Admiralty complement. He was sorry that the Admiralty seemed to be going backwards on even their present inadequate scale. For instance, although the "King Alfred" was a sister ship to the "Powerful," and had 5,000 horsepower more, yet the Admiralty complement was thirty stokers less than that of the "Powerful." He had said that the Navy required 29,000 stokers to man our ships for half-boiler power, but if we wished to bring them up to full power, and also to prepare for contingencies such as sickness, we must add 50 per cent., which would raise the 29,000 to 44,000 stokers, adequately to man our men-of-war in time of war. Allowing for the fact, that in times of peace only about three-fifths of our ships were in commission, we wanted 26,000 stokers for the ships in commission to-day. but we had only 21,000. Therefore, we were 1,000 officers and 5,000 stokers short. Why was there this dearth of engineer officers? It was not so much the want of money as that we could not get them. The position of the engineer officers was entirely inadequate. The Admiralty was reduced to the necessity of advertising in the engineering papers for temporary or emergency

officers who were of a far inferior standard to those who had passed through the course at Keyham, and this must be very injurious to the service. It had been said that other nations had this same difficulty in regard to reconciling the position of their engineer officers with the executive branch, but why should not this country be the first to obtain the advantages of recognising that the centre of gravity of a war ship was shifting from above deck to below deck, and that it is the man who keeps the ship in speed we must look after, therefore he hoped the Secretary to the Admiralty would see his way to a more adequate recognition of the position of the engineer officers.

*MR. FENWICK (Northumberland, Wansbeck) said it would be interesting to know when this cumulative expenditure on the Navy might be expected to cease. He was not interested in the question of water-tube boilers; his interest lay in some of the human machinery used in the Navy. He joined in the appeal that had just been made on behalf of the engineers and particularly of the men who manned our ships below the decks. He thought the two things which lay at the root of the difficulty of procuring engineers were

money and fair treatment. The Admiralty had considerable difficulty in attracting good engineers and artificers to the Navy for the reason that the Service was not made sufficiently attractive to induce artificers to join.

Engineer artificers were very intelligent and highly skilled artisans, and they had to pass a very severe examination as to their skill and physical fitness before they were accepted and enrolled in the Service. These men trained in the Navy would cost the country £200 per man before they reached the stage of efficiency attained by engine-room artificers when they entered the Navy. That was the sum which these men had spent upon their education before joining the Service, and what inducements were offered in the shape of pay? 5s. 6d. a day; That rate of pay was fixed eighteen years ago, and since that time the wages in private engineering shops had increased 15 or 20 per cent. He was of opinion that when the rate of pay was fixed it was fixed far below what ought to have been given, and it ought to be increased. If the rate of pay was increased the Navy would obtain all the men they required. With regard to increase in rank to that of a warrant officer, it seemed to him absurd that a man should be required to have reached thirty-five years of age as well as have ten years confirmed service to his credit before he was entitled to take his higher rating. Ten years service was sufficient without penalising a man by compelling him to wait until he was twenty-five years of age before he could commence to qualify. If that condition was removed younger and more efficient men would be attracted to the Navy, and that was what the Service required. He therefore recommended the abolition of the age limit and the retention only of the ten years confirmed service. The retiring pensions, also, were disproportionate to the wages earned by the artificers, and he hoped the hon. Gentleman would be able to see his way to make some concession in regard to that matter.

*THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.) thought that the view which had been expressed in the course of the discussion that the money for the Ship-

building Vote was not sufficient was hardly the view which the Committee would be inclined to take. He expressed his appreciation of the valuable services of the warrant officers, and said that they had no more ardent champions than the officers of the Navy. The hon. and gallant Member for Wokingham had said that the opinion of naval officers coincided with his own. Had there been unanimity of opinion among naval officers, the matter would have been dealt with long ago. It was because there was at present a difference among the superior officers of the Navy with regard to the way this question should be dealt with that there had not been any conclusion arrived at such as that suggested. It was not clear that any great boon would be conferred on the warrant officers by making it a condition that they should receive commissioned rank. There were many circumstances which differentiated the warrant officers from the quartermasters in the Army. The quartermaster was very often an elderly man with a wife and family, and he lived amid his own domestic surroundings. There was no similar opportunity for the warrant officer, who received his commission and had to take his place late in life in the ward-room, which was the sole social establishment on board a ship-of-war. They must look rather in the direction of supplying adequate inducements on shore for warrant officers of long service and tried capacity. Pledges had been given on this matter which must be carried out. A Committee was now considering the question, and he hoped that the inquiry would result in some advantages to the warrant officers. The whole subject was engaging the attention of the Admiralty.

Hon. Members from Ireland drew attention to the protection of the fisheries. It was not the case to say nothing was done for the protection of Irish fisheries. A torpedo gunboat, two steam cruisers, and two sailing cruisers were detached by the Admiralty for the purpose, and lately an arrangement had been made by the Irish Government to equip a special cruiser. The Admiralty did not pretend in any part of the United Kingdom to superintend the fisheries or to enforce the bye-laws of any local authority, but it did undertake to protect all fisheries of the United Kingdom as far as possible from any encroachment by foreign fishermen. Complaint had been made of the inadequacy of Admiralty expenditure in Ireland. The hon. Member for the St. Patrick Division of Dublin had alluded to the lack of expenditure for construction in Ireland. But the Admiralty was not to blame for any slackness in shipbuilding. The hon. Gentleman had suggested that facilities should be given for the building and repairing of ships in Ireland. If the Department should receive tenders from Galway or Derry to build a battleship for the Navy, he would undertake to see that the Admiralty afforded every chance of success. As a matter of fact, however, the amount of Admiralty expenditure in Ireland was underrated. Some years ago, he believed, the expenditure was estimated to amount to nearly half a million, and the expenditure at the present time must be larger. More had been done in the last few years to make Haul-bowline a well-equipped and effective dockyard than had been the case for many years past. The expenditure there had largely increased, and the personnel had increased likewise. But in addition to the increased expenditure there was a constant expenditure going on by reason of the visits of the Channel Fleet and the presence of another guardship on the Irish coast.

It was said that the Admiralty had been misinformed with reference to the engineer officers of the Navy, the engine-room artificers, and the stokers. He declared that there was no shortage in respect of engine-room artificers at the present time. He took full cognisance of the statements on this subject from the hon. Member for the Wansbeck Division. With regard to engineers, he had made himself acquainted with the discussions which had taken place at their representative institutions, and no one could read these discussions without feeling the difficulties of the question. It was a question which must engage the attention of the Admiralty. Only last year a concession was made to engineers in the Navy, and this he believed had been accepted as some amelioration of their position. He wished that requests on their behalf were put in a more definite form, it was asked that engineer officers should be given executive

rank, and with one exception this had not been found possible in any foreign Navy. That was not a reason against it, but it was an argument they had to consider. It was said that they must give executive authority to the engineers over their men. That proposal was based on a false analogy. It was suggested that an engineer officer could not punish the men under his command for breaches of discipline, but no more could a lieutenant in command of a turret. It was a standing rule in the Navy that no punishment could be inflicted until twenty-four hours after the offence had been committed, and it could only be inflicted by the captain of the ship or the officer he had deputed for the purpose. There was no injustice that he could see done to the engineer officer. With regard to the question of engineers being allowed to sit on courts-martial, his view was that if the Admiralty should see their way to agree to this proposal at any time it would be much wiser and more satisfactory to allow engineers to sit as naval officers, and not as engineers. Another point which he knew had engaged attention was the failure of a large number of engineers to reach the highest branch of the profession; that was to say, promotion of engineer officers to the higher grades must of necessity be arrested at a certain point short of executive command. He did not see how that difficulty was to be got over wholly. It had been got over in part. There had been a considerable addition made to the number in the higher ranks which engineers were capable of attaining. Whether that number could be increased he did not know. One great experiment was being made with regard to engineers, namely, in the United States. The idea was to enter all officers for deck service and for engine-room service indifferently, and to appoint them to either of these services. That was an experiment which would be most interesting and instructive. He was told that up to the present moment the experiment had not succeeded, and they might not get from that all the lessons they would have liked to get. The condition of things was not altogether satisfactory, and they ought to make an attempt to improve matters, for they

could not exaggerate the importance of the engineering branch of the Service. It was an importance which had greatly increased, and he believed anything that could be done to ameliorate the condition of the engineer officers consistently with the interests of the Navy ought to be done. He did not believe that the

full weight of criticism in this matter came from the engineers themselves. He did not find evidence of that. On the contrary, he found that there were very varied opinions, but, as he had stated before, this was a matter which ought to receive the consideration it deserved. If hon. Members would grapple a little more closely with the difficulties of the question, and would submit proposals not incompatible with the interests of the Service, such proposals would receive from the Board of Admiralty all the attention they deserved. All that had been said in reference to engine-room artificers and the question of qualifying age for warrant officers deserved careful consideration. It was not in his power to give any pledge, but the matter should be referred to the Board. In regard to pensions, he was fully sensible of the importance of the remarks made, and no opportunity should be lost for giving them full consideration.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.) suggested that at this point it might be convenient to the Committee to take Tote A. The general discussion might equally range over Vote 1.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) saw no convenience in this, and it might be that a specific Amendment might be raised on Vote 1.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR was quite ready to consult the general convenience, but it might be understood that at the end of the discussion the two Votes should be taken.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said that so far as the Irish Members were concerned they were only anxious to adopt whatever course would be most convenient. It seemed to him that a general discussion such as was now proceeding might be out of order on Vote 1 if a specific Amendment were moved. He suggested that it would be better to go on with Vote A until matters, of general interest had been disposed of.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport) said they all recognised the enormous advantage of having in the Secretary to the Admiralty a gentleman who had a thorough and comprehensive knowledge of every question brought up, and who was able to deal with it instantly and satisfactorily. That was a matter which they could fully appreciate. Whatever might have been the advantages in the past of having a round man in a square hole, they at all events on this occasion had the right man in the right place. The hon. Member had replied to some observations made by the hon. and gallant Member for the Wokingham Division in regard to the treatment of warrant officers. The hon. and gallant Member said that young men of the lower deck who showed special aptitude should be taken in hand then and there by the Admiralty and sent to Greenwich, and given every opportunity of training and education, so that they could have access to the commissioned ranks. Of course, hon. Members knew that the opportunity now came rather late. A man was married and had a family, and consequently it was very difficult for him to uphold the position. But it did seem wrong, in his judgment, that the whole of the lower deck of the Navy should be shut out from the opportunity of attaining the higher ranks of the Navy. They had heard in connection with the war in South Africa that the officers there had not proved what the country might have anticipated. A good many disasters had resulted from bad leading.

There had been social barriers interposed under which men in the lower ranks could not attain the higher. He was perfectly certain that the country would find sooner or later that it had made a serious mistake. The hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Admiralty had made one step forward when he recalled the numerous pledges in regard to the finding of positions for warrant officers given by both administrations extending over a period of ten years. He hoped these pledges would now bear fruit, and that in the hands of the Secretary to the Admiralty they would no longer have a long series of these pledges, but some practical proposal during the current year.

In regard to the engine-room complement, there had been some weighty and powerful speeches by gentlemen who prefaced their remarks with the observation that they were perfectly free and independent, and that they did not represent an interest, and so on. He thought the suggestion was that those who did represent the naval interests were supposed to be under some taint, and that they did not speak with absolutely free minds. He must absolutely deny the soft impeachment. Some hon. Members did represent these men, but they were just as much entitled to speak for them as an agricultural Member was to speak in favour of agriculturists. At all events, these Members were rather late in the field. His hon. friends and himself had been bringing forward these questions for the last nine years, and they were very glad to have the assistance of others, but nevertheless they recognised that it was their duty to bring these questions before the House on behalf of their constituents. He personally brought them forward because he took a great interest in all questions affecting the Navy. The Secretary to the Admiralty in his reply told them that there was no dearth of engine-room artificers, and that, indeed, last year the Admiralty had to stop recruiting. That seemed a strange thing when they considered that they had permanently reduced the engine-room complements, and that at the present moment they could not mobilise the Fleet for war. Two years ago, when they mobilised for the Manoeuvres, they had only one-third of the complement according to the mobilisation scheme, and they had to denude the harbour ships to find men to make up that one-third. It seemed strange to him that they were in such an unfortunate position. Whether that was so or not, certainly with regard to engine-room artificers there was a most woeful lack of skilled rating. The Admiralty, under Mr. Goschen, resorted to all sorts of expedients to get over the difficulty. He took offence at the fact that the trades unions of the country were boycotting the Navy because the Admiralty would not accord to the men the treatment which the trades unions said they were entitled to outside the Navy. The present Secretary to the Admiralty had been very fair, for he had recognised the

importance of those questions affecting the warrant officers, engine-room artificers, and engineers. He thought the hon. Member would find before long that it would be a cheaper operation to give these men a better status, both with regard to rank and pay, than they at present enjoyed.

During the nine years he had been in the House he had had the pleasure of voting for Roman Catholic chaplains in the Fleet.

With regard to the question of courts-martial, he pointed out that under Clause

58 of the Navy Discipline Act executive engineer officers were not entitled to sit on these courts, and he urged that it would only be fair if when a member of the engine-room staff was to be tried by court-martial one of his class should be on it. The present was a manifestly unfair arrangement, and he suggested that Clause 58 required alteration. He had a special reason to give why it should be altered. Pledges given in the House were supposed to count for something. When First Lord of the Admiralty the Secretary of State for India gave an absolute and definite pledge in this House in 1891 to Sir John Pope Hennessy, who brought the matter forward, that the arrangement should be altered. The noble Lord said the Naval Lords did not agree with him, but he thought it was right, and he promised that the concession should be made.

Last summer the Admiralty appointed a Departmental Committee to deal with the question of victualling for the Navy. He appeared before the Committee in July last and gave evidence, and he thought the time had now arrived when they should have some statement as to the outcome of the deliberations. Their complaint was that the variety of the food in the Navy was deficient. Nobody suggested for a moment that the quantity was deficient, because having illustrations of the good physique of the men of the Navy it was impossible to suggest that they were being starved. The food continued on the basis established a quarter of a century ago, and the standard of living in the country had enormously improved since then. The men were compelled, as it were, to supplement the dietary by making purchases in the canteen.

It was estimated that this represented a drain of 30s. a month on the pay of the men. They were served with dry bread and cheese, but no butter or milk, and they did not get preserves. It was a dietary altogether out of date. Another point raised was with regard to the meal hours. They were most antiquated and ludicrous ;breakfast was at eight o'clock, dinner at twelve, and what was called supper at four. That was the last meal a man got until the morning came round again. He knew there was an option exercised of making an additional issue under certain circumstances of half a pint of cocoa, but the system, was altogether wrong under which the last meal was at four o'clock in the afternoon. He did not want to go into too much detail on this question, because he hoped the hon. Member would give them some satisfaction as to what decision had been come to. He wished to say a word as to the management of the canteen. The canteen system was one of which the Admiralty took no particular cognisance. Food was put on board the ship, and the men were exploited right and left with high prices. Contractors got the business, but he could not see why the Admiralty should not carry on these canteens themselves, and sell articles at practically cost price. He suggested that the Admiralty should set up in various ports cold storage depots, so that there would be more fresh food served out to the Navy. These depots might be set up at Hong Kong, Malta, Esquimaux, and Sydney. These were coaling stations where the fleet congregated.

He was glad that the Admiralty were encouraging men who showed a special aptitude for gunnery, and that they were recognising the Marines on board ship. But he did not see why a marine should only be paid an additional 1d. per day for holding the same qualification which a seaman-gunner held, and for which he

got 3d. per day. It was most important that the gunners should have every encouragement. However good a ship might be, and however good the officers and crew to bring the ship within striking distance, the gunner had the last word. They knew what good sighting meant in the war between the Americans and the Spanish.

The Americans mowed the Spanish down because they had good gunners. He wished to know whether the pledge given by Mr. Goschen last year, that the whole question of labour should be taken into consideration, was in course of being carried out. The standard rate of pay in Government establishments was far below that prevailing in outside employment. At the time of the General Election the First Lord of the Treasury gave on behalf of his party a definite promise that fair wages would be paid to Government workmen. The question of pensions affecting chief petty officers and engine-room artificers had been referred to and the Secretary to the Admiralty said that all pensions were based on the rating held in the service, and that the men had not very much to complain about, as they were pensioned on their rating. That was what he should like him to inquire into, because an engine-room artificer held during the time he was serving the rating of chief petty officer, but when he went into retirement he was not pensioned on that rating at all. He was pensioned on a rating which he did not hold; that of first-class petty officer. It worked out in this way.

Although this was a skilled man, who came to them with his skill which did not cost the Admiralty anything, after having qualified himself at some other body's expense, and although they must give him a high rate of pay as a skilled artisan, they sent him out of the service in twenty-two years, or what not, and they gave him a pension altogether disproportionate to the rate of pay drawn when he was serving. The grievance with regard to the petty officers of the second branch was that they could not hold a higher rating and were pensioned at the lower rating. This was a question which had been discussed over and over again. Lord Charles Beresford made a rather inflammatory speech against the hesitation of the Admiralty to grant what was generally recognised throughout the whole Navy as a concession that ought to be made. The hon. Member hoped that now they would receive a more definite offer.

MR. FFRENCH (Wexford, S.) complained that the fishery off the coast of Wexford, which a few years ago was valuable and remunerative, had, owing to the incursions of steam trawlers from Bristol, Milford, and other places, been rendered almost worthless to the Wexford fishermen. Some time ago the names of the steam trawlers were actually secured and forwarded to the proper authorities, but the Government refused to prosecute on the ground that the captain and crews could not be identified. It would, however, have been a very easy matter, having obtained the name of the vessel, to find out the captain and crew. For three years he had repeatedly asked for a gunboat or a sloop-of-war to protect, not only the Wexford fishery, but the Irish fisheries generally, but he had always been told that none could be spared. Last year the Vice-President of the Board of Agriculture promised that as soon as the Board got into working order an armed vessel would be procured to patrol Irish waters. That had been done, and some months ago, when the steam trawlers again visited the Wexford

coast, the Vice-President sent a gunboat down and caught them in the act of piracy. Only a small grant of money was set apart for the Board of Agriculture, and it was not fair that out of that sum Ireland should have to equip this armed vessel, especially considering that Irishmen paid so much towards the maintenance of the Navy, from which they derived no benefit whatever. Ireland had no commerce or trade to protect. She once, had both, but England deprived her of them just as she did of her national Parliament. No doubt it was good policy from the English point of view to strengthen her First Line of defence to keep off foreign invaders. Ireland, however, feared no foreign invaders, as the country had been so impoverished that it would not be worth the while of any nation to take it. Englishmen used to sing, "We've got the ships, we've got the men, and we've got the money too." but now the tune had changed to, "We want the ships, we want the men, and we want the money too." If the Government wanted ships, men, and money, let them tax their own country and self-governing colonies, but not Ireland, which derived no benefit whatever from the expenditure.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.) reminded the Leader of the House that when he was at the Irish Office and a Bill was introduced dealing with steam trawling he induced the Irish Members to withdraw their opposition by an undertaking that ample provision would be made for the protection of the fisheries. They were given to understand that the Admiralty was prepared to back up the right hon. Gentleman's promise, but nothing satisfactory had been done. The hon. Gentleman in charge of the Vote had made out that a certain number of gunboats and cruisers had been placed at the disposal of the Irish Board of Agriculture.

*MR. ARNOLD- FORSTER: I said that five vessels were supplied by the Admiralty, and that a vessel has been recently supplied by the Admiralty for the protection of the fisheries, but outside the control of the Admiralty.

MR. POWER maintained that the funds at the disposal of the Board of Agriculture were very limited, and it was not fair that out of them this vessel should have to be equipped. The Government should supply more boats for the protection, of the Irish fisheries, as the coasts were absolutely infested by these steam trawlers, and owing to the laws being bye-laws instead of general laws damage was being done every day. The hon. Gentleman had given the go-by to the very important question of Catholic chaplains. The Catholic Bishop of Waterford had recently said that if no action was taken by the authorities he should think it his duty to use his influence with, the young men in that district to prevent them joining the Naval Reserve, and he would be perfectly justified in so doing. Out of the sum which was now asked for some £2,500,000 would fall upon Ireland, and what would Ireland gain in return in the shape of trade protection? They had very little trade to protect, because it was notorious that by various laws they took good care to crush the trade of Ireland generations ago. He thought some of the great battleships might be built in Ireland instead of simply sending there ships which required repairs.

There was one point to which he, particularly desired to call attention. All hon. Members acknowledged that more gunnery practice was required both in the

Army and the Navy. Along the coast of Ireland they had naval stations for their Reserve men, but they knew absolutely nothing of gun practice, although the Naval authorities recognised that this was a most important branch of the Service. He maintained that the most important thing they could do was to teach those Naval Reserve men how to handle a gun, and that could only be done by having targets at sea. In his locality no provision was made for getting out those targets properly, and they could only be used when the weather was calm, and when they did not move about. Such practice as that was very little use; and as they had plenty of southwesterly weather, under present circumstances it was impossible to have gun practice during a good many months. If they provided a small boat-slip at Tramore continual practice could be provided, and he hoped the hon. Gentleman would have a Report made as to whether this could be done, and what the cost would be. Some few years ago the Admiralty decided that they did not think this was necessary, but the number of men in training there had increased very largely since, and they could not have proper practice unless some better accommodation was made. He hoped the hon. Gentleman would consult his own Naval authorities on this subject, for he felt that they would bear him out that what he had suggested was absolutely necessary. A very small expenditure in this direction would enable the Reserves to be drilled properly, whereas under the present condition of things matters were so bad that they could not even launch a boat to put up their target unless the weather was absolutely calm. He commended this suggestion to the favourable consideration of the Admiralty, and he

AYES.

Acland- Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F

Bond, Edward

Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-

Corbett, A. Cameron(Glasgow)

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Bull, William James

Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Bullard, Sir Harry

Cox, Irwin Edw. Bainbridge

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.

Cranborne, Viscount

Austin, Sir John

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

Cripps, Charles Alfred

Bailey, James (Walworth)

Cavendish, V.C.W (Derbyshire

Dewar, T. R. (T'rH'mletsS.Geo.

Bain, Colonel James Robert

Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Baird, John George Alexander
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J(Birm.
Dixon-Poynder, Sir John P.
Balcarres, Lord
Chamberlain, J. Austen(Worc'r
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph C.
Baldwin, Alfred
Chapman, Edward
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F.Dixon
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Charrington, Spencer
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Duke, Henry Edward
Banbury, Frederick George
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Bartley, George C. T.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Bathurst, Hon. Allen B.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn 'Edwd.
Beach, Rt Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)
Colomb, Sir J. Charles Ready
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Man'r
Bignold, Arthur
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst

ventured to say that his claim was a very reasonable one.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I beg to move. "That the Question be now put."

AN HON. MEMBER: Why not sit on till Sunday?

MR. JOHN REDMOND: This is not the way to facilitate business.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): On a point of order, I desire to ask whether your attention was called to the fact that before the closure was accepted by you, Mr. Lowther, five or six English Members on the opposite side of the House rose to speak.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY (Yorkshire. Shipley): On a point of order. Mr. Lowther, I wish to say that that is not so.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: On a point of order I ask, with great respect, whether it is in order for an hon. Gentleman opposite to flatly contradict the statement which I made, when it is within the knowledge of every hon. Member on this side of the House that at least four hon. Gentlemen on the other side rose to speak,

including the hon. Member for Great Yarmouth?

*THE CHAIRMAN: I think the denial of the hon. Member might have been couched in more polite language, but I do not think it is unparliamentary to say, "That is not so."

MR. GILHOOLY (Cork Co., W.): Allow me to say that several English Members rose. Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 180;

Noes, 94. (Division List No. 91.)

Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne

Kimber, Henry

Powell, Sir Francis Sharp

Fisher, William Hayes

Knowles, Lees

Pretyman, Ernest George

FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose-

Lawson, John Grant

Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward

Fitzroy, Hon. Edw. Algernon

Lecky, Rt. Hn William Edw. H.

Purvi, Robert

Flannery, Sir Fortescue

Lee, A. H. (Hants, Fareham)

Pym, C. Guy

Fletcher, Sir Henry

Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage

Rasch, Major Frederic Carne

Flower, Ernest

Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie

Remnant, James Farquharson

Garfit, William

Leighton, Stanley

Renwick, George

Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon

Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.

Ridley, S. F. (Bethnal Green)

Goschen, Hn. George Joachim

Long, Rt Hn Walter (Bristol, S.)

Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye

Goulding, Edward Alfred

Loyd, Archie Kirkman

Ropner, Colonel Robert

Graham, Henry Robert

Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsm'th)

Royds, Clement Molyneux

Green, Walford D (Wednesbury)

Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison

Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Greene, Sir E W (B'rySEdm'nda
Macdona, John Cumming
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Grenfell, William Henry
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Shaw-Stewart, M. H (Renfrew)
Hain, Edward
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Mid'x)
Majendie, James A. H.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D.(Strand)
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robt. Wm.
Malcolm, Ian
Stanley, Hon. A. (Ormskirk)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart
Harris, F.Leverton (Tynem'th)
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H E (W'igton
Stroyan, John
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Maxwell, W.J. (Dumfriesshire)
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley)
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.)
Milton, Viscount
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Henderson, Alexander
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw Murray
Higginbottom, S. W.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampsd.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Valentia, Viscount
Hoare, Sir Samuel (Norwich)
More, Robert J. (Shropshire)
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H. (Sh'ffi'd)
Hobhouse, Hy. (Somerset, E.)
Morrison, James Archibald
Walker, Col. William Hall

Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford)
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.
Horner, Frederick William
Mount, William Arthur
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Howard, Capt. J (Kent, Faversham)
Murray, Rt Hon A Graham (Bute)
Welby, Lt.-Col. A.C.E (Taunton)
Howard, J. (Mid., Tottenham)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Welby, Sir C. G. E. (Notts.)
Hozier, Hon. James Hy. Cecil
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Nicholson, William Graham
Williams, Rt Hon J. Powell (Bir.)
Hughes, Colonel Edwin
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Wodehouse, Rt. Hon. E. R. (Bath)
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B. Stuart-
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Jessel, Cap. Herbert Merton
Pemberton, John S. G.
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Penn, John
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Pierpoint, Robert
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Keswick, William
Plummer, Walter R.
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Harmsworth, R. Leicester

O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
Asher, Alexander
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Malley, William
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Hayne, Rt. Hon.Charles Seale-
O'Mara, James
Black, Alexander William
Jacoby, James Alfred
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Blake, Edward
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
O'Shee, James John
Burke, E. Haviland-
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Burns, John
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Price, Robert John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Joyce, Michael
Rea, Russell
Caldwell, James
Kearley, Hudson E.
Reckitt, Harold James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Kennedy, Patrick James
Reddy, M.
Carew, James Laurence
Lambert, George
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Redmond, William (Clare)
Clancy, John Joseph
Leamy, Edmund
Rigg, Richard
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Crean, Eugene
Leng, Sir John
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Cullinan, J.
Lundon, W.
Shipman, Dr. John G.

Daly, James
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
M'Dermott, Patrick
Soares, Ernest J.
Davies, M.Vaughan-(Cardigan)
M'Fadden, Edward
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C R (Northants)
Donelan, Captain A.
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Strachey, Edward
Doogan, P. C.
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Sullivan, Donal
Duffy, William J.
Markham, Arthur Basil
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Emmott, Alfred
Murphy, J.
Thompson, E. C. (Monaghan, N.)
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Ure, Alexander
Fenwick, Charles
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Warner, Thos. Courtenay T.
Ffrench, Peter
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Field, William
O'Brien, Kendal (TipperaryMd)
Wodehouse, Hn. Armine (Essex)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
O'Brien, Patrick (Ki kenny)
Yoxall, James Henry
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
Foster, Sir W. (Derby Co.)
O'Doherty, William
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;Mr. Edward Morton and Mr. Tennant.
Furness, Sir Christopher
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Gilhooly, James
O'Dowd, John
Hammond, John

O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)

Question put accordingly, "That 118,625 men and boys be employed for the Sea and Coast Guard Services for the year ending on the 31st day of March,
AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Flannery, Sir Fortescue

Majendie, James A. H.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Fletcher, Sir Henry

Malcolm, Ian

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Flower, Ernest

Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Foster, Sir W. (Derby Co.)

Markham, Arthur Basil

Asher, Alexander

Furness, Sir Christopher

Martin, Richard Biddulph

Ashton, Thomas Gair

Garfit, William

Maxwell, Rt Hon Sir H. E (Wigt'n

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon

Maxwell, WJH (Dumfriesshire)

Austin, Sir John

Goschen, Hon. George Joachim

Melville, Beresford Valentine

Bailey, James (Walworth)

Goulding, Edward Alfred

Molesworth, Sir Lewis

Bain, Colonel James Robert

Graham, Henry Robert

Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)

Baird, John Geo. Alexander

Green, Walford D (Wednesbury)

Moon, Edward Robert Pacy

Balcarres, Lord

Greene, Sir EW (B'ryS Edmind's

More, R. Jasper (Shropshire)

Baldwin, Alfred

Grenfell, William Henry

Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.

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

Guthrie, Walter Murray

Morrison, James Archibald

Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds)
Hain, Edward
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford)
Banbury, Frederick George
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. L'dG (Midd'x)
Morton, Ed. J. C. (Devonport)
Bartley, George C. T.
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Mount, William Arthur
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Ben.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute)
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H (Bristol)
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Bignold, Arthur
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Nicholson, William Graham
Black, Alexander William
Hayne, Rt. Hon. C. Seale-
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Bond, Edward
Heath, Arth. Howard (Hanley)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Heath, James (Staffords, N.W.)
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Bull, William James
Henderson, Alexander
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Bullard, Sir Harry
Higginbottom, S. W.
Pemberton, John S. G.
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Hoare, Ed. Brodie (Hampstead)
Penn, John
Caldwell, James
Hoare, Sir Samuel (Norwich)
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Hobhouse, H. (Somerset, E.)
Plummer, Walter R.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)

Hope, J. F (Sheffield, Brightside
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Horner, Frederick William
Pretymann, Ernest George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Howard, Capt. J. (KentFaversham)
Price, Robert John
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J.(Birm.)
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r)
Hozier, Hon. James H. Cecil
Purvis, Robert
Chapman, Edward
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Pym, C. Guy
Charrington, Spencer
Hughes, Colonel Edwin
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Rea, Russell
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Reckitt, Harold James
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Remnant, James Farquharson
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Renwick, George
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Ridley, S. F. (Bethnal Green)
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Rigg, Richard
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Corbett, A. C. (Glasgow)
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Kearley, Hudson E.

Royds, Clement Molyneux
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Cranborne, Viscount
Kenyon-Slaney. Col. W. (Salop)
Samuel, H. S. (Limehouse)
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Keswick, William
Seely, Charles Hulton(Lincoln)
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Kimber, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Davies, M.Vaughan-(Cardigan
Knowles, Lees
Shaw Stewart, M.H.(Renfrew)
Dewar, T.R.(T'rH'mlets,SGeo.)
Lambert, George
Shipman, Dr. John.
Dickson, Charles Scott
Lawson, John Grant
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh.)
Dickson- Poynder, Sir John P.
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Dimsdale, Sir J. Cockfield
Lecky, Rt. Hon. Wm. Edw.H.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred. D.
Lee, A. H. (Hants, Fareh'm)
Soares, Ernest J.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R (Northants.)
Duke, Henry Edward
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Egerton, Hon. A.de Tatton
Leighton, Stanley
Strachey, Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Leng, Sir John
Stroyan, John

Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
 Lock wood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
 Strutt, Hon, Charles Hedley
 Fenwick, Charles
 Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol,S
 Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
 Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r)
 Loyd, Archie Kirkman
 Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
 Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
 Lucas, Reginald J (Portsmouth)
 Tennant, Harold John
 Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
 Macartney, Rt Hn W.G. Ellison
 Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
 Fisher, William Haves
 Macdona, John Cumming
 Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
 FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
 M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
 Tritton, Charles Ernest
 Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
 M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
 Ure, Alexander
 1902, including 19,805 Royal Marines."
 The Committee divided:;Ayes, 224; Noes, 54. (Division List No. 92.)
 Valentia, Viscount
 White, Luke (York, E.R.)
 Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
 Vincent, Col Sir CEH. (Sheffield
 Whitmore, Charles Algernon
 Yerburch, Robert Armstrong
 Walker, Col. William Holl
 Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(Br'm
 Yoxall, James Henry
 Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.
 Wodehouse, Hn. Armine (Essex
 Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
 Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R (Bath)
 TELLERS FOR THE AYES;Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
 Wason, John C. (Orkney)
 Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
 Welby, Lt.-Col. ACE (Taunton
 Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
 Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.)
 Wrightson, Sir Thomas

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)

Gilhooly, James

O'Doherty, William

Blake, Edward

Hammond, John

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

Boyle, James

Hayden, John Patrick

O'Dowd, John

Burke, E. Haviland-

Jameson, Major J. Eustace

O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)

Burns, John

Joyce, Michael

O'Kelly, James (Roscommon N.

Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)

Kennedy, Patrick James

O'Malley, William

Carew, James Laurence

Leamy, Edmund

O'Mara, James

Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton

Lundon, W.

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.

Clancy, John Joseph

MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.

O'Shee, James John

Condon, Thomas Joseph

M'Dermott, Patrick

Power, Patrick Joseph

Crean, Eugene

M'Fadden, Edward

Reddy, M.

Cullinan, J.

M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)

Redmond, John E. (Waterford)

Daly, James

Murphy, J.

Redmond, William (Clare)

Doogan, P. C.

Nannetti, Joseph P.

Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)

Duffy, William J.

Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)

Sullivan, Donal

Ffrench, Peter

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

Thompson, E. C. (Monaghan, N.)

Field, William

O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.

Flavin, Michael Joseph

O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)

Flynn, James Christopher

O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)

1. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £5,760,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expenses of Wages, etc. to Officers, Seamen and Boys, Coast Guard, and Royal Marines, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902."

MR. E. J. C. MORTON (Devonport) said there was a matter which had already been dealt with;

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: On a point of order, I should like to put a question. Do we understand that the general discussion is being continued on this Vote?

*THE CHAIRMAN: The general discussion taken on Vote A. cannot be continued on Vote 1.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Surely it is within your recollection, Mr. Lowther, and within the recollection of everybody in the House who was here earlier in the afternoon, that at the time the First Lord of the Treasury asked us to let Vote A pass to come to Vote 1 on the ground that we could have a general discussion on Vote 1, when I suggested that that might possibly not be in order the First Lord of the Treasury shook his head, and from your silence, Mr. Lowther, we were all under the impression that a general discussion could take place on Vote 1. I may be allowed to point out that there are remain-

ing one or two small questions; one of which was raised by almost the last speaker; which have received no answer at all.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: What subject? Was it about trawling?

MR. JOHN REDMOND: No, I refer to the question of accommodation at Tramore, in the county of Waterford. As I stated earlier in the afternoon, there is not the slightest desire on these Votes to have anything in the nature of illegitimate or improper discussion. I may say that on this Vote we had determined that five or ten minutes longer would have enabled us to have concluded the discussion on the Vote. If the right hon. Gentleman had not been so precipitate in moving to cut short the debate I think it would have been better from his own point of view, for he would not have imported the heat which he has done into this matter, and he certainly would have ensured that the sitting would not have been indefinitely prolonged. If, contrary to the universal understanding arrived at earlier in the afternoon, we are now to be shut out from the discussion of main topics, so far from facilitating the progress of business, the illegitimate use of the closure will urge every hon. Member on these benches to throw every obstacle in the way.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I understand that the hon. Member for Waterford was

asking me a question. In reply to the question, certainly it is always possible by agreement between the two sides of the House, with the Chairman giving his consent, to arrange that a discussion shall be taken upon a particular Vote which otherwise might not be in order. I would point out, however, that when the First Lord of the Treasury made that suggestion it was refused by the hon. Member for Dundee sitting on the Front Opposition Bench. As it was refused, and as I was not asked to give my consent, I had no consent to give, and I have, therefore, to follow the ordinary rules of the House.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: As you have referred to my action, Mr. Lowther, I wish to say that if the general discussion is not to be continued on Vote 1, I do not see what is to be gained by this change.

MR. KEARLEY said he understood that the hon. Gentleman would not be permitted to reply on the various subjects which had been raised. The hon. Member in charge of the Vote had given his reply after one and a half hour's discussion. Was it to be understood now that they could have no reply given to the various questions which they had raised, upon the only opportunity which they had had of raising them?

*THE CHAIRMAN: Strictly speaking, any hon. Member who addresses the Committee on this Vote must make his speech relevant to this Vote, but possibly under the circumstances the House would allow the hon. Member in charge of this Vote to reply to the questions which have been raised.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Does your ruling amount to this; that no further questions of general interest can be raised?

*THE CHAIRMAN: "General interest" opens up rather a big question. I should much rather prefer to rule on each point as it arises. This Vote is a big one, and covers a great deal of ground, and it is possible to bring in a good many subjects within the purview of this Vote. I would rather decide on each particular question as it arises.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I will mention one specific question which has already been touched upon in the general discussion, and which has not been answered adequately by the Government; I refer to the question of providing further facilities, from the Admiralty point of view, of boat stages or piers in certain parts of Ireland. Should I be entitled now to continue that discussion?

*THE CHAIRMAN: I think that would come very properly under works and buildings.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: That is a subject which was in order on Vote A, but is not in order on Vote 1. Therefore I beg to move, Mr. Lowther, that you now report progress, and I do so for the purpose of calling attention to what has occurred. I think the Secretary to the Admiralty, as far as he had the opportunity of doing so, answered the questions put to him in a very fair way. I think the Secretary to the Admiralty will admit that it is an unreasonable thing, especially after what occurred earlier in the afternoon, to deprive us of this opportunity of raising this and similar questions. If, as I said before, we had been permitted to continue this discussion for a quarter of an hour longer, the hon. Gentleman no doubt would have answered the point raised by the hon. Member for East Waterford, and he could have disposed of it in a few sentences. No doubt they would have been of a sympathetic character. By the operation of this

rule, which has been brought into play by the Leader of the House, who was not present during the discussion;

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Permit me to say that I was present.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Then, Sir, if the right hon. Gentleman was present, he deliberately moved the closure to prevent his hon. friend next to him from giving an answer. The right hon. Gentleman will gain nothing by this. Such conduct is absurd and childish, and if he desires to get his Estimates; through he should take advantage of the conciliatory spirit shown to him earlier in the afternoon. There was not the slightest intention of prolonging this discussion up to half an hour ago, and everyone present knows that our contributions to this debate were reasonable and to the point, and the proof of this is to be found in the fact that every one of the questions asked met with a sympathetic answer from the Secretary to the Admiralty. The last point mentioned has not met with that sympathetic consideration, because his mouth has been closed by the moving of the closure. It is not only Members on this side of the House who have been closed by this motion, but also Members on the other side. The hon. Member for one of the Divisions of Yorkshire ought to apologise for the flat contradiction; such as I have often heard censured from the Chair; he gave to the statement that some Members rose on that side of the House when the First Lord of the Treasury moved the closure. The contradiction was wrong. Members sitting behind him as well as in front of him rose. The Government will see that in interrupting the amiable and reasonable course of the debate in the way the First Lord of the Treasury has done he is gaining nothing, and he is closing the mouths of hon. Members who wish to raise legitimate discussion. In order to mark the sense of the impropriety and utter unwisdom and stupidity of these proceedings, I beg to move that you now report progress.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again." (Mr. John Redmond.)

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Member has used many hard words, chiefly directed against me and the course I have adopted, his view being that without the closure we should have got on a little bit better. The hon. Member was not present in the House when I made an appeal to the Committee about half-past one o'clock. I was extremely anxious to come to some amicable arrangement; [Mr. JOHN REDMOND: So was I]; and I am quite sure I said nothing that could injure the susceptibility of the most tender conscience. I then suggested that we should come to a distinct understanding that the debate on the Naval Estimates should finish at some reasonable hour.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: So it would.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: But the hon. Gentleman did not fall in with that suggestion.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: The right hon. Gentleman is unintentionally doing me an injustice. I told him so far as Members on this side of the House were concerned that we had no desire to unduly prolong the discussion, nor did we do so. As a matter of fact we had made up our mind to allow Vote A to come to a conclusion within a few minutes of the time the right hon. Gentleman moved the closure.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am always glad to have communications in a friendly spirit as to the course of business, but I could not in justice to the House allow the

discussion to drag on to what might have been an interminable length. I am not attacking hon. Gentlemen opposite, and I am not blaming them. I am only explaining why I, responsible in a measure for the conduct of business, and in no sense desirous of exercising any authority harshly over any section of the House, but having in view the general course of the debate, asked the Committee to conclude the discussion on Vote A and go on to Vote 1, surely not an unreasonable course. The hon. Gentleman said I did that for the purpose of preventing my hon. friend replying to a question put to him. But my hon. friend had no information, and could not have given a reply.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: He was asked to give an assurance that an inquiry should be made.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Of course my hon. friend will make an inquiry. There need be no anxiety on the part of the hon. Member for East Waterford or any of his hon. friends that because an assurance was not given by my hon. friend the matter will escape his attention. It will not escape his attention. I hope the Committee will now proceed with the remaining business.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: A suggestion made by yourself, Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago will relieve the Committee from this difficulty. If that suggestion is now acted on, I am sure my hon. friends will meet it in a reasonable spirit.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have no objection so far as I am concerned.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY: Perhaps as the hon. Member for Waterford has made a personal allusion to myself, I may be allowed to say a word. The allegation was that half a dozen Members on this side of the House had risen. I did not for a moment intend to be rude to the hon. Member for East Glare. What I did desire to indicate was that several hon. Members had matters which they desired to put before the Committee, but having regard to the urgency of business they did not rise to do so. I beg to assure the hon. Member that I had not the smallest intention of showing rudeness to him or to any of his colleagues.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I wish to be allowed to say that I accept fully the assurance of the hon. Gentleman. As a matter of personal explanation what occurred was this: When the closure was moved five or six English Members got up to speak. On my mentioning that fact the hon. Member said it was not true. I accept what he has now said, but I desire to say that I am in a position to prove that at least five, and I believe six, Members stood up. The hon. Member for Great Yarmouth, the hon. Member for Plymouth, two hon. Members sitting behind the hon. Gentleman, and the hon. Member for Devonport, making five, stood up. I am quite sure that the hon. Gentleman will refrain from accusing me of stating what is not true. I quite accept what he has said, and I merely wish to put myself straight with the Committee. I am prepared to fight for my principles, but I have never told lies.

MR. POWER said he acknowledged that he was intimidated to a certain extent by the presence of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House, and was not able to make his statement as clear as he would

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.

Condon, Thomas Joseph

Gilhooly, James
Blake, Edward
Crean, Eugene
Hammond, John
Boyle, James
Cullinan, J.
Hayden, John Patrick
Burke, E. Haviland-
Daly, James
Jacoby, James Alfred
Burns, John
Doogan, P. C.
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Caldwell, James
Duffy, William J.
Jones, David Brynmor (Swans'a
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Ffrench, Peter
Joyce, Michael
Carew, James Laurence
Field, William
Kennedy, Patrick James
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Lambert, George
Clancy, John Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Layland-Barratt, Francis.

have wished. He brought under the notice of the Admiralty two specific cases of local interest, and he certainly thought that his hon. friend in moving to report progress was quite within his right, because the matter would not have taken three minutes to explain. He thought the course taken by the right hon. Gentleman would only prolong the debate. The right hon. Gentleman had raised, the anger of hon. Members, and his tactics, far from facilitating business, would retard it. He ventured to corroborate the fact that several hon. Members had risen to continue the discussion when the closure was moved.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: My hon. friend is quite prepared to consider the matters referred to.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny) said he supported the motion that progress be reported for the reasons advanced by his hon. friend, and also for another reason. It was very extraordinary to him that hon. Members should be so very reluctant to give a Saturday afternoon to the service of the great Empire about which they boasted so much. His hon. friends were willing to stay, but evidently hon. Members opposite thought more of a Saturday to Monday in the country than of the Empire, and he thought it desirable that progress should be reported in order to enable them to catch their afternoon trains. He could not understand

why hon. Members were: reluctant to make a sacrifice. They went to great expense to get into the House, and when they got in their whole idea seemed to be to get out of it again. He hoped the motion would be accepted.

Question put.

The Committee divided:;Ayes 64; Noes, 218. (Division List No. 93.)

Leamy, Edmund

O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)

Redmond, John E. (Waterford)

Leigh, Sir Joseph

O'Connor, J. (Wicklow, W)

Redmond, William (Clare)

Lundon, W.

O'Doherty, William

Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)

MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.

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

Sullivan, Donal

M'Dermott, Patrick

O'Dowd, John

Thompson, E. C. (Monaghan, N.)

M'Fadden, Edward

O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)

Ure, Alexander

M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)

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

White, Luke (York, E. R.)

Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)

O'Malley, William

Yoxall, James Henry

Murphy, J.

O'Mara, James

Nannetti, Joseph P.

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.

Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)

O'Shee, James John

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

Power, Patrick Joseph

O'Brien, Kendal (Tipp'ry, Mid.)

Reddy, M.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Emmott, Alfred

Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward

Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Fenwick, Charles
Leighton, Stanley
Arnold-Former, Hugh O.
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r)
Lockwood, Lt-Col. A. R.
Asher, Alexander
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Long, Rt. Hn Walter (Bristol, S.)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Finlay, Sir Robt. Bannatyne
Loyd, Arthur Kirkman
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Fisher, William Hayes
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Austin, Sir John
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose-
Macartney, Rt Hn W.G. Ellison
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Macdona, John Cumming
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Maconochie, A. W.
Baird, John Geo. Alexander
Fletcher, Sir Henry
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Balcarres, Lord
Flower, Ernest
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Baldwin, Alfred
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Majendie, James A. H.
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Furness, Sir Christopher
Malcolm, Ian
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds)
Garfit, William
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Banbury, Frederick George
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Markham, Arthur Basil
Bartley, George C. T.
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Martin, Richard Biddulph

Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E (Wigt'n
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Graham, Henry Robert
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Green, Walford D. (Wednesb'y.
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Bignold, Arthur
Greene, Sir E W (B'ryS Edm'nds)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Bigwood, James
Grenfell, William Henry
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Bill, Charles
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Black, Alexander William
Hain, Edward
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Bond, Edward
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Middx
Morrison, James Archibald
Brown, Alex. H. (Shropshire)
Hanhury, Rt. Hon. Robt. Wm.
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford)
Bull, William James
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Mount, William Arthur
Bullard, Sir Harry
Harris, F.Leverton (Tynem'th.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Nicholson, William Graham
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbysh.)

Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Heath, James (Staffords., N. W.
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Henderson, Alexander
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Penn, John
Chapman, Edward
Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampst'd)
Pierpoint, Robert
Charrington, Spencer
Hoare, Sir Samuel (Norwich)
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Plummer, Walter R.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Hope J. F (Sheffield, Brightside)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Horner, Frederick William
Pretymann, Ernest George
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Howard, Capt. J. (Faversham)
Price, Robert John
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Purvis, Robert
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Pym, C. Guy
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Hughes, Colonel Edwin
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)
Rea, Russell
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse

Remnant, James Farquharson
Cranborne, Viscount
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Renwick, George
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Dewar, T. R (T'rH'mlets,S Geo.
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Rigg, Richard
Dickson, Charles Scott
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Kimber, Henry
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Duke, Henry Edward
Knowles, Lees
Sandys, Lieut.-Cl. Thos. Myles
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Lawson, John Grant
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart
Lecky, Rt. Hn. William Edw H.
Seton-Karr, Henry
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Lee, Arthur H (Hants, Fareham
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Welby, Sir Charles G.E. (Notts.
Shipman, Dr John G.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Sinclair, Capt. John(Forfarsh.)
Tennant, Harold John
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell (Birm)

Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
 Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
 Wodehouse, Hn Armine (Essex
 Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
 Thorburn, Sir Walter
 Wodehouse, Rt Hn. E. R. (Rath)
 Smith, Hon. W. F. D.(Scrander)
 Tollemache, Henry James
 Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
 Soares, Ernest J.
 Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
 Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
 Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants.)
 Tritton, Charles Ernest
 Wrightson, Sir Thomas
 Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk)
 Valentia, Viscount
 Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
 Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
 Walker, Col. William Hall
 Yerburch, Robert Armstrong
 Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
 Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.
 Strachey, Edward
 Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
 TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther
 Stroyan, John
 Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
 Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
 Welby, Lt.-Col. ACE (Taunton)
 Original Question again proposed.

MR. E. J. C. MORTON: I desire to refer to a matter which has been already referred to, but the point I wish to bring before the Committee has not previously been brought forward. The question I particularly wish to refer to is one which my hon. friend has already given a certain reply to, but the main question to which I desire to make allusion is the position of warrant officers in the British Navy. In connection with it, may I point out that in my opinion it has not been adequately brought before the Committee. Particularly at the commencement of a new Parliament, I may be allowed to bring forward certain considerations in regard to it, which have not been brought forward in this Parliament, although they have been in previous Parliaments. The point I want to make, and the emphasis I wish to lay on this question, is that it is not only a question mainly of justice to the warrant officers of the Service, it is not merely a question; although that is a wide way of looking at it; that affects the treatment of every rank and rating in the British Navy indirectly, but it is a question of supreme public importance. It is of great importance to the

efficiency of the Navy itself, and especially a question which concerns a subject which at any rate used to be regarded as the special constitutional duty of this House; namely, the economic administration of the finances of this country. I do not know whether hon. Members are aware of the fact that throughout the whole history of this country its naval strength has depended entirely on the personnel of the Navy. I believe there never was a naval war in which our ships in matters of construction have been superior to the ships of our enemy. We were ridiculously inferior at the time of the Armada, and even down to Trafalgar the best ships in the British Navy were ships taken from the French. The whole strength of the Navy throughout its history has depended on its personnel, and therefore it is a matter of supreme importance that we should regard personnel as the most important element in our Navy. I would like to ask the attention of the Committee to the fact that it takes twice as long to make a British seaman as to build a first-class battleship. It costs £300 from the moment you first catch the boy until he becomes an ordinary seaman, and even then you do not get the full value out of him that you expect. He begins as an ordinary seaman, after £300 has been expended on him, at an average age of about eighteen years, but you do not get the full value out of him until he becomes an able seaman, at about twenty-one. Then he serves seven years, and at the age of twenty-eight he has his first opportunity of leaving the Navy altogether, or he can re-engage for another ten years. It must be obvious to the Committee that the second ten years are of the greatest value. They are the best years of the man's life, and he is fully competent. Now what happens? From twenty-eight to about thirty-one he has the opportunity of reaching the highest rating open to him; namely, that of warrant officer. He then has to go on for twenty years before he gets the opportunity of a rise at all, and then in a very few cases he becomes what is popularly known as a chief; chief warrant officer, chief gunner, or chief carpenter. He has then a few years of commissioned rank, and he retires with the honorary rank of lieutenant. But practically, with the exception of these very few cases, all men at the age of from twenty-eight to thirty-one find a brick wall across their career, and they have got no further opportunity of advancing. Contrast that with the condition of things in the Army. Will anyone maintain that the rank and file of the Army are superior in training, or education, or ability to the rank and file of the Navy? In the Army we have a special line of promotion, known as the quartermaster's line, which is exclusively for men risen from the ranks, and such men can become lieutenants and captains. In one case I know of, a man who acted as major retired with the rank of colonel, receiving the full value in pay and in every other respect of the rank that he nominally held. What is the result of the present regulation in the Navy? and I ask the attention of the Committee to it. The result is that at the end of the first ten years service, when a man is from twenty-eight to thirty-one there is a more numerous leakage from the Navy than from any other Service under the Crown. I have the last Return, moved for by myself a year and a half ago. Unfortunately the last year is 1895, but I would like to ask the attention of the Committee to the percentage of men who, having served ten years

in the Navy, did not join for a second ten years, The percentage in 1887 was just over 24 per cent., in 1888 just over 32 per cent., in 1880 over 33 per cent., in 1890 over 32 per cent., in 1891 it was exactly 33 per cent., in 1892, 29 per cent., in 1893, 23 per cent., in 1894, 21 per cent., and in 1895 it was again nearly 23 per cent. It should be remembered that every one of these men who did not rejoin cost the nation £;300 as an initial charge before any advantage was got out of their services. If, therefore, we could do something to induce a man to rejoin for another ten years who otherwise would not rejoin, we would undoubtedly save half the initial cost, or £;150 on every man.

It is pointed out to us and claimed by the warrant officers themselves that what they want is a career such as is offered to the common soldier in the Army. I know perfectly well that we cannot start on exactly the same lines, but we may do something analogous by giving commissioned rank to be exclusively devoted to warrant officers, who would be allotted certain services. You might, for instance, allot the Ordnance Store Department to them, or the management of coaling stations might be handed over to warrant officers with commissioned rank. If you do that I believe you will give a career, which will not only affect the warrant officers, but will loosen promotion all down the ratings of the Navy, and will give the hope of a career to every boy joining the Navy. I wish the Committee to realise what we are losing by not giving such a line of promotion. What becomes of the men who do not rejoin? I remember the reply of a previous Board of Admiralty to me on this point. They said whatever I might say about leakage in the Navy, and the want of a career, at any rate they could say that whereas the Army had a difficulty in recruiting the Navy had no such difficulty. That is no answer whatever. I can well believe that the Navy finds no difficulty in recruiting under existing circumstances. First of all, the Navy is a popular Service in the imagination of every British boy, and in the second place, the parents of a boy know that the whole charge of his education and keep is taken off their hands, that he will be taught a trade at the expense of the nation, and that at the end of ten years, before he is thirty, he can leave the Navy a skilled tradesman; one of the best workmen in the country; who can get work anywhere. Further, in the American Navy, which has no training ships whatever, they are able to pay double the wages to their men that we can afford to pay, and they know that they can man their Navy out of men on whom we have spent £;300 per man, and who have served ten years in our Navy. Some fifteen years ago, an agitation was got up in America to start a training-ship for the American Navy. The then Secretary of the American Navy, in a public speech, said that they had no need for training ships, because the American Navy could get any amount of the best material in the world; namely, British sailors who had served ten years in the British Navy. It seems to me singularly foolish to waste £;300 per man for men for the American Navy, but that need not be done if we would only offer a career to every boy joining our Navy.

I know perfectly well, from previous experience, that no man in this House is more sympathetic in his views than my hon. friend in charge of this Vote. I know also that during the nine years I have been in this House we have had nearly all the naval professional Members sympathetic with the idea of establishing a line

of promotion such as I have suggested. We also know that men, including previous First Lords of the Admiralty, gave, as my hon. friend acknowledges, pledges on this question, and yet nothing has been done. I recollect Mr. Goschen replying to me some years ago, and saying that I must surely realise that, inasmuch as nothing had been done, there must be grave reasons against the proposal. It is a curious fact, but we have never been able to get it stated what these reasons are. By a process of exhaustion and not by positive evidence, I have arrived at a conclusion, and that is that the only persons who object are the Naval Lords of the Admiralty. They are the only body that I do not know to be in favour of this proposal. Knowing the sympathy of my hon. friend, and knowing that there exists very grave obstruction in some place or other, I think I am justified in bringing the national importance of this question before the Committee, and putting it on a basis other than justice to the men themselves.

I have only to say, in conclusion, that I hope my hon. friend will say something in his reply on this and the other points that have been raised since he spoke last. I am not going into the arguments over again, because that would be redundancy, and would weary the Committee, but I would specially direct the attention of my hon. friend to the question of the food of the men in the Navy, to which the senior Member for Devonport has already referred in detail. The hon. Member for the Wansbeck Division referred to the engine-room artificers. No doubt there is a conflict of opinion as to the facts in regard to them. The only other point to which I especially wish to direct the attention of my hon. friend, is the question of the wages, particularly of the poorest paid of all; people in the dockyards. Nineteen shillings a week is very inadequate pay for a man engaged

on such work. It is the poorest paid men I feel most about, because they are the men who have the least power to bring pressure to bear on their behalf.

But, after all, the principal question which I urge upon the attention of my hon. friend is that of the treatment of warrant officers, and that is a question not only of justice to the men, but of the efficiency of the Fleet, of the economic expenditure of the money voted by this House for the Navy, and of what the nation as a nation owes to these men. There is no more loyal body of men employed by the Government than these warrant officers. I will give an illustration of that. With the full consent of the officers they had carried on an agitation, but the moment the war broke out they announced publicly in their organ; the Warrant Officer's Gazette; that until the war was over, they would desist from all agitation for the redress of their grievances. Under these circumstances I think they are a body of men who are worthy of all the support which can be given them, but which at present is denied to them.

MR. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.) said he did not often intrude himself on the Committee, especially on Naval questions. However, he had almost a hereditary interest in these matters, for members of his family, for many generations back, had served in the Navy of various monarchs in this country, and possibly more of them had risen to the highest commands in the Service than had come from any other family in the United Kingdom. He had listened with great interest to the speech of his hon. friend below him, in which he had touched on many questions,

giving a very well merited word of praise to his hon. and gallant friend the Member for the Wokingham Division, who spoke with all the authority which appertained to an officer who had served twenty years in His Majesty's Navy. There was one question on which the Secretary to the Admiralty had not been decisive, namely, the provision of a Roman Catholic chaplain to each squadron of the Navy. Although he himself was a Scotchman and a Presbyterian, he had considerable sympathy with hon. Members from Ireland in their demands for Catholic chaplains in the Navy. Hon. Members

opposite came of a grand fighting race, which had done splendid service in the Army and the Navy. If, as they said, and he believed it was true, they placed very great and exceptional value upon the services of their chaplain in times of accident or illness, as was shown by the picture drawn by his hon. and gallant friend as to what would be done in order to obtain ministrations of a clergyman, then in the interests of the country it was obvious that the Admiralty should grant the request of the hon. Members.

Upon the general question of the Navy, he was not like some Members opposite; he approved entirely of the amount which was being spent on the Navy, and only wished it were more, for he felt that the vital interests of the country were bound up in the Navy. He had a very personal and peculiar interest in the question of boilers. His grandfather, Lord Dundonald, who was known in this House as Lord Cochrane, was the first to advocate the use of steam generated in water-tube boilers in all the vessels in the Navy, and did so with such importunity as was always necessary in order to get the Admiralty to adopt any change. He had been looking up some correspondence which had taken place between his grandfather and Lord Minto, who was First Lord of the Admiralty between 1835 and 1841, after that noble Lord had been relieved from the cares of office, and when he took a very different view of things from what he had done in office. Writing with "greater freedom and less responsibility" in 1842, he said that it had been his intention to have fitted up a frigate with one of Lord Cochrane's engines, with a view to the introduction of occasional steam power in all the ships of the line. Lord Cochrane might wish to steam at a rate of ten miles an hour; his wish was much more humble; something equivalent to five knots an hour. He (the speaker) honestly believed that if it had not been for the action of the Members in this House five knots would have been the normal speed of the ships of the Navy at the present day. Lord Dundonald patented a water-tube boiler in 1843, which the hon. Member opposite, who spoke with great technical knowledge, assured him was the exact prototype of the tubular boilers at present used in the Navy. Lord Dundonald brought this boiler

before the naval authorities, and finally the Admiralty commissioned a ship to be built in which to try them. It was found, however, when the ship was built that it was too small for the boilers, and that it could only put to sea in the calmest weather. The boilers had worked splendidly on land, and had given satisfaction to the engineers, but when fitted on board ship they did not come up to expectation, and did not do the work which they ought to have done. Naval officers were a very unsuspicious race as a rule, but the working of the boilers was so extraordinary that when they returned to port the engines were taken to

pieces and carefully examined. The engineers wrote a report on the matter to Lord Dundonald, in which they stated that to their astonishment they found in the middle suction pipe an elm plug driven in so hard that they were obliged to cut it out. Of course, any alteration on the ships of the Navy naturally met with considerable opposition, some of it ludicrous; for instance, that which objected to the introduction of steam on the ground that the smoke from the funnels would blacken the sails of the Fleet; He did not pretend to say that the failure of some of the boilers recently was due to any foul play, although it had been suggested that that had been the case. But the new form of boilers now being tried was a modern invention, and engineers who had to deal with them had only been accustomed to work the old form of cylindrical boilers. Water-tube boilers required the most careful handling by highly scientifically trained men to get the best results out of them, and he did not believe that they were being tried in all the ships under the most advantageous circumstances. That was all he intended to imply. His hon. friend had taken the best means to inform himself on the subject, and had called in the assistance of a committee of experts, whose opinion must carry great weight in the House and the country. He only hoped that these water-tube boilers, which had been sixty years before the country, would not be abandoned without sufficient reflection, inquiry, and experience.

He had great sympathy with those hon. Members who urged the claims of engineers to an improvement in their professional position. The engineers had legitimate complaints, and their demands should be conceded. The Victorian Order had recently been distributed on a certain ship, and the engineer, who probably did more work than anybody else on board, was the only officer who did not get an Order.

The question of submarine boats was of the very greatest importance, and he would like to know if the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Admiralty could not really furnish the Committee with some definite information in regard to the submarine boats under order. He believed that no submarine boat yet built had been a pronounced success, and he would like to know whether any means had been discovered of steering these boats under the surface. He also wanted to know whether provision had been made for the supply of patent fuel and liquid fuel, for both of these were of great importance.

MR. GILHOOLY wished to direct attention to an accident which had occurred in Berehaven Harbour on 1st March. A launch was sailing from H.M.S. "Resolution" to Berehaven with a crew composed of boys and a boy officer. The only able seaman on board was the coxswain, a man of long experience, who was steering the boat, which, however, capsized and seven of the crew were drowned. In his opinion there must have been some mismanagement on the part of those in charge of the launch, because Berehaven was one of the safest harbours in the world. No doubt it was a rough day, but was it necessary that these boys should be sent off in a boat in a rough sea in command of only a boy officer? And why were there no life belts provided in the boat? The bodies had not yet been found, and he wanted to know, if they were found, whether the parents of these boys would get them for interment in the county of Cork.

He complained of the insulting and offensive treatment to which Irish sailors were subjected by an officer in charge of the "Collingwood" in Bantry Bay, who talked of Irish seamen as Irish pigs. If they wanted Irishmen to fight their battles either on sea or land they should be treated with ordinary respect and courtesy. He must say that it would be no surprise, if the men were treated in that fashion by aristocratic and ill-conditioned officers, that when they went into action the men would turn and give assistance to the enemy rather than to their officers. He insisted also that gross injustice was done in connection with the expenditure of the Admiralty in Ireland. Squadrons occasionally put into Berehaven, but their necessary supplies were brought over from co-operative stores in England, instead of being bought locally. Another thing was the manifest unfairness of paying the men on board ships which were in an Irish port. It had frequently occurred that, although money was due to the men on a certain day, the payment was postponed until the ship put to sea in order that the money might be spent in English ports. Moreover, a good many of the Irish sailors required the money in Ireland in order to assist their relatives. The hon. Gentleman had stated from the Treasury Bench that ample provision had been made for the protection of Irish fisheries from illegal trawling, and that a gunboat had been commissioned for this protective work. To his own knowledge several steam beam trawlers from England had made incursions into Bantry Bay. It was true that the "Fly" was sent to watch them, but its speed was not sufficient to keep up with the swift trawlers, which had done very serious injury to the fishermen's nets and lines.

MR. NOLAN (Louth, S.) said he could have wished that the Secretary to the Admiralty had been a little more definite in his promise in regard to the provision of Catholic chaplains for Catholic seamen. He could not help feeling, in listening to the speech of the hon. Gentleman, that he did not seem to appreciate the passionate desire of Irishmen, no matter what their creed, for the ministrations of their clergymen in sickness or in danger of death. Some years ago an officer of the Royal Irish Constabulary drew his attention to the fact that although there was room enough for members of the force to grumble and growl about their duties, there was one thing they never objected to, and that was that when some poor stray outcast who had been arrested during the day was taken ill in the hours of the night with a sickness which might possibly terminate in death, and wanted the ministrations of the minister of the religion to which he belonged, there never was the slightest hesitation on the part of the members of the force in at once jumping out of bed, putting on their clothes, and rushing off for that minister. He mentioned this to show the right hon. Gentleman how great a boon it would be to Irish sailors if facilities were given them to have the ministrations of a chaplain of their own creed when in sickness or in danger of death.

Another matter to which attention had been drawn was the necessity of preventing trawlers coming within the prescribed three-mile limit. So far as his constituency was concerned, he had to thank the Department for having recently placed a gunboat at Drogheda Head. That boat, during the short time it had been

there, had done remarkably good work in the interests of the fishermen. The fishermen on the west coast of Ireland required a little more protection in this way than they could possibly receive from the six vessels which had been referred to. The coast line of Ireland was some 2,000 miles, and it was rather too much to expect that six of even the most efficient vessels would be able adequately to protect the fishing grounds of such an extensive coast line. This was a question of enormous importance, not only to the fishermen themselves but to the Navy, the strength of which above all was in the personnel. If men were wanted for the Navy no better provision could be made than by maintaining the fishing industry of the country, from which the very best recruits were drawn. France, at a considerable cost to herself, maintained and protected the fisheries for the special purpose of training men for the sea upon whom to fall back to man the Navy in time of need. He reminded the hon. Gentleman that the Irish Parliament in the closing years of the eighteenth century, when the Empire ;or the Monarchy, as it then was; was in danger, voted no fewer than 40,000 for the Navy, and those 40,000 were Roman Catholic fishermen of the west and south coasts of Ireland. In the course of a few years an Irish Parliament might be sitting in Dublin, and although he could scarcely conceive under existing circumstances any such number joining the Navy, he was perfectly convinced that if an Irish Parliament made a call the fishermen would not fail to respond to it. One thing, however, stood in the way of obtaining any number of recruits among the Irish fishermen which did not exist one hundred years ago, which was that owing to the neglect of the British Government a large proportion of the fishing population had been swept away.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order; The topics with which the hon. Gentleman is now dealing I do not think are relevant to the question before the Committee.

MR. NOLAN said he bowed to the ruling of the Chairman, and would pass to another point. He desired to draw attention to the necessity of providing piers and harbour accommodation in various parts of Ireland.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said the provision of piers and harbours was nothing to do with the Admiralty. They had no right to do anything with regard to piers and harbours.

MAJOR JAMESON (Clare, W.): Upon a point of order, Sir, we were certainly told we could speak on the question of piers and harbours.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Those are military works; those which the hon. Member for South Louth has referred to, piers and harbours of refuge, do not come under the Navy Vote at all.

MAJOR JAMESON said they had never been able to discover tinder what vote piers and harbours came. If they went to the Board of Trade they were kicked out.

*THE CHAIRMAN: If the hon. Gentleman who is in charge of the Vote says that piers and harbours in Ireland do not come under this Vote, I do not see how you can expect him to give an answer.

MR. JOHN REDMOND said he did not know that it was the desire of his hon. friend to raise the question of piers and harbours, otherwise he would have advised him that this was not the opportunity to do so.

*MR. ARNOLD -FORSTER: Oh, I do not mind. I will reply to anything that I can,

but I am unable to reply to questions with regard to piers and harbours or fisheries.

MR. NOLAN reminded the Secretary to the Admiralty that he represented a maritime constituency, and upon that part of the coast of Ireland there was slender protection for vessels driven to seek shelter by stress of weather, and it would be to the advantage of the Navy and shipping in general, as well as the fishermen, if provision were made in the shape of suitable landing-places.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said it would perhaps be convenient if he were now to reply to the questions which had been raised. He was bound to say he was unable at this moment to answer them all, but if there was any part where the arrangements for landing required inquiry and alteration in order to increase the efficiency of the Navy, he would be glad to make that inquiry. He would answer the specific questions which had been put to him.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I understand that the right hon. Gentleman now gives us an assurance that there shall be an inquiry into this question, because he says if there is anything worth inquiring into, he will inquire into it.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said the senior Member for Devonport had spoken of the victualling of the Navy, a question which was also referred to by the hon.

Member for Portsmouth on the preceding night. Well, he agreed that there was room for readjustment in the victualling arrangements of the Navy. The Admiralty was of that opinion also, and had appointed a Committee of Inquiry. The hon. Member complained that the Committee had not reported at an earlier date in view of the considerable time that had elapsed since its appointment, but if he knew how enormous were the transactions that the Admiralty had to conduct, and how very many considerations were involved in any change, he would not make such a complaint. He could assure him that the Committee had not wasted time, and he hoped to be able before long to announce that it had completed its deliberations and had arrived at a conclusion which would be satisfactory to the men of the Navy. The food now supplied was neither insufficient nor inferior, but there was, he believed, room for variety, and possibly a change in the time for meals might be attended with increased comfort. Then there was the question of the canteens, and as to that he was bound to say he was uninformed at the present moment; still, he undertook that the matter should have his careful consideration. As to cold storage, depots were being built at Malta and Gibraltar, and the use of cold-stored meat had already been introduced on the China Station, and the officers had reported most favourably on the condition of the meat distributed to the ships there.

The hon. Member for Devonport had spoken of the leakage of men from the Service as having amounted to 23 per cent. But that was not leakage in the ordinary sense of the word. It consisted of men who, having completed their engagement on which they entered the Navy, had decided not to re-enter, and he should be inclined rather to suggest that the number of men who had re-engaged was remarkable. Indeed, the total had increased in recent years. The hon. Member for North Ayrshire had given the Committee some very interesting reminiscences. He came of a gallant naval family, but probably the instruction he had given them was not necessary to provide a solution of the problems to which he applied it,

namely, the question of the Belleville boiler. He urged that a trial should be given them from the scientific side, and he need have no doubt whatever but that it would be. He spoke, too, of submarine boats, but at that period of the evening it was impossible to go into the matter at any length, the more so because the Admiralty had not yet had an opportunity of testing those boats for itself. All the information he could give was equally available to all hon.

Members, and was to be found in the descriptions given by foreign authorities of the character and performances of these boats. The hon. Member for West Cork had insisted on the importance of protecting the Irish fisheries against trawlers, and he could only repeat that any specific instance of

neglect on the part of the Royal Navy should receive the prompt attention of the Admiralty authorities. The work of the Navy was already very heavy, and it was not intended that it should go outside its duty. It was not the duty of the Royal Navy to enforce local bye-laws for the protection of Irish fisheries;[An HON. MEMBER: They are not local bye-laws.];but any neglect or shortcoming on the part of the Navy, if reported, should be inquired into.

MR. POWER: Can the hon. Gentleman say if the gunboats which have been placed at the disposal of the authorities for the protection of Irish fisheries are to be placed permanently on that duty?

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said there were five vessels belonging to the Royal Navy devoted to the work of protecting the fisheries on the high seas, and a vessel had also been recently acquired by the Irish Government, over which the Admiralty had no control.

MR. JOYCE: I have a question down for Monday as to the names of the boats. Can the hon. Gentleman answer that now?

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Sufficient for the day is the evil thereof. He could not trust his memory to give the names off-hand. As to the question of Roman Catholic chaplains for the Navy, he could only once again promise to lay the views of hon. Members fully before the Admiralty. He thought he could not be expected to say more than that.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.) said hon. Members around him regarded the reply of the hon. Gentleman on the subject of the protection of Irish fisheries with some alarm.

It was not correct to suggest that the bye-laws which the Navy were asked to enforce were local bye-laws. The regulations were made by the Inspectors of Fisheries and confirmed by the Lord Lieutenant, and were as much the law of the land as any law emanating from Parliament. They were now told that five gunboats were set apart for the protection of the fisheries. The hon. Gentleman had asked for explicit instances of neglect, but ever since he had been in the House he had heard repeated

questions put on this question, and promises of protection given in reply, but no effective good had been done. The Board of Agriculture, they were informed, had itself acquired a vessel for the work. Well, his information was that the vessel in question was a steam launch, the armament of which consisted of a double-barrelled shot gun. There were depredations continually going on off the Irish coast. The fishermen in their small boats could not get up to the steam trawlers in order to secure their numbers, and as great efforts had been made to

develop the Irish fisheries, large sums of money having been expended for the purpose, it was not unreasonable that the Irish Members should on behalf of the poor fishermen call on the Government to do its obvious duty in the matter, and to put down illegality. He had himself seen French boats come within the limits over and over again, take fish and get off before the local boats could get near enough to detect the names of the vessels. He hoped the Admiralty would in the future pay more heed to this complaint than it had done in the past. Let them compare the treatment meted out to this important Irish industry with what was done in Australia. Ireland, it was admitted, contributed nearly three million sterling annually to the maintenance of the Navy. The Australian colonies at the most spent £49,000, yet Ireland was refused the protection of a few gunboats, although she constituted a nursery for the Navy, and possessed one of the best fish-breeding grounds in the world. She also suffered great injustice in regard to the naval expenditure of this country. Surely she was entitled to have spent in Ireland a large proportion of the money she had to contribute for the Navy. But how did she fare in the matter of ship construction? She got nothing back, and with the exception of Haulbowline, which he admitted had received more liberal treatment of late years, Ireland did not receive a pound of the expenditure on the Navy. There were two sources from which, apart altogether from dockyard work and naval construction, Ireland might fairly expect to share in the expenditure. One was in the matter of victualling, and the other was in con-

nection with the discharge of seamen. For many months in the year large numbers of vessels were anchored off Berehaven; one of the finest harbours in the west of Europe; and yet nothing whatever was purchased in the town if it could possibly be avoided. In Queens-town harbour the same thing occurred, and although at one time it was customary to pay vessels off in Irish harbours, now they were sent to an English port for the purpose, and the Irish tradesmen lost the benefit which they might otherwise gain from the seamen expending their wages on coining off a long commission. That was surely not fair treatment for the wealthier country to extend to her poorer neighbour, but still, it was an illustration of the niggardly manner in which the great spending Departments of the State treated Ireland. The expenditure on the Navy was increasing with enormous rapidity, and those responsible for it plunged into it heedless of the developments which submarine engineering might produce. The taxpayer was groaning under the burden, the increase of which never gave satisfaction to those who were continually crying for more.

MAJOR JAMESON said the hon. Member for Devonport had commented on the difficulty of getting recruits for the Navy. The remedy was to open up a career. It was well known that in the Navy boys had not the same chance of rising from the ranks as in the Army, and he would ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if it were not possible for a warrant officer who had become chief engineer after probably forty years service to obtain commissioned rank within three years from that time? He would suggest that there were many cases of warrant officers who had served with great distinction for many years who might advantageously be promoted to the rank of substitute lieutenant. During the last fourteen years he

believed there had only been three warrant officers so promoted, and he feared it was the case that the commissioned ranks of the Navy were closed to deserving men even after thirty-five or forty years of distinguished service. Another matter to which he wished to draw attention was the length of time petty officers had

to serve before they got an increase of pay. At present many of them received little more than 6d. per day increase when promoted to boatswain's rank. They had, however, to provide themselves with new uniforms, and subscribe largely to the mess, their expenses being increased by about 50 per cent. Yet their increase of pay was only from 5s. 6d. to 6s. per day. Some special allowance ought certainly to be made to them to help them meet the great additional expense cast upon them by the promotion. Then again, the carpenters of the Navy complained of the very small amount of pay they received; although they had practically the same rank and duties as foremen in private yards, they got far less pay, and he suggested that they should be raised to 8s. 6d. per day.

Without such an increase, how could they expect to get really good men for the positions? The authorities were guilty of childish, cheeseparing practices in these matters. They would strain at a gnat and swallow a camel. They refused a shilling, but would waste millions of money on Belleville boilers and the like.

Again, there was the question of compassionate allowances to the wives and children of deserving warrant officers who died in the Service. Why should not this class have the allowance as well as the other classes? Why should men who had risen from the ranks be debarred from having it? It was simply scandalous.

Next he wished to ask why no protection was afforded to the Shannon, the largest river in the three kingdoms. For seven years they had been knocking at the Admiralty door, but they had failed to induce the authorities to place a guard-ship there. He thought that if a training ship were placed in the Shannon it would encourage the recruiting for the Navy in the south of Ireland, and he demanded that a gunboat be placed at the mouth of the same river in order to protect the Irish fisheries from the inroads of the French trawlers. Those vessels were allowed to poach in Irish waters with impunity, and although he had called attention to this matter two years previously the Government had done nothing. Ireland paid one-twelfth of the cost of the Navy, and it was only just that they should derive some benefit from it.

MR. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.) asked whether the five gunboats alluded to were for the protection of Irish fisheries alone or for the fisheries of the three kingdoms?

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: No, they are for the protection of Ireland alone.

*MR. O'SHEE complained that no good had been done by these vessels, and thought it was a somewhat remarkable fact that the one vessel which had been placed at the disposal of the Department of Agriculture had been able to do more for the protection of Irish fisheries in the short time it had been engaged in that task than these five boats altogether during the whole time they had been on the coast. Whilst that boat had had many prosecutions, not a single case had been brought forward by the other five. If those vessels had been doing their duty they had been doing it in a most extraordinary manner, and he hoped that some

inquiry would be made as to the mode in which they carried out their duty. He was glad to see that steps were at last being taken to see the importance of the submarine boats. If those boats were able to do half what was claimed for them, then the present gigantic expenditure for naval construction was entirely uncalled for. A submarine boat could be built for £25,000 and manned by ten men, and if it were true that they were able to combat the big ships which the Government were building, those ships would be absolutely useless except for carrying the submarine boats to places where they were to work. It was important that the Government should make up their mind quickly as to the nature of these vessels. If they were all that was claimed for them, it would render unnecessary the £9,000,000 which was now being expended on new battleships. He did not agree with the suggestion that guardships and training ships should be placed on the coast of Ireland for the purpose of inducing young Irishmen to join the Navy, because he regretted

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex F.

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Bain, Colonel James Robert

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Austin, Sir John

Baird, John Geo. Alexander

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy

Baldwin, Alfred

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Bailey, James (Walworth)

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

that his young countrymen should ever be persuaded to enter the Service. The first use of the Navy was the defence of our shores, and for this purpose the money required ought not to be half the amount that was asked. The proper way to defend our shores was to adopt a short service conscription for home defence, and if that were done there would be no fear of invasion, and, so far as home defence was concerned, this huge expenditure on the Navy would be unnecessary. Why should the Government set up the standard that the Navy of this country should be larger than the combined fleets of France and Russia? Italy, which had as large a coast to defend, set up no such standard, nor was she in a constant state of fear and trembling lest her shores should be invaded. And if it came to a question of protecting foreign trade, he would point out that neither Germany nor the United States, the great trade rivals of this country, had anything like so large a navy. While there were Catholics in the Navy it would be, he thought, to the interest of the country and the Government to give every opportunity for them to receive the ministrations of their religion. He was sorry to see so many Irish Catholics in the Navy, and he thought it the duty of all true Irishmen, until self-government was granted to Ireland, to advise all young Irishmen to refrain from joining the Service. A hundred years ago two-thirds of the men in the Navy were Irishmen, and it was the fighting qualities of those men that made

the Navy so successful at that time. It was not the guns that won our battles, but the fighting courage of the men who boarded the ships of the enemy.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move. "That the Question be now put."

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

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 177; Noes, 77. (Division List No. 94.)

Balfour, Rt. Hn. Ger. W. (Leeds)

Greene, Hy. D. (Shrewsbury)

Nicol, Donald Ninian

Banbury, Frederick George

Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill

O'Neill, Hon. Herbert Torrens

Bartley, George C. T.

Guthrie, Walter Murray

Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)

Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin

Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Mid'x

Penn, John

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

Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert W.

Pierpoint, Robert

Bignold, Arthur

Hare, Thomas Leigh

Platt-Higgins, Frederick

Bigwood, James

Harris, F. L. (Tynemouth)

Plummer, Walter R.

Bond, Edward

Hay, Hon. Claude George

Powell, Sir Francis Sharp

Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-

Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)

Pretymann, Ernest George

Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.

Heath, Jas. (Staffords., N.W.)

Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward

Bull, William James

Henderson, Alexander

Purvis, Robert

Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.

Higginbottom, S.W.

Pym, C. Guy

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

Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.

Remnant, James Farquharson

Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)

Hope, J.F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J (Birm.
Hozier, Hon. James Henry C.
Round, James
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Chapman, Edward
Hutton, John (Yorks., N. R.)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Charrington, Spencer
Jebb, Sir Richard C.
Sandys, Lieut-Col. Thos. Myles
Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H. A. E.
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Seely, Charles Hilton(Lincoln)
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Sharpe, William Edw. T.
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
Kenyon, Hon. G. T. (Denbigh
Shaw-Stewart, M. H.(Renfrew)
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Kimber, Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Knowles, Lees
Smith, Jas, Parker (Lanarks.)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Lawson, John Grant
Smith, Hon. W. F. D.(Strand)
Cranborne, Viscount
Lecky, Rt. Hn. William Edw. H
Stanley, Hon Arthur(Ormskirk
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Lee, Arthur H (Hants, Fareham)
Stewart, Sir Mark J M'Taggart
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chath'm
Legge, Col. Hon Heneage

Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Davies, M.Vaughan-(Cardigan
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Stroyan, John
Dickson, Charles Scott
Leighton, Stanley
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Long, Rt Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fd.Dixon
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Lucas, Col. Francis(Lowestoft)
Tollemache, Henry James
Duke, Henry Edward
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. E.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Dyke, Rt. Hon Sir William Hart
Macdona, John Cumming
Valentia, Viscount
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
M'Arthur, Charles(Liverpool)
Vincent, Col Sir CEH (Sheffield
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Majendie, James A. H.
Walker, Col. William Hall
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r)
Malcolm, Ian
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir HE (Wigt'n
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Maxwell, W.J.H. (Dumfriessh
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. CE (Taunton
Fisher, William Hayes
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.

FitzGerald, Sir R. Penrose-
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Whitmore, (Charles Algernon
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward A.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(Birm
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Wilson, A. Stanley (Yorks, E. R.
Fletcher, Sir Henry
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Flower, Ernest
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Wolfl, Gustav Wilhelm
Garfit, William
Morrison, James Archibald
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B. Stuart-
Gordon, Maj Evans (T'rH'mlets)
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptf'rd
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Goschen, Hon. George J.
Mount, William Arthur
Wyndham, Rt Hon. George
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Graham, Henry Robert
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
TELLERS FOE THE AYES;
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)
Murray, Col.Wyndham (Bath)
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Greene, Sir EW (B'rySEdm'nds)
Nicholson, William Graham
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork,N. E.)
Douglas, Chas. M. (Lanark)
Lambert, George
Ambrose, Robert
Duffy, William J.
Leamy, Edmund
Asher, Alexander
Ffrench, Peter
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Blake, Edward

Field, William
Lundon, W.
Boyle, James
Flavin, Michael Joseph
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Flynn, James Christopher
M'Dermott, Patrick
Caldwell, James
Furness, Sir Christopher
M'Fadden, Edward
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Gilhooly, James
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Carew, James Laurence
Hammond, John
Morgan, J. Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Causton, Richard Knight
Hayden, John Patrick
Morton, Edw. J.C. (Devonport)
Clancy, John Joseph
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Chas. Seale-
Murphy, J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Jacoby, James Alfred
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Crean, Eugene
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Cullinan, J.
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Daly, James
Joyce, Michael
O'Brien, Kendal (Tippera'yMid
Doogan, P. C.
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Doherty, William
Rea, Russell
Stevenson, Francis S.
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Reckitt, Harold James

Sullivan, Donal
O'Dowd, John
Reddy, M.
Tennant, Harold John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Thompson, E. C. (Monaghan, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N)
Redmond, William (Clare)
White, Luke, (York, E. R.)
O'Malley, William
Rigg, Richard
Yoxall, James Henry
O'Mara, James
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh.)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
O'Shee, James John
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R. (Nrtha'ts)
Question put accordingly, "That a sum, not exceeding £5,760,000, be granted to
His Majesty, to defray the Expenses of Wages, etc., to Officers, Seamen and
Boys, Coast Guard, and
AYES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r)
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Lucas, Reginald J (Portsmouth)
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison
Asher, Alexander
Fisher, William Hayes
Macdona, John Cumming
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
FitzGerald, Sir Rbt. Penrose-
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Austin, Sir John

Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Majendie, James A. H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Malcolm, Ian
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E. (Wig'n
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Flower, Ernest
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Furness, Sir Christopher
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Baird, John George Alexander
Garfit, William
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Baldwin, Alfred
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'rH'mlts)
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A.J. (Manch'r)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Goulding, Edward Alfred
More, Robt, Jasper (Shropshire)
Banbury, Frederick George
Graham, Henry Robert
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Bartley, George C. T.
Green, Walford D (Wednesbury
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Greene, Sir E W (B'rySEdm'nds
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Beach, Rt Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)
Greene, HenryD. (Shrewsbury
Morrison, James Archibald
Bignold, Arthur
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford)
Bigwood, James
Hain, Edward
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Bond, Edward
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Ld. G.(Midx.
Mount, William Arthur

Boscawen, Arthur Griffith.
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Rbt. Wm.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham(Bute
Brown, Alexander H.(Shropsh.)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Bull, William James
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Murray, Col. Wyndham(Bath)
Caldwell, James
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Nicholson, William Graham
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Causton, Richard Knight
Heath, A. Howard (Hanley)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Cavendish, V.C. W(Derbyshire)
Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Henderson, Alexander
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Higginbottom, S. W.
Penn, John
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Hobhouse, H. (Somerset, E.)
Pierpoint, Robert
Chamberlain, J. A. (Worc'r)
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Bright'de
Platt-Higgins. Frederick
Chapman, Edward
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Plummer, Walter R,
Charrington, Spencer
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Pretymen, Ernest George
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Jacoby, James Alfred

Purvis, Robert
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Reckitt, Harold James
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Remnant, James Farquharson
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Rigg, Richard
Cranborne, Viscount
Kenyon, Hon. G. T. (Denbigh)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W (Salop)
Round, James
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Kimber, Henry
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Knowles, Lees
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Dickson, Charles Scott
Lambert, George
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Dickson- Poynder, Sir John P.
Lawson, John Grant
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Lecky, Rt. Hon. Wm. Edw. H.
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Lee, Capt. A. H (Hants, Fareham)
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)
Douglas, Rt, Hon. A. Akers-
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)
Duke, Henry Edward
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)

Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
 Leighton, Stanley
 Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
 Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. H.
 Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
 Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R. (N'rth'nts.)
 Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
 Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
 Stanley, Hon Arthur(Ormskirk)
 Royal Marines, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on
 the 31st day of March, 1902."
 The Committee divided::Ayes. 196; Noes, 53. (Division List No. 95.)
 Stevenson, Francis S.
 Tritton, Charles Ernest
 Wilson, A. S. (York, E. R.)
 Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart
 Valentia, Viscount
 Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
 Stirling-Maxwell, Sir J. M.
 Vincent, Col. Sir C.E.H (Shef'd
 Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
 Stroyan, John
 Walker, Col. Wm. Hall
 Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
 Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
 Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.
 Wrightson, Sir Thomas
 Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
 Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
 Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
 Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
 Welby, Lt.-Col. A.C.E. (Ta'nt'n
 Yerburch, Rbt. Armstrong
 Tennant, Harold John
 Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts
 Yoxall, James Henry
 Thorburn, Sir Walter
 White, Luke (York, E. R.)
 TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
 Tollemache, Henry James
 Whitmore, Chas. Algernon
 Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
 Williams Rt Hn J Powell(Birm)
 NOES.
 Abraham, William (Cork,N. E.)
 Gilhooly, James

O'Doberty, William
Ambrose, Robert
Hammond, John
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Blake, Edward
Hardie, J. K.(MerthyrTydvil)
O'Dowu, John
Boyle, James
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Burke, E. Haviland-
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
O'Kelly, James(Roscommon.N)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Joyce, Michael
O'Malley, William
Carow, James Laurence
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Mara, James
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Leamy, Edmund
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Clancy, John Joseph
Lundon, W.
O'Shee, James John
Condon, Thomas Joseph
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Crean, Eugene
M'Dermott, Patrick
Reddy, M.
Cullinan, J.
M'Fadden, Edward
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Daly, James
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Doogan,P. C.
Murphy, J.
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Duffy, William J.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Sullivan, Donal
Ffrench, Peter
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Field, William

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

TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.

Flavin, Michael Joseph

O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'ry Mid

Flynn, James Christopher

O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)

CIVIL SERVICES EXCESSES, 1899–1000.

2. £;24 2s., Excesses.

MR. JOHN REDMOND said he thought that under the circumstances the Government ought to be allowed to get this Vote.

Resolution agreed to.

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

WAYS AND MEANS.

Considered in Committee;:

(In the Committee.)

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

1. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty for the Service of the years ending on the 31st day of March, 1900 and 1901, the sum of £;5,229,355 2s. be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom.:(Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.)

MR. JOHN REDMOND said he understood that this was only a formal proceeding, and that there was no intention of proceeding to put the question.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): It is necessary to take this Vote now, but it is a purely formal proceeding. It is simply authorising the payment out of the Exchequer of sums already voted by the House in Committee of Supply for the present year.

Question put, and agreed to.

2. Motion made, and Question proposed. "That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty for the Service of the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, the sum of £;44,721,500 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom.:"(Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.)

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I understand that this Committee is for the purpose of enabling these sums to be put into the Appropriation Bill, and that when the Bill is introduced the whole question can be discussed. [The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Hear, hear.] If I am right in that contention I shall allow it to go.

Question put, and agreed to.

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

Adjourned at ten minutes before Seven of the clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 25th March, 1901.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

CROMER WATER BILL.

Read a second time and committed.

NORTH BRITISH RAILWAY BILL.

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

BERWICKSHIRE COUNTY TOWN BILL [LORDS].

Ordered that the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills do examine the Berwickshire County Town Bill [Lords], with respect to compliance with the Standing Orders relative to Private Bills.;(Mr. Long.)

WOLVERHAMPTON AND CANNOCK CHASE RAILWAY BILL.

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

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP 2).

Colonel H. F. Bowles reported from the Committee on Group 2 of Railway Bills, that, there being no business ready for their consideration, they had adjourned until Wednesday next, at Eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

PETITIONS.

BEER BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Alderton; and Ebrington; to lie upon the Table.

CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

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

COAL MINES (EMPLOYMENT) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Chaloner; Tibshelf; Boosbeck; Upleatham; Lumpsey; Loftus; Carlin How; Guisborough; Liverton; and Lingdale; to lie upon the Table.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (HIGHER GRADE AND EVENING CONTINUATION SCHOOLS).

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

LOCAL AUTHORITIES OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Birkenhead; and Northfleet; to lie upon the Table.

MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Rotherham (two); Carlin How; Lumpsey; Loftus; Guisborough; Chaloner; Boosbeck (two); Liverton; Upleatham; Lingdale; Tibshelf; and Carhouse (two); to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN RILL.

Petitions in favour, from Bootle (twenty-nine); Aintree(two); Walton on the Hill (four); Battersea; Litherland; Battersea Rise; Bedfordshire; Horsham; Islington; Mexborough; Nottingham; Ramsgate (two); Bristol (twenty-three); Faygate; Manchester; Gravesend; Bow; Easton; Edinburgh; Fauldhouse; Hull; Cemmaes (two); Sheffield; Alexandria; Crawley; Wolverhampton; Wigan (six); Horfield; Brunswicke; Cardross; Little Stonegate; London (two); Worcester; West Bristol; and Aberdeen; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Pulteneytown; Loch Leven; Lochore; Uphall; Armadale; Dundee; Garioch; Glasgow; Weem; Law; Anstruther Wester; and Dumbarton; to lie upon the Table.

SOUTH AFRICA.

Petition of John Xavier Merriman and Jacobus Wilhelmus Sauer, for leave to be heard on the question of future policy; to lie upon the Table.

SOVEREIGN'S OATH ON ACCESSION BILL.

Petition from Peden's Stone, against; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

AMERICAN MAIL SERVICE.

Return [presented 23rd March]; to be printed. [No. 98.]

EXPLOSIONS (FELT HAT WORKS, DENTON, NEAR MANCHESTER).

Copy presented, of Report by Captain J. H. Thomson, R. A., His Majesty's Chief Inspector of Explosives, and H. S.

Richmond, Esq., His Majesty's Super-intending Inspector of Factories, to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Home Department, on the circumstances and probable causes of the Explosion which occurred at the Felt Hat Works of Messrs. Joseph Wilson and Sons, Denton, near Manchester, on the 14th January, 1901 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

UNITED STATES (No. 1, 1901).

Copy presented, of Correspondence respecting the Convention signed at Washington, 5th February, 1900, relative to the Establishment of a Communication by Ship Canal between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 2565 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING ACTS, 1828 AND 1888.

Copy presented, of Special Report by the Board of Trade under Section I of the Electric Lighting Act, 1888 St. Marylebone Electric Lighting (No. 2) Order, 1901] [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of Revised Regulations of the 21st March, 1901, as to Certificates of Age, Proficiency, and School Attendance [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

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

Soane's Museum.; Copy of Statement of the funds of the Museum of the late Sir John Soane on 5th January, 1901 [by Act].

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR; EXECUTION OF BRITISH SUBJECTS BY BOERS.

SIR J. FERGUSSON (Manchester, N.E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether His Majesty's Government have received official information to the effect that four British

subjects who had been made prisoners by the Boers, two of them named Theunissen, one M'Lachlan, and one Boyd, after being brutally treated, were taken out of goal at Wolmaranstad and publicly shot to death one by one by order of Generals Delarey and Smuts; and whether it is known on what grounds this execution took place.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): I have received the following telegram from Lord Kitchener;

"M'Lachlan and Boyd, believed to be British subjects, and three burghers,

Mathisen, Theunissen and Ahrens, were tried at Wolmaranstad on charge of high treason by the Boers, and shot on 23rd February."

I have no further information.

TAAIBOSCH TRAIN WRECKERS.

*MR. HAVILAND-BURKE (King's County, Tullamore): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the three men shot at De Aar on the 19th instant by sentence of a military court, confirmed by Lord Kitchener, for alleged treason and murder in connection with the wrecking of a train near Taaibosch, and the two men who were sentenced by the same military court to five years penal servitude for the same alleged offence, were thus punished in connection with the wrecking of a coal train near Taaibosch on Monday, 18th February, which train was also carrying Kaffirs, horses, and men of the 29th Imperial Yeomanry Company; whether any one or more of these men were among the eight Boer prisoners of war reported to have been taken by the rescuing force on that occasion; whether any one or more of them were local Dutch farmers who had failed to give warning of the contemplated train-wrecking to the British military authorities; whether any evidence was produced to show that they could have otherwise prevented the train-wrecking; and whether the proceedings of the military court are on record, and can be produced for the information of this House.

*MR. BRODRICK: I have no further information beyond what I gave the I hon.

Member last Friday

; See page 847.

MR. HAVILAND-BURKE: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he can possibly give me a straight answer to a straight question?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; That is a very improper observation to make.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): And a very unreasonable thing to expect.

LINDLEY SURRENDER.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the letter of the War Office, dated 16th December, 1900, demanding General Colvile's resignation, alleged that General Colvile was mainly responsible for the surrender of the Yeomanry at Lindley; and whether that allegation is borne out by the finding of the Court of Inquiry into that surrender.

*MR. BRODRICK: The War Office letter alluded to stated that "the Secretary of State having discussed the incidents of the surrender of No. 13 Imperial Yeomanry battalion, concurs with Lord Roberts that you were mainly responsible for the surrender." The Court of Inquiry absolved Colonel Spragge from any blame; General Colvile was held responsible by his military superiors for not attempting his relief.

MR. LAMBERT: Will the right hon. Gentleman answer the last part of the question?

*MR. BRODRICK: I have done so. The Court of Inquiry found that Colonel Spragge had done all in his power, and laid the responsibility on other shoulders.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): But what about the men who raised the flags of surrender?

PEACE NEGOTIATIONS WITH GENERAL BOTHA.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies,

with reference to the negotiations between Commandant Louis Botha and Lord Kitchener, if he will cause inquiry to be made from the Boer general as to the terms which his Government consider essential to bring about the termination of the war, more especially as in Lord Kitchener's opinion Botha is anxious to bring about peace; and whether he will procure and lay upon the Table of the House the copy of the letter from Commandant Botha referred to by Lord Kitchener as having been brought to him through Mrs. L. Botha, on the 23rd ult.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.):

The answer to the first paragraph is, No, Sir. In reply to the second I have to say that I have telegraphed to South Africa for the text of this letter, and will consider whether it can be laid on the Table of the House.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether if General Botha desires to give his version of the conversation between him and Lord Kitchener in reference to the terms of peace, he will afford facilities for its transmission by telegraph or otherwise to this country in its complete form and without delay.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: This is a hypothetical question, and I cannot answer till the circumstances contemplated in it have actually arisen.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: May I ask if it is a fact that Lord Kitchener has given one version of the conversation, and that possibly there is a second one, and does not that supply to the right hon. Gentleman's mind sufficient reason;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The right hon. Gentleman has said that he cannot give an answer to the question.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: He does not want to. But I will put it down again.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can say whether Mrs. Botha went to meet her husband on the occasion of the recent negotiations for peace of her own motion; and, if not, at whose suggestion.

MR. BRODRICK: Mrs. Botha went to meet her husband at his request.

*MR. CORRIE GRANT (Warwickshire, Rugby): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War on what date the letter (No. 10) (in Paper Cd. 528) was sent by Lord Kitchener to Commandant Louis Botha, and what was the date of the reply (No. 11).

MR. BRODRICK: The letter from Lord Kitchener was sent on the 7th March; the reply from Commandant General Botha was received on the 16th March; I do not know on what date it was despatched.

ASSISTANCE TO BOER FARMERS AFTER THE WAR.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, in reference to the Peace negotiations in South Africa, if he will withdraw the words "by loan" in reference to the assistance proposed to be given to the Boer farmers, in view of the fact that both Sir Alfred Milner and Lord Kitchener have expressed disapproval of those words, considering them likely to interfere with the success of the negotiations.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No, Sir. The negotiations are closed, and His Majesty's Government adheres entirely to the views it has expressed on this subject.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: May I ask whether, in view of the fact that in respect of these conditions there is a great difference of opinion between the right hon. Gentleman, Sir Alfred Milner, and Lord Kitchener, these negotiations will be opened again with a view to settlement.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I am not aware of the great difference which the hon. Member supposes to exist, but in any case there is no intention of reopening the negotiations.

MR. PIRIE: How long will this intention remain?

[No reply was given.]

PLAGUE IN CAPE COLONY.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in view of the gravity of the outbreak of plague in Cape Colony and the number of persons who are now travelling backwards and forwards between the Cape and this country, he will ask the authorities at Cape Town to furnish weekly Returns of the number of cases and deaths among whites, negroes, Indians, and Malays; of the localities in which the disease is prevalent; and of the number of cases and deaths among the military forces in South Africa.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I have asked the Governor to invite the Cape Ministers to send a weekly Return in the form desired by the hon. Member.

REPATRIATION OF SOUTH AFRICAN REFUGEES.

MR. FULLER (Wiltshire, Westbury): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in view of the fact that many former inhabitants of the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies, being British subjects, have been ruined in the course of the war in South Africa, and that in many cases their wives and families have come to this country while they themselves are serving in Colonial regiments in South Africa, he will consider the possibility of sending such refugee families back to South Africa at the conclusion of the war at this country's expense.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I could not give any pledge on behalf of His Majesty's Government, but I should be prepared when the war is over to consider any individual case such as is described by the hon. Member on its merits, and in connection with any petitions for repatriation that may exist at the time.

BOER PRISONERS; SUGGESTED SETTLEMENTS IN CANADA AND AUSTRALIA.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if his attention has been called to the suggestion of General Ian Hamilton that some of the Boer prisoners of war at St. Helena should be afforded an opportunity of engaging in agriculture in Canada, and, in the event of that Government or the Commonwealth of

Australia or New Zealand being willing to receive some of these men, if His Majesty's Government will consider the question, having regard to the absence of any occupation for them in St. Helena; and whether, in such event, upon the conclusion of peace, the Government will consider the issue of a grant equivalent to the estimated value of the passage to South Africa, and the re-establishment upon their farms of any Boers willing to settle in such British colonies.

MR. BRODRICK: I do not think it possible to enlarge these prisoners pending terms of peace being arranged.

WAR DESPATCHES.

MR. BLACK (Banffshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether any written despatches have been received from the Commander-in-Chief in South Africa since Lord Roberts's despatch of 15th November, 1900; and, if so, whether, in view of the meagre character of the telegraphic despatches and the censorship of extra-official sources of information, these despatches will be published before the debate on the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill.

MR. BRODRICK: No despatches have been received.

MR. BLACK: Will the right hon. Gentleman wire to Lord Kitchener requesting despatches as soon as possible?

MR. BRODRICK: I have no doubt that Lord Kitchener will send the despatches as soon as he finds it desirable.

VOLUNTEERS FOR THE FRONT; DRILL ARRANGEMENTS.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if all the Volunteers and Yeomanry who have volunteered for service in South Africa have been drilled and trained after joining at their depots before embarkation by officers who have had experience of South African warfare.

MR. BRODRICK: There is no information to show this. At some few depots, there are officers with South African experience, but the majority of such officers are at present either in South Africa or at home sick.

ST. JOHN'S AMBULANCE BRIGADE; PENSIONS.

MR. PIERPOINT (Warrington): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether a pension will be granted to the widow of Private J. Maddocks. No. 544. St. John's Ambulance Brigade, who, after long service with Lord Methuen's Field Force, died at Mafeking on the 18th January.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): The widow in question has been awarded a pension of 5s. a week with 1s. 6d. a week for her child, and a gratuity of £5 by the Patriotic Fund. The question of how such cases should be further dealt with is now under consideration.

CANADIAN HORSES FOR SOUTH AFRICA.

*MR. GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies will he explain in what way the winter climate of Canada interferes with the purchase and transportation of horses for the war in South Africa; will he also say how Canadian horses have borne the change of climate; and whether horses purchased in Australia or the Southern States of the United States have proved of better service to the authorities.

LORD STANLEY: The severe weather in Canada during certain months causes horses to get out of condition, and also renders railway transport difficult. So far as information is available Canadian horses which have reached South Africa have borne the change of climate well, but there have been very heavy losses in some cargoes in passing through the tropics at this period of the year.

ROYAL RESERVE REGIMENTS.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War

whether he can state approximately the total strength of the Royal Reserve Regiments on 1st March, and how many of these troops have volunteered for the garrison battalions in the Mediterranean and elsewhere.

LORD STANLEY: The Royal Reserve Infantry battalions approximately numbered 17,500 non-commissioned officers and men on the 1st of March. About 1,000 have enlisted into the garrison regiment up to date.

OFFICERS' HALF PAY AND RETIRED PAY DECLARATIONS.

MR. STOPFORD-SACKVILLE (Northamptonshire, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, seeing that inconvenience and delay may be caused to officers in receipt of half-pay or retired pay by the necessity of their declarations being attested by specified persons according to existing regulations, he will consider the desirability of allowing agents or bankers to give the necessary certificates of their clients being alive, according to the practice which prevails for analogous claims in the Indian Army.

LORD STANLEY: Such declarations are required by the Appropriation Act. I will consider the question further.

VOLUNTEER REGIMENTAL SERGEANT-MAJORS.

MR. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state why regimental sergeant-majors of Volunteers are refused the rank of warrant officer, when this rank is granted to regimental sergeant-majors of Militia and Yeomanry, whose duties are lighter and less continuous.

LORD STANLEY: The Secretary of State will consider this matter again, but it has not been hitherto deemed that the duties of sergeant-majors of Volunteers entitle them to warrant rank.

MILITIA DISEMBODIMENTS.

SIR GEORGE FARDELL (Paddington, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can explain why regiments of Militia which were embodied in November or December, 1899, have not been disembodied in preference to those regiments which were embodied some-months later, some of which have been already disembodied; having regard to the statement made in the House on 7th August last by the then Under Secretary of State for War that battalions first embodied would have a strong claim to be first released.

LORD STANLEY: Before the disembodiment referred to, the wishes of the various units were ascertained through the General Officers Commanding. Those units accordingly who wished to be disembodied were disembodied, and the services of those who did not press for disembodiment were retained.

MILITIA OFFICERS' PROMOTIONS.

SIR GEORGE FARDELL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if officers of Militia over fifteen years service, seconded from the Militia to enable them to serve in the Regular Army, who are also captains in the reserve of officers, will be promoted on completion of their service in the Army so as to entitle them to rank as field officers in the Reserve.

LORD STANLEY: There is no intention of promoting any particular category of officers en bloc. Individual cases of specially good service rendered will be considered on their merits.

COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF IN INDIA.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL (Armagh S.)

: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether Sir Power Palmer has been appointed Commander-in-Chief for India for the space of a year and a half only; and whether this is the usual period, and if not, why has any alteration been made.

MR. BRODRICK: It has been decided to continue Sir Power Palmer, who as senior officer in command took over the post of Commander-in-Chief in India provisionally, on the death of Sir W. Lockhart on 18th March, 1900, to make up a period of two years dating from 19th March, 1900. The usual term of the appointment has been for five years. It is not considered desirable to extend Sir Power Palmer's appointment beyond the time mentioned.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL: Was this appointment made solely to keep the place for Lord Kitchener?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

ARMY EXAMINATIONS;FRENCH SYNTAX.

MR. PIERPOINT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been drawn to the decree concerning the teaching of French syntax, issued by the French Minister of Education, dated 31st July, 1900; and whether he will cause the rules for examination therein laid down to be adopted in the examinations in the French language for the English Army.

LORD STANLEY: The Secretary of State will consider this matter in consultation with those engaged in the teaching of French at our military academies.

MR. PIERPOINT: Will the advisers of the Secretary of State be the examiners or independent persons?

LORD STANLEY: I cannot say.

CANTEEN BANKERS;CUBY'S BANK GIBRALTAR.

MR. PIRIE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the canteen and other regimental losses at Gibraltar owing to the stoppage of payment of Cuby's Bank; whether he is aware that this bank was a semi-private one, kept by a man well known to belong to the class of money-lenders as distinct from that of bankers, and that regimental funds had been allowed to accumulate balances at the bank in excess of the regulations, one battalion losing upwards of £1,000 in canteen and sergeants' mess funds, and another £900; whether one sergeants' mess requested leave to remove its money from the bank, and was refused, and if so, can he explain why, and whether he can state the total loss of regimental moneys; and whether he will cause inquiry to be made as to responsibility in the matter.

LORD STANLEY: The bank referred to is, I presume, that of Messrs. Cuby and Son. My attention has been drawn to the case and a thorough inquiry is being made into it.

ARMY ESTABLISHMENT BEFORE THE WAR.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what were the numbers of regular soldiers in this country immediately before the South African War over the age of 20, and with one year's service; under the age of twenty, and with less than one year's service; reservists; also, what were the total numbers in each class belonging to the British Army.

LORD STANLEY: The numbers of the rank and file on the 1st October, 1899, were as follow;

At home.

Under 1 year's service

28,245

Over 1 year's service

65,072

Under 20 years of age

28,183

Over 20 years of age

65,134

Reservists

81,163

Total in British Army.

Under 1 year's service

30,302

Over 1 year's service

168,487

Under 20 years of age

32,663

Over 20 years of age

166,120

The sergeants, drummers, and trumpeters are not classified as above, but amounted to 9,735 at home and 18,253 in all.

MILITARY MANŒUVRES ACT (1897) AMENDMENT BILL.

COLONEL BROOKFIELD (Sussex, Rye): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce during the present

Session a Bill to amend and? extend the provisions of the Military

Manœuvres Act, 1897; or otherwise to ask for increased facilities for the training and instruction, on a large scale, of the troops in the United Kingdom.

MR. BRODRICK: Yes, Sir; I hope to introduce a Bill amending the Manœuvres Act.

ARMY SCHOOLS;DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE.

MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office if he will state the names of the members of the Departmental Committee on the Conditions of Service in Army Schools; what are the terms of the reference to the Committee; and will the question of compulsion to wear uniform when off duty be considered.

LORD STANLEY: The representative of the Treasury is Mr. T. L. Heath. The representative of the Board of Education has not yet been selected. Those of the War Department are Colonel Yates, A.A.G., Woolwich, and Mr. Higgins, Deputy Accountant General. The terms of reference are to examine the proposals for improving the tuition of pupil teachers at Duke of York's School and Royal Hibernian Military School, and to advise generally on the mode of training and remunerating Army schoolmasters and of inspecting Army schools; also to consider the necessity of an increase of the establishment. The Committee will,

doubtless, not lose sight of the hon. Member's suggestion on the subject of uniform.

QUEEN VICTORIA'S FUNERAL; TREATMENT OF SCOTTISH VOLUNTEERS.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state the nature of the food and accommodation which was provided for Volunteers of the 1st Seaforth, Argyll and Sutherland, and Gordons on their arrival at King's Cross early on the morning of the 2nd February, and also during the hours they were in London by invitation of the War Office to take part in the funeral ceremonies of the late Queen; and will he say whether any dinner or other substantial meal was provided for these Volunteers; and, if so, where it was served.

LORD STANLEY: The food supplied to these Volunteers was the same as that supplied to the whole of the troops, and was as follows:;Breakfast;Bread and butter, sandwiches, sausage or ham, and tea. Dinner;A large meat pie, bread and cheese, and a pint of beer or a bottle of minerals per man. The Cordons and Argyll and Sutherland Highlanders had both meals in the London Scottish drill hall. The Seaforths had their dinner there, and their breakfast at the King's Cross goods shed.

MR. WEIR: Is the noble Lord aware that these men had nothing but stale dry bread and cold tea?

LORD STANLEY: That is not my information.

MR. WEIR: Then the noble Lord's information is inaccurate.

QUEEN VICTORIA'S FUNERAL; DETAILS OF COST.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, seeing that in the Civil Service Supplementary Estimates there is a charge of £;35,000 for expenses of the funeral of Her late Majesty, out of which the War Office claims £;15,000 for travelling expenses, food, and accommodation for troops, will he state how much of this sum was expended in connection with the Volunteers from Scotland who attended the funeral at the invitation of the War Office.

LORD STANLEY: The cost was estimated at £;1,400. I cannot give the exact expenditure on each corps without going into details, the interest of which would not justify the labour of their collection.

NAVAL SHIPWRIGHT RATINGS.

MR. GILBERT PARKER: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, having regard to the fact that at the naval ports there is a deficiency in the naval shipwright ratings, and seeing that the present pay is inferior to the rate of wages in the dockyards or private shipbuilding firms, whether he can state what additional inducements, if any, are being offered to obtain shipwrights.

*THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): No additional inducements are being offered. A large number of boys are being trained in H.M. dockyards to serve as shipwrights in the Fleet, a plan which, in the opinion of the Admiralty, will enable them to obtain all the shipwrights they require.

CROMARTY FIRTH.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that there is anchorage for His Majesty's Fleet in Cromarty Firth opposite the towns of Invergordon and Cromarty, Ross-shire; and will the First Lord confer with the

Secretary of State for War as to the expediency of fortifying the two headlands known as the Sutors at the entrance to the firth.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I must refer the hon. Member to the answer given to a similar question on 14th December last by the Civil Lord. It is impossible to consider the cases of particular harbours apart from the general question.

Mr. WEIR: But has it not been promised that the First Lord will confer with the Secretary of State for War?

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: That is the statement in the question. My reply is that we must treat the question as a whole and not merely as relating to Cromarty Firth.

NAVAL ROMAN CATHOLIC CHAPLAINS.

MR. LEAMY (Kildare, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can say on how many occasions since the year 1878 a Roman Catholic chaplain has accompanied a squadron of the Navy, in accordance with the Admiralty minute of that year.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: No Roman Catholic priest has accompanied a squadron, the occasion required by the Minute referred to not having arisen. On two occasions Roman Catholic priests have been specially appointed to minister to squadrons, namely, at Crete in 1898, and in the North of China last year.

COLONIAL CUSTOMS TARIFFS.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he is prepared to enter into communications with the Colonial Governments with a view to induce them to adopt the customs tariff of the United Kingdom, so that British and Irish goods will be allowed to enter their colonies on the same customs tariff as applies to goods entering the United Kingdom, or, failing this, to induce those Colonial Governments who have not done so to adopt a preferential tariff for British and Irish goods, as is done by the Canadian Government.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I am not prepared to enter into such communications as the hon. Member describes. It is, in my opinion, essential to the success of movements of this nature that the initiative should come from the colonies themselves.

CHINA; ANGLO-RUSSIAN DISPUTE AT TIENTSIN.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can state by whom, and at what date, the Russian concession at Tientsin was granted; whether it is a concession to the Russian Government itself; and whether its area includes a portion of the railway line which is mortgaged to British subjects as security for the Chinese Imperial railway loan.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRANBORNE, Rochester): On the 31st of December Li Hung Chang signed an agreement granting to the Russian Government as a concession a considerable tract of land of which the Russian military authorities had previously announced themselves possessed by right of conquest. His Majesty's Government are not aware under what

authority Li Hung Chang signed the agreement. In answer to the third paragraph, it appears that the concession includes property in the occupation of the Chinese Railway Administration, but at present it is not possible to be more precise. I may add that we have declared that the validity of the concession and of proprietary rights within it must be reserved for future examination. Count Lamsdorff made a proposal to the same effect to Sir C. Scott on the 20th instant.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: Am I to take it that the date previously given was not correct?

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: I think that the answer just given may be taken to be an accurate statement so far as we are aware.

ANGLO-GERMAN AGREEMENT AND MANCHURIA.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: On behalf of the hon. Member for North Roscommon, I beg to ask the Under

Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the German Government accepts the view of His Majesty's Government that the Anglo-German Agreement applies to Manchuria as well as to China proper.

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: His Majesty's Government have no information on this subject other than that already at the disposal of the public.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: May I ask the noble Lord whether, in view of the statement, publicly made, that the German Chancellor has declared that the Agreement does not apply, the Government will take steps to ascertain whether the German Chancellor made that statement, and whether it is true?

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: If the hon. Gentleman will be good enough to put that question on the Paper, I will endeavour to answer it.

RUSSIA AND MANCHURIA.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT (Sheffield, Ecclesall): I beg to ask the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs whether the Russian Government have presented to the Government of China a somewhat modified form of the agreement signed between the Russian and Chinese local representatives at Port Arthur; whether this last agreement reserves for Russia exclusive privileges in regard to all mines, railways, and industrial developments in Manchuria, and binds China to construct a railway from the Trans-Siberian Railway to the Great Wall, such railway to be under Russian military guardianship; and whether Russia has withdrawn from the so-called Concert of Europe.

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: We understand that the terms of the proposed agreement are still under discussion, and I am unable to make any positive statement on the subject. The Russian Government have informed us that they have no intention of withdrawing from co-operation with the other Powers in the affairs of China.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: Do the other Powers accept the principle that the agreement should be made behind their backs?

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: I am afraid that that is a question of which I must ask for notice.

ALLEGED LOOTING IN CHINA.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he can now say whether despatches of General Gaselee, with reference to looting

and pillage in China, will be laid upon the Table.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR, INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): I have looked at this despatch since the hon. Gentleman put his last question to me on this subject, and I do not think that it can be published.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Why not?

LORD G. HAMILTON: Because it concerns the acts of troops other than those under General Gaselec's command. As far as I know, no allegation has been made against the conduct of our troops. But if the hon. Member can supply me with any particular allegation I will telegraph to General Gaselee, and any reply that may be received I will give.

SLAVERY IN ZANZIBAR AND PEMBA.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether steps can be taken to expedite the emancipation of slaves in Zanzibar and Pemba.

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: As a result of various causes, including emancipation, it is estimated by the best authorities that there are in the islands of Zanzibar and Pemba only half as many slaves as were believed to exist in 1897. It is the opinion of those of our officials who are qualified to judge, and it is believed I that the representatives of the missionary societies on the spot share the view, that further abolitionist measures would not be necessary. His Majesty's Government would be glad to consider any suggestions which may be made with a view of facilitating emancipation.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS: But are there not 50,000 slaves still there?

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: About that number.

KOREA.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS: I beg to ask the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs whether it is a fact that Mr. M'Leavy Brown has been dismissed from the post of Director General of Customs in Korea, and, if so, what are the grounds of dismissal.

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: A difficulty has arisen in regard to Mr. M'Leavy Brown, Director General of Customs in Korea, but it would be premature to make any detailed statement on the subject.

PROPOSED IMPORT DUTY ON STEEL.

MR. FITZALAN HOPE (Sheffield, Brightside): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in view of the formation of the American Steel Trust, the threatened increase in the German steel duties, and the need for raising fresh revenue to meet the growing expenditure of the country, he will consider the advisability of submitting proposals to the House for a substantial import duty on foreign steel.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): I can only say to the hon. Member, what I say to the numerous correspondents who offer me suggestions for raising revenue, that I cannot anticipate my Budget statement.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet): Do I understand the right hon. Gentleman to say he is not prepared to consider this suggestion?

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: Oh, I have been considering a great many things.

MERTHYR TYDVIL STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATE.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the

Home Department if he will lay upon the Table of the House the correspondence that has passed between himself, the stipendiary magistrate for Merthyr Tydvil, and the justices of the peace for the division of Caerphilly Higher, in the county of Glamorgan; and if he can state the relative position and authority of a stipendiary and local justices in cases coming before them upon which they are not agreed; and whether the decision of the stipendiary overrides the opinion of any number of lay justices sitting with him in petty session.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): A stipendiary magistrate when sitting with other magistrates acts as chairman, and, of course, in view of his position and legal acquirements, his opinion carries great weight, but I am advised that he has not in point of law any power to override the decision of a majority of the justices sitting with him. I do not think that any good purpose would be served by laying the correspondence referred to on the Table.

BREWERS' LICENCES RETURNS.

MR. JEFFREYS(Hampshire, N.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether in the Brewers' Licences Returns the number of brewers mentioned in the first column of Part III., under the heading of persons licensed, could be divided into two classes, namely, those who use malt only, and those who use malt with substitutes for same, and the amounts of materials used by each class be returned separately instead of combined as is now the case; and whether the actual quantity of bulk barrels of beer made by each and every class could be added to the Returns.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The change desired by my hon. friend shall be made in future Returns. It cannot be made in the Return for the year ended 30th September last, as that is already practically ready for printing.

BRITISH WHEAT AVERAGES.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state the mean price of the 4lb. loaf and the Gazette price of British wheat in the first week in March in 1900 and 1901 respectively.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The average Gazette price of British wheat per quarter in the first week of March, 1901, was 25s. 11d., and in the first week of March, 1900, 26s. 4d. There is no officially ascertained price of bread, but returns made to the Board of Trade by over 300 co-operative societies in Great Britain show that the mean price of the 4lb. loaves sold by them at the beginning of March, 1901, was 5s. 6d., and at the beginning of March, 1900, 4s. 6d.

SOUTH KENSINGTON MUSEUM; BUCKLAND FISH COLLECTION.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is yet in a position to make any statement in reference to the ultimate destination of the Buckland Fish Collection at South Kensington.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: No, Sir.

PETERHEAD AND HOLYHEAD HARBOURS.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state the total of the Government grants to Peterhead Harbour,

also the total of the Government grants to Holyhead Harbour.

MR. GEEALD BALFOUR: The total expenditure upon Holyhead Harbour from the year 1855 to the 31st March, 1900, was £; 1,611,360. As regards Peterhead Harbour, I am informed by the Admiralty that the total of the Government grants to the Harbour works from their commencement in 1885–1886 to 1900–1901, both inclusive, amounts to £;426,360, and that the expenditure during that period has been £;398,000.

HECKMONDWIKE SCHOOL OF SCIENCE.

MR. YOXALL: I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education whether he is aware that the Board of Education have ordered that fees must be charged at the Heckmondwike School of Science; whether this decision was taken on the complaint of the Dewsbury Grammar School authorities; and, seeing that the Heckmondwike Science School is under the administration of a Technical Instruction Committee and receiving aid from moneys devoted to technical instruction, whether this requirement to charge fees is allowable under existing regulations of the Science and Art Branch of the Board of Education.

*THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): The answer to the first paragraph of the question is in the affirmative. The decision was taken after local inquiry, and is in accordance with Clause VI. of the Directory of the Board of Education.

MR. YOXALL was understood to ask if a charge on the local rates was not the alternative to fees; and, getting no answer, to give notice that he would raise the question on the Estimates.

TRAINING COLLEGES.

MR. YOXALL: I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether a Board of Education Committee on training colleges has been appointed; who are the members of this Committee, if appointed; and what are the terms of reference to it; and will the Committee consider the lack of training college accommodation, with a view to reporting upon advisable measures of remedy.

*SIR J. GORST: No Committee on training colleges has been appointed. But a Committee is suggesting to the Board of Education courses of study desirable for candidates for certificates. It is not usual to publish the names of such Committees nor the terms of reference, which are not formal. The answer to the last paragraph is in the negative.

IRISH DRIFT SURVEY.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether it is intended to utilise the Geological Survey of Ireland in issuing the Drift Survey, and when it may be expected; whether it is intended to commence the Soil Survey of Ireland, and whether it will be conducted under the Irish Agricultural Department; and whether a sufficient grant and competent staff will be provided to enable its being properly carried out.

*SIR J. GORST: The question of the Drift Survey is, as I have already stated,

under the consideration of the Board of Education. The question of a Soil Survey is one for the Irish Agricultural Department, not for the Board of Education, which has to do with geological surveys only. The last question does not arise.
BOARD SCHOOL SITES IN THE TOWER HAMLETS; REHOUSING.

MR. THOMAS DEWAR (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education, having regard to the fact that Mr. Wylie, who attended at the Limehouse Town Hall on Friday last to inquire, on behalf of the Board of Education, as to the eligibility of Blakesley Street site for the erection thereon of a board school in the Tower Hamlets School Board Division, Block H, was offered an alternative vacant site in the same block, and was assured on behalf of the Stepney Borough Council that if the London School Board would exercise its responsibilities for rehousing, by taking a larger number than twenty houses in any slum property, the council would willingly cooperate with the School Board in any rehousing scheme, whether the Vice-President will order the Education Department to veto the Blakesley Street scheme, which proposes to dishouse 120 people in the most congested and populous district of East London, and to accept either of the alternative suggestions offered.

*SIR J. GORST: There has not yet been time to consider the Report of the Inspector who attended at the inquiry.

ENGLISH LAND REGISTRY.

SIR WALTER FOSTER: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General whether he can state the number of titles registered since 1862, when the existing system of land registry was established, under which it is open to any landowner in England to voluntarily register his title; and, having regard to the fact that the system of compulsory registration of title, under the Land Transfer Act, 1897, was to be experimental only, as is shown by the provision that the system was not to be extended beyond one county for three years after the first Order making registration compulsory; and, seeing that the new system came into operation in the county of London under an Order dated 18th July, 1898, whether it is intended to hold an inquiry into its working before the experimental period of three years expires on the 17th July next; or whether it is proposed to test the working of the system in some other way, in view of the complaints that 'the system has added to the difficulty and expense of dealing with property.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): The total number of titles registered to the end of February is 17,281, of which 756 were prior to 31st December, 1898, as appears from the Parliamentary Return in July, 1899, No. 304. No case for holding an inquiry into the working of the Act has been established. Its extension is intended to be gradual, and its working will be tested from time to time by experience of the system in actual operation.

KEIGHLEY SUNDAY LETTER DELIVERIES.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he is aware that on two Sundays in February the postman delivering in the Knowle Park district of Keighley returned numbers of undelivered letters; that the delivery of those letters was delayed twenty-four

hours; that, on one occasion, the postmaster accompanied the man round the walk and insisted that he should not stay until his knocks were answered but should carry away the letters; and that, although many householders complain that though they responded with promptitude, the postman left before they reached the door; and whether he will give instructions to the Keighley postmaster to act in such a manner as to avoid inconvenience in the Sunday morning delivery of letters.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): The Sunday delivery of letters at Keighley having become too protracted, in order to test the working of the arrangements, the postmaster accompanied one of the postmen on his round on the two Sundays referred to. He reports that most of the houses in the Knowle Park district have no street door letter boxes, and that at many of them no one came immediately to receive the letters. In order that other people might not have to wait for their correspondence, and that the postman's Sunday work might not be unduly protracted, the postmaster instructed the postman, after knocking at the door and waiting a reasonable time without response, to proceed on his route. In the Postmaster General's opinion the postmaster was justified in adopting this course.

LIGHT RAILWAYS IN HIGHLAND CROFTING COUNTIES.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if he will state how many certificates have been issued by the Secretary for Scotland, under Section 5 of the Light Railways Act, 1896 for the construction of light railways in the six Highland crofting counties; and will he state how many light railways have been constructed in these counties since the Light Railways Act came into force.

*THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SCOTT DICKSON, Glasgow, Bridgeton): Perhaps I may be allowed to answer in the absence of my right hon. friend. Five certificates have been issued by the Secretary for Scotland, but no light railways have been constructed in the six crofting counties.

MIGRATION FROM SCOTTISH CONGESTED DISTRICTS.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if he will state how many crofters and cottars have been migrated with the assistance of the Congested Districts Board from the congested districts of the Highlands and Islands of Scotland to other districts.

*MR. SCOTT DICKSON: If the hon. Member means me to state the number of cases in which crofters and cottars have been migrated from the congested districts of the Highlands and Islands of Scotland to places outside the congested districts area, the answer is that there have been none; but there have been, and are, in course of progress migrations of crofters within the congested districts, particulars of which will appear in the -Report.

MR. WEIR: If the information is to be furnished with the Report of the Board, when will that Report be presented?

*MR. SCOTT DICKSON: I hope within two months.

HALF TIMES IN SCOTCH SCHOOLS.

MR. PIRIE: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether he can state the total number of children in Scotland for whom additional attendances have been claimed for

the years ending 30th September, 1898, 1899, and 1900 respectively, under Article 23 (b) 1 of the Scotch Code, 1900; also the number of such children not employed under the Half Time Act but over ten years of age, and certified by the managers to be prevented from giving full attendance at school in consequence of being beneficially and necessarily employed at work during school hours during the same years respectively.

*MR. SCOTT DICKSON: With regard to the first part of the hon. Member's question, the number of children for whom additional attendances were claimed under the article quoted in the Code of 1900, and under the equivalent article in previous Codes was as follows: 3,402 in 1898, 3,434 in 1899, and 3,082 in 1900. As regards the second part of the question, the number of such children not employed under the Half Time Act, but certified as described, was: 2,556 for 1898, 2,318 for 1899, and 1,211 for the period ended 30th April, 1900, at which date the article under which this allowance was made was abolished.

ULSTER ASSIZES.

MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he could state when last the Ulster winter assizes were held in the city of Londonderry, and in what other Ulster towns or cities have they since been held; and whether, considering that Londonderry has as good railway and other accommodation as any other town or city in Ulster, the step will be taken of holding the winter assizes this year in that city.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): Perhaps I may be allowed to reply to this question. The winter assizes were last held in the city of Londonderry in the years 1891 and 1895; in the remaining years since the former date they have been held in Belfast and Omagh. In the selection of the venue for winter assizes the governing consideration is the effective, convenient and economical administration of justice. This depends on a number of changing circumstances which vary from year to year, so that it is impossible at this period to give the undertaking asked for in the question.

MR. O'DOHERTY: Will the right hon. Gentleman say what are the special circumstances which render Belfast so favourable a venue?

MR. ATKINSON: I cannot do that in answer to a question, but if the hon. Member will raise the subject on the Estimates I shall be happy to give him the numerous reasons.

MOVILLE POLICE.

MR. O'DOHERTY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that the three superior officers of the Royal Irish Constabulary stationed at Moville; namely, the district inspector, head constable, and senior sergeant; are Protestants although Moville is a place where over three-quarters of the population are Roman Catholics; and, seeing that some time ago complaint was made to the Inspector General by the parish priest of Moville asking to have this remedied, whether the promise then made by him would now be carried out so that some at least of the senior officers who are Protestants be removed and their places filled by Roman Catholics.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The

facts are as stated in the first paragraph. No promise was made by the Inspector General to the parish priest of Moville to the effect mentioned. I understand, however, that the senior sergeant, who is a Protestant, is about to be transferred to another station, and that he will be replaced by a Roman Catholic sergeant.

THE "GRANUAILLE."

MR. O'DOHERTY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Congested Districts Board's steamer "Granuaile" underwent her annual repairs and survey in England last year; and whether, if the Londonderry Shipbuilding and Engineering Company, Limited, are willing to undertake the repair of the steamer on terms similar to those charged the Board by the English firm who did the work last year, the necessary work of survey and repair will be entrusted this year to the Londonderry company, to which port the "Granuaile" often puts in, and thereby give employment to a city contiguous to the congested districts of Donegal.

MR. WYNDHAM: The contract for repairs to this vessel last year was given to a Scotch firm, whose tender was considerably less than that of the Londonderry firm. When the vessel again requires to be repaired, tenders will be invited from the firms at Derry.

MR. O'DOHERTY: What was the cost?

MR. WYNDHAM: I have not the figures with me.

FISH CURING STATIONS ON THE DONEGAL COAST.

MR. BOYLE (Donegal, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state how many curing stations have been erected by the Congested Districts Board on the Donegal coast; who are the lessees of same; and why has the curing station at Rossbeg been taken from a local fishcurer and handed over to a Scotchman, although the local man was prepared to pay the same rent as the Scotchman.

MR. WYNDHAM: There are ten curing stations, all of which save one, sublet to a Scotch firm, are at present on the Board's hands. These stations are only sublet for a fishing season, and then to the fishcurer who, in the Board's opinion, offers the best terms to the fishermen, regard being had to other circumstances, such as the business reputation of the applicant,

LONDONDERRY ASSIZES;SENDING TRIVIAL CASES FOR TRIAL.

MR. M'FADDEN (Donegal, E.): I beg to ask the Attorney General for Ireland if his attention has been drawn to the case of the King c Sarah Hagan and the King v. Mary Jane M'Laughlin and Mary A. Nelson, heard at the Londonderry Assizes on 18th March instant, and to the observations of Lord Justice Holmes commenting on the practice of magistrates sending such cases for trial at the assizes and putting the county to unnecessary expense, and stating that the Act under which the defendants were tried contemplated that such cases should be summarily dealt with and the county saved the expense of a trial at assizes; and if, in view of the observations of the Lord Justice in these and similar cases heard by him at the assizes for the north-west circuit, he will consider the advisability of issuing a circular to magistrates to refrain in future from returning such trivial cases for trial when they can be summarily dealt with at potty sessions,

and also a circular to district inspectors of constabulary to cease asking magistrates to return trivial cases for trial, and thus save the ratepayers.

MR. ATKINSON: In the first case mentioned the coroner's jury had found a verdict of manslaughter against the accused, and it was upon that charge she was brought before the magistrates, so that they had no option in the matter. In the other cases the solicitor concerned for the accused applied to have the cases disposed of summarily and the police officer in charge offered no objection whatever to that course. The Government cannot dictate to the magistrates as to how they should decide the cases which may come before them, but instructions will be given to the police to call the attention of the justices in cases of this character to their power of disposing of them summarily.

GWEEBARRA BRIDGE, CO. DONEGAL.

MR. BOYLE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention as President of the Congested Districts Board has been drawn to a resolution of the Donegal County Council regarding the condition of the Gweebarra Bridge in the Glenties Rural District, County Donegal, and urging that the Board should take steps to have the bridge repaired; and whether, seeing that the bridge has only been recently erected by the Board, they will comply with the request of the county council.

MR. WYNDHAM: The bridge was completed in December, 1896, at a cost to the Board of £9,000. The Board is unable to relieve the county authorities of the responsibility undertaken by them in March, 1897, to maintain the bridge.

KILLYDYSART DISTRICT COUNCIL.

MAJOR JAMESON (Clare, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board, having regard to the fact that the District Council of Killydysart, County Clare, were forbidden by the Local Government Board to pay an account due to Mr. Patrick M'Inerney, of Ennis, for timber, and that Mr. M'Inerney sued the District Council of Killydysart at the last quarter sessions and obtained a decree with costs against the district council, whether the Local Government Board will pay these costs incurred by the action of the Local Government Board in Ireland.

MR. WYNDHAM: The guardians of the Killydysart Union inquired from the Local Government Board whether they could legally pay a sum of money to Mr. M'Inerney for timber supplied between August, 1897, and January, 1899, but for which he did not present his account until August, 1900. The Board informed the guardians that in view of the terms of Section 51 (7) of the Local Government Act, it had no power to extend the time for payment in the case of sums due since the date of passing of the Act, namely, the 12th August, 1898. The action of the Board consisted merely of explaining the limits of its own jurisdiction. The reply to the last query is in the negative.

MAJOR JAMESON: Will the right hon. Gentleman take steps to see that the Inspectors of the Local Government Board do not unnecessarily interfere in these local matters?

MR. WYNDHAM: I said that we have no power.

MAJOR JAMESON: But is not the right hon. Gentleman aware that they did interfere?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: In view of the fact that costs were incurred in this case owing to the acts of the Local Government Board, will the right hon. Gentleman take steps to have the money refunded to the local authority?

MR. WYNDHAM: I am afraid I can give no such undertaking. In this case the Board put a query to the Local Government Board, which replied that it had no jurisdiction. I cannot carry the matter any further.

IRISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT DRUG CONTRACTS.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Irish firms competing for the Supply of Local Government Board's prescribed lists of medicines are compelled to offer a discount off the scheduled prices; and that the Apothecaries Hall of Ireland, which holds a Royal charter, occupying a semi-official position, tenders for those contracts under cost price; whether any of the members of the Apothecaries Hall hold Government appointments; and whether a system will be adopted to enable private firms to enter into competition for those, contracts.

MR. WYNDHAM: All firms tender upon precisely the same terms (and offer an abatement upon the gross cost of the articles purchased during the year). The Apothecaries Hall enjoys no privilege in connection with these contracts. It holds a charter for instruction in medicine, but the commercial branch transacts business for the benefit of the shareholders in the same way as any other firm. Private firms already compete for these contracts, and appear to secure about 96 per cent, of the contracts, and the Apothecaries Hall about 4 per cent. No change is proposed to be made in the system. I have no information on the second paragraph.

MR. FIELD: Will the right hon. Gentleman be good enough to answer the second paragraph?

MR. WYNDHAM: I have no information to enable me to do so.

MR. FIELD: Why not inquire?

CONGESTED DISTRICTS IN COUNTY SLIGO.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the number of electoral divisions at present scheduled under the Congested Districts Board in the poor law unions of Tobercurry and Boyle No. 2 (county Sligo), and whether, in view of the fact that there are grazing tracts in these districts, some of which are advertised for sale, he will consider the advisability of having the whole of these unions scheduled in order to facilitate the sale of the waste lands mentioned to the Board.

MR. WYNDHAM: The numbers are 9 and 3 respectively. There is no power to schedule as congested areas divisions not already scheduled.

FEVER IN THE ISLES OF ARRAN.

MR. DUFFY (Galway, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether any complaints have reached him regarding the fitness of the person appointed to the position of fever nurse in the Isles of Arran; whether several fresh cases of typhus fever have broken out; whether he is aware that the medical inspector of health has not as yet paid attention to the complaints

made in this House regarding his non-visitation to the Isles; and whether, in view of the fact that the spring mackerel fishing industry soon opens, he will direct this Gentleman to proceed at once to the Isles and take such steps as may be necessary to check this disease.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have already stated that the employment of the male nurse referred to was the best arrangement possible in the emergency. Only one fresh case of sickness has since broken out, and it is doubtful whether it is fever. There is every reason to hope the disease is checked. The medical inspector visited the islands on 21st February, 28th February, and again on Saturday last, when he conferred with the medical officer of health, and ascertained that all due precautions had been carried out. The matter is being dealt with in the ordinary way by the rural district council, and the Local Government Board sees no reason for interfering in the discretion of the council in the choice of nurses, or otherwise.

BAILIEBOROUGH UNION AMBULANCE.

MR. SAMUEL YOUNG (Cavan, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state why the Local Government Board have prevented the clerk of Bailieborough Union from paying promptly for the horsing of an ambulance van hired by them, which would diminish the payment to be made; and if he will direct more latitude to be given to boards of guardians in the future than is now allowed by the Local Government Board in such matters.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Local Government Board did not take the action imputed to it in the first part of the question. The Board, in order to assist the Union in a controversy with the contractor, suggested that the guardians should enter into a permanent contract for the performance of such work. The guardians are acting on that suggestion.

NATIONALIST MEMBERS AND THE COMMISSION OF THE PEACE.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Mr. Kendal E. O'Brien, an hon. Member of this House, has been deprived by the Lord Chancellor of Ireland of the Commission of the Peace, which he held by virtue of his office as chairman of the Tipperary District Council, and that Mr. O'Brien has been twice since re-elected to the position, and each time refused the appointment by the Lord Chancellor: whether the evidence on which Mr. O'Brien was deprived of the Commission of the Peace was based on extracts taken from two alleged speeches which appeared in newspapers, no representatives from which were at either meeting; and whether, seeing that Mr. John O'Dowd and Mr. Conor O'Kelly, both hon. Members of this House, were similarly superseded, and subsequently re-appointed, there is any reason why Mr. O'Brien should not be similarly treated by the Lord Chancellor.

MR. WYNDHAM: The circumstances of the case of the hon. Member for Mid Tipperary were different from those of the Members for South Sligo and North Mayo. The first hon. Member, so far from seeking to lessen the disqualification in respect of which he was removed from the magistracy, or allowing time to mitigate its force, gave utterance in further speeches, as reported in the press, to sentiments amounting, in the opinion of the Lord Chancellor, to further

disqualification. The language reported to have been used by the hon. Member was communicated to him by the Lord Chancellor, but he neither denied having used it, suggested any inaccuracy therein, or disclaimed its obvious meaning.

MR. CULLINAN: May I ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland whether the hon. Members of this House who were deprived of the Commission of the Peace, and have since been restored, admitted or denied the language they had used; and also whether these hon. Members made any apology whatever previous to their re-appointment to the Commission of the Peace?

MR. WYNDHAM: I have already given the grounds which guided the Lord Chancellor in this matter, and I can add nothing.

MR. O'DOWD: I beg to say that in the circumstances in which I was reappointed I made no apology whatever for the views I had stated. I wish to say that I was deprived of the Commission of the Peace for sympathising with the Boers, and afterwards, on my re-election as Chairman of the District Council, I was re-appointed to the Commission of the Peace, and I made no apology for my views with regard to the Boers.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The hon. Member is not entitled to make a speech.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): Is there any appeal from the decision of the Lord Chancellor in these cases? MR. WYNDHAM: No, Sir.

MR. O'DOHERTY: In what particulars did the case of the hon. Member for Mid-Tipperary differ from the cases of the hon. Members for North Mayo and South Sligo?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The hon. Member cannot call on the right hon. Gentleman to argue these points. [Ministerial laughter.]

MR. CELLINAN: I think this is not a matter for laughter. I think it is a very serious matter.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The hon. Member is not entitled to make observations of that kind.

MR. KENDAL O'BRIEN (Tipperary, Mid) rose.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order;

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): Allow me, Sir, to point out that you may not be aware that the hon. Gentleman who has just risen is one of the hon. Gentlemen referred to in this question, and he may have a personal explanation to make.

MR. KENDAL O'BRIEN: I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman why the Lord Chancellor refused my application after being re-elected last June as Chairman of the District Council?

MR. WYNDHAM: I think the hon. Member will see that, since I have put these questions to the Lord Chancellor, I cannot answer them without notice.

SIR GEORGE WHITE'S CLAIM AT ANTRIM ASSIZES.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that at the County Antrim Assizes, on Thursday, 21st March, Sir George White claimed £25 in respect of damage done to the windows of his house at Knocknacarry, near Cushendun, for which damage the county court judge had previously awarded him £4 10s., that Mr. Justice Barton considered it was not a case of malicious injury, and disallowed the claim to compensation;

and whether His Majesty's Government will see that Sir George White suffers no pecuniary loss in this matter.

MR. ATKINSON: The Government have no power to award compensation to Sir George White under the circumstances mentioned.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL: Is not this the house from which a priest was evicted, and has Sir George White turned house-grabber?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

DUBLIN CUSTOMS HOUSE EXAMINATIONS.

*MR. O'DOHERTY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state who conducts the examinations held at the Custom House, Dublin, for candidates appointed by the county councils to the positions of assistant surveyor in Ireland; in what subjects the candidates are examined; and is the examination conducted in the same way, and are the subjects the same, or have they been increased, or has the standard for obtaining a certificate been raised since the coming into operation of the Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1898.

MR. WYNDHAM: The examinations are conducted by the Engineering Department of the Local Government Board. The subjects of examination in the case of persons not professionally qualified are English composition, arithmetic, mensuration, building construction, construction and maintenance of roads, chain levelling and surveying. The questions set in these subjects are of an elementary character. Before the Act of 1898 came into operation, the examinations were conducted at the office of the Board of Works, and the subjects were mensuration, chain levelling, road and drainage works, surveying, and estimates for works.

*MR. O'DOHERTY: Have the subjects increased in numbers since the Local Government Board came into operation, and is it because the candidates are now Nationalists, whereas formerly they were Unionists?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOLS;EXTRA SUBJECTS.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state what is the fee paid for Irish taught in national schools as an extra subject; are fees paid on general proficiency or on individual passes; and in what classes, under new rules, may children be presented for Irish as an extra subject.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am not at present in a position to make any statement on this subject, as the correspondence with the Treasury has not yet concluded.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY.

*MR. O'DOHERTY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will grant the Return on the Notice Paper for Monday with reference to the Royal Irish Constabulary.

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes, Sir. But Galway having been merged into the county by the operation of the Local Government Act it has now no separate authorised police establishment. I can exclude Galway, or include it with a note to the above effect.

*MR. O'DOHERTY: It is my mistake. I should have put Limerick instead of

Galway. Will the right hon. Gentleman grant the Return, if I substitute Limerick for Galway.

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes, Sir.

KNOCKBRACK (DONEGAL) SUB-POST OFFICE.

MR. M'FADDEN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that a sub-post office which has been in existence at Knockbrack, Letter-kenny, county Donegal, for upwards of twenty years was abolished last year; and whether, seeing that the inhabitants of the district are unanimous in asking that the office be re-opened on the ground of public convenience, he will give directions to have the old post office restored to the district, in accordance with the memorial to the Postmaster General setting forth the inconvenience caused by closing this office.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The sub-post office at Knockbrack, Letterkenny, was closed last year in view of the difficulty of finding anyone suitable for the appointment of sub-postmaster. The postal business of the neighbourhood is not sufficient to justify the maintenance of a post office, and as a house-to-house delivery has now been established the office is no longer required as a place of call for letters. The Postmaster General will, however, make a further endeavour to find a suitable person for the office.

IRISH LANGUAGE IN THE POST OFFICE.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he can say for what languages interpreters are employed in the General Post Office, London; and whether, seeing that until recently efforts were made to deliver letters addressed in Irish, he can state who is responsible for a circular issued to post office officials directing them to regard all letters addressed in Irish as undeliverable or insufficiently addressed, and therefore to make no effort to deliver them.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The ordinary staff in the General Post Office, London, is able to deal with correspondence addressed in most languages, but no regular interpreters are employed. The Postmaster General doubts whether there are many persons, if, indeed, there are any, who can write letters in Irish and cannot write in English, and he does not consider it generally practicable to make special arrangements for the translation of addresses in Irish into English, especially in the case of letters posted in England. Nevertheless, he has given instructions that in the event of a letter in Irish passing through an office where it can be deciphered, the address shall be translated into English and the letter sent on to its destination.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: May I ask if the hon. Gentleman is aware that a number of Irishmen prefer to write their letters and address them in the Irish language?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: That does not arise out of the question on the Paper. The Postmaster General has nothing to do with the language in which letters are written. If letters are written in Irish it will be for the convenience of the parties themselves.

MR. WEIR: Will similar instructions be given with regard to letters addressed in Gaelic?

[No answer was returned.]

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Is it not a fact that a number of people Hying in Ireland can only write in the Irish language?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

MR. FLAVIN: I will call attention to the matter on the Estimates.

GLENCOLUMBKILLE (DONEGAL) EX-SUB-POSTMASTER.

MR. O'DOHERTY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he can give the date of dismissal of the ex-sub-postmaster of Glencolumbkille, county Donegal, and the date of appointment of his successor; whether he is aware that the head postmaster of the district removed the post office to the house of a man named Byrne, whose house was the most suitable, and whom he recommended for the vacant position, and that a memorial, signed by nearly all the inhabitants, recommending the appointment of Mr. Byrne, was sent to the Postmaster General; and can he explain why the position has been filled by the appointment of a retired sergeant of the Royal Irish Constabulary, who was not a householder; can he say who recommended the present sub-postmaster for the position, and why a Protestant was appointed, seeing that the Roman Catholics are in a large majority in the district.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The situation of the late sub-postmaster of Glencolumbkille, county Donegal, was declared vacant on the 23rd December last, and it was decided on the 26th ultimo to appoint the present sub-postmaster. In the interim Mr. Byrne was placed in temporary charge of the duties (that being the best arrangement which could be made at the time), and two memorials, signed by inhabitants of the district, recommending Mr. Byrne for appointment, were received. Mr. Byrne's premises, however, were not so conveniently situated as the present sub-office: and there were other reasons against his appointment.

The appointment of the present sub-postmaster was recommended by persons on whose judgment the Postmaster general can rely; and, having become the tenant of the premises in which the late sub-postmaster carried on the business, and which were central, and otherwise suitable, he was selected for the appointment. The Department is not concerned with a candidate's religious belief, and the appointment in such cases is dependent simply on character and fitness to perform post office work.

MR. O'DOHERTY: Can the hon. Gentleman say whether the person to whom he gave the appointment was a member of the Royal Irish Constabulary at the date of his application and appointment?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I do not know whether that was so or not.

MR. O'DOHERTY: Will the hon. Gentleman inquire?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I will do so if the hon. Member wishes, but it does not appear to me to be of any consequence.

MR. O'DOHERTY: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that this is an Irish-speaking district, and that Mr. Byrne was an Irish speaker?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member cannot argue the question now.

CAHIR (TIPPERARY) POST OFFICE.

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

Postmaster General, whether representations have been made of the unsuitability of the post office in Cahir, county Tipperary; whether the postal authorities have been negotiating for more suitable premises; and if he can state what steps will be taken to provide a post office in keeping with the requirements of this centre.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: A scheme for providing a Crown post office at Cahir on a site in Church Street has been sanctioned and the acquisition of the ground is in progress.

PROTECTION OF IRISH FISHERIES.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he can state the number and names of gunboats detailed for the protection of Irish fisheries, and how long ago they were detailed for this work.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The following gunboats are employed in the protection of Irish fisheries; namely, "Skipjack," "Argus," and "Amelia." The orders under which they are so employed were revised and issued in the year 1889; but gunboats have been employed in Ireland on fishery duty for many years prior to this.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: What is the speed of these sailing cruisers?

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The speed of the sailing cruisers varies with the strength and direction of the wind.

MR. FLAVIN: Will the right hon. Gentleman say where these vessels are stationed?

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said he could not say. The duty was about the coast.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: May I ask whether these sailing ships are of the least value against steam trawlers?

*MR. SPEAKER: That question does not arise. The only question on the Paper is with reference to the number and names of the vessels.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND asked if the hon. Gentleman would cause an additional number of cruisers to be sent in view of the fact that three were entirely insufficient.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: That is a question of opinion.

IRISH UNIVERSITY EDUCATION.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen. S.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether His Majesty's Government, in case they should advise His Majesty to issue a Royal Commission to inquire into and report upon the questions connected with university education in Ireland, will so frame the terms of reference to the Commissioners as to enable them to inquire into the present arrangements of Trinity College, Dublin, and to report whether any and what changes can be made in those arrangements which would induce persons not members of the Protestant Episcopal Church to resort more freely to Trinity College and make it more attractive to them.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A.J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): No, Sir; I should be reluctant to increase the controversial difficulties of a very difficult and controversial subject by including Trinity College within the scope of such an inquiry.

MR. BRYCE: Will the right hon. Gentleman before coming to a final decision consider the effect on the value of the findings of the Commission which such an

exclusion would involve?

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): Will the First Lord of the Treasury state when the debate on the question of a Roman Catholic University for Ireland will be taken?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The debate on the question that the Speaker leave the Chair will come on immediately after the Budget, and, if the necessary resolutions are obtained on Thursday, the 18th, I should move the Speaker out of the Chair on Friday, the 19th. If it is necessary to take more than one day for the necessary work of the earlier stages of the Budget, then on the Monday following I should move the Speaker out of the Chair.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the desirableness of not finally settling the terms of reference on the subject of university education in Ireland before that debate takes place?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I will consider the propriety of that suggestion.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE; EASTER RECESS.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can now state when the House will rise for the Easter Recess and meet again for the despatch of business.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think probably the most convenient course with regard to the holidays will be to move the resolution on the subject on Tuesday week at the beginning of business. We might then proceed with the private Members' resolutions, and we should return on Thursday, the 18th, when the Chancellor of the Exchequer will introduce his Budget. That will be a more convenient course than returning on the Monday fortnight.

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): Will the Leader of the House state what business will be taken this week.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: To-morrow the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill will be the first order, on Thursday the Third Reading, to be followed by the Army (Annual) Bill, and on Friday the Navy Estimates.

SIR WALTER FOSTER: What will follow the Appropriation Bill on Thursday?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Some small Bill; the Isolation Hospitals Bill, I believe.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR; PEACE NEGOTIATIONS WITH GENERAL BOTHA.

MR. ALEXANDER URE (Linlithgowshire): I beg to ask leave to move the adjournment of the House in order to call attention to a definite matter of urgent public importance; namely, the recent negotiations between Commandant Botha and Lord Kitchener.

*MR. SPEAKER: I think I ought not to submit the question to the House, and for this reason:; There is on the Paper for to-day the Report of the Vote on Account, which, I admit, is not a very favourable opportunity of raising such a question, but technically it is one. There is also fixed for to-morrow the Second Reading of the Consolidated Fund Bill, on which the subject can properly be discussed. When the absence of urgency arises from the existence of other opportunity for immediate discussion it must necessarily be dealt with by the Chair, and, in dealing with this question now as I am doing, I am simply following precedent.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I wish to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that the Report of the Vote on Account is the last of the Paper, and it

cannot possibly be reached until a late hour, and with regard to to-morrow, by a long-standing engagement it has been settled that there shall be, on the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill, a discussion on the Irish Local Government Vote, which will undoubtedly occupy the greater part of the sitting.

*MR. SPEAKER: I cannot go into details as to the length of time a debate may last on a particular question, but I am bound to follow the rules of the House.

COMMONS.

Mr. Crombie, Mr. Freeman Thomas, Mr. Jeffreys, Mr. Heywood Johnstone.

Mr. William Jones, Mr. A. K. Loyd, and Mr. Montagu were nominated Members of the Select Committee on Commons, with Five Members to be added by the Committee of Selection.:(Sir William Walrond.)

NEW BILL.

DEMISE OF THE CROWN.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): The object of the Bill which I ask leave to introduce is to render unnecessary fresh appointments to office on the demise of the Crown. The House may be aware that, according to the doctrine of Common Law, all offices held of the Crown were vacated by the death of the Sovereign, and fresh appointments by the successor were necessary. Until such appointments were made there would be a complete suspension of all functions of the body politic. The extraordinary inconveniences incident to such a rule have led to several qualifications by statute, but except as to commissions in the Army and Navy, as to which the rule was abrogated in 1837, it still prevails with the qualifications to which I have referred. These qualifications may be shortly stated. In 1707, by the Act regulating the succession to the Crown, it was provided that officers in Great Britain and Ireland and the Colonies should continue to hold their commissions for six months after the demise of the Crown, subject, of course, to the power of earlier removal; and in 1830 this period was for the colonies extended to eighteen months. These enactments apply only to British dominions, so that offices under the Crown in protectorates, which are not technically part of the King's dominions for this purpose, and in foreign parts generally, would still be vacated immediately on the demise of the Crown. As regards British dominions, reappointment is still necessary within the term of six months for the United Kingdom, and eighteen months for the colonies. This state of the law is productive of inconvenience, as the House is aware from the numerous questions which have been addressed to Ministers as to the tenure of office by Justices of the Peace; and, indeed, in the case of protectorates, if the rule were acted upon in practice, it would produce an entire paralysis of all government until the pleasure of the new Sovereign should be made known. It has been suggested that the necessity of reappointment in consequence of the demise of the Crown might have a further effect in the case of Ministers of the Crown who are Members of this House. The House is aware that in 1867 it was provided that, in the case of certain Ministerial offices, re-election should not be necessary in the case of a Member who had held one of these offices at the time of his election and afterwards accepted another in lieu of the first. The suggestion is that reappointment to

the same office rendered necessary by the demise of the Crown is a casus omissus, and that while no re-election would be necessary on appointment to another office, reappointment to the same office might entail re-election. This, of course, would be a somewhat extraordinary state of the law. It may well be doubted whether reappointment under such circumstances would amount to an acceptance of office under the Statute of Anne requiring re-election, but the enactments as they at present stand are far from clear, and opinions may differ as to their effect on this point. I hope the House will agree that the point is not one which should be left in any doubt, and that the proposed Bill, if passed into law, will very properly put an end to a state of things under which conceivably this House might arrive at one conclusion and the Courts of Law at another. The rule that offices are held only during the life of the Sovereign by whom the appointments were made is, in fact, a legacy from days in which constitutional government as it now exists in this country had not been evolved, when, by the death of the Sovereign, Parliament was not only ipso facto dissolved, but all executive government, and indeed all judicial functions, were regarded as having their service in the personal will of the Sovereign for the time being. No good reason can be given for the continued existence of such a rule at the present time, and it is proposed by this Bill that the tenure of office should not be affected by the demise of the Crown. The Bill will apply to all offices under the Crown, whether within or without His Majesty's dominions, and it is proposed that it should take effect as from the last demise of the Crown. I have only to add that it will not in the slightest degree affect the prerogative of the Crown to dismiss at pleasure those who hold office, but it will only dispense with the necessity for reappointment. I beg to move.

DEMISE OF THE CROWN.

Bill to amend the Law relating to the holding of offices in case of the demise of the Crown, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Balfour, and Mr. Solicitor General.

DEMISE OF THE CROWN KILL.

"To amend the Law relating to the holding of offices in the case of the demise of the Crown," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 118.]

SUPPLY [23RD MARCH].

(SECOND ALLOTTED DAY.)

Resolutions reported;

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1901–2.

A. "That 118,625 men and boys be employed for the Sea and Coast Guard Services for the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, including 19,805 Royal Marines."

1. "That a sum, not exceeding £5,760,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expenses of Wages, etc., to Officers, Seamen, and Boys, Coast Guard, and Royal Marines, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902."

CIVIL SERVICES EXCESSES, 1899–1900.

2. "That a sum, not exceeding £;24 2s., be granted to His Majesty to make good Excesses on certain Grants for Civil Services and Revenue Departments, for the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1900, namely;;

Class I.

£;

s.

d.

Peterhead Harbour

…

2

2

0

Rates on Government Property

…

10

0

0

Class VI.

Hospitals and Charities, Ireland

2

0

0

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

Post office

10

0

0

Total

£;24

2

0 "

Resolutions read a second time.

First Resolution;;

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

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said he wished to take that opportunity of saying with how much satisfaction he had heard when this Vote was last before the House the statement of the hon. Member for Dundee as to the great amount to which these Estimates had been swollen this year. More especially was he glad to hear that the hon. Gentleman spoke in behalf of the Front Opposition Bench and of many Members who sat behind them. He thought it was quite time for formal expression of dissatisfaction to be given from the Front Opposition Bench about the very heavy Estimates which were becoming customary in this House, and which were apparently accepted without a word of protest. He had heard the First Lord of the Treasury state that there was no such word as economy in the vocabulary of the House now; but a very good speech had been made by the hon. Member for

Dundee in behalf of more moderate Navy Estimates. The position they were in in regard to these large Estimates; the increases in the men and money asked for; was unprecedented in the history of the country. At the close of a long and arduous campaign, instead of the nation being allowed to have a time of rest and quiet and an escape from these heavy liabilities, the Estimates laid before the House had reached unparalleled figures. Only four years ago; in 1897; the Army and Navy Estimates amounted to £;40,000,000; but this year, apart altogether from the war, they amounted to £;64,000,000, or an increase of three-fifths. It seemed to him that the question put by his hon. friend; why these Estimates were so large?; was a very necessary one for them to consider.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member appears to me to be entering on a general discussion. This is the Report of Supply on Vote A 1, and the hon. Gentleman's argument must be confined to that particular Vote.

MR. LOUGH: I thought there was an understanding that on this Vote, which refers to the increase of the number of men for the Navy, it would be possible to make a general protest against the Estimates if it were thought well to do so.

*MR. SPEAKER: I am not cognisant of any such arrangement. I only know what the rule of the House is.

MR. LOUGH said he would try and keep within the limits Mr. Speaker had laid down. He thought they had abundant evidence that this Vote, as well as the Estimates generally, had been brought forward in a spirit of panic for which he could see no reason whatever. He would point out that the standard which was adopted by the House and country, that our Navy as regards men and ships should be equal to the navies of any two European Powers, had been entirely departed from. Now we seemed to be nearly as strong as any three Powers. He knew that that was questioned by the right hon. Baronet the Member for Forest of Dean, but very strong reasons could be given in support of it. It was quite clear, at any rate, that we were doing a great deal more this year than necessary if we were only to maintain the old standard. We were more responsible than any other Power in the world for the great increase in recent years of both naval and military expenditure. That responsibility used to rest with France and Germany, but now it rested upon England, and he questioned whether we were improving our relative position, for the more we spent the more would the other Powers be stimulated to spend. In 1893 the total amount which was spent was £;30,000,000; in this year the Government had spent £;48,000,000.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The hon. Member seems to be entering upon a general discussion, which is not in order upon the Report stage. The discussion on this Vote must be confined to the number of men.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) asked the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he had considered the question put to him when this matter was before the House in the previous week, namely, the desirability of obtaining some comparative statement as to the strength of the active lists of the navies of the world.

When occupying the position which the hon. Gentleman held, some six years ago, he had obtained such a statement, and a very important statement it was, as it enabled the House to compare the active strength of our Navy with that of other navies. He believed that the Intelligence Department of the Admiralty could

arrive at a fairly accurate idea, and he felt that the country would be gratified if the hon. Gentleman would promise that such a statement would be prepared.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) disclaimed any intention of occupying the time of the House upon this subject, but said he could not allow the Vote to go without a protest. A very substantial increase of men had been asked for on those voted in the previous year, an increase of 4,000, and it was worthy of the attention of the House to remember that there was no finality about this matter. The numbers asked for increased year by year, and he thought the Government ought to say what their policy was with regard to these naval Estimates. Was it intended to go on year after year for all time asking for increases of men and money, or was there a standard which the Government desired to reach and with which they would be satisfied when it was attained? The Irish Members had every reason to be dissatisfied with these Estimates, because Ireland derived very little benefit from the Navy. There were only three gunboats on the coast of Ireland protecting fisheries, manned by comparatively few men, and it was therefore hard that Ireland should be asked to agree to this large increase, the cost of which would in a great measure fall upon her. Before increasing the number of men in the Navy he would like to hear whether the Government had put themselves into

communication with the great self-governing colonies of the Empire, and asked them whether they were prepared to bear any share of the enormous cost which this great increase involved. The colonies paid little or nothing in support of the Navy, and if the Government had not done so it was not unreasonable to ask them to approach the colonies in this matter, and ask them whether they were prepared to bear the expense of, say, 500 of the men asked for in the Vote.

*THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.) apologised for having omitted to answer the question of the hon. Member for Dundee, who had asked for a Return of the active lists; the personnel of the navies of the world. He did not agree with the suggestion that such a Return should be produced. In dealing with the French Navy it would be necessary to include the Inscription Maritime. The active list of the Russian Navy did not include the men of the volunteer fleet, while that of the United States contained enlisted men and, landsmen. They would be comparing a number of things so absolutely dissimilar that they would greatly mislead the public by issuing a Return of the active personnel of the various navies. The Return of the materiel published in response to a request of the Member for Forest of Dean was, he thought, a much more satisfactory criterion of the comparative strength of the navies of the world. He was very much in sympathy with the views of the hon. Member for East Clare, and he most fervently desired that we should have contributions from all our great colonies to our Navy as well as to our Army. But he would point out that this was not made easier when an hon. Member described, as the hon. Member for Limerick did describe, the contributions from the colonies to the Army as being composed of "gaol-birds" and "corner boys."

*MR. H. J. WILSON (Yorkshire, W. R. Holmfirth), who was very indistinctly heard, was understood to say that he associated himself with the opinions expressed by

the hon. Member for West Islington that there ought to be greater control of this military and naval expenditure, which was piling up year after year to an enormous extent. Even those who thought it was all very well in times of good trade would find that in times of depression it would inflict a great burden upon the country. He maintained that it was an entirely unnecessary, extravagant, and wild expenditure, and he should protest against it by his vote. MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.) asked how the Vote for the increased number of men stood with regard to firemen and stokers. He pointed out that these men had a strong and natural disinclination to work the Belleville or any water-tube boilers, having regard to the constant accidents which were happening and the danger attendant on working them, and he asked to know whether a refusal on the part of these men to work these boilers would entail any punishment upon them.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport) said he wished to address a question to the First Lord of the Treasury. When the Army Estimates were before the House, the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War stated that one of his proposals was an increase in the number of men in the Army; that this was to relieve them of the responsibility of manning the coaling stations, and that the Admiralty would naturally take over that responsibility. The Secretary to the Admiralty the other day gave them to understand that the Admiralty viewed that proposal with disfavour. There was no doubt that the Admiralty and the War Department were at conflict on this very important (matter. It was an open secret that the late Board of Admiralty were adverse to this proposal, and he could certainly say that the Board previous to the late Board of Admiralty were hostile to it. The position was this: If the War Department was not going to relieve the Navy of this responsibility, the new scheme would not increase the effective force by 5,000 men, as the Secretary for War foreshadowed the other day. If the Admiralty meant to stand firm and not be cajoled into taking over the responsibility, he thought this was the opportunity to ask the First Lord of the Treasury to give the House and the country some enlightenment as to what was likely to happen on this very important question.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): When my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War referred to what he considered the desirability; and what from many points of view is the desirability; of handing over the garrisoning of coaling stations to the Admiralty, he did not state, and he would not have been justified in stating, that the matter is one which has been finally decided upon. It was still under discussion. As the hon. Gentleman is aware, there is a great variety of opinion upon the subject, and probably neither the Admiralty nor the War Office is very desirous of having handed over to them the somewhat ungrateful task of garrisoning these naval fortresses. It would be impossible for me to make any definite statement as to a policy which is still undecided, but of course we cannot wait for our number of men for the Navy until that decision has been taken. I do not think this matter strictly relevant to the Vote before the House.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs) said the reasons which the Secretary to the Admiralty gave for not making a comparison between the British Navy and those of other Powers showed clearly how well the British Navy compared with others. That

being the case, he would ask the hon. Gentleman whether, under the circumstances, there was really any justification for this enormous increase in the number of men the House was asked to sanction. He wished also to ask why the Government did not do a little more in the way of developing the fishery harbours. If this country were ever unfortunately engaged in a maritime war, it would have to depend to a great extent for its reserves of men upon the seafaring class, and more particularly the fishermen. Could not something of permanent utility be done in that direction, which would be an additional source of strength to the country in time of war, instead of making large additions from time to time in the numerical strength of the Navy?

*SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.): I do not think the answer of the First Lord of the Treasury is quite as full as we might desire. I should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the number of men we are now voting for the Navy does or does not include the number of men that will be required if the Admiralty take over the garrisoning of the coaling stations? The Secretary to the Admiralty has said that the Secretary of State for War was expressing only a personal opinion on the expediency of the Navy taking charge of these stations. I should assume, unless I am told to the contrary, that this Vote is on the basis that they really do not contemplate taking charge of the coaling stations. That is a curious position, because the plan of the Secretary of State for War of reinforcing his Regular troops so as to have 120,000 men always ready to go abroad depends to a certain degree upon the Navy discharging this duty. The hon. Gentleman in charge of the Vote says the Navy does not want this duty, but the House ought not to pass the Vote until we have a clear understanding as to who is going to garrison the coaling stations.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think I can satisfy the right hon. Gentleman. In any case there will be no change in the course of the present year.

*SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Then what becomes of your Army plan?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No one has suggested that the whole Army scheme should be carried out in the next twelve months.

*SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: What I understand is that the number of the Regular forces which may be required to go abroad at any moment depends on the Navy taking over the charge of the coaling stations. Therefore we are to assume that for the present the Navy will not take over the coaling stations. The next time we have an opportunity of examining the Secretary of State for War we must ask him what has become of that part of his plan, which was certainly assumed to be most essential to the efficiency of the force of 120,000 men which is to be ready for all eventualities. The scheme will at least be lame of one foot.

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.) said it seemed to him extraordinary that the War Office and the Admiralty should not have made up their minds on this somewhat important matter. The difficulty of getting men was the crux of both positions, and the country and the world were taken into the confidence of the Government in a way that indicated there was a difference of opinion between the two Departments. He regretted that anything had been said about this until the Government were in a position to state that some final decision had been come to. It was hardly in accordance, with the past traditions of the Government when

there was this difference of opinion that they should state-it in the House.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY (Yorkshire, Shipley) said charges had been made against the Government by the Member for West Monmouthshire and the Member for West Islington which were a little difficult to understand in their

contradictoriness. They were told over and over again that the House should be taken into the confidence of the Government, that the Government should not come there with a cut-and-dried scheme, but that the House should have the opportunity of debating the scheme and advising the Government according to their collective wisdom. Then hon. Members availed themselves of the opportunity when it arose for attacking the Government because there was apparently a want of cohesion between the Departments. It seemed to him, having regard to the number of hon. Members in the House who had Service experience, that it was most desirable that the Government should take the sense of the House upon the question whether or not the coaling stations should be dealt with by men belonging to the Army or Navy. Therefore he ventured to think, now that the question was open for debate, it was one well worthy the attention of the House.

The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire appeared to suggest that if these men, numbering about 7,000 altogether, were not borne by the Navy, the whole of the Army scheme was destroyed.

*SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I said it would be lame of one foot

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY said one foot was half the power of the Army. There was obvious exaggeration in the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman, which he was sure the House would appreciate almost the moment it was made. It seemed to him that the Admiralty Board would be ill advised if they were to deal with this question without the fullest consideration. That the Service Members were capable of assisting the Admiralty Board he felt perfectly certain, He wished to refer to a matter which the Secretary to the Admiralty left largely untouched in his reply the other night; the question of the engineers of the Fleet. There was an amount of quiet discontent among the engineers, but they would continue to do their duty, notwithstanding the apparent want of sympathy with them which was shown by the Admiralty Board. He urged that the Board should grant them the one privilege of rank which they asked. This matter was not new. He believed it was thoroughly understood by the Secretary to the Admiralty. He would remind the hon. Member that there had been inquiries extending over several years in regard to this question. Lord Lansdowne, in a recent speech apropos of Army doctors, used these pregnant words;

"It has sometimes been said, what does rank matter? Is not the title of doctor or surgeon by itself to be regarded as a title, which any one should be proud to bear without further adjuncts? I think the answer to this question is that in the Army rank is the outward and visible sign of consideration and authority, and it is necessary in the military profession that a man should have a military stamp to distinguish him and to secure him his proper place among his comrades."

Admiral Sir J. O. Hopkins, who was formerly a Lord of the Admiralty, and lately served as Commander-in-Chief on the Mediterranean Station, had used these words;

"And now let me touch on the vexed question of the position of the engineers, and suggest that the time has arrived to accord them executive rank. Their

duties are purely executive, and should be recognised as such, and the recognition cannot, in my opinion, clash in any single instance with the other executives."

The Secretary to the Admiralty had stated that there was no possibility of engineers, if given executive rank, ranking in the Navy in such a way that they would be able to assume, ultimately, executive command of a ship. There was no suggestion or desire on the part of engineers that they should be able to do so. All they had asked for was that they should have the same relation to the men under them as the marine officer had to the men under his command. That was the one thing which the engineers were pressing for. It was the universal feeling amongst engineers of the Fleet. This was not a matter of philanthropy or of grievance; it was rather a matter of making the Fleet absolutely efficient by getting the very best men for a position with so large a responsibility, and keeping them contented. He did not wish to press this matter ad nauseam. The matter was thoroughly understood by the Secretary to the Admiralty, and he felt certain that if a reasonable amount of time was allowed to the Board of Admiralty, with the cooperation of the hon. Gentleman, some reform would be made. He regretted, however, from communications which had reached him that the statement made by the hon. Gentleman was so little satisfactory and so little encouraging that he thought it would be desirable to press the matter upon him once more.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): I entirely sympathise with my hon. friend's contention, and I think the change must be made sooner or later; the sooner the better. I merely wish to point out, however, that there is no right on the part of the marine officer on board ship to exercise such functions. The captain can delegate to the marine officer the power to inflict punishments for minor offences, and that, I understand, is all my hon. friend claims on behalf of the engineers. The engineers are becoming so important a unit in the Navy that you ought to approach this question in a somewhat larger spirit. My opinion is that if they had this executive authority, you ought to organise the engineer branch as a unit in itself, the same as the Royal Engineers in the Army, and the marine force in the Navy. The question should be approached from the point of view rather of the

Service than of the engineer. In the First Lord's statement there is a very remarkable passage with regard to the wastage in the marine force. He points out that that wastage is greater than it has been for a great many years, but he does not tell us what is the wastage of the executive and engineering branches of the Navy. Is the wastage in the marine branch on the increase, and is it greater now than it has ever been? If so, can the Secretary to the Admiralty give any reason for it? I am informed that it is because the marine force has not been kept up in the same proportion with the Navy proper as formerly, and that instead of, as in former times, the marine spending most of his time on shore, and the smaller part at sea, he now spends more of his time at sea relatively to his time on

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex.F.

Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Faber, George Denison
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Causton, Richard Knight
Fardell, Sir T. George
Allen, C. P. (Glouc, Stroud)
Cautley, Henry Strother
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edwd.
Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.
Cavendish, R. P. (N. Lancs.)
Fenwick, Charles
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Cavendish, V. C.W. (Derbysh.)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Finch, George H.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J.(Birm.
Fisher, William Hayes
Asher, Alexander
Chamberlain, J. Austen(Worc.
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose-
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Chapman, Edward
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert H.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Flower, Ernest
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Cochrane, Hon. Thos H. A. E.
Foster, Sir M. (Lond. Univ.)
Austin, Sir John
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co)
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Bain, Col. James Robert
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse

Fuller, J. M. P.
Baird, John George Alex.
Colomb, Sir John C. Ready
Furness, Sir Christopher
Balcarres, Lord
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Garfit, William
Baldwin, Alfred
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Gibbs, Hon. V. (St. Albans)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Balfour, Rt. HnGerald W(Leeds)
Cox, Irwin, Edward Bainbridge
Gordon, Maj Evans-(Tr. H'm'l'ts)
Banbury, Frederick George
Cranborne, Viscount
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir JohnEldon
Bartley, George C. T.
Crombie, John William
Goulding, Rdward Alfred
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton
Graham, Henry Robert
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M.H. (Bristol
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Gram, Corrie
Beach, Rt. Hn. W.W.B. (Hants.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Green, Walford D (Wednesbury
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Dalziel, James Henry
Greene, Sir E W. (B'y S. Edm'nds
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Bignold, Arthur
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Grey, Sir Edward (Berwick)
Black, Alexander William
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Blundell, Col. Henry
Dewar, T R (T'r H'm'l'ts, S.Geo.
Guthrie, Walter Murray

Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Hain, Edward
Boulnois, Edmund
Dockson, Charles Scott
Haldane, Richard Burdon
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Midd'x)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G. (Mid'x)
Broadhurst, Henry
Dixon-Hartland, Sir E. Dixon
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Brookfield, Col. Montagu
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Brown, Alex. H. (Shropshire)
Duncan, James H.
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Dunn, Sir William
Harris, F Leverton (Tynemouth)
Bullard, Sir Harry
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Burt, Thomas
Edwards, Frank
Hayne, Rt.-Hon. Charles Seale-
Buxton. Sydney Charles
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.
Caine, William
Elibank, Master of
Henderson, Alexander
Caldwell, James
Elliot, Hon. A Ralph Douglas
Hoare, Edw Brodie (Hampstead)
Cameron, Robert
Emmott, Alfred
Hobhouse, C.E.H. (Bristol, E.)

shore. I am told, but it is a difficult thing to establish, that as a matter of fact, if you compare the gunnery and torpedo branch of the Navy with the marine artillery or marine branch, it will be found that you are now keeping the marine branch at sea longer than the bluejacket branch. That is not a right state of

things. I therefore merely ask my hon. friend whether he can throw any light on the question of wastage, and give us any information as to its cause, and whether it is exceptionally great in that particular branch of the Navy in comparison with the executive and engineering branches.

Question put.

The House divided:;Ayes, 303; Noes, 52. (Division List No. 96.)

Hothouse, Henry (Somerset, E.

Moon, Edward Robert Pacy

Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)

Holland, William Henry

More, Rbt. Jas. (Shropshire)

Sharpe, William Edward T.

Hope, JF (Sheffield, Brightside)

Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)

Shaw-Stewart, M.H. (Renfrew)

Hornby, Sir William Henry

Morley, Chas. (Breconshire)

Shipman, Dr. John G.

Horniman, Frederick John

Morris, Hn. Martin Henry F.

Simeon, Sir Barrington

Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry

Morrison, James Archibald

Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)

Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil

Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford

Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks.)

Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.

Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.

Smith, Samuel (Flint)

Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)

Muntz, Philip A.

Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)

Jacoby, James Alfred

Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G.(Bute)

Soames, Arthur Wellesley

Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse

Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)

Spencer, Rt. Hn C. R (Northants

Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick

Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)

Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)

Johnston, William (Belfast)

Myers, William Henry,

Stevenson, Francis S.

Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)

Nicol, Donald Ninian
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Joicey, Sir James
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Stock, James Henry
Jones, David Brynmor (Swans'a
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Strachey, Edward
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Stroyan, John
Kearley, Hudson E.
Palmer, Sir Charles M (Durham
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Palmer, Geo. Wm. (Heading)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W (Salop)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Tennant, Harold John
Kimber, Henry
Parker, Gilbert
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Kinloch, SirJonn (George Smyth
Partington, Oswald
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.
Knowles, Lees
Peel Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr)
Lambert, George
Pemberton, John S. G.
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings)
Lambton, Hon. Fred. Wm.
Percy, Earl
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Lawrence, William F.
Philipps, John Wynford
Thornton, Percy M.
Lawson, John Grant
Pierpoint, Robert
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Lee, Capt. AH. (Hants, Fareh'm
Plummer, Walter R.

Ure, Alexander
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Valentia, Viscount
Leighton, Stanley
Pretymann, Ernest George
Vincent, Col. Sir CEH(Sheffield)
Leng, Sir John
Price, Robert John
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Priestley, Arthur
Walker, Col. William Hall
Levy, Maurice
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Wallace, Robert
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Purvis, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham)
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Warner, Thos. Courtenay T.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter(Bristol,S
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Rea, Russell
Weir, James Galloway
Lough, Thomas
Reid, James (Greenock)
Welby, Lt.-Col ACE (Taunton)
Lowe, Francis William
Renshaw, Charles Bine
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Rentoul, James Alexander
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Rickett, J. Compton
Whiteley, H.(Ashton-under-L.
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Ridley, Hn. M.W.(Stalybridge)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Ridley S. Forde(BethnalGreen)
Whitmore, Charles Algernon

Lyttleton, Hon. Alfred
Rigg, Richard
Williams, Rt. Hn J Powell-(Birn)
Maconochie, A. W.
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
M'Arthur, Wm. (Cornwall)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Malcolm, Ian
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Wilson, J. W.(Worcestersh, N.
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Wodehouse, Hn. Armine(Essex)
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Markham, Arthur Basil
Round, James
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfries.
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Middlemore, John Throgmorth
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Young, Commander(Berks, E.)
Milward, Colonel Victor
Samuel, Harry S.(Limehouse)
Yoxall, James Henry
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants
Saunderson, Rt. Hn Col.Edw.J.
NOES.
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N.E.)
Ffrench, Peter
Mooney, John J.
Ambrose, Robert
Field, William
Murphy, J.
Blake, Edward

Flavin, Michael Joseph
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Boyle, James
Flynn, James Christopher
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Burke, E. Haviland-
Gilhooly, James
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Burns, John
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Carvill, Patrick G. Hamilton
Joyce, Michael
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.
Clancy, John Joseph
Labouchere, Henry
O'Doherty, William
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Leamy, Edmund
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Crean, Eugene
Lundon, W.
O'Dowd, John
Cullinan, J.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
O'Kelly, J. (Roscommon, N.)
Delany, William
M'Dermott, Patrick
O'Malley, William
Dillon, John
M'Fadden, Edward
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Doogan, P. C.
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Reddy, M.
Sullivan, Donal
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Redmond, John E.(Waterford)
Thompson, E. C. (Monaghan, N.
Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.
Redmond, William (Clare)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)

Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)

Second resolution::

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

MR. KEABLEY: In connection with this Vote I want to put before the Secretary to the Admiralty what I deem to be a practical point with reference to recruiting.

At the present moment the Navy is recruited in those districts where the Service is held to be a hereditary service. In the constituency I represent, fathers and sons have for generations gone into the Navy, and it is the same in other naval ports. The suggestion I make is that the Admiralty should consider the advisability of recruiting by recruiting officers in country districts. The country boy has many advantages. He is healthy, and so on, and for the stoker class especially I would suggest there are many advantages to be gained by sending recruiting officers into the country districts. If a boy in a country district wishes to join the Navy, he has nowhere to apply except possibly to a clergyman or at the police station, where you circulate recruiting notices.

Neither of these is the proper medium to which a boy would be likely to apply, but if there was a petty officer recruiting in an agricultural district, say one officer to each county, I am perfectly certain you would get shoals of recruits. But it would be necessary to send a man down into the country in uniform. A country boy's idea of a sailor is a man in serge and so on. He would not understand a cloth coat. His only conception of a sailor is a man wearing blue serge and the ordinary get-up of a sailor. I make the suggestion because I think it is a practical one. There is no getting away from the fact that the Navy is the more popular Service. The Army may have some complaint because you are poaching on their preserves, but they are not so likely to get such a large number of men from the country districts into the Army, whereas if a man goes away from a country district into the Navy and puts in his full time, as the majority of them do, he

comes back with a good pension and is a good advertisement for the Navy. You are wanting 4,000 or 5,000 recruits, and I should be glad to hear whether the hon. Gentleman thinks this suggestion a practical one.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB said he desired to direct the attention of the Secretary to the Admiralty to the annoyance and vexation that many naval officers were put to by the in and out system of full pay and half pay. He would not ask for an immediate answer, but would give an illustration which would convey the point he wished to make. A ship came home, and was paid off. An officer got leave, and was on full pay for a certain period. He was then put on half pay, although he was about to be appointed to a guardship on full pay. He would give an instance of an officer at Chatham who, although it was known he was about to be appointed to a ship at Devonport, was put on half pay for a day or two previous to his appointment in order that he, and not the country, should pay his travelling expenses to Devonport. It was a constant trick on the part of the Admiralty to put an officer on half pay for a few days, with the result that he had to pay his own travelling expenses to join a ship. That led to great annoyance, and was very unjust. He merely wished to publicly direct the attention of the Secretary

of the Admiralty to the way in which things were manipulated at the Admiralty with a view to justice being given to officers in the circumstances he had mentioned.

MR. FLYNN said he desired to make a few observations of a general character, and also a few remarks of a local character. There was an increase of practically a quarter of a million in the amount of the appropriations in aid, and surely they were entitled to ask when finality in such an increasing expense would be reached. If the House voted nearly six millions of money, in another year or two the alarmists would start fresh sensational rumours about England being on the brink of invasion, there would be sensational pamphlets and paragraphs, and another increase of a million or two would be asked for, and Estimates already swollen would be still further swollen. There should be a protest against the continual increase of the Estimates, and it was time that the representatives of the taxpayers raised their voices against it. The Admiralty was stirred by every league and movement and plunged into greater and greater extravagance. Notwithstanding Ireland's enormous contribution to the Navy the Irish Members could not obtain from the Secretary to the Admiralty a guarantee that ships other than old tubs would be sent to protect the Irish fisheries; yet Australia was well provided with ships, although it contributed only £30,000 to the expenses of the Navy.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The contribution is £156,000.

MR. FLYNN said there was a contribution of £14,000 in another Vote, and the wealthy and populous Australian colonies only paid the interest on the amount spent of the construction of the ships they had. Here was a contribution of only £30,000 from Australia, while that from Ireland was two and a quarter millions, and yet they could not obtain from the Admiralty the necessary gunboats for the protection of Irish fisheries.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The question of the Irish fisheries does not come within this Vote. I would further remind the hon. Member that it is not in order to raise the question of the financial relations of Ireland on Report of Supply on the number of men for the Navy.

MR. FLYNN said he was only drawing a lesson, and not discussing the financial relations of Ireland. He was calling attention under Sub-head K to the very small contributions given by Australia and India to the support of the Navy; and he thought that the Admiralty should direct the attention of the Australian colonies, now federated into a mighty Empire, with enormous resources, increasing wealth and population, to the fact that they ought to contribute a larger share than they did to the cost of the Navy. He failed to see why they should not.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB, on a point of order, said that the sum of money contributed by the colonies was on Vote 16, and could be discussed when that Vote was reached.

MR. FLYNN said that the hon. and gallant Gentleman was quite wrong. It was quite possible that there was another appropriation dealing with maintenance, but he was looking at Vote K. The other Vote was for a sum of £14,000 odd, payable by way of interest on capital expenditure for the construction of the ships of the Australian squadron. His point was that the contribution of the Australian

colonies to the maintenance of the Navy was altogether inadequate in view of the increasing taxation in this country.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: In reply to the hon. Member for North Cork, I have already said all that there is at present to say in regard to the question of colonial contributions to the Navy. The hon. Member for Devonport spoke of increasing the facilities for recruiting for the Navy in the inland counties. I think it is proved that even in the western counties we, as a rule, get the boys for the Navy from the inland and agricultural districts rather than from the sea-side towns. The sea-side boys generally go into the fishing fleet. The boys who enter the Navy do so more from having read books than from seeing ships. As a matter of fact, I am happy to say that at present we have experienced no serious difficulty in obtaining a full supply of well-qualified boys for the service of the Fleet.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick) said that the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Admiralty had stated in answer to a question put to him that there were five coastguard gunboats to watch the Irish fisheries. He thought from his knowledge of the subject that that was a mistake;

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member will find an opportunity of dealing with that question on a later Vote.

MR. JOYCE: I defer to your judgment on this matter, Mr. Speaker. I would not defer to anybody else's judgment in this House. But I find on this Vote of five millions a portion of the money is for the payment of the coastguard vessels.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: These are not coastguard vessels.

MR. JOYCE said he would raise his point at the proper time if he was not in order now. But he found one portion of this five millions was for the victualling of the Navy;

*MR. SPEAKER: That is a separate Vote. The question before the House is merely that of the pay of the men, and if the hon. Member wants to say anything on that he will be relevant.

MR. ARCHDALE (Fermanagh, N.) wished to call attention to a most deserving class in the Navy; the boatswains. Four years ago the Admiralty had given the gunners an extra pay of eighteen-pence a day, and he saw no reason why the equally deserving class of boatswains should not have had the same money. He confessed that in his own time in the Service, when all the ships were masted, the boatswains were of more use than now, but what with the increase in education the boatswains were in these days as well up in gunnery and torpedo work as the warrant officers, and he pressed on the Secretary to the Admiralty to give them the same rate of pay as the warrant officers. He also wished the Admiralty would send to the West Coast of Ireland a training ship to induce the boys there to join the Navy. In his own county he had done the best he could to induce boys to join the Navy, which he thought one of the finest services in the world; and he believed a training ship in Loch Swilly would do a great deal of good.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.) said that Irish Members looked at the question of the Navy from a different point of view from other hon. Members who regarded it from the purely British or colonial standpoint. Irish Members had unfortunately

different interests to protect. It had been said that the cost of the Navy was merely an insurance for the safe carrying on of British trade, but Ireland had no foreign trade to protect, and he thought the colonies, with their expanding trade, ought to contribute more than they did to these gigantic Votes.

COMMANDER YOUNG (Berkshire, Wokingham) wished to re-echo what had been said by his hon. and gallant friend in regard to the pay of the warrant officers in the Navy; and he felt certain that the Secretary to the Admiralty would give those interested in this subject an opportunity of laying their views fully before him on this matter. He hoped the filling up of the ranks of the chief warrant officers would not be so long-delayed in the future as in the past. For instance, the chief boatswain or the chief carpenter standing on the list first for promotion ought to be promoted almost immediately; for, if not, he might die in the meantime and his widow would lose all the advantages of pension of the rank to which he ought long before to have been promoted. The hon. Member for Devonport had spoken of the advantages of recruiting for the Navy in the rural districts, and expressed the hope that it would be extended. He should suggest that when the Admiralty sent an officer to recruit they should send one likely "to go down." A man came to his district who could not spin a yarn, sing a song, nor dance a hornpipe, and objected to sit up late at night. From what he heard, the people in the neighbourhood said that if the Admiralty could not send a better man they had better send none at all.

*MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty) desired to support the hon. Member who had been urging the importance of going to new recruiting districts for the Navy. There were no better districts than the coasts of the United Kingdom, and no better material could be found than on the north and north-west coast of Scotland. The Admiralty had been good enough to promise that the "Northampton" training ship should visit Stornoway in the autumn, but that was not enough; a training ship should be permanently stationed in the district. A large sum was down on the Vote for the coastguard. He would ask that the coastguard should be instructed to report cases of illegal trawling, and he thought the Naval Reserve at Stornoway should be provided with something better than model guns.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

*MR. WEIR said he was only anxious that the Naval Reserve men should be allowed the opportunity of becoming expert gunners.

*MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.) joined in the protest of the hon. Member for North Cork that the self-governing colonies did not contribute to the Navy the same amount in proportion to their resources and population as Ireland did. Ireland was an agricultural country which fed herself, and consequently she had no commerce to protect; and therefore the supremacy of the British Navy was quite immaterial to them in Ireland. The hon. Member for North Fermanagh had said that they in Ireland were interested in this Vote as the Government had stationed a training ship in Lough Swilly. The constituency he represented extended all round Lough Swilly, and he had been there quite recently, but he saw no training ship, unless it was one of the new invisible submarine boats. Ireland gained nothing from the expenditure on the Navy. Not many months ago the Corporation

and people of Derry sent a petition to the Admiralty asking that the Channel Fleet should visit Lough Foyle; a request which had also been made the previous year; but nothing had come of it except a formal acknowledgment of the receipt of the letter. The suggestion of the hon. Member for Ross-shire that the coastguard should take some share in the looking after illegal trawling had much to commend it, and he hoped the Secretary to the Admiralty would take note of it. His constituency was altogether maritime, and he had to complain of the large number of English steam trawlers which were investing their waters.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The hon. Member is not in order in debating the Irish Fisheries on this Vote.

*MR. O'DOHERTY said that with due respect to the Speaker the cost of the coastguards was on this Vote, and he thought the coastguards should be asked to report on any illegal trawling that took place in local waters. The coastguards, moreover, had a great deal of leisure time, and they could carry out the recommendations of the Commission on Salmon Fisheries without much fatigue to themselves.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; That does not arise on this Vote.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.) said that as the Government had refused to send any portion of the Fleet to protect the Irish fishing industry, they were perfectly justified in asking whether the coastguard, which was on this Vote, could not be employed in that duty.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member cannot go into the question of employing the coastguard in protecting Irish fisheries. That is a matter which comes under some other Vote.

MR. FLAVIN bowed to Mr. Speaker's ruling, but he would ask what were the duties of the coastguard? Were Irish Members not justified in saying that if their constituents were compelled to contribute a portion of the annual payment to the coastguard, they were entitled to claim an explanation of what their duties were, and whether these duties could not be extended to the protection of the Irish fisheries when they were refused protection from any other sources. Knowing the condition of the Irish fisheries they, had made application year after year for protection;

MR. SPEAKER: I have told the hon. Gentleman that he cannot go into the question of illegal trawlers.

MR. FLAVIN said that with all due respect he was not going into that question. He was only pointing out that if it was necessary to prevent a long discussion on this Vote, more than ordinary attention should be paid to asking the coastguard to afford some protection to the Irish fisheries. If he was in order he would like to ask what justification there was for increasing the number of men or ships in the Navy. What were they going to receive in return for this vast amount of money? None of His Majesty's ships were either built or repaired in Ireland. Perhaps a certain number of men were recruited there, but that was an unwise thing, in his opinion, from an Irish point of view.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman is entirely out of order, and I really must ask him to conform to my ruling.

MR. FLAVIN: I most respectfully bow to your ruling, but, as the £5,000,000 is

part and parcel of the naval expenditure of this country, I thought I was entitled to discuss it.

*MR. SPEAKER: The question is whether £5,000,000 should be voted for the pay of officers and men. The hon. Member is now going into the comparative sizes of the navies of Britain and other countries, and other matters which do not arise on this Vote.

MR. FLAVIN said he was not going into an elaborate discussion of the whole question, but he thought he might be justified in saying that the expenditure was not warranted, considering the revenue of the country as compared with the naval expenditure. The Nationalist Members considered that they were justified in protesting against all such expenditure. The people whom they represented received nothing in

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Bentinck, Lord Henry C.

Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.

Chapman, Edward

Aird, Sir John

Bignold, Arthur

Churchill, Winston Spencer

Allen, C. P. (Glouc, Stroud)

Black, Alexander William

Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.

Allhusen, Augustus Hy. Eden

Blundell, Colonel Henry

Coghill, Douglas Harry

Anson, Sir William Reynell

Bond, Edward

Cohen, Benjamin Louis

Archdale, Edward Mervyn

Boulnois, Edmund

Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Bowles, Capt. H.F. (Middlesex)

Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Brand, Hon. Arthur G.

Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole

Asher, Alexander

Broadhurst, Henry

Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)

Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis

Brookfield, Colonel Montagu

Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)

Ashton, Thomas Gair
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Cox, Irwin Edw. Bainbridge
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herb. Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Cranborne, Viscount
Atherley-Jones, L.
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Cross, H. Shepherd (Bolton)
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bullard, Sir Harry
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Austin, Sir John
Burt, Thomas
Cust, Henry John C.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Caine, William Sproston
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen n)
Baird, John George Alexander
Caldwell, James
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardiga
Balcarres, Lord
Cameron, Robert
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Baldwin, Alfred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Dewar, T. R. (T'rH'ml'ts, S Geo.)
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Cautley, Henry Strother
Dickson, Charles Scott
Banbury, Frederick George
Cavendish, Rt. F. (N. Lancs.)
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Bartley, George C. T.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Beach, Rt. Hn Sir M. H. (Bristol)

Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Beach, Rt. Hn. W.W.B. (Hants
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J.(Birm.)
Duke, Henry Edward
Bell, Richard
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r)
Duncan, James H.

return for the money. They had asked for the protection of their fisheries, and that had been refused, and the only thing the Nationalist Members could do was to get up and protest night after night, and session after session against the expenditure of money. As long as the House continued to refuse to do justice to the fair claims of Ireland there was no other course open to them but to harp away until that country was allowed to manage her own affairs.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green) said that until the Irish Members got a more sympathetic answer from the Secretary to the Admiralty in regard to the appointment of Roman Catholic chaplains in the Navy it would be a very unwise thing to take any lad of that faith from his home and put him in the Navy, where he would not get the consolation of his religion. This Vote was asked for the purpose of providing an increased number of men, and he thought they had a perfect right to ask how many of the men would be apportioned to Ireland to assist in protecting the Irish fisheries.

Question put.

The House divided: Ayes, 318; Noes, 56. (Division List No. 97.)

Dunn, Sir William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Price, Robert John
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Edwards, Frank
Knowles, Lees
Purvis, Robert
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Lambert, George
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Rasch, Maj. Frederic Carne
Faber, George Denison
Lawrence, William F.
Ratchffe, R. F.
Fardell, Sir T. George
Lawson, John Grant
Rea, Russell
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward

Layland-Barratt, Francis
Reid, James (Greenock)
Fenwick, Charles
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants. Fareham)
Reid, Sir R. T. (Dumfries)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Legge, Col Hon. Heneage
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Finch, George H.
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Rentoul, James Alexander
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Leighton, Stanley
Rickett, J. Compton
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Leng, Sir John
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Fisher, William Hayes
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Ridley, S. F. (Bethal Green)
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Levy, Maurice
Rigg, Richard
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Lockwood, Lt. -Col A. R.
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Charles T.
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Flower, Ernest
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Foster, Sir Michael (Lond. Univ.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Lowe, Francis William
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Ropner, Col. Robert
Furness, Sir Christopher
Lowther, Rt. Hon. James (Kent)
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel W.
Garfit, William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman

Round, James
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Godson, Sir August us Frederick
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W G Ellison
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'rHml'ts
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Maconochie, A. W.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H.(Renfrew
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Goulding, Edward Alfred
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall
Simeon, Sir Harrington
Graham, Henry Robert
Majendie, James A. H.
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire
Green, Walford D. (Wednsbury
Malcolm, Ian
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)
Greene, Sir E. W (B'ryEdm'nds
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Smith, H.C.(Northmb. Tyneside
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Gretton, John
Maxwell, W.J.H. (Dumfriesshire
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Grey, Sir Edward (Berwick)
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C R (Northants

Guthrie Walter Murray
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Hain, Edward
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Stevenson, Francis S.
Haldane, Richard Bunion
Milton, Viscount
Stewart Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Hall, Edward Marshall
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Stock, James Henry
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Lord G. (Middx
Montagu, Hon. J. S. (Hants.)
Strachey, Edward
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Stroyan, John
Hare, Thomas Leigh
More, Robert J. (Shropshire)
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Harris, F. L. (Tynemouth)
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Morgan, J. L. (Carmarthen)
Tennant, Harold John
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Morrison, John Archibald
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.)
Henderson, Alexander
Moulton, John Fletcher
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Hoare, Edw Brodie (Hampstead
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Thornborn, Sir Walter
Hobhouse, C.E.H (Bristol, E.)
Muntz, Philip A.
Thornton, Percy M.
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.

Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Holland, William Henry
Murray, Col. W. (Bath)
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Hope, J.F (Sheffield, Brightside
Myers, William Henry
Ure, Alexander
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Valentia, Viscount
Horniman, Frederick John
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Walker, Col. William Hall
Howard, Capt J. (Kent, Faversham)
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Palmer, Sir C. M. (Durham)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Palmer, George W. (Reading
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R)
Parker, Gilbert
Weir, James Galloway
Jacoby, James Alfred
Partington Oswald
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C E. (Taunton
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Peel, Hon. William Robert W.
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Pemberton, John S. G.
Wharton, Rt.Hon. John Lloyd
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Penn, John
White, George (Norfolk)
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex
Philipps, John Wynford

White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Joicey, Sir James
Pierpoint, Robert
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Jones, David Brynmor (Swans'a
Pirie, Duncan V.
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Jones, William (Carnavonsh.
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Plummer, Walter R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh, N.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Pretymann, Ernest George
Wodehouse, Rt. Hon. E. R. (Bath)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Yoxall, James Henry
NOES.
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N.E.)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Ambrose, Robert
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Doherty, William
Blake, Edward
Gilhooly, James
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Boyle, James
Hardie, J. K. (Merthyr Tydvil)
O'Dowd, John
Burke, E. Haviland-
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
Burns, John
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
O'Malley, William

Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Joyce, Michael
O'Shaughnessy, J. P.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Leamy, Edmund
Power, Patrick Joseph
Clancy, John Joseph
Lundon, W.
Reddy, M.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Crean, Eugene
M'Dermott, Patrick
Redmond, William (Clare)
Cremer, William Randal
M'Fadden, Edward
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Cullinan, J.
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Delany, William
Mooney, John J.
Sullivan, Donal
Dillon, John
Murphy, J.
Thompson, E. C. (Monaghan, N.)
Doogan, P. C.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Duffy, William J.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Ffrench, Peter
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipp'rery Mid)
Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.
Field, William
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)

Ordered, That the Resolution which, upon the 21st day of this instant March, was reported from the Committee of Supply, and which was then agreed to by the House, be now read.

"That a number of Land Forces, not exceeding 450,000, all ranks, be maintained for the Service of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland at Home and Abroad, excluding His Majesty's Indian Possessions, during the year ending on

the 31st day of March, 1902."

Ordered, That leave be given to bring in a Bill to provide, during Twelve Months, for the Discipline and Regulation of the Army; and that Mr. Secretary Brodrick, Mr. Arnold-Forster, and Lord Stanley do prepare and bring it in.

Third Resolution agreed to.

ARMY (ANNUAL) BILL.

"To provide, during Twelve Months, for the Discipline and Regulation of the Army," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 119.]

SUPPLY [19TH MARCH].

Resolution reported::

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS REVISED SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1900–1901.

"That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £;893,316, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the following Civil Services and Revenue Departments, namely::

CIVIL SERVICES.

Class V.

£;

Vote 3. Colonial Services

212,300

Vote 2. British Protectorates in

Uganda, etc

200,000

Class VII.

Vote 1. Temporary Commissions

9,000

Class II.

Vote 23. Stationery and Printing

110,000

Vote 27. Secretary for Scotland, Office of

100

Class III.

Vote 2. Miscellaneous Legal Expenses

400

Class IV.

Vote 5. Wallace Collection

3,333

Vote 8. London University

70

Class V.

Vote 1. Diplomatic and Consular Services

15,800

Vote 6. Treasury Chest Fund

66,108

Class VI.

Vote 1. Superannuation and Retired Allowances

10,000

Vote 5. Savings Banks and Friendly Societies Deficiencies

51,758

Class VII.

Vote 2. Miscellaneous Expenses

4,600

Vote 6. Local Loans Fund

4,337

Vote 7. Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York (Visit to the Colonies)

20,000

Vote 8. Funeral of Her late Majesty

35,500

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

£;

Vote 2. Inland Revenue

20,000

Vote 3. Post Office

130,000

Vote 4. Post Office Packet Service

10

Total Civil Services and Revenue Departments

£;893,316"

Resolution read a second time.

*SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said: I rise for the purpose of objecting to this Vote, and I think it will be for the advantage of the House that we should have your advice and decision as to the unusual form in which this Vote has been presented. It is a Vote of nearly a million of money, and it presents itself, I believe, for the first time, in the form of a Vote consolidating a number of classes of the Civil Service Estimates. Quite apart from the merits of that change, what I should like to hear your opinion upon is, under what authority and in what manner substantial and serious changes in the practice of the House are made. The circumstances will be fresh in the recollection of many Members. I do not wish to attribute any evil intention to those who made it, but this change was made in a manner which gave substantially no notice, and I venture to say it took all the non-official Members of the House by surprise. I have had some years experience of the Estimates, and I myself derived no information of any serious change having been made from reading the Paper. If such a change were necessary, I venture to suggest that it would have been proper that there should have been, as we often have in regard to Bills and Parliamentary Papers, a memorandum telling Members of the House that such a change had been made. What I wish to have your opinion upon is this, Has the Executive Government the power at a moment, with or without notice, and without consulting the House generally, to alter the established practice of Parliament? One of the most important duties of Members of the House is to watch the expenditure of the country, and

that has been done by the aid of certain rules which have been made in regard to the form of Supply. Supply has been divided into classes which the House may conveniently consider, deal

with, and vote upon, and, that being the established practice, this matter of form is vital to the control by the House over Supply. By what authority are serious changes to be made in the practice? If the Government can consolidate half a dozen or a dozen classes, they may consolidate the whole of them, and if such a principle were to be laid down, then the Executive Government can practically defeat the whole control by the House over Supply by consolidating the classes. By that principle you may consolidate the Army, Navy, and Civil Service Estimates in one Estimate and close it. In considering what is to be the policy, when making changes, we must consider the extreme case which might arise under such authority. No man is better acquainted than you, Sir, with the sound principle in the Courts of Equity that the practice of the Court is the law of the Court. And so the practice of the High Court of Parliament is the law of Parliament until it is altered by proper authority. Is it not sound

Parliamentary and constitutional law that no established practice of this House should be changed without giving the House sufficient notice and allowing us to give our opinion upon it? I have observed, as some mitigation of the course taken by the right hon. Gentleman, that when he was asked by one of his own supporters whether this was to be a regular practice or whether it was only done under extreme pressure, the right hon. Gentleman said nobody but a lunatic would ever dream of its being made a precedent. I hope that we may, with your assistance, have it laid down that this is to be no precedent in the future. So much then for the first part. I want to ask your opinion upon, Sir, what I am contending for, and it is a most important thing, and that is, that no change shall be made in the established rules of this House, especially with regard to the question of Supply, without giving the House of Commons an adequate opportunity of discussing the change. We know it was done without notice being given to the House of Commons, but what I should like to know is whether it was done on your authority. It was done on Friday night, after the Government had obtained a great many Votes with the consent of the House. This is a matter which lies at

the root of the authority and character of the House of Commons. We are told, indeed, that this House is falling in the estimation of the country. I think it is our business to maintain the rights of the House in the face of the country. Now I pass for a moment to the merits of the thing itself. What is the merit in itself of consolidating a dozen separate Votes on each one of which the House ought to have a right of discussion and dividing. Although the Chairman of Committees has already ruled in Committee that we might discuss each item and divide upon it, we have no security that we shall be allowed to do so, if a Minister is at liberty to move the closure as soon as the Vote has been presented, and that motion can only be disposed of by a single division. If the principle laid down by the Chairman of Committees is conceded then we might discuss and divide on each item of the Vote, but there is no security for it, because the closure may be moved when six out of twelve items have been

discussed, or it can be moved on the whole. If you once give the Government such authority in this matter without safeguards, you give them power to prevent discussion and division on any or all of these Votes. I venture, Sir, to submit that that is a question for you to advise the House as to whether or not changes of this magnitude and of this vital importance can be made, simply upon the suggestion of the Government, without adequate notice being given to the House. Whether there is any limit whatever, if it be so, to our power to test the feeling of the House by discussion and division, and whether this course might be taken in another year without there being an opportunity for that discussion and division upon these matters, which have hitherto been the universal practice of the House. It is a matter of vital importance, having regard to the position in which it places the House, and I venture to ask you, Sir; your authority stands much higher than even that of the Chairman of Committees upon this subject; if you will give the House the benefit of your judgment as to how far we have the power of resisting the autocracy of the Government in this matter of Committee of Supply and Report of Supply. It would be a very useful thing for the House of Commons to have an authoritative ruling from you.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I understand that the right hon. Gentleman was putting a question upon a point of order. He has put several questions so far as I can gather upon that point of order, and, that being so, perhaps I may be permitted to put a question also.

*SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said it was not strictly a point of order; it was rather asking the direction and advice of the Speaker on a change of procedure.

*MR. SPEAKER: I considered that the right hon. gentleman was raising a point of order.

*MR. A. J. BALFOUR: On the point of order, Sir, may I ask whether it is not the fact that the consolidation of which the right hon. Gentleman has spoken did not place any further obstacle in the way of the Committee coming to a decision upon any item in the manner with which they were all familiar in dealing with Army and Navy Estimates. Is there not a distinct parallel?

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): They are all under one official head.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That is true, although the remark is irrelevant. I would like to ask a question with regard to the practice of the House. As I understand the right hon. Gentleman's question to you, Sir, he desired to know whether it was in the power of the Government to alter the form in which the Estimates are to be presented without consulting the House. I will ask whether it is not the immemorial practice and tradition to do so. It is not in the power of the Government to make any great change in the Orders of this House, and I admit fully and amply that it would be a serious matter indeed if there were power to effect any great change in the Orders of this House without the fullest notice and the fullest opportunity being given to discuss the alteration. I grant that fully, but I will ask you, Sir, whether at the time this change was effected there was not such a congestion of Estimates that unless this change or some other not less violent had been effected it would have been impossible to carry out the law and practice of Parliament; and I

will also ask you. Sir, whether the alteration in the Order was not as much due to the degree in which the Government was forced at the commencement of the session by the House in the discussion of these Estimates? These are questions which I hope you will bear in mind before coming to a decision.

*MR. SPEAKER: Both the right hon. Gentlemen in putting to me points of order have introduced many questions of fact, have dealt with the merits of these questions, and have presented their arguments under the guise of arguing a question of order. Upon these matters I do not feel called upon to give an answer. So far as order and procedure are concerned. I may briefly say that it is extremely difficult in my judgment to define the precise limits of the rights of a Minister of the Crown in making alterations in the form in which Estimates have been usually presented to the House. Changes have undoubtedly been made from time to time (I have not had the opportunity of investigating them) in the form in which Votes have been presented. Votes have been consolidated and reduced in number; but what the extent of the power of a Minister in that direction is I am not prepared to say. The change in the present instance, I am bound to say, does seem of a somewhat sweeping nature. I was glad to hear the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury say that it was only resorted to as a means of meeting a great emergency which had undoubtedly arisen. As to this state of emergency and how it was brought about, that has been dealt with by the two right hon. Gentlemen, and it is not my business to say anything about it. There was undoubtedly considerable difficulty in getting through business within the proper time, and it was to meet this emergency on this special occasion only that this change was made. If there was any idea on the part of the Government, of this or any Government, to make any permanent change of a large and important character in the method of presenting Votes in Supply, I cannot help thinking that they would themselves consider it necessary to take the House into their confidence, and to afford the House an opportunity of

expressing an opinion upon it. Such a course appears so proper and natural that I feel confident that this Government or any other Government would follow it.

As regards this particular instance, it has, as the right hon. Gentleman has said, been treated as a case of emergency, and an emergency there undoubtedly was and that being so, it should not be regarded as a precedent.

*MR. JOHN ELLIS said he had a few questions to ask the Colonial Secretary in reference to one item of considerable importance which came under the sub-head "O 1, The Transvaal Concession, Land Settlement Commission, £7,800." He believed that an inquiry had been held as to the possibility of settling soldiers and others upon land in South Africa, and the questions he desired to ask were; what were the terms of reference to the Commission, who were the Commissioners, where did they hold their proceedings, did they go to South Africa, and did they hold any sittings there, did they examine witnesses there; what, in fact, they did there, and what conclusions did they arrive at? He supposed they had now returned to this country. He gathered from a reply of the right hon. Gentleman's that the Report had been submitted to Sir A. Milner for his comments, and those, no doubt, would be valuable; but inasmuch as the House was asked to vote £2,500

for the expenses of the Commission the House had a right to see the Report without delay. This question of land settlement called up many associations. In all countries and at all times the policy of dumping down persons (especially those who had recently been fighting against the late owners and occupants) upon land by the authority of a Government had led to a great deal of evil, and raised many grave misgivings. Land settlement was always a serious matter, but in South Africa at the present moment its seriousness was aggravated to a terrible degree. He had never been to South Africa, and was not sure whether that was not an advantage at the present time. But anyone who had read the history of South Africa, and had conversed with persons who had been missionaries or farmers or had occupied official positions in South Africa, as he

had done ever since he had sat upon the South Africa Committee, would know that land settlement in South Africa was no new thing and had been not very successful in the past. Where the political element entered into the land settlement in South Africa there would be a state of things to which only the word "dangerous" could be applied. Had the Colonial Secretary seen a book on South Africa recently written by Mr. Dormer entitled "Vengeance as a Policy; Plea for a New Departure"? Mr. Dormer was formerly one of Mr. Cecil Rhodes's most intimate friends, but, like most respectable persons, had dropped Mr. Rhodes and all his works. In his book Mr. Dormer said;

"The two cardinal concurrent aims of any policy worthy of practical statesmanship must be the conciliation of the Dutch and the reinforcement of the British element in the population."

What seemed to be meant by land settlement was placing soldiers and others here and there to increase a particular racial element supposed by some people to be more loyal than another racial element. It was to be hoped that the soldier settlers would be of a different character from those whom they had seen in the streets going by the ridiculous name of yeomen. Everyone who knew country life, as he did, knew that the town-bred man picked up in the slums of our great cities was no good at all as a farmer or cultivator of the soil. They must have men who understood husbandry, the habits of animals ;or what he would call nature;the peasantry, and not the little undersized starvelings they had seen decked out in khaki during the last few days, a discredit to the British Army.

What was the Colonial Secretary's policy? He believed that the conclusion to which Mr. Dormer came further on in his book; would be a true one;

"The most obvious means of attaining the end in view would be to make a settlement of loyal colonists on the land. If, however, it be the case;and this is the conclusion which is being slowly forced even upon those most reluctant to accept it;that suitable colonists are not likely to be forthcoming in adequate number; while it is, to say the least, doubtful whether the right sort of land in the right locality would be found,"

and so on Where was it proposed to place these settlers in South Africa?

The most likely districts had been taken up, especially in the Transvaal, by the only people who really could cultivate it in the proper sense of the term. Their environment had made the Boers what they were, and to send out English settlers

from the slums to that land could only end in failure. This policy of trying to get people to try land cultivation had never been a more gigantic failure than in Rhodesia. He asked what the policy of the Government was in issuing the Commission; what had we got by it; and what were its proposals? He hoped the Colonial Secretary would be able to give some information which would allay the alarm which the proposal to send out these persons had created in certain districts. He objected to any of the money of the British taxpayer being used for so dangerous an experiment, and as a protest he begged to move the reduction of the Vote by £;100.

Amendment proposed;

"To leave out '£;893,316,' and insert '£;893,216,' instead thereof.";(Mr. John Ellis.)

Question proposed, "That '£;893,316' stand part of the Resolution."

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; I must point out that the hon. Member has travelled somewhat beyond the limit of the Vote in entering into a discussion as to what the policy of land settlement would be. The Vote before the House was for the Commission, and upon a Vote for the Commission it is not in order to discuss the future land settlement in South Africa.

MR. DILLON (Mayo. E.) asked whether it would not be in order to discuss the policy of appointing the Commission at all.

*MR. JOHN ELLIS remarked that he had only said what he did to draw some explanation of policy from the Colonial Secretary.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham. E.): I am glad to learn from you, Sir, that I am not expected, and, indeed, it would not be in order for

me, to follow the hon. Gentleman in the somewhat discursive remarks with which he has introduced this Amendment. Therefore I suppose I need not do more than refer to his extraordinary statement to the effect that the men who, as Imperial Yeomanry, are going out to fight the battles of their country in South Africa, are little, undersized starvelings and a disgrace to the British Army.

*MR. JOHN ELLIS: I said those whom we have seen in certain plaaces in London during the last few days.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: During the last few days; I should have thought. I think still, there is no other Member of the House who would repeat this statement, or who has been so unfortunate as the hon. Member in seeing the specimens of the new force whom he has seen. But, coming to the practical question, the hon. Gentleman asks what was the reference to this Commission. It was instructed to inquire into the possibility of a settlement for soldiers in South Africa, and subsequently the reference was extended to other employments besides the settlement on the land. The hon. Gentleman asks what was the composition of the Commission. It was composed of my hon. friend the Secretary to the Admiralty, as chairman, and Mr. Southey, who, I believe, is a large and highly respected farmer at Middelburg, as second member. It was originally intended that General Plumer should be added to the Commission, but, owing to his being actively engaged in the war he was unable to take his share in the inquiry, which was there-fore, conducted by the two gentlemen I have named. I

should have thought, before I heard the speech of the hon. Gentleman, that everyone was agreed on the point of principle that it was desirable, to possible, to settle those who desired to settle in South Africa on the land, and, in the words of the book from which the hon. Gentleman has quoted, to "reinforce the British element" by that means. But as to the possibility of doing so the Government felt themselves to be very much in doubt. It was therefore necessary to make inquiry into the points which the hon. Gentleman himself has suggested as subjects for inquiry; namely, as to who would be the right men to be so settled, and as to whether any considerable number of soldiers, and not merely English, Scotch, or Irish soldiers, but those who have come from the colonies to assist us, should be settled. They also had to inquire whether there was land in existence which could be used for this purpose: whether it was the right sort of land or could be made the right sort of land by irrigation or other forms of improvement: what would be the cost of any scheme of settlement; in fact, a practical scheme was what we hoped the Commission would settle. Now the hon. Gentleman comes to this House and puts forward a statement which is entirely novel; that when the Government appoints a small Commission to inform it on an important question it is necessarily bound, immediately on the receipt of the Report, to present it to the House. There is no such rule or practice. Again and again it happens that a Commission is appointed to make inquiry, that a Report is produced for the information of the Government, and is not laid on the Table of the House or ever produced: and, in fact, it is a matter entirely in the discretion of the Government whether it should or should not be produced. In regard to the present matter, we have got a Report, which we think is a very informing Report, and for which we feel greatly indebted to my hon. friend the Secretary to the Admiralty and his colleague, who have taken an immense amount of pains and labour to produce it. They took a great deal of evidence, they examined a great number of places for themselves, and have given us a great deal of information which is worthy of the most serious consideration. But, before we can form any policy of our own or make any communication to the House on the subject, we consider it necessary that we should consult Sir Alfred Milner. Considering the confidence which we at any rate, feel in Sir Alfred Milner, and considering the position which he occupies as Governor of the territories which, I think, are concerned, it seems to me perfectly absurd to take any other course. We have sent out a copy of the Report to Sir Alfred

Milner, and I have said, in answer to questions of the hon. Gentleman and others, that as soon as we get his observations upon the Report we will consider whether it should be laid upon the Table of the House. If it would relieve the mind of the hon. Member, I would say that, as far as I can see at present, there can be no possible objection to the production of this Report. I do not think it would be wise to produce it at this particular moment, not only because we have not the advantage of any observations which Sir Alfred Milner may desire to make, but also because I do not think it would be prudent at this moment, before we have formed any idea ourselves as to what policy we ought to adopt, to indicate certain places in South Africa which are not at present in our

possession as being places which are most suitable for a, scheme of this kind.

MR. JOHN ELLIS: Does the Report recommend the further expenditure of money?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The hon. Gentleman is very inquisitive. He is endeavouring indirectly to get from me information which I have declined directly to give, and, with all respect to him. I cannot go further than I have gone. As soon as we get this Report back from Sir Alfred Milner we will consider; with every expectation of being able to satisfy the curiosity of the hon. Gentleman; whether we can lay it on the Table of the House. We cannot go beyond that at the present time for the reasons I have given, and I think every reasonable man will consider them to be sufficient reasons.

*SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: This is a very startling innovation of the Government. The right hon. Gentleman says he will take into consideration whether he will ever let us see this Report.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Hear, hear.

*SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: My repartee to that is that we will take it into consideration whether we will pay for it. The practice of not laying Reports before the House seems to me to be a very strange one. You have got an interim Report from a Boiler Committee which discredits the efficacy of the whole British Navy, but you lay that upon the Table immediately, without waiting to decide whether you are going to remove the boilers or adopt a different make. The usual custom is to lay a Report upon the Table, and to say. "With regard to the Report before you, we have not had time to determine our policy." The Report is laid, and the Government take whatever time they like to consider the policy they will found upon it. The right hon. Gentleman has spoken, and justly, of the competency of the Commissioners appointed. The hon. Member opposite has shown his capacity in dealing with the Navy Estimates, and I understand he was the principal member of that Commission. Why is it, then, the Government will not lay the conclusions of this Commission upon the Table of the House? I hope I am not too suspicious, but I venture to think that it is because the Report does not suit them or carry out the view of the right hon. Gentleman with regard to the strong reinforcement of British influence there.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I suppose the right hon. Gentleman did not hear me. That was a quotation which was used by the hon. Gentleman opposite. They were not my words, although I am quite ready to adopt them.

*SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: That is quite enough for my purpose. We have heard much of this. It is a gigantic plan of creating British faggot-votes in South Africa. I do not know how that may be but I am sure that at any rate the hon. Member for South Belfast will approve of an Orange settlement.

MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON (Belfast. S.): In the Orange Colony.

*SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Then the Orange Free State is to become an Orange colony in South Africa; I quite understand. But there are two sides to this question. To propound to the Dutch population, whom you desire to pacify, the notion that you are going to take land which may belong to them for the purpose of reinforcing British influence is not likely to lead to an early pacification. I Therefore the sooner we know what is

the intention of the Government, and what is the Report of this Commission on the subject, the better, because while the matter is left in doubt it is a source of the greatest irritation to the Boer population. Nothing can be more irritating to a people than to know that you are going to introduce among them; they do not know in what numbers; a population which is, I will not say hostile, but at any rate alien to themselves, with different interests and different objects. It is impossible to conceive anything more dangerous than that. I will not go into the general policy of the settlement to be made, assisted, as I understand, by the State. There was an experiment made within recent years with the Scotch crofters in Canada, but it was not at all satisfactory. Many of them have been entire failures, and the money has not been repaid. If you are going into a large scheme of settlement for the purpose of increasing the British possession of land, and consequently diminishing the Dutch possession of land, it seems to me that you are quite unnecessarily introducing a factor of racial irritation. To do this in the interests of one race and against the interest of another is a most unwise and dangerous policy, and one which will make the hopes of pacification, which are distant enough already, more distant still. Therefore, if, as I conjecture, the Report of this Commission is adverse to any proposal of this kind, the sooner we have, it produced in order to remove this suspicion on the part of the Dutch population the better, for it would do more than anything else to reassure the Dutch people and the Boers against the fear of confiscation and expropriation for racial purposes. The Government have a Report of competent people upon this subject, and we are as entitled to know the result as they are, or as Sir Alfred Milner is. Let Sir Alfred Milner express his opinion upon the Report; let the Government express their opinion upon the Report; but for Heaven's sake let the House of Commons know what that Report is and, above all let the people whose interests are to be affected by it know what the Report, drawn up by men who have seen South Africa, is. We have been told that we must trust the man on the spot, Well,

the correspondence recently laid upon the Table has shown that it is the man on the spot whom we do not trust. I should like to have the opinion of the Secretary of State on this Report, although he is not the man on the spot. I should like to have the opinion of the hon. Gentleman who sits beside him (the Secretary to the Admiralty), who has been to South Africa and examined this question, as to what the Report says. It is a most extraordinary thing to ask the House of Commons to pay for a Report which perhaps they will never see at all. And when the Government have got the opinion of Sir Alfred Milner, what do they propose to do with it? Will they drop their own Report? I have never seen the Report of a Commission presented with the comments of an outsider upon it. It is an extraordinary thing that the Government, after sending out a Commission of this kind, should ask Sir Alfred Milner whether the House of Commons should ever be allowed to see the Report. That is not a proper Parliamentary practice, and I shall certainly vote against it.

MR. COHEN (Islington, E.): One would imagine from the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman opposite that he already knew the contents of this Report. At any

rate, he has spoken as though he did, and he has condemned the recommendations he imagines it to contain. But the right hon. Gentleman appeared to contradict himself towards the end of his speech. My right hon. friend the Colonial Secretary gave as reason for not laying the Report on the Table at the present moment, that the Government wished to consult Sir Alfred Milner. In my judgment, with all respect to the Colonial Secretary, I think the opinion of Sir Alfred Milner will be of even higher authority than that of the right hon. Gentleman himself on this subject. But the right hon. Gentleman opposite complained of the Government desiring to consult Sir Alfred Milner, and then, before he sat down, he found fault with the Government because on another occasion they did not follow a recommendation of Sir Alfred Milner. Such a line of argument seems to me to be both inconsistent and inconsequential. There are many precedents for a Government referring a matter of such importance to one so particularly competent to give advice.

"SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: We do not say that they should not consult Sir Alfred Milner before they determine what to do upon the Report. That is not my point. Of course they may. They may consult him as to what they should do a year hence if necessary. All I say is that they should not consult him as to whether we should see the Report.

MR. COHEN: I did not understand my right hon. friend to say he was consulting Sir Alfred Milner as to whether or not he should lay the Report on the Table. He is going to decide that when he gets Sir Alfred Milner's remarks. That is a very wise decision, and it is not at all the same thing as the right hon. Gentleman opposite made out. I think my right hon. friend is wise in withholding the Report for the present, so that concurrently with laying it on the Table, which he has announced his present intention of doing, he may be able to give the House the conclusions at which, fortified by the advice of Sir Alfred Milner, the Government have arrived.

MR. CAINE (Cornwall, Camborne): I am sorry to infer from the statement of the Colonial Secretary that there really is no intention on his part to divulge the contents of this Report?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I am not sure whether I heard the hon. Gentleman correctly. Did he say I was not going to publish the Report?

MR. CAINE: I said I inferred it.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Then the hon. Member has no light whatever to make that inference. There is every probability that it will be produced as soon as we get Sir Alfred Milner's reply.

MR. CAINE: I am glad to hear it because it will save me the necessity of making any long speech. This is not a mere Departmental Committee, but a Commission, and it is customary when a Department appoints a Commission that the Report of that Commission should in one way or another be made public. I represent a constituency which takes a very great interest in South Africa. We have in the mining parts of Cornwall a larger number of persons interested in Cape Colony and the Transvaal than any other constituency in the United Kingdom, and this Report has been looked for with great interest. The Cornish miner is also a bit of a farmer, and many are thinking that now the

country- is conquered and there is a likelihood of a settled Government, and all the rest of it, they may be able to get a bit of land in the Transvaal, and by working the land during a part of the year and earning good wages in the mines during the other part, they will be able to make a very comfortable livelihood for themselves. Many of them are looking for this Report to be published, and I trust the Colonial Secretary will make some communication, for the sake not only of Cornwall, but also of the rest of the country with regard to the future of these colonies. Another reason for issuing this Report is that a very great number of those who have enlisted or are now enlisting in the various forces for South Africa have done and are doing so with the belief that when the war is over and they have completed their service some decent sort of settlement will be found for them in the country they have helped to conquer. I believe that this Report will show that there is really no prospect of land settlement for these men, and it is most important that the Report should be published so that we may know exactly what the Commission have done, what witnesses they have examined, and what are the conclusions they have drawn, and I what recommendations they have made.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland): I take this opportunity of raising this question in view of the fact that the Colonial Secretary a few nights ago, in his most honeyed tones, disclaimed any intention of attempting another plantation of Ulster in South Africa. Let me call the attention of the House to the peculiar position in which it is placed with regard to this Report. In the first place I regard the issue of the Commission at all as an extremely serious blunder. I venture to say that the issue of this Commission and, above all, the terms in which it was issued, and I may say, without any disrespect to the Secretary to the Admiralty, the personality of the Chairman of the Commission, all, I think, had a very serious effect in the prolongation of the unhappy and terrible struggle in South Africa. If this House had been asked to sanction the issue of this Commission, I am perfectly sure many Members would have resisted it as something of the most dangerous and serious consequence. But the Commission was issued without consulting the House of Commons, and now, after the Commission has taken place, after it has heard evidence and made its Report, when we come to deal with the cost of the Commission, the House is not even given an opportunity of discussing the policy of the Commission, and up to the present there is no promise that we shall ever see the evidence or the Report. The House had no control over the Commission when it was appointed, and it is to have no supervision of it now it has reported. The Colonial Secretary says, "Oh, but you can vote against the money for the Commission"; in other words, the full liberty of Members of the House of Commons is preserved when they can vote in a minority against the payment of money already spent. I never heard a proposition that put the House of Commons in a position of such ridiculous and absurd futility as this proposition of the Colonial Secretary. What is the statement of the Colonial Secretary? He does not tell us what the Report is. He does not even give us a glimpse of it. He confines himself to two propositions. First, when I raised this question before, He said we might relieve our minds, as nothing like the plantation of Ulster was contemplated. So far so good. Now he says it would

be imprudent for the Government to publish a Report with regard to what would be done with lands which are not yet in our possession. That is a most sinister observation. In other words, the lands which are now held and occupied by the Boers, against whom this country is fighting, are to be part of the spoil which the Government contemplated handing over to the British troops after the war. The Colonial Secretary says it would be imprudent to publish this Report of the Commission stating what was to be done with the territory not now in our possession.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I shall be most happy to give a full explanation on that point. The idea that we contemplated taking land which is not ours, except by purchase in the ordinary way, is a suspicion which has only entered into the minds of hon. Gentlemen opposite. We have no intention whatever of expropriating owners or of confiscating their property, or of obtaining property for this purpose in any way other than as we should obtain it supposing the thing were to occur in this country.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: I think this debate has been justified by that admission at any rate. The debate is fully justified if it elicited only that statement from the right hon. Gentleman.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: It never entered into my mind until I heard the hon. Gentleman suggest it, that anybody would suspect such a thing.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: I put this to the House. A Commission is appointed, with the hon. Member for West Belfast; a gentleman who with all his ability, is not known for particular sweetness and gentleness and amiability to his political opponents; a Commission is appointed, under the chairmanship of this gentleman, this violent Imperialist, for the settlement of the soldiers in South Africa after the war. I say the only possible interpretation that the world; and especially the Boers, who are not very trustful, and who have no reason to have great confidence in the permanency of their position, from which they have been driven three times in succession by British forces; could put upon such a Commission is that the English soldiers were, to be settled upon the land taken from defeated or conquered Boers. I express my gratitude to the hon. Member who initiated the debate, which has brought from the Colonial Secretary for the first time;

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: For the first time;

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No. The hon. Gentleman said something about the Ulster plantation the other night, and I told him then that he might rest assured that nothing of the kind was contemplated in South Africa.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: The point to which we have got is this: Is the Report going to be published or not? The right hon. Gentleman set up a Commission without consulting the House of Commons. He now comes to the House and demands the money to pay for the Commission, and at the same time refuses to give the slightest value for the money; namely, the evidence and the Report. The question is, Ought this Report to be published or not? I hold that every day the publication of the Report of the Commission is delayed is a day of prolongation of the war in South

Africa. We do not know what the Secretary to the Admiralty reported. The golden chain of silence is flung upon him by the Colonial Secretary. He is not usually so diffident in the expression of his views, but to-night and on the last occasion the question was under discussion the Colonial Secretary did not allow the hon. Gentleman to break that golden silence in which on rare occasions in his Parliamentary career he has taken refuge. Let us know if it is true that the Secretary to the Admiralty reported that South Africa was no place for those men; that all the talk about splendid positions and opportunities was but mere imagination; and that, as matter of fact, there is in South Africa nothing but the mining camp for the miner and the veldt for the Boer. That would have a great effect in this country, as well as in South Africa, and would do a great deal to bring the war to an end. What was the fact in recruiting for the Yeomanry? Many of them are going out not merely for the purpose of fighting your battles, but with the intention and belief of finding a new career when the war was at an end. Is it not cruel, if in the pocket of the Colonial Secretary there is a Report against the possibility of all this, that young fellows should be allowed to go out buoyed up with hopes and fallacies of this kind? On the other hand, is it not cruel to the Boers, if this Report clearly shows that the Government do not intend to confiscate the lands, to allow them to go on fighting in the belief that it is their lands they are fighting for? I think we have proved conclusively that this motion has been justified, and that the House should press again and again until they get the early publication of this most interesting and vitally important Report.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I venture to point out to the House that this is not a very profitable way of spending the evening when there are questions of real substance and importance to be raised, and I suggest that we might now proceed to a division. [Nationalist cries of "Oh!"]

MR. DILLON: We were not allowed to say a word on this in Committee, we were closed.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman may not share my view, but surely I may express the view that this is not a question of such substance as should deserve to occupy much more time, when there are other questions demanding consideration? My reasons for that belief are very shortly stated. The indignation of the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down is founded upon two beliefs; first, that the Report of this Commission is adverse to the policy of the Government, and that therefore the Government are endeavouring to conceal it, and, secondly, that it is part of the scheme of the Government to forcibly expropriate the Boer population, and to substitute in their place soldiers or other emigrants from this country. Both those beliefs are entire misconceptions. My right hon. friend refuses to say whether he will or will not publish this Report. There is nothing contrary to precedent in that. There are endless Reports of Commissions which have never seen the light. I do not think it probable that this Report will be added to them. But it is not fair to find fault with my right hon. friend the Colonial Secretary for refusing to give any answer other than that which he has given; namely, that he will not in the present state of affairs make that Report public. We pledge ourselves, however,

that the beliefs which have aroused the indignation of hon. Gentlemen opposite have absolutely no foundation at all. If they had a foundation, no doubt they would justify

some of the anger which has been poured upon our heads, and no doubt they would provoke a great deal of fear in South Africa. But I am sorry that even the suspicion of them has found expression in the House. Owing to the strangely exaggerated and truncated versions of our debates which reach South Africa, the suspicion of hon. Gentlemen opposite may reach Boer ears as if they represented the real facts of the case. They do not represent the truth of the matter. If then, hon. Gentlemen opposite are to continue this debate, at all events let them not do so under the erroneous impression that any such act of suicidal policy as the compulsory confiscation of Boer lands in South Africa is contemplated by this Government.

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E): The right hon. Gentleman told us or we gathered from him, that he rose with a double object; first, to put an end to what he considers an unprofitable discussion, and, secondly, to remove what he described as groundless suspicions. I cannot understand how, if those were the purposes, he had in view, the right hon. Gentleman did not perceive that there was one simple and efficient way of securing his end; namely, by answering the appeal which has been made by producing this Report. If we obtained from the Government a promise that the Report would be produced within a reasonable time and laid upon the Table of the House, so that Parliament, which is now voting the money for the Commission, could, before the close of the session, have some opportunity of considering whether this was a legitimate and justifiable expenditure, I think we should be very well satisfied. But the matter really does not end with the rights and usages of the House of Commons in relation to the expenditure of money. It has been pointed out over and over again that there are two sets of people whose minds are agitated so long as the contents of this Report are not disclosed. On the one hand, you have the Boer farmer in South Africa, who may be, as the right hon. Gentleman has told us, under a complete misconception. The Boer farmer, rightly or wrongly, is in a state of apprehension as to whether or not his land is going to be taken from him. On the other hand, you have the soldiers who are being recruited day by day and sent out to South Africa from this country, many of whom go out in the belief that they will there find homes and means of livelihood. Surely, as long as you have that state of apprehension, suspicion, hope, and expectation, you have a condition of unsettlement which it is most undesirable to perpetuate, and to which the production of this Report would at once put an end. I confess I have never heard a stronger case made out for the presentation of a document which is in all its essential characteristics a public document, and I earnestly hope the Government will put an end to this debate, as they can do if they please, by promising to produce this Report.

*MR. LAMBTON (Durham, S.E.): I think there is a very obvious reason why this Report should not be produced to the House. I am not in the secrets of the Commission, and I do not know the contents of the Report, but if there is any recommendation as to the acquisition of tracts of land in South Africa it is

most undesirable that the Report should be laid upon the Table of the House at the present moment. We have heard a great deal from the other side of the House about the influence of the millionaires and the land speculators in South Africa. The Colonial Secretary is perfectly right in refusing to produce the Report now, because if any other course were taken it would very likely strengthen the hands of those land speculators, and enable them to gain possession of the land before the Government have the opportunity of so doing, and thus raise the price this country will have to pay. The right hon. Member for West Monmouth talks a great deal about Boer susceptibilities, but he never appears to think of English susceptibilities. There are many English and loyal colonists in South Africa whose susceptibilities ought to be regarded just as much as those of the Boers and the Dutch. Sixty years ago in the settlement of Canada, there were the same racial susceptibilities as now exist in South Africa, but the men who were the Liberal statesmen of those days, and who then settled Canada, did not entirely give in to the French susceptibilities. Their plan was to settle English men upon the land, to produce English interests, and to regard English susceptibilities in Canada. I therefore think that the Members of the Opposition who speak only of the Boer susceptibilities are not carrying out the true traditions of the old Liberal party.

MR. BROADHURST (Leicester): I do not think the hon. Member who has just spoken has built up a very strong case for the Government withholding this Report. Our case is that this is a public Commission, paid for out of public money, and that this House, which has to vote the money, has the first title to see the Report in all its purity, before it is doctored in South Africa. With regard to the Yeomanry, it is pretty well known that the greater part are not yeomen at all. Most of them know nothing whatever of farming. You might as well put a farmer into a druggist's shop as to put many of these so-called yeomen on farms in South Africa, or elsewhere, it is admitted that many of them had never touched a horse in their lives, and they probably would scarcely know a cow from a bullock. Moreover, as the right hon. Gentleman knows, the difficulty is to get them to remain in South Africa; they are wanting to come home. It is the same also with the time-expired soldiers.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The hon. Member is getting away from the question of this Commission.

MR. BROADHURST: I was led into that digression by the fact that this Commission was appointed to consider what inducements, if any, could be held out to Englishmen to remain in South Africa as residents. With regard to the right hon. Gentleman's statement that there is no intention of taking the land from the Boers and giving it to a foreign people, all of us here would accept the right hon. Gentleman's word of honour. But what reliance can we expect the Boers to place upon his statement? The Boers remember the Prime Minister's declaration that we desired neither territory nor gold-fields, a declaration which was followed by the annexation of the two Republics. Therefore, if they doubt and disbelieve the right hon. Gentleman's word we cannot be much surprised. We have a right to the production of this Report immediately on or before payment for

it. My object in rising was to appeal to the Secretary to the Admiralty, the Chairman of the Commission, to give the House some further information on the matter. It is most unusual for him to be muzzled by anyone, and if, with his great power of lucidity and condensation, he would give us a ten minutes résumé of the leading features of the Report, we should listen with great interest, and probably reward the Government by an early decision on this Vote. Neither the Colonial Secretary nor the Leader of the House has given any precedents for this procedure, so that I presume there are none. I remember the appointment of a great many Commissions in my time, but never have I known one the Report of which was sent round the world for the observations of people in no way connected with it before being presented to Parliament. I ask the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Admiralty to return to the ways of his early youth, and give the House some information. It was not always that we wen¹ so anxious to hear him, but to-night we are dying for him to speak. It is a great opportunity for the hon. Gentleman to distinguish himself, and I sincerely trust he will not miss it.

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

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton) said he could not understand the Government appointing this Commission, because it did not seem to him that a large part of the Orange River Colony or the Transvaal were yet fit to go into. Certainly if a gentleman in the position of the Secretary to the Admiralty had gone into the portions of the Transvaal where soldiers might be settled, he would not have returned to tell the tale. Of what value then could be the Report of such a Commission? An hon. Gentleman had said that the Government had taken a wise

step in suppressing the Report, because if they had done so millionaires and land speculators would have taken advantage of it and would have bought up the land. For his part he did not think there were many millionaires, who were not loved by the Boers, who would buy land there, He did not gather from the speech of the right hon. Gentleman what reason he had for entertaining the proposals of this Commission. This Commission differed from ordinary Commissions, inasmuch as it did not consist of experts. The only expert was a farmer who came from Middleburg, and who might be a great authority on the method of settling people on the land; but could anyone say that the Secretary to the Admiralty had a large amount of agricultural experience? Was Sir Alfred Milner consulted on the point as to whether that hon. Gentleman should be sent out on the Commission? If so, he surely might have been able to see the Report of the Commission before it was sent home to the right hon. Gentleman. But if Sir A. Milner did not see the Report before, why should it be sent out to him before being placed on the Table of the House? Why should Sir A. Milner be placed before the House of Commons? The Report would not alter by a single iota the policy which Sir A. Milner would adopt. He could hardly believe that Sir A. Milner had been consulted as to the selection of the Commissioners for so important a purpose as that stated. The Secretary of State for the Colonies said that this was a very informing Commission, and that the Report was informing. But what could the Secretary to

the Admiralty know of agriculture or irrigation in South Africa? He would rather take his opinion on Army and Navy matters. All sorts of conditions had to be considered in South Africa; climatic conditions, and so forth; and a very strong Commission should have been appointed. Why was it necessary to appoint a Commission at all? Why could not Sir- Alfred Milner have interviewed farmers in South Africa and obtained advice upon this question for the Government? Such a course would have obviated the necessity of sending out the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Admiralty at all. But the Commission having been appointed, and having reported, he could not understand why the Report was not laid on the Table. If the Report was one which, would help the Government to settle soldiers and others in South Africa he failed to see why it was not published. For his part he believed this policy of settlement on the land would not be a success, and it was probably owing to the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Navy also being of that opinion that the Report was not presented to the House. The scheme of the Colonial Secretary did not commend itself to the colonies, who looked with distrust upon any scheme of settling the colonial forces in South Africa. The colonies wanted to retain their men in their own colonies. The opinion of the Boers upon the appointment of this Commission and the settlement of their lands was also a matter worthy of consideration. He thought that the country had a right to know, as they had to pay, what it was they were paying for, and that the Report of the Commission ought to be presented to the House. That being so he supported the Amendment of the hon. Member for Rushcliffe Division.

MR. DILLON: When the Secretary of State for the Colonies interrupted the hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool, he said the Government had no idea of expropriating property or acquiring land in the two Colonies, as you call them, but which we call the two Republics, except in the ordinary way of purchase; and my hon. friend the Member for Scotland Division seemed to be to some extent satisfied, or, at least, to have his fears allayed, by the statement. I confess, Sir, that that statement had no such effect on my mind, because, in my opinion, the purpose and method by which land is to be got, or by which the Government expect to get land in the Transvaal and Orange Free State, is not by expropriation or confiscation after the pattern of the Ulster settlement in Ireland, when the inhabitants were swept out of the country, treated like wild beasts, and deprived of their lands. The Government know they have no need of having recourse to that system, and, for my part, I confess that the interruption of the Secretary of State for the Colonies had for me a most sinister and significant meaning when taken in connection with the recently published Papers giving particulars of the negotiations between Louis Botha and Lord Kitchener. When we hear the Secretary of State for the Colonies declaring that the Government has no intention of confiscating the lands of the Boer farmers, but intends to acquire them by the ordinary machinery of purchase, we are reminded in the most unpleasant way of what the Secretary of State for the Colonies did when, in his telegram to Sir Alfred Milner, he substituted the word "loans." What, I ask, was the object of offering these men, ruined by your policy, burned out of houses

and homes, and their property carried away; what was the object. I say again, of offering them loans?

*MR. SPEAKER, Order, order; The hon. Member is now criticising correspondence which has no bearing on the question.

MR. DILLON: I am only criticising it in so far as it bears on the observations of the Secretary of State for the Colonies when he said it was not proposed to acquire the land of the Boers except by methods of purchase. I say that is not what he has provided for in dictating to Lord Kitchener the terms and the machinery by which he will have these unfortunate Boer farmers at his mercy.

*MR. SPEAKER: These references to the correspondence in question do not bear on the observation made by the right hon. Gentleman, that if the lands were taken for the purpose of settling others on them, those lands would be bought in the ordinary way by purchase or compensation. The two things are quite dissimilar.

MR. DILLON: I shall not press that point further in view of your ruling, Sir, but I may remark that it seems to me that this question of loans gives the Secretary of State for the Colonies the opportunity of acquiring the lands, and I think it is most natural that this rather extraordinary correction of Lord Kitchener's offer should have arisen in my mind when I heard the right hon. Gentleman making the interruption to which I have alluded. The point which I chiefly desire to emphasise is the impolicy of appointing such a Commission at all. I think that is a point that has not been sufficiently dwelt upon, and I say further that the full effects of the appointment of that Commission are aggravated by the withholding of the Report. If we had that Report we would know whether it was in favour of or against these settlements. If it is against the settlements it would have a considerable effect in allaying the suspicions of the Boers and in promoting peace. If, however, as I strongly suspect, this Report is in favour of these settlements, then I think the House of Commons should have an immediate opportunity of discussing it and the policy it embodies. I hold, further, that the appointment of this Commission while the war was still in progress was a monstrous and most iniquitous blunder. It was a policy calculated, if not intended, to prolong the war. It appears to me that that is so clear that it requires no argument to support the contention. In this case you have to deal with a people whose history is very singular and peculiar. This is not the first time their lands have been taken away. This is not the first time they have been driven into the wilderness, driven too by the very Government with which they now have to deal. And when they hear of a Commission sent out to investigate whether it is possible to plant English soldiers in their country; a Commission presided over by a prominent representative of an Ulster Protestant constituency; I say even if these people were much less suspicious the natural conclusion in their minds would be that the policy about to be put in force was a policy of confiscation, a policy like that which was practised in Ireland with such disastrous results for the people of Ireland. It may be thought by those who have not studied the question as carefully as I have that this is an exaggerated view to take, but let me remind the House of one circumstance, which is of dramatic and picturesque interest in this matter, and which gives colour, consistency, and confirmation to the views I have

expressed. This is the circumstance to which I refer. Commandant Louis Botha is probably the one man of all others amongst the Boers who is most inclined to make peace on honourable lines, and put an end to this disastrous war. Mrs. Botha, who is acting as the emissary of your generals in South Africa, and carrying on the peace negotiations, is a grand-niece of the Irish rebel, Robert Emmet, and do you suppose that Commandant Louis Botha, her husband, and the other Boer leaders are not. through her familiar with every detail of the history of Ireland, and of the ruin of our country by the very methods you are proposing to put in force in the Transvaal and Orange Free State? They know what you did for Ireland; the tyranny you introduced, the confiscation you practised. In this respect I may say these men have lived, as it were, in an Irish atmosphere; and when you send out to represent you on this Commission the Member for an Ulster constituency, what conclusion can they come to hut that you are going to treat them as you treated Ireland? What can you expect these men to think if you are going to inflict upon the Transvaal and the Orange Free State a system which has plunged Ireland for hundreds of years into religious and political animosities? No matter what this Report contains. I impugn the policy of the appointment of this Commission, and I say deliberately, that in my opinion the appointment of this Commission, and its secret Report, is in a considerable measure responsible for the prolongation of the war. One of the conditions put forward by Louis Botha in his interview with Lord Kitchener was that there should be three millions of money put into the work of restoring the destruction you have perpetrated in the Transvaal and Orange Free State. The object of that was of course, to enable the people to hold their homes. Lord Kitchener agreed to that, but the right hon. Gentleman, who has this Report in his pocket. would not agree to it. Is it not absurd to suppose that Botha, when he reads these proceedings, can come to any other conclusion than that the reason why Lord Kitchener was overruled was because this Commission, presided over by the Member for West Belfast, would have to be set aside if Lord Kitchener got his way in the negotiations with Botha? I say this action of appointing this Commission was a policy calculated to have the effect of prolonging the war. The Secretary for the Colonies took a very wobbling position upon this Report. "First he would and then he would not." He declared there was no obligation whatever for the Government to publish this Report. Then, when pressed, he said it would not be published until he had Sir Alfred Milner's opinion; I wish he had more respect for that opinion; upon the terms of peace. But what in the name of commonsense has Sir Alfred Milner's opinion upon this Report to do with its publication? I say it is an outrage to think that the House of Commons is to be denied this most important Report, bearing upon the policy of this Empire and upon the war, until Sir A. Milner gives his opinion.

The First Lord of the Treasury stated that the only thing that made him uneasy was the account of this debate that might he sent out to South Africa. Well, Sir, there will be a great deal of suspicion, and the account of these transactions will confirm the suspicion in the minds of Botha, De Wet, and the Boer farmers that there is some monstrous effort being made to rob them of their

land. But the Boer leaders do not look to the speeches of Ministers qua Ministers. They look to the men who have directed the policy of England ever since the Jameson Raid, not to the speeches of a Colonial Secretary who three years ago declared that it would be not only unwise, but immoral, to put pressure on the President of the Transvaal, but who, although he had made that declaration, within two years engaged all the forces of the Empire in crushing the forces of that State. So the Boer farmers and their leaders naturally look to the men who in the past have shown that they could make their policy prevail, and when they see in the press in South Africa, and the press here controlled by Rhodes and Company, over and over again telegrams announcing that when this war is over three-fourths of the farmers of the Transvaal will be ruined men, and will be forced to part with their farms at any price offered by the Government, and that then these farms should be given to British soldiers; then. Sir, I think I am justified in saying that suspicion on

their part is not unnatural. I must repeat these words; that three-fourths of the farmers will be ruined men, and must part with their farms for any price that is offered by the Government. That is the policy that has been adopted by the party opposite. That is the policy avowed by the Rhodesian press in this country and South Africa. That is the policy that has made these men desperate, and I say deliberately that when the Secretary of State for the Colonies refuses to confirm even the offer of Lord Kitchener, in view of the quotations which I have referred to, and in view of the cheers we have listened to, small wonder if Louis Botha and his men should say "Let us die with our arms in our hands, with as many Englishmen around us as we can kill, rather than be outcasts and beggars in the land." [A laugh.] I accept that laugh as good testimony of the spirit in which some hon. Members deal with this subject. I have said outcasts in the land. I repeat, is it any wonder that a soldier and gentleman like Louis Botha would prefer to die with arms in his hands and as many Englishmen lying round him as he could kill, rather than be a beggar in the land which his fathers won from the wilderness, and which they themselves love and are defending with a gallantry which the whole annals of the human race can hardly surpass.

MR. GEORGE WHLITELEY (Yorkshire, W.R, Pudsey) said that in the speech delivered by the right hon. Gentleman there were matters of great weight and gravity to be debated and discussed. The object of the right hon. Gentleman was apparently to dissipate what he believed to be the erroneous views which were held by the hon. Members opposed to him in this policy. If he desired to dissipate any views which he believed to be wrong there was one method of doing so; by producing the Report of the Commission which the House was so desirous to have. If he was not prepared to produce the actual Report, the right hon. Gentleman might at least have informed the House of the gist of it. He might have submitted a synopsis of it, so that the minds of hon. Members might be satisfied. No blame had been attached to the Government for their action in transmitting the Report to Sir Alfred Milner before proceeding to act on it, but they did blame the Government for refusing to take the House into their confidence about the matter at a time when the Report was being bandied about between London and South Africa. The House was in a very difficult position, as was the Government, with regard to

this matter. The Government sent out a Commission well qualified to deal with such questions as might crop up, the president of which was so much in the confidence of the Government that he was elevated to an important post in the Government in his absence from this country. The hon. Gentleman made a Report to the Government which was no doubt a very able one, but before the Government presented it to the House it had to be sent out to Sir Alfred Milner in order that he might dot the "i's" and cross the "t's" of the Report of the hon.

Gentleman. The Government had placed the House in a, very undignified position, and put a stigma upon the efforts of the hon. Gentleman. What incentive would the hon. Member in the future possess to undertake such labours if after all his trouble his Report might never see the daylight in the first place, and be held back from the House, or might be presented in a mutilated form. The debate upon this question had, in his opinion, been justified. The House had not obtained an inkling as to the suggestions which the Report contained, except that it contained some scheme of purchase. No one would quarrel with any scheme of purchase, but he would like to know who it was that was going to purchase. Were the men who were now promenading the streets in khaki going to purchase the land. Judging from their style he did not think they had the funds to do so, and if they were not to purchase the land who was? Was the unfortunate British capitalist going to purchase the land? These were matters upon which the country had a right to be informed. One hon. Member had alluded to the physique, stamina and hardness of the pseudo-Yeomanry now being sent out to South Africa. At a time when we were trying to attract men to the Army to do this work in South Africa, it was advisable to present an attractive scheme, so that the farm labourers of this country; the bona fide yeomen; would be attracted. If the Government were prepared to produce a scheme they should boldly say what their proposals were, and if they had done so, and showed that they were desirous of meeting in some form the desires of the House of Commons, they would have staved off the debate which was taking place, and have been able to deal with more important matters.

MR. LLOYD -GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) pointed out that the Government were alone responsible for the present debate and its prolongation, because on the last occasion when information was asked on the point the Colonial Secretary, who refused to say whether there was a Report prepared at all, within a few minutes of the question being raised moved the closure. Here was a Commission of great importance, which had cost nominally £2,500, but the actual cost of which would be something like £20,000,000, which according to the right hon.

Gentleman had prepared a Report containing valuable information with regard to the settlement of soldiers in South Africa. Yet this document was withheld from the very body which represented the people of England, and which had eventually to find the money to carry out the recommendations of the Report. It was part of the policy of treating the House of Commons with disdain. We had a new constitutional theory now. Sir Alfred Milner was the latest importation into our constitutional theory. Last week it was the House of Lords which was first in receiving information, and the House of Commons nowhere. This week it was Sir Alfred Milner and the right hon. Gentleman who were first in regard to this

important information, and the House of Commons nowhere. Step by step the House of Commons was being gradually lowered in the constitutional and political scale. Soon the people's chamber would be wiped out altogether, and the Government would be carrying out a policy of nominating an executive council to carry out the dictates of the Colonial Secretary, or rather of the Cabinet. He called the attention of the House to the state of the Front Ministerial Bench. There were two occupants of it who knew what the Report contained; the Colonial Secretary and the Secretary to the Admiralty. The former was absent, and the latter had gone as far towards the boundary which divided the House from its precincts as he possibly could. He was muzzled; he was not allowed to say a word, he was only allowed to laugh. The laughter and jeers which they had heard during the previous speech from the Ministerial Benches were very significant. He was not at all sure whether the whole meaning of the Report could not be evolved from those sneers. The House was not to be told what the Report contained. This was the first time the Report of a Commission of this importance had been withheld from the knowledge of the House. [At this point Mr. BALFOUR took his seat,] At last the House was getting a responsible Minister to take part in the proceedings. He feared, however, it was not the First Lord of the Treasury's interest in the subject which had drawn him to the House; it was much more likely to be an intention to terminate the discussion. An indication of the real value of the Report was given by the Colonial Secretary when he explained that the Commission inquired about places for the settlement of English soldiers which were not in our possession. Where were these places? In the possession of the Boers; in parts of the Transvaal and Orange River Colony that we had not yet ever penetrated? He had heard about cooking a hare before it was caught, but the Colonial Secretary was cooking the hare before it had even been seen; It was no wonder that the Colonial Secretary showed small keenness to issue the Report. The real reason was that the, right hon. Gentleman must be beginning to doubt the wisdom of his policy in appointing the Commission. His reluctance to publish the Report was its condemnation. A more unwise, a more unfortunate, a more reckless act than the appointment of this Commission had never been perpetrated in South Africa even by the Colonial Secretary. The right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury was very solemn in his appeals to the Opposition not to say anything which might reach the ears of the Boers. The appeal should have been addressed to the colleague who sat next to him; the Colonial Secretary. It was not the speeches of individual Members of the House that did the mischief and the evil; it was the acts of the Government. Which had the greatest weight among the Boers, the speech of a humble Member below the gangway, or an act under the Seal of the Colonial Office, which appointed a Commission to inquire whether the Government could settle soldiers upon the farms of the Boers in South Africa? The Boers had heard of the Commission, because it was appointed, as was everything that was done by the Colonial Secretary, with a flourish of trumpets. It was one of the right hon. Gentleman's impulses to do a cheap and popular thing, which had from time to time created so much mischief. It had been suggested by the papers supporting the Colonial Secretary that the farms ought

to be divided amongst the yeomen. In one journal an article was headed, "The Spoils for the Victors"; it was a recommendation from beginning to end in favour of confiscating the property of "these rebels." If the Government wished to encourage the Boers and provoke them to prolong the war to the utmost they could do so in no better way than by such foolish, such indiscreet acts as the appointment of this Settlement Commission. The mere statement of the Colonial Secretary that we should buy out the Boers was no answer to their anxiety for the safety of their homesteads. The right hon. Gentleman had denuded their country, depleted their farms, burnt their homes, and now proposed to buy them out; What was there that would in the slightest degree make these people believe that our intention was not to turn them out? The result of the Colonial Secretary's refusal to publish the Report would be that the suspicious nature of the Boers, of which so much had been heard, would be stirred to its depths, and that the war would be prolonged for a longer and more inde-

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Arnold-Forster, Hush O.

Bagot, Capt. Joceline FitzRoy

Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc, Stroud)

Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis

Bailey, James (Walworth)

Archdale, Edward Mervyn

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Bain, Colonel James Robert

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Austin, Sir John

Baldwin, Alfred

finite period. The right hon. Gentleman ought not only to publish the Report but also to state whether he was going to act upon it.

MR. CAWLEY (Lancashire, Prestwich) stated that, having travelled through the Transvaal, he was able to form a fair idea as to the nature of the country, and in his opinion;

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member would not be in order in discussing the probability of success or failure of a scheme of settlement in the Transvaal.

MR. CAWLEY desired merely to impress upon the right hon. Gentleman the importance of telling the British public the truth about the country. If this Report were published, it would doubtless save a great number of the yeomen and others who were going out to South Africa from dire disappointment. Before the war commenced a certain portion of the British press incited the people of this country to war by making out that the Transvaal was a sort of E1 Dorado for farmers. It was a peculiar thing that the people who knew least about farming always thought that they knew most, and the greater number of the yeomen, who had no real knowledge of farming;

*MR. SPEAKER intimated that the hon. Member was again entering into the policy of such a scheme of settlement.

MR. CAWLEY said he would merely ask the right hon. Gentleman to reconsider his

decision, and give an epitome of the Report, so that the British public might not go out to South Africa, only to meet with disappointment.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

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

The House divided:;Ayes, 193;.Noes, 118. (Division List No. 98.)

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

Gray, Ernest (West Ham)

Nicol, Donald Ninian

Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds)

Greene, Sir E W(B'rySEdm'nds)

Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)

Banbury, Frederick George

Greene, Hy. D. (Shrewsbury)

Pemberton, John S. G.

Bartley, George C. T.

Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)

Pierpoint, Robert

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

Gretton, John

Platt-Higgins, Frederick

Bentinck, Lord Henry C.

Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill

Plummer, Walter R.

Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.

Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton

Powell, Sir Francis Sharp

Bignold, Arthur

Hain, Edward

Pretymann, Ernest George

Bigwood, James

Hall, Edward Marshall

Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward

Bludell, Colonel Henry

Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G (Mdd'x

Purvis, Robert

Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-

Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd

Rasch, Major Frederic Curne

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John

Harris, F. Leverton(Tynem'th)

Ratcliffe, R. F.

Brookfield, Colonel Montagu

Heath, James(Staffords.,N.W.)

Reid, James (Greenock)

Bull, William James

Hoare, E. B. (Hampstead)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Bullard, Sir Harry
Hope, J F (Sheffield, Brightside)
Rentoul, James Alexander
Butcher, John George
Howard, Capt. J (Kent, Favers.)
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenh'm)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Hozier, Hon. James Henry C.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Hutton, John (Yorks., N. R.)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Rothschild, Hn. Lionel Walter
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Round, James
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'l)
Kenyon Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Chapman, Edward
Keswick, William
Seton-Karr, Henry
Churchill, Winston Spencer
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Knowles, Lees
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Lambton, Hon. Frederick W.
Smith, H C (North'mb). Tynes'de
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Lawson, John Grant

Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Stanley, Lord (Lanes.)
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Stock, James Henry
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Leveson-Gower, Fredk. N. S.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Stroyan, John
Cranborne, Viscount
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter(Bristol,S)
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Lowe, Francis William
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'dUniv)
Dalkeith, Earl of
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chath'm
Macdona, John Cumming
Tollemache, Henry James
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Maclver, David (Liverpool)
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Dimsdale, Sir JosephCockfield
Maconochie, A. W.
Valentia, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Duke, Henry Edward
M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.)
Walker, Col. William Hall

Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Majendie, James A. H.
Warde, Lt.-Col. C. E.
Faber, George Denison
Maxwell. Rt. Hn Sir HE (Wigt'n)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Maxwell, W.J.H (Dumfriessh.)
Welby, Lt.-Col. ACE (Taunton)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Middlemore, John T.
Welby, Sir Charles G.E. (Notts).
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Milward, Col. Victor
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Finch, George H.
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-und.L.)
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
William's, Col. R. (Dorset)
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
More, R. Jasper (Shropshire)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Fisher, William Hayes
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Foster, Sir Michael (Lond. Univ.)
Morrell, George Herbert
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh, N.)
Garfit, William
Morrison, James Archibald
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Morton, Arthur H.A. (Deptford)
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Mount, William Arthur
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-
Murray, Rt. Hn A. Graham(Bute)
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES;

Colliding, Edward Alfred
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Graham, Henry Robert
Nicholson, William Graham
NOES.

Abraham, William(Cork,N.E.)
Brigg, John
Causton, Richard Knight
Ambrose, Robert
Broadhurst, Henry
Cawley, Frederick
Asher, Alexander
Burke, E. Haviland-
Clancy, John Joseph
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Burns, John
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Bell, Richard
Burt, Thomas
Crean, Eugene
Black, Alexander William
Caine, William Sproston
Cremer, William Randal
Blake, Edward
Caldwell, James
Cullman, J.
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Boyle, James
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Delany, William
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh)
Leamy, Edmund
Redmond, JohnE.(Waterford)
Dillon, John
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Redmond, William (Clare)
Doogan, P. C.
Levy, Maurice
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries)
Dully, William J.
Lewis, John Herbert
Rickett, J. Compton

Duncan, James H.
Lloyd-George, David
Rigg, Richard
Ellis, John Edward
Lundon, W.
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Fenwick, Charles.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Ffrench, Peter
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Roe, Sir Thomas
Field, William
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
M'Demott, Patrick
Schwann, Charles E.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
M'Fadden, Edward
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Flynn, James Christopher
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Mooney, John J.
Sinclair, Capt. Jn.(Forfarshire)
Gilhooly, James
Morgan, J. Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Gladstone, Rt. Hon.Herbert J.
Morton, Edw. J.C. (Devonport)
Spencer, Rt. Hn C. R. (Northants)
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Murphy, J.
Sullivan, Donal
Griffith, Ellis J.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Thomas, David Alf. (Merthyr)
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Thompson, E. C. (Monaghan, N.)
Hardie, J. Keir(MerthyrTydvil)
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Harwood, George

O'Brien, Kendal(Tipp'rary Mid)
Weir, James Galloway
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Connor, James(Wicklow,W)
White, George (Norfolk)
Hayne, Rt. Hon Chas. Seale-
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Holland, William Henry
O'Doherty, William
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Horniman, Frederick John
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
O'Dowd, John
Wilson, Fred W.(NorfolkMid.)
Joicey, Sir James
O'Malley, William
Wilson, Henry J.(York,W.R.)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Joyce, Michael
Partington, Oswald
Kinloch, Sir John GeorgeSmyth
Pickard, Benjamin
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Labouchere, Henry
Power, Patrick Joseph
Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.
Lambert, George
Rea, Russell
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Reddy, M.

Question put accordingly, "That '£;893,316' stand part of the Resolution."

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J (Birm.
Garfit, William
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Chapman, Edward
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Austin, Sir John
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Graham, Henry Robert
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Greene, Sir E.W. (Bury St. Ed.
Balcarres, Lord
Corbett A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Greene, HenryD. (Shrewsbury)
Baldwin, Alfred
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Cox, Irwin Edward Bain bridge
Gretton, John
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W.(Leeds)
Cranborne, Viscount
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Banbury, Frederick George
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Hain, Edward
Bartley, George C. T.
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Hall, Edward Marshall
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H (Bristol)
Dalkeith, Earl of
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Lord G (Mid'x
Bentinck, Lord Henry C,
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashfd.
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.

Davies, Sir Horatio D(Chatham)
 Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)
 Bignold, Arthur
 Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
 Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.
 Bigwood, James
 Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
 Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampste'd
 Blundell, Colonel Henry
 Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
 Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.)
 Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
 Duke, Henry Edward
 Hope, J. F. (Shef'ld, Brightside
 Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
 Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
 Howard, Capt J(Kent, Faversh.
 Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
 Faber, George Denison
 Howard, J. (Midx., Tottenham)
 Bull, William James
 Fardell, Sir T. George
 Hozier, Hon. James Henry C.
 Bullard, Sir Harry
 Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
 Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)
 Butcher, John George
 Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
 Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
 Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
 Finch, George H.
 Johnston, William (Belfast)
 Cautley, Henry Strother
 Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
 Johnston, Heywood (Sussex)
 Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
 Firbank, Joseph Thomas
 Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
 Cavendish, V. C. W.(Derbysh.
 Fisher, William Hayes
 Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.(Salop.)
 Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
 Foster, Sir Michael (Lond, Univ,
 Keswick, William
 The House divided::Ayes, 196; Noes, 121. (Division List No. 99.)
 King, Sir Henry Seymour

Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Knowles, Lees
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Stock, James Henry
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Nicholson, William Graham
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Lawson, John Grant
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Stroyan, John
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants. Fareh'm)
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Pemberton, John S. G.
Talbot, Rt. Hn J. G. (Oxf'dUniv.
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Pierpoint, Robert
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Long, Col. Charles W. Evesham
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Thornton, Percy M.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Plummer, Walter R.
Tollemache, Henry James
Lowe, Francis William
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Pretymann, Ernest George
Valentia, Viscount
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Pryce-Jones. Lt.-Col. Edward
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Purvis, Robert
Walker, Col. William Hall
Macdonald, John Gumming
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne

Warde, Lieut. Col. C. E.
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Maconochie, A. W.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Welby, Lt-Col.A.C.E(Taunton)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Welby, Sir Charles G.E.(Notts.
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (EdinburghW
Rentoul, James Alexander
Wharton, Rt. Hn. John Lloyd
Majendie, James A. H.
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Charles T.
Whiteley, H. (Ashton. Lyne)
Maxwell, Rt. HnSir H E(Wigt'n)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Maxwell, W.J.H.(Dumfriessh.)
Bollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Middlemore, Jn. Throgmorton
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Milward, Colonel Victor
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Wilson, J. W (Worcestersh, N.)
Moles-worth, Sir Lewis
Round, James
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
More, R. J. (Shropshire)
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Morgan, Day. J. (Walthamst'w)
Seton-Karr, Henry
Young, Commander (Berks,E.)
Morrell, George Herbert
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Morrison, James Archibald
Simeon, Sir Barrington
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford

Smith, HC (Northum, Tyneside
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Mount, William Arthur
Smith, James Parker(Lanarks.
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G.(Bute)
Smith, Hon. W. F.D.(Strand)
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Mooney, John J.
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Morgan, J. L. (Carmarthen)
Ambrose, Robert
Flynn, James Christopher
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Asher, Alexander
Foster, Sir Walter (DerbyCo.)
Murphy, J.
Asquith, Rt. Hon Herbert Henry
Gilhooly, James
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert. J.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Bell, Richard
Goddard, Daniel Ford
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Black, Alexander William
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'ryMid
Blake, Edward
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm.
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Hardie,J. K. (MerthyrTydvil)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
Boyle, James
Harwood, George
O'Doherty, William
Brigg, John
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Broadhurst, Henry
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
O'Dowd, John

Burke, E. Haviland-
Hobhouse, C.F.H. (Bristol, E.)
O'Malley, William
Burns, John
Holland, William Henry
O'Shanghnessy, P.J.
Burt, Thomas
Horniman, Frederick John
Partington, Oswald
Caine, William Sproston
Jameson, Maj. J. Eustace
Pickard, Benjamin
Caldwell, James
Joicey, Sir James
Power, Patrick Joseph
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Rea, Russell
Causton, Richard Knight
Joyce, Michael
Reddy, M.
Cawley, Frederick
Kinloch, Sir John George S.
Redmond, John (E. Waterford)
Caney, John Joseph
Labouchere, Henry
Redmond, William (Clare)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Lambert, George
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Crean, Eugene
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Rickett, J. Compton
Cremer, William Randal
Leamy, Edmund
Rigg, Richard
Cullinan, J.
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Levy, Maurice
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Delany, William
Lewis, John Herbert
Roe, Sir Thomas
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)

Lloyd-George, David
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel
Dillon, John
Lough, Thomas
Schwann, Charles E.
Donelan, Captain A.
Lundon, W.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Doogan, P. C.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Dully, William J.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Sinclair, Capt. Jn. (Forfarshire
Duncan, James H.
M'Arthur, Wm. (Cornwall)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Fenwick, Charles
M'Dermott, Patrick
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C R (North'ants
Ffrench, Peter
M'Fadden, Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Field, William
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Weir, James Galloway
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk,Mid)
Mr. John Ellis and Mr. T. P. O'Connor.
White, George (Norfolk)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
White, Luke (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Whiteley, George (York, E.R.)
Yoxall, James Henry

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

*SIR ALBERT ROLLIT (Islington, S.) referred to the item in respect to savings banks and friendly society deficiencies. The deficiency this year in respect of savings banks amounted to £;39,866, and in 1903, when the interest on Consols was reduced, the deficiency might be materially increased. The Chancellor of the Exchequer would be faced with the serious question of how that deficiency in respect of both trustee and post office savings banks should be dealt with, and

he hoped that the idea which would commend itself to the right hon. Gentleman would be not only an increased power of investment to the National Debt Commissioners in respect of funds entrusted to them and paid over by the savings banks, but also that the trustees and managers of the savings banks would be allowed greater powers of investment in local and other securities. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had more than once stated that legislation on this subject must take place, and last session a Bill was introduced providing for a fluctuating rate of interest to the depositors. Those connected with banks generally, not only the depositors, but also trustees and managers, felt that such a fluctuating rate of interest fixed annually would be a matter of great difficulty with regard to anticipatory calculation, and also that it would have a tendency to decrease the deposits in savings banks, which were so conducive to the thrift and providence of the country. As Chairman of the Inspection Committee of Trustee Savings Banks, he (the speaker) believed, so far as it was possible to form a judgment, that the deposits were made by those classes which it was the original intention of the Savings Banks Act to help, and that generally speaking the banks had the great provident value which had always been attached to them. Further, the State got the benefit of the services of these honorary trustees and managers, who did most admirable work on behalf of the country. His main object in rising was to make a strong appeal to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to make at least a full inquiry before he again proposed a measure for the establishment of a fluctuating rate of interest, and also to give an opportunity to those connected with the banks to express the very strong wish that existed for an enlarged field of investment. He believed that properly made investments in local securities were the very best and a perfectly safe form of investment, and he hoped before any legislation was a tempted with regard to the matters he had referred to a committee would be appointed to inquire into the whole subject, and into the expediency of effecting those administrative reforms which had been recommended by the Inspection Committee in its annual reports, and embodied by himself in a Bill which he had introduced into the House of Commons.

*SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I hope the right hon. Gentleman will be extremely cautious in dealing with this matter at all. When this question was before us on a previous occasion it was supposed that Consols were too high, and that they were going up to lot). The present tendency seems to be to go to 50 rather than 150. The dangers which were anticipated with reference to savings banks in consequence of what are called the terribly inflated condition of Consols has disappeared, and I do not I think the danger is likely to reappear; at present, at all events. Therefore, if I might venture to offer any suggestion to the Chancellor of the Exchequer it would be to leave this matter alone.

MR. BARTLEY said that with Consols at 95 and Exchequer Bills bringing in 311½, the House might very well wait before dealing with this subject. He seriously doubted the wisdom of largely increasing the scope of the present investments of savings banks, because directly the savings banks held large sums in other securities they practically guaranteed those secure ties, and the advantage of their having a larger field of investment was at once

done away with. It was not necessary to go into the subject of the fluctuating rate of Consols, but he could not see why the savings bank rate should not fluctuate the same as any other bank rate, if necessary. From the present condition of the money market it was not likely that the difficulty with regard to Consols would arise for some years, and he congratulated the Chancellor of the Exchequer on not having done much at present.

MR. COHEN urged the Chancellor of the Exchequer to be very cautious as to how he interfered with the securities in which savings banks funds might be invested.

The depositors had the security of the State, and when the State had given that security it should take care that the funds were invested in Government securities. He did not say that that was a rule from which under no conceivable circumstances should any departure be made, but certainly the right hon.

Gentleman had been very wise in not allowing the actual price of Consols at the moment to govern his decision in the matter. The question was far too important to be determined by the fluctuation in the price of Consols, and if the present rule were departed from it would artificially appreciate the value of the other securities in which the savings banks were permitted to invest.

MR. LOUGH congratulated the hon. Members for East and North Islington on their change of mind in regard to this question, and reminded them that when the Bill to which reference had been made was introduced he stood up for the very principle they were now so well advocating. There was every reason why the rate of interest paid to depositors in savings banks should not fluctuate. The Vote before the House dealt with the state of savings banks only to the end of 1899, but perhaps the Chancellor of the Exchequer could state the position at the end of 1900, as the House would be glad to know exactly how the matter now stood.

SIR EDGAR VINCENT (Exeter) joined in the congratulations that no change was about to be made in the

present conditions. He very strongly held the opinion that a fluctuating rate of interest would be a great calamity to all the investing classes of the country, and also that the reduction of the present rate of interest would be detrimental to savings banks. He therefore hoped that no change would be made in either respect so long as present conditions obtained.

MR. PLATT-HIGGINS (Salford, N.) said the Manchester trustees of savings banks felt very keenly that they were compelled to invest the money they lent in the purchase of Manchester Corporation stock. They wished most distinctly not to be obliged to purchase stock which fluctuated, but to be allowed to lend money in fixed sums to be returned in the same amounts. They did not wish to incur the risk of complications arising in the market; if they lent £100 they desired to get £100 back. The House had never had any explanation from the Chancellor of the Exchequer as to why they were subjected to the present inconvenience.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS desired to call attention to a matter which affected a large class of taxpayers in the country. The income-tax on incomes up to £700 a year was graduated;

*MR. SPEAKER: I do not see under which part of the Vote the hon. Member is proceeding.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS said that under the Inland Revenue Vote there were certain

charges for law expenses, prosecutions, and collection, and his point was that under the existing administration there were very considerable difficulties in the way of people obtaining rebates of amounts due to them if their incomes were less than £;700 a year. He did not in the least blame the local officers, as they simply acted upon instructions, but it ought to be made as easy as possible for people to obtain such rebates as they were entitled to.

*MR. SPEAKER: I do not see how this comes under the present Vote. The hon. Member's complaint seems rather to touch the policy of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and in that case would come on on the ordinary Estimates, on the Vote for the Chancellor of the Exchequer's salary.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS then called attention to the desirability of improving post office accommodation at the large railway stations in this country. On the Continent the accommodation for post office purposes at the stations was infinitely superior to that provided in this country.

*MR. SPEAKER intimated that in the Report of Supply for the 28th February there was a Vote for post office buildings, but not in the Report under discussion.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS then directed attention to the Vote for stationery and printing, and thought the House was entitled to have the printing of Hansard done more expeditiously. Members of the Canadian Parliament actually had on their breakfast tables the report of the debate of the previous evening.

*MR. SPEAKER: This Vote is for printing done for public departments and in the Stationery Office. Hansard, is not printed in the Stationery Office; there is merely an arrangement between the Treasury and Hansard by which a certain number of copies are supplied.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS was about to refer to the question of slavery in British East Africa, when

*MR. SPEAKER pointed out that the only expenses asked for in the Supplementary Estimate with regard to British East Africa were in relation to a punitive expedition, and the abolition of slavery would not come under that.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS said the House was constantly being told that the object of these military expeditions in distant parts of the Empire was the suppression of slavery, and under these circumstances he thought the House had a right to say a word with regard to the cost of those operations.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member must confine his remarks to this particular expedition in Zanzibar.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS thought that if these military operations were undertaken, one of their main objects being to put down slavery, we should be perfectly consistent and put down slavery where we had the power to do so as early as possible. He concluded by thanking the Speaker for the courtesy with which he had pointed out the circumstances under which he was precluded from raising the questions to which he had referred, but doubtless other occasions would arise upon which he could return to those subjects.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil) referred to the Printing and Stationery Vote, a portion of which was required for mourning stationery in connection with the death of the late Queen. He did not intend to quibble with the amount spent, but he certainly thought the Government might have set a better standard of taste in

regard to the stationery. Its hideous black border was offensive to the eye and the taste. [Ministerial laughter.] If hon. Gentlemen opposite had no taste he could not help it.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; That observation is beyond the courtesies of debate.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: In that case, Sir, I will call your attention to the fact that hon. Gentlemen sitting opposite are evidently not in a fit condition to behave themselves.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; That again is a most irregular observation, and I must ask the hon. Gentleman to withdraw it.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: As probably I cannot prove it, I beg to withdraw the observation. The hon. Member expressed the hope that when in future such stationery was required some form of border would be devised which was less offensive to the taste than that now adopted. He also objected to the Vote of £20,000 which took the form of a grant to the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York in connection with their visit to the colonies. The object for which that expense had been incurred had been neither considered nor sanctioned by the House of Commons, and he asked whether it was in accordance with constitutional practice and procedure that the nation should be called upon to bear such expenses without the House of Commons having first sanctioned the expenditure. Cases of emergency might arise- wherein it was necessary to incur liabilities without an opportunity presenting itself for consulting the House of Commons, but that was not the case on the present- occasion. If this expenditure was not being incurred under any rule or decision of the House, by whose authority was it undertaken? The next Vote on the Paper was in connection with the funeral of the late Queen. He had no objection whatever to the amount spent on the funeral ceremony; his objection was entirely to the manner in which the money had been expended. The ceremony took the form of a military funeral, and he protested in the strongest and most emphatic manner against the Head of a constitutional State being buried with military honours, to the total exclusion of the whole civil and religious life of the community. The late Queen was the head of the Army, but she was also head of the Anglican Church as bylaw established, of the law courts, and of the State, and an explanation was due to the- nation why the funeral was entirely a military display from which civic, religious, and communal life was altogether excluded. A part of the Vote was for stands erected along the route of the procession. He recalled with a feeling of shame that he had the honour of occupying a position on one of those stands. There were three stands erected, one for the veterans of the Army, one for cadets being trained for the Army, and the third for Members of the House of Commons. The dignified part which the representatives of the people of England were called upon to play in the funeral ceremonies of England's greatest Queen was to stand on tip-toe upon a stand some thirty yards away from the procession in order to obtain a glimpse of it as it passed along. Whoever was responsible for the making of those arrangements was guilty of an insult to the nation at large and to the House of Commons in particular. The leading characteristic of the august Lady who for so long

adorned her high office was that of domestic simplicity. Nothing gaudy appealed to her; garish displays were alien to her tastes and feelings; and it did seem to him a mockery that the last ceremony in connection with the passing of such a Queen should have taken the form of a huge military display, a pageant, a show for the multitudes to gape at, from which all simplicity was absent, and in connection with which feelings of reverence were all but an impossibility. ["No."] Hon. Members might differ from him on that point; his feelings were dictated by what obtained among the simple and homely people of a Scotch village, where reverence for the dead was a marked and distinguishing feature of all these last rites and ceremonies, and the great military show, and the enormous crowd of people, assembled not to do reverence to England's dead Queen, but to see the ceremony provided for them, grated upon his feelings. What he felt then, and what he felt now was that the dead body of England's Queen was used as a recruiting sergeant to help the military designs now being carried into effect. Apart from any feeling of that kind the fact could not be denied, and dare not be disputed, that the House of Commons, the representative of the nation, was ignored and passed over, and that the gentlemen of England were prepared to submit to the indignity without protest and without feeling the degradation it involved. If anything were required to mark the decadence of England's greatness they had it in the fact that the House of Commons, composed of English gentlemen, was prepared to see its high position taken from it, and the soldier placed where the ruler by right should stand. He asked for information in connection with these two items; first of all, by whose authority the expenditure for the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall's tour had been incurred, and secondly, who was responsible for the arrangements in connection with the funeral of the late Queen, and why it was that the funeral was turned into a military display from which the civil life of the nation was altogether eliminated?

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol. W.): The hon. Member has called attention to two items in the Supplementary Estimate. The first is that of £20,000 for the tour of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York to our colonial possessions. He has asked by whose authority the expenditure has been incurred. By my authority. I am convinced that there is perhaps no item in all the Estimates that are presented this year which would be more cheerfully voted by the House of Commons than that of the expenses of this tour, undertaken, as it is at personal sacrifice to the Duke and Duchess and the King and Queen, in the discharge of a solemn duty, undertaken at the request of our great colonies in Australasia and Canada and in other parts of the world, and calculated. I believe, to be of immense advantage in consolidating and welding together our Empire, and in instructing its future ruler as to the greatness of his responsibilities. I do not believe that even the hon. Member himself really seriously objects to this Vote. I now come to the second point to which the hon. Member called attention; the expenses of the funeral of her late Majesty the Queen. The hon. Member has not expressed, and I am quite sure that no one would express, any objection to the amount of the Vote, but he has called attention to the manner in which the funeral appeared to

him to have been conducted. He has described it as a military pageant from which the civil and religious elements were entirely absent, and he has stated that in his opinion that solemn procession through 'the streets of the metropolis was viewed merely as a pageant by the hundreds and thousands of spectators, and not with feelings of reverence. I do not think that would be the impression of anyone else who witnessed it. If there was a military element in the funeral it was largely necessitated by the fact that it was impossible to keep the streets without the presence of the military, and no one, so far as I am aware, has expressed any objection to this except the hon. Member himself. I am persuaded that though there was a certain amount of military ceremony in the funeral, it was not more than was right and proper in the funeral of a Sovereign of this country, that the ceremony was solemn, quiet, and reverent, and that certainly both the civil and religious elements were adequately represented. The hon. Member has found fault with the accommodation reserved for the House of Commons. I have nothing to do with arrangements of that kind. All the arrangements for the funeral were under the supreme control of the Duke of Norfolk, the Earl Marshal, who, I think, the House will remember was not long ago responsible for similar arrangements on the occasion of the public funeral of Mr. Gladstone, and who, I believe, conducted on both occasions the arrangements entrusted to him in a manner deserving praise. I do not think the hon. Member is justified in the remarks he has made, and I think it was perfectly evident that they did not meet with the sympathy of the House. Having dealt with these two points I will say one or two words on the matter brought before the House by the hon. Member for South Islington. He referred to the item in the Vote for the expenses of the savings banks. I am glad to observe that this is a diminishing item owing to the fact that the investments have been more profitable during the past year than in the immediately preceding years. I agree with the hon. Member that it is eminently desirable that careful inquiry by the House of Commons should precede any legislation on this subject. When I introduced my Bill last year I was careful to state that such was my intention. I do not anticipate that any Bill for dealing with the interest paid to depositors in savings banks should or ought to receive assent without very careful previous inquiry by a Select Committee; and although I am sorry that the particular proposal I made was not very well received by some Members of the House, yet I am by no means wanting in the hope that when it comes to be fairly examined and discussed it may be found to be much more valuable than has been supposed. I can only say that it has been eminently successful in connection with savings banks in France. There is one point which makes the matter somewhat urgent, and that is the fact that in 1903 the rate of interest in Consols is automatically reduced by ½ per cent., and that as the savings banks moneys are largely invested in Consols, the income from this investment will diminish by a large annual sum: and therefore after that time there may be a considerable deficiency to be voted by Parliament. Before that time comes the question must be examined by the House of Commons in order to ascertain in what way it can be dealt with.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND directed attention to the fact that the last fifteen Votes

in the Supplementary Estimate were passed through Committee without a single word being said about them, owing to the new procedure adopted by the First Lord of the Treasury, and by which they were lumped together. He would ask the Secretary to the Treasury to give some information to the House upon some of the subjects in connection with which they were asked to vote money. In the Stationery and Printing Vote there was the extraordinary sum of £;100,000, which the Secretary to the Treasury said had been necessitated by the war. He had often said that there was absolutely no knowing where the expenses of the war were going to end. The large sum asked to conduct military operations did not represent what would be the full cost of the war and that was illustrated by the fact that no less a sum than £;100,000 extra was asked for stationery and printing. Could the Secretary to the Treasury give any facts to justify this enormous sum? That gigantic sum appeared to be out of all proportion to any real necessity there could be. An additional sum of £;15,800 was asked for the diplomatic and consular services. How did it come about that this considerable sum was asked for? He presumed that it was expense which had arisen out of military operations in China. He also asked explanations of £;4,000 in connection with the state of affairs in the Portuguese Settlement, and £;1,200 for telegrams in connection with the state of affairs in the Far East. It would be much better in his opinion if the Government were to cease their policy of aggravating the Chinese, and leave them alone in their own country. He was sure they would treat in a proper way the Europeans going there, but the present system of harrying and worrying the Chinese;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; That question is not relevant.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said he mentioned this merely for the purpose of pointing out that the cause of the cost of which he complained was to be found in the warlike policy of His Majesty's Government. In the Vote for the Treasury best Fund an increase of £;63,261 was asked. He ventured to say that the explanation given of that amount was not quite clear. They were asked to vote an additional sum of £;4,600 for the Lord Chamberlain's Department to provide insignia of the Distinguished Service Order. No doubt that Order was highly prized by the gentlemen who earned it, and no doubt they received it in a meritorious and proper way. He believed that the vast majority of those who received the Order would feel it to be only a compliment to be allowed to pay any paltry cost there might be in connection with providing themselves with the decoration which they hung upon their breast. When there were so many people in the direst straits in this country, when they found themselves surrounded in every part of the United Kingdom by distress, when they knew that even within a few minutes walk of the House there were in the streets and alleys and slums of Westminster people who were probably at the moment hungering for a crust of bread, and suffering semi-starvation, it was rather frivolous that the taxpayers should be asked to pay £;4,600 merely for the purpose of buying some blue, green, red, or yellow ribbon to decorate the coats of gentlemen who had been awarded the Distinguished Service Order. The next Vote had reference to the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall's visit to the Colonies. With regard to that he had nothing whatever to say. He thought if they sent them there it would be rather hard to ask them

to go without their travelling expenses. The Irish felt it, no doubt, a hard thing that they should be called upon to pay a proportion of that expense, which really did not affect them much, but from the English point of view, and from the ordinary commercial business point of view, he did not blame the Government for paying the travelling expenses of their Royal Highnesses. With regard to the Vote of £;35,000 for the funeral of Her late Majesty, he did not desire to say a single word. That was a matter for the country and the House of Commons, and if they thought that the money was properly expended he did not feel disposed to offer any objection. It was a hardship and a grievance that Members of the House should be called upon at that hour (11.25 p.m.) to consider fifteen Votes, upon which they were not allowed to say one word in Committee of Supply. He might say in this connection that he believed the whole House of Commons heard with the greatest satisfaction the statement which Mr. Speaker made from the Chair, in connection with the new departure of lumping the Votes of the Supplementary Estimate together, that this would not be regarded as a precedent by the Government in the future.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) called attention to the extra expenditure in connection with the diplomatic service. The Vote showed an increase of 75 per cent, on the original Estimate, and that mainly for telegrams. That was a very large increase in one year after the Estimates had been made out. That could not be entirely owing to the prolongation of the war, for even if the war had been over there would have been large expenditure in connection with peace negotiations. An increase of 75 per cent. on diplomatic telegrams was more than could be accepted without very considerable explanation. Several hon. Members had intended to raise the question in Committee, but were precluded from doing so because the Vote was not reached. There was very considerable difficulty in discussing the matter on the Report stage, and his only course was to move a reduction at once.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member cannot now move a reduction.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER said that that was another difficulty which confronted hon. Members when discussing Estimates on the Report stage. He hoped that the Government would give the House some explanation of such a large increase. He regretted that hon. Members should be precluded from discussing such an important question in Committee.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): I will deal as briefly as I can, but I hope, with sufficient fulness to satisfy hon. Members, with the various questions that have been addressed to me. If the hon. Member who has just spoken will look at the Vote he will observe that only £;4,000 can in any way be said to be connected with the state of war existing in South Africa.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER: I pointed out that it was not due to the war in any way.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Then the hon. Member relieves me from the necessity of making any further explanation.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER: Then what was the cause of the increase?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The first cause is the disturbed condition of affairs in China, and secondly there is a sum of £;4,000 for telegrams with reference to

the state of affairs at Lorenzo Marques. As the hon. Member knows, Lorenzo Marques became of very considerable importance. Events of great interest took place there, and he will understand that it was necessary for the Foreign Secretary to communicate with our representative there, and not infrequently. It is not unreasonable, having regard to the circumstances of the past year, that more inquiries than were anticipated were necessary, especially when it is remembered that the Estimates had to be framed in October, November and December of the year before last. The hon. Member for East Clare asked me to give him some indication as to how the £100,000 for the Stationery Vote was made up, that sum being described in the Vote as being mainly due to the war. I ought to say that the Stationery Vote includes something more than hon. Members may suppose. It is not only notepaper and printing, but a variety of other stores also, such as packing-paper, required by the War Office for the stores they have sent out to South Africa. That has been supplied by the Stationery Office, as well as special waterproof coverings to cover articles which might be damaged by damp. Then there were thirteen million envelopes demanded by the War Office in excess of their normal supply, and 250,000 discharge certificates were also required in excess of the usual supply. Then there were special account books for the use of officers and men, which were prepared with counterfoils, so that an order might be given for payment and a record kept. Of all ordinary supplies there has been a large excess required this year. Without wearying the House, I think I have said sufficient to show hon. Members how the increase has occurred.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said he was much obliged to the hon. Gentleman for the information, and merely wished to ask whether the hon. Gentleman would consider the advisability of putting the details in the Estimates next year, which would have the effect of preventing him and other hon. Members from making speeches.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I would be very ready to fall in with the hon. Gentleman's view, and am perfectly open to make a bargain with him. The hon. Gentleman asked me to explain the item for the Treasury Chest Fund. This consists of a fixed sum of about £700,000 to supply various treasury chests abroad, and to meet the needs of the Services in different places. In ordinary years there may be some deficiency to be made good owing to the loss incurred in transferring money. In the present year there has been a loss on the Treasury Chest Fund in some dozen different stations, and profits on treasury bills in half a dozen others, but of course the main item which has raised the figure this year is the very large sum required in South Africa for the pay of our forces. In ordinary times the money required by the treasury chest at the Cape is provided by the Cape Government, we supplying them in return with any money they may require in London. But owing to the very large increase in the amount necessitated by the war, the Cape Government were not able to supply us, and we were obliged to make arrangements with the banks instead.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND asked if the money for the troops would appear again in the Army Estimates.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Oh, yes, Sir. No money is included in this Vote for the payment of the troops; this is merely the cost of providing

money in South Africa. Then, with reference to the provision of the Distinguished Service Order badges, the War Office anticipated that a considerable number would be required. [Mr. LABOUCHERE: Have they got them in stock?] Yes, Sir; there are a certain number in stock, which will shortly be required. Some, I believe, have already been required in connection with the operations in China and West Africa, though none up to the present in connection with the operations in South Africa. By ordering a very large number we have been able to secure a very considerable reduction on each badge. [Mr. W. REDMOND: How much?] I speak from memory, but I think I am substantially correct when I say that the reduction is from £;9 12s. to £;6. [Mr. W. REDMOND: How much does a Victoria Cross cost?] There are no Victoria Crosses in this Vote, but I imagine that the Victoria Cross does not cost anything like as much as the Distinguished Service Order Badge. The hon. Member suggested, I do not think seriously, that the recipients of these honours should be called upon to pay for them. I think that would be very ungracious, all the more as the Order is one that is given to all ranks, and may therefore be a very heavy tax on the scanty means of some of the recipients.

MR. FIELD (Dublin. St. Patrick) said that, while acknowledging the courtesy of the hon. Gentleman, he desired to call attention to two points. There was an enormous increase in the Post Office Vote, regarding which he should like to have an explanation. Then there was £;200,000 added for Commissions. He was a Member of the Port and Dock Board of Dublin, and he wished to have a Commission appointed, and would like to know its probable cost. Then the expenses connected with the Scotch Private Bill Act were increased by £;100,000. He would also like some explanation as to that, because it was a subject in which Irish Members took an enormous amount of interest. He objected, as a business man, to the way in which the Supply Estimates were brought forward in one sum. The heads of the different Departments ought to be criticised across the floor of the House in a businesslike fashion. He hoped the system would not be used as a precedent, but that in future the financial business of the House would be carried on on ordinary business principles. Surely no commercial firm would lump such an enormous number of items together without giving an opportunity of their being analysed or audited. He entirely agreed with what had been said with regard to the savings banks, and believed it would be highly prejudicial if the rate of interest were to fluctuate, in his opinion it ought to be a settled rate. He trusted the hon. Gentleman would give him some information about the increase in the Post Office Vote. Of course, he knew it extended over the three kingdoms, but still the Post Office authorities ought to be able to judge their expenditure better.

MR. NANNETTI said that with reference to the stationery and printing contracts he was not satisfied with the explanation that had been given. As a printer himself he would not object to the expenditure, provided it was spent among the working printers of England. He should like to know how many of the thirteen million envelopes referred to by the hon. Gentleman were produced in England. He knew well that none of them were manufactured in Ireland, and the next best thing, to his mind, was that they should be of English manufacture, and that

Germany and other Continental countries should not get the money. If there were thirteen million envelopes he, wished to know how many millions of reams of notepaper were required. The printers of England were badly in want of employment, and he should be glad to know that the money mentioned in the Vote was spent among them. He also wished to know whether all the money went into one firm or was spread over a number of firms, or spent in overtime. If the overtime system were adopted, owing to pressure or otherwise, it was a very bad thing, and he would appeal to the hon. Gentleman to put a stop to it.

MR. FLAVIN said he hoped that the hon. Gentleman would give the information which his hon. friend had asked

for. Apart from political considerations he felt that the subject was very important to the manufacturers of England, if not to the manufacturers of Ireland. The taxpayers of Great Britain were compelled, owing to war and other unforeseen causes, to pay very heavy rates, and the very least they could expect was that the money raised by that means should be distributed among them again. Although hon. Members had pressed the question again and again they had been unable to obtain any information as to where the envelopes and other articles mentioned were manufactured. They all knew that in Germany, owing to the sweating system, envelopes could be supplied at a cheaper rate than in England. He hoped the hon. Gentleman in charge of the Vote would give some explanation on the matter. Then, with reference to the printing for public Departments, he certainly had not heard any detailed explanation regarding it. It was extraordinary that on every single occasion on which his hon. friends endeavoured to encourage the industries of England or of Ireland they were absolutely refused information. If it were to be the policy of the Government to boycott the industries not only of Ireland but of England and Scotland, and send money out of the country, then right hon. Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench should announce that policy at the General Election, but they would not do that. It might be said that his hon. friends spoke simply for the purpose of obstructing, but that was not so. They claimed all along the right to express their opinion on questions before the House. They had always complained of the small amount of money spent in their own country, although it contributed more than its fair share of taxation. They were compelled to pay, and could only make their protest. They were justified in protesting, not only on behalf of their own constituents, but on behalf of the constituents of other hon. Gentlemen who did not do their duty. Only a few nights ago he raised a very important question of interest to the agricultural community of England; namely, as to how corn was supplied to His Majesty's horses. But he could not obtain any information. He could assure

hon. Gentlemen, however, that the more information was suppressed the more they were determined to press for it. He hoped the hon. Gentleman would answer the questions which had been raised, otherwise he was sure, some of his hon. friends would think it necessary to continue the discussion.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I have no right to speak a second time, hut, with the permission of the House. I may assure the hon. Member that all the, stationery stores are ordered within the country.

MR. NANNETTI: What country? Does the hon. Gentleman mean England or Ireland?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Within the United Kingdom. All the stationery and printing required in Ireland is ordered in Ireland; and the whole of it within the United Kingdom. In every case where it is possible public competition is invited for tenders, the only exception being in the case of one or two firms where some speciality is required which only these firms can supply, but even these firms are in the position of having contracts obtained by public competition.

*MR. O'DOHERTY: Are we to understand that the stationery used in Government offices in Ireland is made from paper manufactured in Irish paper mills?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I understand that is so. Part of the increase of the Post Office Votes is due to the war, which involved a considerable increase in the stores: a great deal to the extra cartage by road owing to the removal to Mount Pleasant, and the remainder to the general increase of business which requires a larger staff, and the engagement of men to fill the places of the Reservists and others who have gone out to the war in South Africa, and whose places had to be filled in other ways.

MR. FIELD: Am I to understand that no considerable portion of this money is given to railway companies in the shape of increased subsidies?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: No, Sir.

*MR. O'DOHERTY said a question had been raised with reference to £;700, the cost of the Salmon Fisheries Commission in Ireland. He wanted the assurance of the hon. Gentleman that the Government would take steps by legislation to carry out the recommendations of that Commission in order to protect the salmon fishing, industry in Ireland.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: That is not the Commission of which the hon. Gentleman thinks. That is the Scottish Salmon Fishery Commission.

*MR. O'DOHERTY said that in Committee of Supply he had called the attention of the First Commissioner of Works to the increased Vote for fuel and light; and the First Commissioner informed the Committee that he had made certain arrangements with colliery owners in England for next year. He would like to draw attention to the fact that several Continental Governments were inquiring into the use of compressed peat for raising steam for machinery and ships. A few days ago there was an announcement in the Engineer that the Government of Sweden had appointed an expert to examine the peat resources of Sweden and Norway for the purpose of providing an economical fuel for the public service. If that were done by the present Government in this country, it would go a good way towards developing a great industry not only in Ireland, but in Scotland. He asked the Government to give an assurance that they would appoint a Commission to inquire into the use of compressed peat, which would give employment to many people in the congested districts both of Ireland and Scotland. There might be a large saving to the British taxpayer, for no doubt during the last two years the Government had been at the mercy of the colliery owners. Apart from the saving in money, it might be the means of educating workmen in districts of the United Kingdom which were not coal-producing. He was glad to hear that a great part of the stationery used by the Government departments in Ireland was manufactured in

Ireland; but the hon. Gentleman had not answered the question whether any part of the thirteen million envelopes required for the South African campaign were manufactured in Ireland, or whether they were manufactured (entirely in England.

MR. GILHOOLY (Cork County, W.) said he wished to direct attention to the question of the failure of the Postmaster General to provide a postal service to the village of Castletown, Berehaven.

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Dickson, Charles Scott

Jones, William (Carnarvonsh)

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-

Kearley, Hudson E.

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

Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield

Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)

Allhusen, Augustus Hy. Eden

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-

Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.

Anson, Sir William Reynell

Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)

Keswick, William

Archdale, Edward Mervyn

Duke, Henry Edward

King, Sir Henry Seymour

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin

Knowles, Lees

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton

Lambton, Hon.Frederick Wm.

Asher, Alexander

Elibank, Master of

Lawrence, William F.

Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis

Faber, George Denison

Lawson, John Grant

Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herb. Henry

Fardell, Sir T. George

Lee, Arthur H(Hants.,Fareham)

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.

Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage

Austin, Sir John

Fenwick, Charles

Leigh, Sir Joseph
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Bain, ' Colonel James Robert
Finch, George H.
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S,
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r)
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Levy, Maurice
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W. (Leeds)
Fisher, William Hayes
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Long, Col. C. W. (Evesham)
Beach, Rt. Hn.SirM. H. (Bristol)
Fuller, J. M. E.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter(Bristol, S.
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Garfit, William
Lowe, Francis William
Bignold, Arthur
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Bigwood, James
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth)
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Brigg, John
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'rH'mlt's)
Macdona, John Cumming
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-
M'Iver, David (Liverpool)
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Gorst, Rt.Hon. Sir John Eldon
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Bull, William James
Goschen, Hon. Geo. Joachim
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)

Bullard, Sir Harry
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Majendie, James A. H.
Butcher, John George
Graham, Henry Robert
Malcolm, Ian
Caldwell, James
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Maxwell, W.J.H. (Dumfriessh.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Greene, Sir E. W. (BurySt.Edm
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Middlemore, John T.
Cavendish, V. C.W. (Derbysh.)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Grenfell, William Henry
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Gretton, John
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
More, Rbt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc.
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Ld. G. (Midx
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow
Chapman, Edward
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd.
Morgan, J. L. (Carmarthen)
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynemth.)
Morrell, George Herbert
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Morrison, James Archibald
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Hayne, Rt.Hon. Charles Seale-
Morton, Arthur H.A. (Deptford)
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready

Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.)
Morton, Edw. J.C.(Devonport)
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Henderson, Alexander
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Corbett, A. Cameron(Glasgow)
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Muntz, Philip A.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset,E.)
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Holland, William Henry
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Cranborne, Viscount
Hope, J. F (Sheffield, Brightside
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Horniman, Frederick John
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Howard, Capt J (Kent, Faversh.
Nicholson, William Graham
Dalkeith, Earl of
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Joicey, Sir James
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not entitled to ask any question on the Post
Office service unless it applies to the Supplementary Votes.
MR. GILHOOLY said he would draw attention to the subject on the Appropriation
Bill next day.
Question put.
The House divided:;Ayes, 241; Noes 53. (Division List No. 100.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Seton-Karr, Henry
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Partington, Oswald
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Pierpoint, Robert
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)

Wanklyn, James Leslie
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Warde, Lt.-Col. C. E.
Plammer, Walter R.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Pretyman, Ernest George
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)
Weir, James Galloway
Price, Robert John
Smith, HC (North'mbTyneside)
Welby, Lt.-Cl. A.C.E. (Taunt'n)
Priestley, Arthur
Smith, James Parker(Lanarks)
Welby, Sir Charles G.E.(Notts.
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Smith, Hon. W.F.D. (Strand)
Wharton, Rt. Hn. John Lloyd
Purvis, Robert
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
White, George (Norfolk)
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Spencer, RtHn C.R. (Northants)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Reckitt, Harold James
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Whiteley, H (Ashton und. Lyne)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Stock, James Henry
Wilcox, Sir John Archibald
Rentoul, James Alexander
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid)
Ridley, S. F. (Bethnal Green)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Rigg, Richard
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Ox. Univ.
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh., N.)

Richie, Rt. Hon. Charles T.
 Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.)
 Wodehouse, Hn. Armine (Essex)
 Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
 Thomas, David Alfred (Merthr)
 Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
 Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
 Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings)
 Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B. Stuart-
 Ropner, Col. Robert
 Thornton, Percy M.
 Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
 Round, James
 Tollemache, Henry James
 Young, Commander (Berks, E)
 Royds, Clement Molyneux
 Trevelyan, Charles Philips
 Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
 Ure, Alexander
 TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
 Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
 Valentia, Viscount
 Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
 Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
 Walker, Col. William Hall
 Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
 Wallace, Robert
 NOES.
 Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
 Gilhooly, James
 O'Doherty, William
 Ambrose, Robert
 Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
 O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
 Bell, Richard
 Hardie, J. Keir (MerthyrTydvil)
 O'Dowd, John
 Boyle, James
 Hayden, John Patrick
 O'Malley, William
 Burke, E. Haviland-
 Jameson, Major J. Eustace
 O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
 Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
 Joyce, Michael
 Power, Patrick Joseph

Cawley, Frederick
Leamy, Edmund
Reddy, M.
Clancy, John Joseph
Lundon, W.
Redmond, JohnE. (Waterford)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Redmond, William (Clare)
Crean, Eugene
M'Dermott, Patrick
Roe, Sir Thomas
Cullinan, J.
M'Fadden, Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Delany, William
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Thompson, E.C. (Monaghan,N)
Doogan, P. C.
Mooney, John J.
Whiteley, Geo. (York, W.R.)
Duffy, William J.
Murphy, J.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Duncan, James H.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Ffrench, Peter
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Field, William
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Flavin, Michael Joseph
O'Connor, James(Wicklow, W.)
Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool
SUPPLY [28TH FEBRUARY] REPORT.

Remaining Resolutions [12th March] further considered;;
CIVIL SERVICES SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1900–1901.
Class I.

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

4."That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £;7,000, be granted to His

Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Expenses of the Post Office, and Post Office Telegraph Buildings in Great Britain, including Furniture, Fuel, and Sundry Miscellaneous services."

Third Resolution::

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

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would give some details of the Vote.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's) said that the Supplementary Estimates were partly occasioned by changes in Embassies abroad. Further, at Lisbon the sanitary arrangements, which were entirely wrong, had to be set right.

MR. FLAVIN asked why a house which was suitable for the previous occupant was not suitable for his successor.

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS said that he thought that a house that had been occupied for five or six years by an Ambassador and his family required a certain amount of painting and alteration when it was vacated.

Question put, and agreed to.

Fourth Resolution::

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

MR. FLAVIN said that in connection with the Vote they had pressed the right hon. Gentleman very strongly to give some information as to the contracts. In July, 1900, Her Majesty's Government entered into a contract for the supply of fuel for a period of six months, and in some cases for fifteen months, when fuel was at its highest price. If the right hon. Gentleman was catering for his own household he would not enter into such a contract at that time. They had failed to obtain the name of the mine owner who supplied the fuel, and also as to whether the lowest tender was accepted. They had also asked, in Committee, for information as to household articles referred to in the Vote, and as to whether they were manufactured in England or Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman and his officials were directly responsible for having entered into a contract for fuel when coal was at its highest price. Anyone who knew the conditions of the coal market knew very well that the price could not have gone higher, and he could not see any justification or excuse for such a transaction.

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS said that in regard to the coal contract tenders were asked from all the firms in South Wales who supplied the kind of coal they required. They accepted the two lowest tenders which were made. As to the length of the contracts, in the first instance the contract was for six months and in the other instance for three months.

MR. FLYNN said they all acknowledged the conciliatory tone of the right hon. Gentleman, and his desire to explain as well as he could the various items in the Vote, but surely he would recognise that no private individual in conducting his business would consider it good accounting that the original Estimate should be exceeded by 50 per cent. If these Supplementary Estimates merely represented

small amounts they might be explained on the ground that they were almost inevitable, but with a few exceptions the Supplementary Estimates were for large and alarming amounts.

MR. POWER said that the prediction of the state of things which would follow the new rule introduced by the First Lord of the Treasury had been borne out by what had taken place. If the officials who made up original Estimates came to believe that Supplementary Estimates would pass without criticism they would become careless in the preparation of the Estimates. No good business man in the conduct of his own affairs would be so very much out of his calculation as the Government appeared to be in regard to these Estimates.

MR. NANNETTI said there were coalfields in Ireland that might have been utilised. There were districts in Ireland where, he was happy to say, coal was being produced at 10s. per ton. He would suggest to the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works that the Government would be doing a good act if they encouraged the Irish to develop the coalfields of the country. That question might be worthy of the consideration of the Cabinet.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.) said that as a new Member he would state the opinion he had formed in regard to the manner in which the Estimates were prepared. In local boards throughout the country the Estimates when submitted gave details in order that the members of those boards might perfectly understand what was to be done with the money. He found the Estimates submitted in that House did not give the details they ought to give. When this matter was before them on a previous occasion they had what was described as an unpleasant and disgraceful scene in the House. Why was that? It was because the information asked by the Nationalist Members was not supplied. It was a most unbusinesslike method to
AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Gray, Ernest (West Ham)

Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Greene, Sir E. W. (B'rySEdm'ds)

Penn, John

Anson, Sir William Reynell

Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)

Platt-Higgins, Frederick

Archdale, Edward Mervyn

Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)

Plummer, Walter R.

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Grenfell, William Henry

Pretymann, Ernest George

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Gretton, John

Priestley, Arthur

Asher, Alexander

Greville, Hon. Ronald
Pryce-Jones, Lt.- Col. Edward
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G.(M'dx)
Purvis, Robert
Atkinson, lit. Hon. John
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd
Radcliffe, R. F.
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Reckitt, Harold James
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J. (Manch'r
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Reid, James (Greenock)
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-
Remnant, James Farquharson
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.
Rentoul, James Alexander
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Bell, Richard
Hope, J F (Sheffield, Brightside
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Howard, Capt J (Kent, Faversham.
Rigg, Richard
Bignold, Arthur
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Joicey, Sir James
Roe, Sir Thomas
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Bull, William James
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.

Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Bullard, Sir Harry
Keswick, William
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Butcher, John George
Knowles, Lees
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Caldwell, James
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Cautley, Henry Strother
Lawson, John Grant
Seton-Karr, Henry
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Cavendish, V. C. W.(Derbysh.
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Leveson-Gower, Frederick NS.
Simeon, Sir Harrington
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Levy, Maurice
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.)
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Smith, HC (Northumb Tyns'ide)
Chamberlain, J Austen(Worc'r)
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Chapman, Edward
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Spencer, Rt. Hn CR(Northants)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Lucas Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Stock, James Henry
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Macdona, John Cumming
Talbot. Lord E. (Chichester)

Cranborne, Viscount
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Talbot, Rt. Hon. J. G. (Oxf'dUniv.
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Thomas, F. Freenman-(Hastings
Dalkeith, Earl of
Majendie, James A. H.
Thornton, Percy M.
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Malcolm, Ian
Tollemache, Henry James
Dickson, Charles Scott
Maxwell, W.J.(Dumfriesshire
Ure, Alexander
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Valentia, Viscount
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Walker, Col. William Hall
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Elibank, Master of
Montagu, G (Huntingdon)
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.
Fardell, Sir T. George
More, R. Jasper (Shropshire)
Wason, JohnCathcart (Orkney
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Fenwick, Charles
Morley, Charles (Breconshire
White, George (Norfolk)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Morrell, George Herbert
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Finch, George H.
Morrison, James Archibald
Whiteley, H.(Ashton-under-L.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Fisher, William Hayes

Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray G.
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Muntz, Philip A.
Wilson, Arthur S. (York, E.R.)
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. Herbert John
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Gordon, Maj. E. (T'wer H'mlts)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Nicholson, William Graham
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Nicol, Donald Ninian
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Goulding, Edward Alfred
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Graham, Henry Robert
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay

have these large accounts lumped together with no details, and so far as he was concerned he would, while he was in that House, try to resist the system and press every Minister to give information as to how the money was expended.
Question put.

The House divided:; Ayes, 182, Noes, 49. (Division List No. 101.)
NOES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N.E.)
Goddard, Daniel Ford
O'Doherty, William
Ambrose, Robert
Hardie, J. K. (Merthyr Tydvil)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Boyle, James
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Dowd, John
Burke, E. Haviland-
Jameson, Maj. J. Eustace
O'Malley, William
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)

Joyce, Michael
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Clancy, John Joseph
Leamy, Edmund
Power, Patrick Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Lundon, W.
Reddy, M.
Crean, Eugene
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Redmond, J. E. (Waterford)
Cullinan, J.
M'Dermott, Patrick
Redmond, William (Clare)
Delany, William
M'Fadden, Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Doogan, P. C.
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Duffy, William J.
Mooney, John J.
Weir, James Galloway
Duncan, James H.
Murphy, J.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Ffrench, Peter
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Field, William
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Flavin, Michael Joseph
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)
Gilhooly, James
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
SUPPLY [1ST MARCH] REPORT.
Remaining Resolutions [14th March] further considered.
CIVIL SERVICE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1900–1901.
Class II.
4."That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £;6,000, be granted to His Majesty,
to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending
on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Department
of His Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs."

5."That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £7,200, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Department of His Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies."

6."That a sum, not exceeding £1,015, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of the Lord Privy Seal."

Fourth Resolution::

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

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND asked why the Supplementary Estimates for the increased cost of telegrams were placed in two Votes. On the Vote just passed there were £15,000 for telegrams, and on the one before the

House there were another £6,000. Such a system was very confusing, and perhaps the Secretary of State would state why the money was thus divided.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRANBORNE, Rochester): The Vote which the House had under consideration just now was for telegrams sent from abroad to the Foreign Office; diplomatic and consular telegrams. This Vote is for telegrams sent abroad from the Foreign Office, which therefore are accounted for under the Foreign Office. The reason the double Estimate is kept up is simply that it follows the pattern set by the main Estimate, as of course it must do.

MR. FLYNN: Is not the real reason that there has been a great addition to the cost of telegrams owing to the state of affairs in China?

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: That is so.

MR. FLYNN further asked whether the Foreign Office had not some system under which their telegrams were sent at a lower rate than is charged ordinarily.

MR. FLAVIN thought it rather extraordinary that the additional sum required, should be an even £6,000, without an odd pound or shilling. Did the £6,000 represent the actual amount spent, or did it represent merely in round figures: the amount required? In his judgment, it was not a correct statement of the actual amount of the deficiency which they were asked to vote.

MR. FIELD wished to know if the Government had made any special terms with the telegraph companies in regard to the prices charged for telegrams in the Vote.

*MR. SPEAKER: The question whether the companies charge different rates or not does not come under this Vote.

MR. FIELD said that all he wished to know from the noble Lord was whether any endeavour had been made to enter into an arrangement with the companies so that the telegraphic service might be carried out with economy.

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: The reason why this item for telegrams appears as a round sum is that it is in the nature of an Estimate up to the 31st of March, and it is, therefore, impossible to go into those odd shillings which have been referred to.

MR. FLAVIN asked how the single pound came into the Estimate?

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: Because we are dealing with the Supplementary Estimate and not with the original Estimate. This question as to the rates paid for telegrams has nothing to do with my Department, for it concerns the Post Office, but I know that Government telegrams are sent cheaper and there is a reduction allowed for taking a quantity.

Question put and agreed to.

Fifth Resolution::

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

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said he did not know whether the explanation given by the noble Lord in regard to the last Vote held good in reference to this Vote. He desired to know why the excess telegrams charged for were not put all into one Vote.

MR. FLYNN asked if the Colonial Office got those telegrams at a special rate?

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Bignold, Arthur

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Bain, Colonel James Robert

Blundell, Colonel Henry

Anson, Sir Wm. Reynell

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

Brand, Hon. Arthur G.

Archdale, Edward Mervyn

Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Bathurst, Hon. A. Benjamin

Bull, William James

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

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

Bullard, Sir Harry

Asher, Alexander

Bell, Richard

Butcher, John George

Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis

Bentinck, Lord Henry C.

Caldwell, James

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Yes

MR. FIELD wished to know if the telegrams alluded to were in connection with the war in South Africa.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: It is stated in the Vote that they are cablegrams in connection with South Africa and Ashanti.

*MR. FLYNN said it was stated in the Vote;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The hon. Member has already spoken,

MR. FLYNN contended that he had a right to speak upon the other Vote, and there was an item of £7,200 in connection with official telegrams from the office of the Colonial Secretary to His Majesty's representatives in South Africa. That being so, he wished to know how many of those telegrams had been given to the public.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; That will arise on the Vote for the salary of the Colonial Secretary.

MR. FLAVIN said they had down in the Vote simply an item of £7,200 for telegrams. Were they not entitled to some information as to the number of telegrams which were sent, and to ask whether they were genuine or not?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: In regard to the number of telegrams, we have no information. The telegrams are those sent between the Government. and His Majesty's representatives in South Africa and Ashanti. All those telegrams of importance to the House and the country have already been published, and a vast number of the telegrams upon this Vote are upon trifling matters of business and departmental subjects which, if we were to publish them, would constitute a whole library.

Question put.

The House divided:;Ayes, 173; Noes, ;14. (Division List No. 102.)

Cautley, Henry Strother

Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightsd.

Priestley, Arthur

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

Howard, Capt J (Kent, Faversh)

Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward

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

Johnston, William (Belfast)

Purvis, Robert

Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)

Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex),

Ratcliffe, R. F.

Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)

Joicey, Sir James

Reckitt, Harold James

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

Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)

Reid, James (Greenock)

Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc.

Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh

Rentoul, James Alexander

Chapman, Edward

Kenyon-Slaney, Col W.(Salop.

Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge

Churchill, Winston Spencer

Keswick, William

Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green

Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H. A. E.
Knowles, Lees
Rigg, Richard
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Lawson, John Grant
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas, Thomson.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney
Cranborne, Viscount
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Roe, Sir Thomas
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Dalkeith, Earl of
Levy, Maurice
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Davies, Sir H.D. (Chatham)
Lockwood, Lt. Col. A. R.
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Long, Col Charles W. (Evesham
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.),
Duncan, James H.
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Seton-Karr, Henry
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsm'th)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Elibank, Master of
Macdona, John Cumming
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Fardell, Sir T. George
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Smith, HC(North'mb.Tyneside)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Majendie, James A. H.
Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks.),
Fenwick, Charles

Malcolm, Ian
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand).
Fielden, Edw. Brocklehurst
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.)
Stanley, Lord (Lanes.)
Finch, George H.
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Stock, James Henry
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Fisher, William Hayes
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings).
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Thornton, Percy M.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Morgan, David J. (Walthamst.)
Ure, Alexander
Gordon, Maj Evans-(TrH'mlets)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Valentia, Viscount
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-
Morrell, George Herbert
Walker, Col. William Hall.
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Morrison, James Archibald
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Weir, James Galloway
Graham, Henry Robert
Muntz, Philip A.
Welby, Sir Charles C.E. (Notts.
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Murray, Rt. Hn A. Graham (Bute
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Greene Sir EW (B'ry. SEdm'nds)
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)

Whiteley, H(Ashton-und.Lyne)
Greene, HenryD. (Shrewsbury)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Grenfell, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.),
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Ld. G (Midd'x)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashfd.
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Penn, John
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Heath, James(Staffords., N. W.)
Plummer, Walter R.
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.)
Pretymann, Ernest George
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Gilhooly, James
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
Ambrose, Robert
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Boyle, James
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Doherty, William
Burke, E. Haviland-
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
O'Donnell, J. (Kerry, W)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)

Joyce, Michael
O'Dowd, John
Clancy, John Joseph
Leamy, Edmund
O'Malley, William
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Lundon, W.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Crean, Eugene
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Cullinan, J.
M'Dermott, Patrick
Reddy, M.
Delany, William
M'Fadden, Edward
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Doogan, P. C.
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Duffy, William J.
Mooney, John J.
Sullivan, Donal
Ffrench, Peter
Murphy, J.
Field, William
Nannetti, Joseph P.
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary Mid.)
Sixth Resolution;

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

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said that it might be remembered that, when the Vote was under discussion before, he raised a question about the renewal or, what lie might call, the recrudescence of the office of Lord Privy Seal, and that the First Lord of the Treasury defended it as on the whole a convenient abnormality. That was what his reply came to. He did not intend to renew the discussion, but he wished to put one point before the House. The Lord Privy Seal was the Prime Minister, but as Prime Minister he did not appear on the Estimates. As Lord Privy Seal he had no duties to perform, and he appeared on the Estimates in that capacity in order that he might receive a salary for the position of Prime Minister, who had no official or legally-recognised position,

and which, therefore, could not be paid for out of public funds. He wished to point out that the Prime Minister as Prime Minister was mainly responsible for the policy of the Government, of which he was the chief. They could not discuss his duties as Lord Privy Seal, there being no such duties, and how, therefore, were they to discuss his policy as Prime Minister, when as Prime Minister he did not appear on the Estimates?

*MR. SPEAKER: The only course open to the hon. Member is to bring forward the question as an independent substantive motion. The only matter that can be debated now is the duties of Lord Privy Seal.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said that was precisely his point. He desired to direct attention to the fact that the Supplementary Vote they were discussing differed from the ordinary Supplementary Votes, because it appeared not as a Supplementary Vote at all, but as a substantive Vote.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member hardly appreciates what I have said. He cannot discuss on this Vote whether or not the salary of the Prime Minister ought to be put upon the Votes in some way so that he could be criticised in his capacity as Prime Minister. That is a matter for a substantive motion.

SIR E. ASIIMEAD-BARTLETT (Sheffield, Ecclesall) said that, when the Vote was discussed in Committee, the First Lord of the Treasury and the Attorney General very carefully pointed out that the money in the Vote was not given to its recipient as Lord Privy Seal, but as Prime Minister. The question was discussed whether the salary was suffi-

cient for the Prime Minister, and there appeared to be a general concurrence of opinion that the amount should be increased to £5,000. He now wished to ask when hon. Members could possibly discuss the policy of the Prime Minister if not on this Vote. He did not propose to discuss it now, but as a precedent for the future, and with all respect to what had been said from the Chair, he wished to point out as strongly as he could that the House of Commons ought to have it in its power to discuss this Vote as a Vote for the Prime Minister, as undoubtedly it was.

*MR. SPEAKER: If Lord Salisbury-were still Foreign Secretary and Prime Minister, his duties as Prime Minister could not be discussed on the Vote for the salary of the Foreign Secretary. It is exactly the same with the Lord Privy Seal. The duties of the Prime Minister cannot be discussed on the Vote for the office of Lord Privy Seal.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT said that the House was therefore in the position that they could discuss the position of the Lord Privy Seal, who had no duties, and were prevented from discussing his position as Prime Minister, for which this Vote was intended.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said that the position of Premiership was not on the Estimates, and he asked the First Lord whether he did not feel himself compelled, in fairness to the House, to find some opportunity of associating the Prime Minister with an office, such as that of the First Lord of the Treasury, so that the right of criticism applied to every member of the Government might be applied to the Prime Minister.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the hon. Gentleman was labouring under a mistake. The

First Lord of the Treasury had certain duties assigned to him. They were told that those duties were not onerous. He did not mean to discuss whether they were onerous or not, but they did not carry the duties of the Prime Minister. In truth, the hon. Gentleman was dealing not with an anomaly created by the new circumstances in respect to the office of Lord Privy Seal, but an anomaly attaching to the office of Prime Minister. The difficulties of discussion were inherent in that strange and abnormal characteristic of the British Constitution by which the chief person in that Constitution had no recognised place. The Constitution did not recognise the Prime Minister; there were no official duties for him to perform, and there was no salary attached to the position of Prime Minister as such. Therefore, even if the Prime Minister also held the office of First Lord of the Treasury, or any other office, it would be impossible to discuss any action of the First Minister of the Crown, as Prime Minister, until Parliament chose to create the office of Prime Minister and attach to it a salary. This might be abnormal, but on the whole it was expedient, for it was impossible to say where the duties of the Prime Minister began or ended. He supposed that in a sense the Prime Minister was responsible for the action of all his colleagues, but it would be highly inconvenient to discuss his action in that form.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said it was now getting on for two o'clock in the morning, and the House of Commons was engaged in the extraordinary task of voting a sum of £2,000 to a gentleman because he held an office which, admittedly, had no duties whatever connected with it. Such an absurdity never was heard since Mr. Gilbert gave up writing comic operas for the Savoy theatre. Would it not have been quite as easy for the Government to come down and say, "Let us pay the Prime Minister £2,000 a year," or whatever salary they thought fit to mention? That would have been a straightforward course, and would, at any rate, have relieved the House of Commons from the absurd position in which it now found itself. Apart from the absurdity of it, he protested against voting this salary at all. To his mind there was nothing more extraordinary in the political life of England than the line drawn between the private Member of Parliament and the purely official Member, if ever a question was raised as to the payment of M. P.'s generally, a howl of indignation was at once heard from one end of the building to the other. It was held that there was no justification in pointing out that payment of Members of Parliament obtained in our colonies and other countries. The very idea of private Members of Parliament being remunerated in this country was treated with derision and hoots. It was said that it would be derogatory to the position of a Member of the House of Commons, and perish the thought of such a thing; But if they got away from the private Members, who worked as hard as Members of the Government, if they did their duty, and came to; he did not use the phrase in any offensive sense at all; the; very meanest and most insignificant Member of the Ministry; then the idea of payment at once blossomed into an absolute necessity. He did not object to Members of the Government being paid for performing duties necessary for the conduct of the Government of the country, but he did say that as long as private Members had to keep the same hours, and to pay the same attention to current

affairs in the House of Commons, had to read the same Parliamentary Reports, and had to sit up to the same hour of the night or morning, as Members of the Government, and were paid nothing he would, for one, utter his most emphatic protest, not against payment of members of the Government, but against extending that principle to the absurd suggestion of paying £2,000 a year to the occupant of an office which they were truly told had no duties attaching to it at all. Now the Prime Minister of England either deserved a salary or he did not. If he deserved a salary, why all this hugger-mugger about it? It would be as easy to vote a salary to the Prime Minister as to vote millions to spend on the war. If they were going to create a new salary for another Member of the present Government, which, collectively, was already overpaid, they should do it honestly and not humiliate the Prime Minister by putting him in the position of Pooh Bah

MR. FLYNN said he did not think the ruling of the Chairman had brought the discussion of this Constitutional fiction down to real business. He was surprised at the absurdity of the Government gravely, seriously, and with a full sense of moral responsibility asking the House to vote £2,000 a year for the payment of an office-holder who had no duties whatever. Did anything in the Gilbertian writings transcend that? But it was not only the Lord Privy Seal's salary. The House was asked to vote the salaries of two private secretaries to a Minister who had no duties, and he supposed these private secretaries would have nothing to do either. If the Government had any sense of the humorous they would withdraw the Vote. It would be far more straightforward to propose a salary for the Prime Minister. The Vote was not a Supplementary Estimate at all. It had been put down newly, and it would have been equally simple to put down a Vote for the Prime Minister, and pay him for the duties he discharged and not pay him for an office which had no duties. He thought his hon. friend was perfectly justified in making his protest. Payment of Members was derided by hon. Members opposite, and by none with more sarcasm than right hon. Gentlemen on the Front Treasury Bench. They said, "Why pay a paltry £200 or £300 a year to men who come into the House of Commons to discharge their duties? It would lower the prestige of Parliament and of public life and public character." But it was not at all derogatory to the highest Member of the Government to have a salary even for an office in which he discharged no duties. If an intelligent foreigner could be confronted with the House of Commons solemnly sitting up till two o'clock in the morning to vote a salary for an office which had no duties, he would consider that hon. Members had reached the acme of absurdity.

MR. NANNETTI said he also desired to protest against a salary being voted to the Lord Privy Seal. The people of England ought to thank the Irish Members for having called attention to the anomaly of voting money for an office which it was admitted had no duties. He was surprised that no hon. Member had spoken on behalf of the over-taxed people of England. It was like throwing money into the Thames after having wrung it out of the unfortunate taxpayers of the country, and, in his opinion, it was nothing less than a scandal. He had no objection to voting Lord Salisbury a proper salary for discharging the duties of Prime

Minister, because he held that, whether as a Member of the Government, or as a private Member, the man who did the work of the State was entitled to be paid for it. They would be neglecting their duty to their constituents if they allowed the

Vote to pass without a protest. They were not sent to the House of Commons to follow the lead of the First Lord of the Treasury. Every Vote would be amply and properly discussed, and they would leave hon. Members opposite to follow their Leader and vote.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.) said he had seen during his short acquaintance with the House many strange things attempted, but he was afraid he must characterise the attempt which was being made on the present occasion as one of the most unconstitutional acts he had ever seen. After all, what were they proposing? It was said that the office of Prime Minister carried no official salary. It was also said that the office of Lord Privy Seal did not carry with it in recent years any official salary, and the question then arose to which of the two offices was £2,000 a year to be allocated. The only conclusion that the Irish Members could come to was that while the money was apparently voted for the office of Lord Privy Seal, which has no duties, and which therefore, could not be criticised in the House of Commons, it was really intended for the Prime Minister, though not given to him as such, in order that he might escape criticism. It would be more honourable and more reasonable on the part of the Government to assert plainly that they intended to give a salary to the Prime Minister as Prime Minister, and not to attach a salary to an office which had not had a salary in recent years. Taking into account the family relations which existed between members of the Government, he thought that the country should be enlightened on the innovation which had been introduced. They were led to believe that that family were very well able to look after their own interests. Irish Members intended to criticise every Vote coming before the House. They never hoped to gain anything from the salaries and positions which Englishmen might hope to gain. They did not even hope that Ministers would ever consider the working man in the House of Commons as worthy of a salary. That, in the minds of Members opposite, would be a very dangerous innovation, because then poor men would be able to attend the House of Commons and look after the interests of their class, which were now neglected in favour of the interests of ascendancy.

MR. DOOGAN (Tyrone, E.) said he was surprised that Members of the House of Commons should vote away public money without receiving any return whatever for it. There were no duties attaching to the office of Lord Privy Seal, and if such a transaction occurred in private life it would be considered a very serious matter. The anomaly in his opinion had arisen from the Prime Minister being in the Upper House. If the Prime Minister were in the House of Commons he would receive a salary as First Lord of the Treasury. Supposing the Prime Minister had a seat in the House of Commons, would he still hold the office of Lord Privy Seal and draw the salary of £2,000? Would he have added to that the salary of the First Lord of the Treasury, or would that office be held separately from that of the First Lord of the Treasury? These were questions which should be

looked into. What would be the position a few years hence, when he hoped and he dared to say it was the general opinion of the House the work of the country would be done by a Prime Minister sitting in the House of Commons? It was certainly most important that no public money should be voted merely as a gratuity.

MR. FIELD said he entirely agreed with what had fallen from his colleagues in regard to the salary paid to the Lord Privy Seal, who held an office to which
AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex F.
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Gordon, Maj. Evans-(Tr.Hmlts)
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.)
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
Gorst, Rt.Hon. Sir John Eldon
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Chapman, Edward
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Graham, Henry Robert
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Asher, Alexander
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Greene, Sir E W (B'ryS Edm'nds)
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Atkinson, Right Hon. John
Cranborne, Viscount
Grenfell, William Henry
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G. (Mid'x
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G.W. (Leeds)
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chath'm
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Dickson, Charles Scott

Hare, Thomas Leigh
 Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Brstl.)
 Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
 Hay, Hon. Claude George
 Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
 Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
 Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.
 Bignold, Arthur
 Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
 Henderson, Alexander
 Blundell, Colonel Henry
 Elibank, Master of
 Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
 Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
 Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
 Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brights'de
 Bull, William James
 Fenwick, Charles
 Howard, Capt. J (Kent Faversh.)
 Bullard, Sir Harry
 Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
 Johnston, William (Belfast)
 Cautley, Henry Strother
 Finch, George H.
 Johnston, Heywood (Sussex)
 Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
 Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
 Joicey, Sir James
 Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
 Fisher, William Hayes
 Jones, William (Carnarvonsh'e)
 Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
 Godson, Sir Augustus Fred.
 Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)

no duties were attached. If they were to have a Prime Minister, he ought to be paid, and not only so, but he should be paid the largest salary that came from the public purse. It ought to be put before the House in a business fashion. The officials of the House were well salaried, but the Members who came there to do the work received nothing but ignominy and calumny.

MR. FLAVIN asked what were the duties of the two private secretaries, who received £;400 and £;200 a year, if there were no duties in connection with the office of Lord Privy Seal.

*MR. O'DOHERTY said they were told that they could not discuss the duties of the Prime Minister as such on this Vote. He thought, however, when they found that the Vote included salaries for two private secretaries they were entitled to ask what their duties were. If a district or county council in Ireland were to put

forward such an item of expenditure the Government auditor would be down on their heads, and the members of the council would be surcharged for the sum thus paid. He believed in calling a spade a spade, and he had no hesitation in saying, although the Vote was fathered by the First Lord of the Treasury, that it was nothing more nor less than obtaining money under false pretences.

Question put.

The House divided:;Ayes, 148; Noes, 52. (Division List No. 103.)

Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)

Murray. Rt. Hn A Graham (Bute

Simeon, Sir Barrington

Keswick, William

Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)

Smith, HC (North'mbTyneside)

Knowles, Lees

Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath

Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks.

Lawson, John Grant

Newdigate, Francis Alexander

Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)

Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage

Nicholson, Wm. Graham

Stanley, Lord (Lancs)

Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie

Nicol, Donald Ninian

Stock, James Henry

Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.

O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens

Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)

Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.

Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay

Thornton, Percy M.

Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham

Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)

Ure, Alexander

Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S

Platt-Higgins, Frederick

Valentia, Viscount

Loyd, Archie Kirkman

Pretymann, Ernest George

Walker, Col. William Hall

Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)

Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward

Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.

Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)

Purvis, Robert

Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)

Macdona, John Cumming
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Welby, Sir Chas. G E. (Notts)
Majendie, James A. H.
Reckitt, Harold James
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Malcolm, Ian
Reid, James (Greenock)
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u-Lyne)
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Rentoul, James Alexander
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Ridley, Hon. MW (Stalybridge
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Rigg, Richard
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Morgan, David J (Walthamst'w)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Morley, Chas. (Breconshire)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Morrell, George Herbert
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Morrison, James Archibald
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Mowbray, Sir Rbt. Gray C.
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Muntz, Philip A.
Sharpe, Wm. Edward T.
NOES.
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N.E.)
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Doherty, William
Ambrose, Robert
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-

O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Boyle, James
Jameson, Maj. J. Eustace
O'Dowd, John
Burke, E. Haviland-
Joyce, Michael
O'Malley, William
Caldwell, James
Leamy, Edmund
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Levy, Maurice
Power, Patrick Joseph
Clancy, John Joseph
Lundon, W.
Priestley, Arthur
Condon, Thomas Joseph
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Reddy, M.
Crean, Eugene
M'Dermott, Patrick
Redmond, J. E. (Waterford)
Cullinan, J.
M'Fadden, Edward
Redmond, William (Clare)
Delany, William
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Doogan, P.C.
Mooney, John J.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Duffy, William J.
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Sullivan, Donal
Ffrench, Peter
Murphy, J.
Weir, James Galloway
Field, William
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.
Gilhooly, James

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

Goddard, Daniel Ford

O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)

SUPPLY [5TH MARCH].

Resolution reported::

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1901–2 (VOTE ON ACCOUNT).

"That a sum, not exceeding £;17,301,000, be granted to His Majesty, on account, for or towards defraying the Charges for the following Civil Services and Revenue Departments for the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1002, namely::
CIVIL SERVICES.

Class IV.

£;

Board of Education

4,100,000

Class II.

Board of Trade

60,000

Class I.

Royal Palaces and Marlborough

House

20,000

Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens

40,000

Houses of Parliament Buildings

16,000

Gladstone Monument

1,000

Miscellaneous Legal Buildings,

Great Britain

18,000

Art and Science Buildings, Great

Britain

12,000

Diplomatic and Consular Buildings

12,000

Revenue Buildings

140,000

Public Buildings, Great Britain

145,000

Surveys of the United Kingdom

80,000

Harbours under the Board of Trade

2,000

Peterhead Harbour

6,000

Rates on Government Property
250,000
Public Works and Buildings, Ireland
70,000
Railways, Ireland
70,000
CLASS II.
United Kingdom and England;;
House of Lords, Offices
3,000
House of Commons, Offices
12,000
Treasury and Subordinate Departments
39,000
Home Office
50,000
Foreign Office
30,000
Colonial Office
23,000
Privy Council Office, etc
5,000
Privy Seal Office
1,000
Mercantile Marine Services
30,000
Bankruptcy Department of the Board of Trade
3
Board of Agriculture
75,000
Charity Commission
15,000
Civil Service Commission
18,000
Exchequer and Audit Department
24,000
Friendly Societies Registry
2,200
Local Government Board
85,000
Lunacy Commission
5,000
Mint (including Coinage)
10
National Debt Office
6,000

Public Record Office
11,000
Public Works Loan Commission
5
Registrar General's Office
130,000
Stationery and Printing
280,000
Woods, Forests, etc., Office of
8,000
Works and Public Buildings, Office of
23,000
Secret Service
40,000
Scotland;;
Secretary for Scotland
25,500
Fishery Board
8,000
Lunacy Commission
2,500
Registrar General's Office
28,000
Local Government Board
5,000
Ireland;;
Lord Lieutenant's Household
2,000
Chief Secretary and Subordinate Departments
16,000
Department of Agriculture
70,000
Charitable Donations and Bequests
Office
1,000
Local Government Board
26,000
Public Record Office
2,000
Public Works Office
16,000
Registrar General's Office
20,000
Valuation and Boundary Survey
6,000
CLASS III.

United Kingdom and England;;
Law Charges
40,000
Miscellaneous Legal Expenses
27,000
Supreme Court of Judicature
140,000
Land Registry
14,000
County Courts
14,000
Police, England and Wales
22,000
Prisons, England and the Colonies
260,000
Reformatory and Industrial Schools, Great Britain
140,000
Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum
18,000
Scotland;;
Law Charges and Courts of Law
30,000
Register House, Edinburgh
15,000
Crofters Commission
2,000
Prisons, Scotland
30,000
Ireland;;
Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions
35,000
Supreme Court of Judicature, and other Legal Departments
45,000
Land Commission
50,000
County Court Officers, etc
46,000
Dublin Metropolitan Police
40,000
Royal Irish Constabulary
600,000
Prisons, Ireland
45,000
Reformatory and Industrial Schools
55,500
Dundrum Criminal Lunatic Asylum

3,500
Class IV.
United Kingdom and England;;
British Museum
80,000
National Gallery
9,000
National Portrait Gallery
3,000
Wallace Collection
4,000
Scientific Investigation, etc., United Kingdom
25,000
Universities and Colleges, Great Britain, and Intermediate Education, Wales
41,000
Scotland;;
Public Education
650,000
National Gallery
1,400
Ireland;;
Public Education
600,000
Endowed Schools Commissioners
400
National Gallery
1,400
Queen's Colleges
2,500
Class V.
Diplomatic and Consular Services
225,000
Uganda, Central and East Africa Protectorates and Uganda Railway
320,000
Colonial Services
230,000
Cyprus, Grant-in-Aid
15,000
Subsidies to Telegraph Companies
50,000
Class VI.
Superannuation and Retired Allowances
280,000
Merchant Seamen's Fund Pensions, etc
3,000
Miscellaneous Charitable and other Allowances

1,000
Hospitals and Charities, Ireland
17,000
Class VII
Temporary Commission
10,082
Miscellaneous Expenses
8,000
Total for Civil Services
£;10,434,000

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

Customs
350,000
Inland Revenue
830,000
Post Office
3,800,000
Post Office Packet Service
210,000
Post Office Telegraphs
1,680,000
Total for Revenue Departments
£;6,870,000
Grand Total
£;17,304,000

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT protested against a Vote of such magnitude being taken between two and three o'clock in the morning. The Vote in Committee was discussed for only one night, and the entire evening was then occupied with the important but not very practical subject of education. The Vote included items of Supply of all descriptions ; English, Irish, Scotch, Welsh, foreign and colonial;and yet it was closed after so short a consideration. There certainly appeared to be a desire to prevent the House discussing most important matters, and, seeing that the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill was to be practically de-

voted to a discussion on the Irish Local Government Board, he thought he was justified in making this protest.

MAJOR JAMESON (Clare. W.) declared that the Vote would take a week to discuss properly, but he would confine himself to two items. The first was the question of harbours under the Board of Trade. Two years ago a Board of Trade inquiry was held into the ownership of the Kilrush pier, and the Report of that inquiry proved that His Majesty's Lieutenant, although he had tried to keep possession of the pier, originally stole it. In all, about £;1,200 had been expended on the pier, of which £;600 was returned by the Board of Trade, and it was proved that His Majesty's Lieutenant had no interest in it whatever. This was the only pier in Ireland which had not been placed under the urban district council. Capitalising the rates which had been lost to the town, the ratepayers had been

deprived of about £;700. The hon. Member was proceeding to discuss the matter in greater detail, when;

*MR. SPEAKER ruled that the matter could not be considered under the Vote before the House.

MAJOR JAMESON said he would pass from that to the Constabulary Vote. In January last a man named Ryan was arrested by Sergeant Sherridan and a constable for posting seditious notices. The man was kept in prison from January 1st to January 26th, when a sort of Star Chamber Court sat upon the case, with the result that the man was spirited away and the sergeant and constable dismissed from the force. Either the man posted those threatening notices, in which case he should be brought to trial, or he had nothing to do with it. In which case the sergeant and constable should have been prosecuted for making false evidence. If the police were guilty, they should have been placed in the dock, while if they were not guilty a great injustice had been inflicted upon them by their dismissal from the force. If ever there was a case which required a public inquiry, this case did.

MR. BOYLE (Donegal, W.) said he wished to enter his protest against the policy which had been adopted by the Chief Secretary since he came into office, for he appeared to be adopting the same regime as his predecessor. If the costs of the abortive prosecutions which had been alluded to were included in this item as law charges and criminal prosecutions a more monstrous charge was never imposed upon the English public. Until the administration in Ireland came more in touch with the people there never would be peace. The small section of Ireland represented by the hon. Member for North Armagh had more influence in the House of Commons than the large district represented by the hon. Member for Water-ford. He intended to oppose this Vote as strenuously as he could. He believed that the Chief Secretary had the best possible intentions towards Ireland, and if his hands were untied he had no doubt that the right hon.

Gentleman would do something towards removing many of the grievances complained of. It was on those grounds that he protested against this Vote. He hoped that the Chief Secretary would inquire into the needs and requirements of the country and look into the office directed by the Attorney General's devil in Dublin Castle. He knew the Attorney's General devil in Ireland.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The official of whom the hon. Member is speaking is not a member of the Government. He must address himself to something more serious, and which really has something to do with the question.

MR. BOYLE said he had been much impressed up to the present by the sympathetic policy the Chief Secretary had adopted, and he would conclude betaking this opportunity of asking the right hon. Member to look with the greatest possible suspicion upon his advisers in Dublin Castle.

MR. CLANCY (Dublin County, N.) said he desired to bring forward a matter with reference to the recent disturbances in Portadown, which was distinguished not only from the rest of Ulster, but from the rest of Ireland, religious enmity being rampant there. Last August the Catholics, who were in a minority in the town,

proposed to have an excursion to Bundoran, and, warned by past experience ' that

they might possibly be assaulted by their Orange brethren, even when engaged in amusing themselves, the hon. Secretary to the Catholic Young Men's Association on 19th August addressed the following letter to the District Inspector of Police;

"Dear Sir,;I am instructed by the Committee of the above Association to inform you that the members and their friends are going on an excursion to Bundoran on Sunday next, 26th inst., leaving Portadown Station at 8 a.m. and returning back again about 9.30 p.m., and to ask you to kindly make arrangements for their safety in your district. They will assemble at the station, but going to it and returning to their homes the police should be on the streets. They will travel viâ Armagh going and returning. Water Street, Bury Street, Edgarstown, etc., should be patrolled, and we would suggest that where a crowd assembles if some of their names were taken it would have a good effect, as they then would be afraid to do wrong."

That letter was a proper letter to write under the circumstances, but lest it might not have been enough, the Catholics telegraphed to the Under Secretary, Dublin Castle, on August 25th;

"Large Catholic excursion going Portadown to Bundoran to-morrow. Fear attack here, leaving and returning. Make proper provision, please. Committee Catholic Association."

A reply was sent by letter on the same day from Sir David Harrel which stated;

"In reply to your telegram of this evening, I beg to inform you that the Inspector General of Constabulary has been communicated with and has wired directions to Armagh constabulary to take the necessary steps to preserve the peace."

One would have imagined that the pledge contained in that letter would have been fulfilled. He would recount to the House as briefly as possible what happened. The Catholic excursionists, in order to avoid giving any offence whatever, not only went to the station without banners or bands, which in that locality might excite disorder and opposition, but went in twos and threes and fours by different routes. In every street leading to the railway station and on the steps of the station Orangemen came up and assaulted the Catholics without the slightest provocation. There was only a single policeman present to protect the excursionists. He asked the other day what had been done by the Castle or its agents in the locality to give the special protection promised by the Under Secretary, and he was rather surprised that so candid a gentleman as the Chief Secretary for Ireland did not give a more candid reply. He asked the right hon. Gentleman what did the special protection consist in, but the right hon. Gentleman absolutely refused to answer. He asked him now to deny that no special protection was given at all. There were not more than half-a-dozen policemen in Portadown on that morning, although from previous experience the police must have known that an attack would be made on the Catholic excursion. The Orangemen of the district felt that they were masters of the situation, and they renewed the attack on the excursionists when it returned in the evening. Again he challenged the right hon. Gentleman to deny that there was no special protection on the streets of Portadown that evening. The result

was that for two days afterwards the Orangemen of Portadown, feeling that they had the magistrates on their side, and that there were no police ready to protect the Catholics, continued their violent assaults on Catholics going to and returning from their work. The disturbance lasted for a few days. The Catholic minority were subjected to continued acts of violence, and they thought that even still an appeal to the Castle would produce some effect. Accordingly on the 22nd September they wrote a long letter in which they made certain suggestions as to the preservation of the peace in future. The letter said; "Catholics here feel that they have no one but themselves to depend on for protection, seeing that those responsible for the peace of the town, though timely warned when the Catholic excursion was being promoted both by our Committee and by bills posted on the hoarding, afforded us practically no protection."

That was a very respectful letter, and the following reply was received;

"Sir,;I am directed by the Lord Justices to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of '22nd inst., with regard to the recent disturbances in Portadown.;I am, Sir,

"Your obedient servant."

The Catholics of Portadown might well be expected to give up faith in Dublin Castle after that, but they wrote again on the 8th October to the Under Secretary as follows;

"Sir,;On behalf of the C.Y.M.S. we would urge upon your immediate attention the prayer of our memorial of the 22nd ult. We have grounds to fear a renewal of the disturbances on the declaration of the poll on Saturday should Mr. Orr be returned. Besides the fact that a portion of the contents of our memorial was published in the last issue of our local Orange press is not calculated to add to the safety of our Catholic brethren, while the present local administration obtains."

Now I wish to direct the attention of the right hon. Gentleman to that letter. A memorial, which is practically confidential, was addressed to the Under Secretary. It was supposed to be private, and no Catholic journalist got hold of it. Yet it leaked out of Dublin Castle down to the office of the local Orange paper. An answer was duly received, which stated;

"I am directed by the Lords Justices to acknowledge the receipt of your further letter of the 8th inst., with reference to the state of affairs at Portadown.;I am, Sir,

"Your obedient servant."

The Catholics of Portadown seemed to be very hard to deprive of confidence in the Castle. Again on 8th November another respectful letter;a much more respectful letter than he would have counselled them to write;was sent, suggesting additional police and so on. And again what was the answer?

"Dublin Castle, November, 17th, 1900."I am directed by the Lords Justices to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 5th inst., in regard to the disturbances at Portadown on the 26th August last, and to say that the matter is receiving the due consideration of the Government."

If a matter was "receiving the due consideration of the Government" in Ireland,

that was a sign that it was at the last stage that could be reached. The next letter, written by the Secretary of the association, was dated 22nd of December, and was as follows;

"I am instructed by the Committee of the above Association to ask you what decision, if any, the Government have come to regarding the recommendation contained in their letter of 22nd September, 1900."

He had asked the right hon. the Chief Secretary the other day whether it was the fact that the last two letters had been left without an answer, and he said they were not. Further, he said he would give the matter his personal attention. Now he was informed by telegram from Portadown that the statement of the right hon. Gentleman had no foundation. Of course he did not attribute any wilful or intentional

misstatement to the right hon. Gentleman, but he was compelled to believe that the statement from Portadown was correct. The last letter written by the secretary of the association was dated 26th January, when the right hon. Gentleman was in office. That letter directed attention to the correspondence which had taken place, pointing out that no answer had been received to previous communications, and stated that if the recommendation of the association were not attended to it was their intention to have the matter discussed in the House of Commons. The letter went on to say that the committee wished, in justice to the right hon. Gentleman, as he had not been in office at the period of their former communication, to give him an opportunity of redressing the grievances under which the Catholics in Portadown suffered. They had been given to understand that justice would have been done before this, had it not been for the action of local officials, who forwarded reports regarding the character of their association which were at variance with the truth. The letter concluded by saying that, if necessary, a list of members of the association would be supplied, when the right hon. Gentleman would be able to judge for himself on whose authority and behalf the committee spoke. Now, that was a somewhat pathetic letter addressed to the right hon. Gentleman; a kind of despairing appeal to his sense of justice; and he asserted that no answer, not even a bare official acknowledgment had been given to it. He did not exaggerate when he said that this correspondence revealed a state of things which was a disgrace to any Government which had for one of its objects the preservation of the peace, and enabling Catholics to live in quietness. He asked what would have been the action of the Executive if a thing like that had occurred in the south or west of Ireland, in a town like Galway or Bandon, where the Catholics were in an overwhelming majority and the Protestants in a minority? The state of things which prevailed in Portadown and a few other places in the north was so utterly strange to the experience of men in other parts of Ireland that they could hardly believe it. Supposing in the town of Galway or Bandon a Protestant society representing a minority of the population proposed to go on excursion, and asked for protection; thanks be to God, they would not need it; but supposing they did need it, and asked for it, did anyone in his senses believe that, if necessary, the whole police force of Munster would not be drafted on to the spot? They knew what took place when a landgrabber was in difficulties. Why,

not only the police but the military would be sent to his assistance. He had been on the spot and spoke from personal knowledge, and he maintained that in Portadown not only had the Catholics no confidence in the agents of the police, but in his opinion those agents did not deserve it.

The right hon. Gentleman had told the House the other day that certain persons I had been arrested and prosecuted. Yes, they were; and he would give the House the story of two prosecutions. A member of the Orange Society had gone up to and struck a Catholic, admittedly without the slightest provocation, and knocked two or three of his teeth out. On the following day, whether there was a row or not he did not know, the man assaulted struck the Orangeman. The two men were prosecuted, and both were convicted. But what did the magistrates do? They sent the Catholic to gaol and took surety only for keeping the peace from the Orangeman. One would have imagined that for shame's sake they would have left the case to the resident magistrate, but the Orange magistrates crowded the bench, and he would not be speaking the truth if he did not say that they went there predetermined as to the course they would take. Again, he would not be speaking the truth if he did not say that the resident magistrate was as bad as the rest of them. He warned the right hon. Gentleman that as long as he left Mr. T. D. Gibson at Portadown he would run the risk of inducing the Catholics of that town to believe that the best thing they could do for their own protection was to do as the Orangemen did; namely, arm themselves and fire bullets at the persons who in future might attack them without provocation. He had asked the other

day whether it was a fact that the Catholic chapel in Portadown had its windows broken, and the right hon. Gentleman could not deny the fact. But what did the right hon. Gentleman say in reply? These were not his replies, they were the replies he got from the local Orange officials. He should have expected the right hon. Gentleman to say, occupying the position he did, "Yes, the windows of this Catholic church were broken; it was a very detestable outrage; I deprecate such attacks, and hope they will be prevented in future."

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): I said it was a wanton and mischievous act.

MR. CLANCY said he would have expected the right hon. Gentleman would have said something to the effect that he disapproved heartily of these outrages. But what did he do? He gave an answer which amounted to a justification or rather an excuse for the outrage. He (the hon. Member) was not given to making reckless statements, or using immoderate language; but he was indignant when the right hon. Gentleman answered that not only had the windows of the Catholic church been broken, but also the windows of the Protestant church. Now, what had that to do with the case? But he would inform the right hon. Gentleman that this trumped-up excuse was an excuse-three or four years old; the work, as the right hon. Gentleman himself said, of some little boys, but it was three or four years ago. And that was the act set up by the right hon. Gentleman by way of excuse for the ruinous breaking of the windows of the Catholic church in Portadown within the last few months. At that inopportune hour he would not occupy more of the time of the House, but from what he had said he was certain the House would

be under the belief that he had not, up to that point, occupied their time unnecessarily. He had only one other remark to make, and that was that in his opinion no justice was at present to be had for the Catholic community in Portadown; and unless the right

hon. Gentleman that night or on some other occasion took the opportunity of washing his hands clear of this foul transaction; because he could call it nothing else; he would have taught a lesson to the people of other parts of Ireland the fruits of which he would live to regret.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.) said he desired to associate himself with his hon. and gallant friend the Member for West Clare. He had never been able to love the Irish Constabulary, but at the same time he believed every man had a right to fair play. He wished to know from the Chief Secretary whether Mr. Irwin, who was concerned in discharging a sergeant and constable in Clare for having put a document into a man's pocket, was the Mr. Irwin who was a witness at The Times Commission, before which Mr. Parnell and his compatriots were impeached and came out with flying colours? He also wished to know whether he was the man who was sent into the gaol at Cork before the trial of Twiss? Why were not the two policemen who were dismissed put on trial in the ordinary way? It seemed to him that there was something mysterious and dangerous behind the action of the Executive. He would not interfere if all the policemen in Ireland were chasing each other into the Irish Sea, but at the same time he hoped that the case to which he referred would be investigated, and that the right horse would be saddled. With reference to the disposition of the money under discussion, Ireland had no interest, except in so far as she had to pay a proportion of it, which it was acknowledged by experts was too great. They in Ireland had had experience of the British Government. They remembered the famous telegram sent to Youghal. "Do not hesitate to shoot" and also the men who were shot down in the square of Mitchelstown.

MR. REDDY (King's County, Birr) said he was glad to have an opportunity of discussing the manner in which justice was administered in Ireland. He would state very briefly the facts of one particular case which could not be contradicted. One evening in June last a tramp went to the workhouse in Birr, and asked to see the master. He was refused admission, and the master stabbed the tramp with a knife. His life was in danger for several weeks. Ultimately the master was brought before the magistrates, and he being an Orangeman, the Catholic magistrates, with a sense of decency and propriety, declined to attend. What was the result? Lord: Boss and his satellites attended, and the accused man. Benjamin Goode, who had been an emergency man for Lord Ross, was admitted to bail. The matter was reported to the Local Government Board, and he himself asked a question about it in the House, but the Chief Secretary gave him a snappish answer. They demanded an inquiry, and applied for the informations to the Clerk of the Petty Sessions, and he refused them. They were then told by the Local Government Board that, not having the informations before them, they could not grant an inquiry. Why did not the Local Government Board take action? If Benjamin Goode were a Catholic, would Lord Ross and his satellites let him out on bail? That was how the law was administered in Ireland. He was prepared to

stand by his statements, and defied contradiction. He held the Chief Secretary responsible. They were told to admire the constitution in Ireland, but there was no such thing. He had little confidence in the British Constitution anywhere, but when a man submitted himself to be governed by it, he ought to be governed fairly and impartially. They had heard about Portadown, but there were Portadowns all over Ireland.

MR. FIELD called attention to the fact that the Civil Service Estimates of £142,000 included expenditure in connection with the Board of Trade, and asked why the Irish people should be asked to contribute to the payment of that expenditure, seeing that there was no branch of the Board of Trade in Ireland. There was no means of knowing, in regard to Ireland, statistics of imports and exports which would prove how trade was going on in that country. On the previous day he asked the President of the Board of Trade whether there was any intention to start a department of the Board of Trade, and he replied in the negative. He wished

now to ask the Chief Secretary why the Irish people were asked to help to support the Board of Trade, which had no representative in Ireland? Referring to the item in the Estimates for the geological survey, he said that, while the survey in England was completed many years ago, it had not yet been commenced in Ireland. What was more important was that the Education Department at Kensington had not yet begun the soil survey. [Laughter.] Hon. Members who laughed were only revealing their ignorance. If they had any acquaintance with the manner in which this matter was attended to in Germany, France, and the United States, hon. Members opposite who laughed would know that this was a vitally important subject. The reason why England was obliged to import so much food was that agriculture was being neglected. If the food supplies of England were shut off for six weeks the people would be starved out. The harbours around the Irish coast were monuments of the incompetence of the Board of Works. These harbours showed that the Board of Works had in their employ the worst engineers in the country. With regard to the rates on Government property, he said he was informed by a gentleman of high official authority that the rates in Dublin were not one-fifth of the value of the property. That was a public scandal. What were the railways in Ireland? They were the worst railways in the world. They had the highest rates and less facilities than existed in any part of the world. They had no cheap trains for working men. In his opinion the railways of Ireland as at present constituted were more dangerous to Irish prosperity than the Irish landlords. The landlords' rents were liable to revision at certain terms, but the railways could and did charge what they liked. He knew how they mangled and maimed the animals they carried, and the owners could get no satisfaction whatever. The railways were a sort of commercial Dublin Castle, and there was not the slightest chance of getting any kind of justice from them. His experience of the Local Government Board in Ireland was that it was a kind of Irish House of Lords. There were three or four non-elected and irresponsible individuals on it whose

apparent aim was to make local government as expensive and unpopular as possible. He protested against the system of valuation that prevailed in Ireland

at the present time. The five county boroughs in Ireland were to be revalued, and, judging by what had taken place in Belfast, there would be an enormous increase in taxation, because by increasing the rating the Imperial taxation would also be largely increased. If excessive taxation were drawn from a country, that country was bound to be impoverished. That was largely the reason Ireland was so poor, and if the present system of revaluation continued, the effects would be even greater than at present. He therefore appealed to the hon. Members for Belfast to support him in his endeavour to obtain the transplantation of the English system in Ireland. From every piece of Irish legislation the heart was generally left out. That had been the case with the Local Government Act, as the taxation powers were taken out of the hands of the local people. With regard to the reformatory and industrial schools, since the recent action of the Lord Lieutenant the number of children sent to these institutions had enormously decreased. Industrial schools tended to prevent the manufacture of criminals, and since the establishment of these schools there had been a notable diminution in the amount of juvenile crime. The Lord Lieutenant's Order, however, had made it very doubtful whether many of the institutions could remain open much longer, and he hoped that some arrangement would be come to under which the schools could go on as formerly. The increase of lunacy was another serious matter in Ireland which the Government should take into consideration.

MR. WYNDHAM: It is impossible for me to refer to all the subjects which the hon. Member has just mentioned, but one of them was the question of industrial schools. I am quite alive to the importance of that matter; in fact, I think it so serious a matter that the number of children in industrial and reformatory schools in Ireland far exceeds proportionately the numbers in such schools in England and Scotland that I should show a want of appreciation of its gravity if I attempted to discuss it at this hour of the morning. The hon. Member referred to the railways, and seemed to suggest that as we have courts to fix fair rents we should have courts to regulate railway fares. Fair rents are bad enough, but fair fares would be infinitely worse. The hon. Member ran his fingers through some notes in the scale with reference to the Local Government Board, but as we are to have, as he has told us, a "concerted piece" to-morrow on that subject. I may leave it for the present. In regard to the arrest and subsequent discharge of Ryan, and the dismissal from the police force of a sergeant and constable, the question put to me was why, if we did not prosecute Ryan, we did not prosecute these two officers of the constabulary. The evidence against Ryan, the constituent of the hon. and gallant Member, was not of a character to justify a prosecution for posting seditious notices, and therefore, after being remanded for three weeks, he was discharged. The two policemen were not prosecuted because the evidence against them did not warrant a prosecution, and yet I felt that their evidence was so unsatisfactory that those officers could not be retained in the force with any advantage to the public. I have nothing more to say on that point, except that I believe the course taken was the right one under the circumstances. It is very difficult to follow the large number of speeches which have been made, but I now come to the speech of the

hon. Member for Dublin County, North, He made a speech addressed somewhat pointedly towards myself. The subject matter of his speech was a regrettable incident which took place in August last at Portadown, before I was Chief Secretary; but I am prepared to defend the course which the Government took upon that occasion. The hon. Member opposite said that he knows more about Portadown than I do. Perhaps he does, but I know that it is in the borderland between Orange Ireland and Nationalist Ireland, and there the Orange dement is in a large majority. There was a Catholic excursion, and they went off with great public display.

MR. CLANCY said he could not allow a statement like that to pass unchallenged, for they did not go with great display.

MR. WYNDHAM: J am not making any point against them on that account, for I think it is a subject of great regret that these conflicts should go on, but J have a very clear view as to the duty of the Government in this matter. The Government having received notice that there would be an excursion which would be interfered with, special orders were sent from Dublin Castle that protection was to be given and that adequate police arrangements were to be made. In the opinion of the Government, adequate arrangements were not made, and, as have already told the House, this remissness has been censured, and every precaution will be taken to see that such an incident does not occur again in the future.

MR. CLANCY said he wished;

MR. WYNDHAM: J object to giving way to the hon. Member's interruptions.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member must not interrupt unless he has a point of order to raise. He has no right to interrupt the right hon. Gentleman unless the right hon. Gentleman chooses to give way to him.

MR. CLANCY: But the right hon. Gentleman has given way.

*MR. SPEAKER: No; the right hon. Gentleman said he refused to give way.

MR. WYNDHAM: This transaction, is not a matter of much moment, but the attitude of the Government is that protection shall be given to one side or the other and that the public peace shall be preserved. What happened on a particular occasion in last August was surely trivial and obsolete in comparison with the similar incidents which are happening every day. On more recent occasions adequate protection has been given, and the peace has been preserved. I do not think that either Orangemen or Catholics have any cause to complain. I hope that I have now satisfied the hon. Member that I am fully alive to the importance of these difficulties which do arise in such cases as the disturbance at Portadown, and I may add that the Government is determined to give impartial protection to the Orangemen on the one side and to the Nationalists on the other. If I have omitted any other points which have been raised I will undertake to deal with them more fully when they are, raised on the Irish Estimates.

MR. DOOGAN alluded to the occasion of a riot at Stewartstown, where he himself was burned in effigy. Under those circumstances, how could the Chief Secretary say that the Government had taken proper steps to prevent these occurrences? He had always done his level best on all occasions to allay any bitterness in sectarian feelings. In regard to the disorderly proceedings in the town of

Dungannon, the Nationalists had a torchlight procession, and he himself told them to go home and avoid rioting. The police took the names of five rioters on each side. They were brought before the magistrates, and the cases were adjourned for a month, and subsequently for another month. Dungannon was proclaimed for seven days. The result ultimately was that no one was convicted. Now could the right hon Gentleman, who was responsible for the peace of Ireland, defend such action? If the right hon. Gentleman desired to have peace in Ireland he would have to put down partisanship on the magisterial bench. He could give several other instances. They knew that the Orangemen were shielded, that the law was not fairly administered, that the bench was

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Hay, Hn. Claude George
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Cranborne, Viscount
Heath, J. (Staffords., N.W.)
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Hobhouse, Henry Somerset E
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Dalkeith, Earl of '
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside)
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Howard, Capt J. Kent, Faversham
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Dickson, Charles Scott
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manchester
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Kenyon, Hn. Geo T. (Denbigh
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward

Knowles, Lees
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Lawson, John Grant
Bignold, Arthur
Finch, George H.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Blundell, Col. Henry
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Brodrick, Rt. Hn. St. John
Fisher, William Hayes
Leveson-Gower, Erederick N.S.
Bull, William James
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Bullard, Sir Harry
Gordon, Maj Evans (T'rH'lets)
Long, Col. Chas. W.(Evesham)
Cautley, Henry Strother
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbysh.)
Graham, Henry Robert
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Greene, Sir EW. (B'rySEdm'nds
Macdona, John Cumming
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon J (Birm.
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs
Majendie, James A. H.
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc.
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Malcolm, Ian
Chapman, Edward
Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G (Mid'x
Melville, Beresford Valentine

packed, and that the scales of justice were weighted. At a public meeting in
Dungannon five policemen were injured, and the ratepayers, who had nothing to do
with it, had to pay the policemen enormous sums as compensation, He had been

asked by the people of Duugannon to bring the matter before the House of Commons, and to ask to have an inquiry into all the circumstances. He hoped that would be done, and that an example would be made. If the offences of one party were not condoned by the local magistrates and by Dublin Castle, Ulster would soon be the most peaceful province in Ireland.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place and claimed to move that the question be now put.

MR. DOOGAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, this is an important matter, which concerns the peaceful inhabitants of Duugannon, and I would ask the representative of law and order in Ireland;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The hon. Member is not raising any point of order.

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

The House divided:;Ayes, 130; Noes 51. (Division List No. 104.)

Middlemore, John Throgmor'n

Pretyman, Ernest George

Thornton, Percy M.

Molesworth, Sir Lewis

Pryce-Jones, Lt. Col. Edward

Valentia, Viscount

Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)

Purvis, Robert

Walker, Col. William Hall

Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)

Ratcliffe, R. F.

Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.

Morley, Charles (Breconshire)

Reid, James (Greenock)

Wason, John Cathcart Orkney

Morrell, George Herbert

Ridley, Hon. M. W.(Stalybridge)

White, Luke (York, E.R.)

Morrison, James Archibald

Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)

Whiteley, H (Ashton und. Lyne)

Mowbray, Sir Robt. Gray C.

Rigg, Richard

Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)

Muntz, Philip A.

Ritchie, Rt. Hon Chas. Thomson

Willox, Sir John Archibald

Murray, Rt. Hn A Graham (Bute

Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)

Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)

Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)

Royds, Clement Molyneux

Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Murray, Col. Wyndham(Bath)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B. Stuart-
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Nicholson, William Graham
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Smith, HC (North'mbTynesde)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Smith, Hon. W.F.D. (Strand)
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Stanley, Lord (Lanes.)
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
NOES.
Abraham, Wm, (Cork, N. E.)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Md)
Ambrose, Robert
Gilhooly, James
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)
Asher, Alexander
Hardie, J, Keir (Meithyr Tydvil)
O'Doherty, William
Boyle, James
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Burke, E. Haviland-
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Chas. Seale-
O'Dowd, John
Caldwell, James
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
O'Malley, William
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Clancy, John Joseph
Joyce, Michael

Power, Patrick Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Leamy, Edmund
Priestley, Arthur
Crean, Eugene
Lundon, W.
Reckitt, Harold James
Cullman, J.
Macdonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Reddy, M.
Delany, William
M'Dermott, Patrick
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Doogan, P. C.
M'Fadden, Edward
Redmond, William (Clare)
Daffy, William J,
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Sullivan, Donal
Elibank, Master of
Morton, Edw.J. C.(Devonport)
Weir, James Galloway
Fenwick, Charles
Murphy, J.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES;

Ffrench, Peter
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.
Field, William

Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)

Question put accordingly. "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution.

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Greene, Sir E. W. Bry. S Edmnds
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
Greene,W. Raymond-(Cambs)
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Chapman, Edward
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.
Hamilton, Rt. HnLord G.(Mid'x
Arkwright, John Stanhope

Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Corbett, A. Cameron(Glasgow)
Rare, Thomas Leigh
Asher, Alexander
Cranborne, Viscount
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Chas. Seale-
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Dalkeith, Earl of '
Heath, James (Staffords N.W.)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Hobhouse, Henry Somerset, E.
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A.J. (Manch'r)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Hope, J. F (Sheffield, Brightside
Bafour, Rt. Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A Akers-
Howard, Capt. J. (Kent, Fay.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Johnston, Wm, (Belfast)
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Elibank, Master of
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Bignold, Arthur
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Kenyon, Hn. G. T. (Denbigh)
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Finch, George H.
Knowles, Lees
Bull, William James
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Lawson, John Grant
Bullard, Sir Harry
Fisher, William Hayes

Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Caldwell, James
Godson, Sir Augustus Fred'rick
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Cautley, Henry Strother
Gordon, Maj Evans(T'rH'mlets)
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Cavendish, V.C.W (Derbyshire
Goschen, Hn. George Joachim
Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham)
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Graham, Henry Robert
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (Bristol, S.)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
The House divided:;Ayes, 140); Noes, (Division List No. 105.)
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Smith, Hon. W.E.D. (Strand)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Stanley, Lord (Lanes.)
Macdona, John Cumming
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Majendie, James A. H.
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Thornton, Percy M.
Malcolm, Ian
Pretymann, Ernest George
Valentia, Viscount
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Priestley, Arthur
Walker, Col. William Hall
Middlemore, John Throgmorth
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Purvis, Robert
Wason, John C. (Orkney)
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Ratcliffe, R. E.

Weir, James Galloway
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow
Reckitt, Harold James
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und Lyne)
Morrell, George Herbert
Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)
Morrison, James Archibald
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Morton, Edw. J.C. (Devonport)
Rigg, Richard
Wilson, A. Stanley (York.E. R.)
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Muntz, Philip A.
Robertson, H. (Hackney)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Simeon, Sir Barrington
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Nicholson, William Graham
Smith, H.C (N'rthmb.Tyneside)
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Md
Ambrose, Robert
Gilhooly, James
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)
Boyle, James

Hardie, J. Keir(MerthyrTydvil)
O'Doherty, William
Burke. E. Haviland-
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
O' Dowd, John
Clancy, John Joseph
Joyce, Michael
O'Malley, William
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Leamy, Edmund
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Crean, Eugene
Lundon, W.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Cullinan, J.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Reddy, M.
Delany, William
M'Dernott, Patrick
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Doogan, P. C.
M'Fadden, Edward
Redmond, William (Clare)
Duffy, William J.
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Sullivan, Donal
Fenwick, Charles
Murphy, J.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES;

Ffrench, Peter
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.
Field, William

Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)

WAYS AND MEANS [23RD MARCH].

Resolutions reported::

- 1."That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty for the Service of the years ending on the 31st day of March, 1900 and 1901, the sum of £;5,229,355 2s. be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom."
- 2."That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty for the Service of the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, the sum of £;44,721,500 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom.

Resolutions agreed to; Bill ordered to be brought in by the Chairman of Ways and

Means, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. Austen Chamberlain.
CONSOLIDATED FUND (No. 1 BILL).

"To apply certain sums out of the Consolidated Fund to the Service of the years ending on the 31st day of March, one thousand nine hundred, one thousand nine hundred and one, and one thousand nine hundred and two, "presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time this day.

CHINA;ANGLO-RUSSIAN DISPUTE AT TIENTSIN.

On the motion for adjournment;

MR. KEIR HARDIE: Before the question is put, may I ask the Leader of the House whether he has any information as to the statement made last night that three British soldiers were killed or wounded at Tientsin, and whether or not the peace has been disturbed in that place.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No. Sir; I have no information.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Send for Lord Lansdowne.

Adjourned at a quarter before Five of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 26th March, 1901.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 62 COMPLIED WITH).

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

Great Central Railway Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDERS 62 AND 66 COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Orders Nos. 62 and 66 have been complied with, viz.:

Kingscourt, Keady, and Armagh Railway Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

GLASGOW AND SOUTH WESTERN RAILWAY BILL.

HULL, BARNSELY. AND WEST RIDING JUNCTION RAILWAY AND DOCK BILL.

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (TRAMWAYS AND STREET WIDENINGS) BILL.

NORTH EASTERN RAILWAYS BILL.

NOTTING HILL ELECTRIC LIGHTING BILL.

CAMBRIAN RAILWAYS BILL. (BY ORDER.)

Read a second time, and committed.

LONDON WATER (PURCHASE) BILL. (BY ORDER.)

Order for Second Reading read.

*MR. JOHN BURNS (Battersea): I beg to move the Second Reading of this Bill. It is a private Bill, but, in consequence of the magnitude of the issues involved and the large area to which it applies, as well as the public interest which for many years;for generations I may say;has attached to this subject, it is not a private Bill in the ordinary sense, but it is a public measure of great and universal interest to London. It is a Bill, too, which, notwithstanding the

magnitude of the issues involved, would, had it applied to any other city than London, have been unanimously read a second time and sent upstairs to be dealt with by the ordinary tribunal appointed by this House. It ought not to be made a Government measure. It ought not to be subjected to either Parliamentary prejudices or political tests. It is a Bill that is complicated by many issues which, in the past have prevented London getting what, under similar circumstances, other municipalities have secured and enjoyed. But, being a London Bill, this measure has to pass exceptional ordeals. There are many reasons for this, but I need not go into them this afternoon. They are patent to everybody, but I believe that some day public opinion will make up its mind in such an overwhelming and decisive manner that even Parliament will no longer ignore the claims of London.

This Bill has an exceedingly good object. It deals with a matter of public health, and involves the elements of life and death in a great community. It deals with a subject which vitally affects this great metropolis. It has to do with cleanliness and with public safety. It seeks to give to London that coequality of treatment which is enjoyed by other cities; cities which have been afforded the opportunity of converting the private ownership of the public water supply into a municipal ownership, and which have, consequently, been enabled to improve the public health, and to reduce the cost of the water supply. What other cities and towns have been permitted to do this Bill proposes to enable London to do. It will, if carried, convert a supervisory body in regard to water; and that is what the London County Council now is; into an owning and controlling body, with full powers and the widest responsibilities. I contend, on behalf of the London County Council, that as that body is the fire authority, the drainage authority, and the flood prevention authority for fire millions of people, the additional power that this Bill seeks to impose upon it is the logical complement of its public health duties. Recent events have induced the London County Council to repeat this session the policy of purchase which has characterised that body ever since it was created. At the last election London gave to the County Council a clear, decisive, and overwhelming mandate in favour of the purchase of the London water companies' undertakings. [Cries of "No. no."] Hon. Members say, "No, no." I have the honour of being elected on the County Council with a majority of 4,100 votes. That decisive majority could not have been given to me on account either of my views on the war or on pure beer. It was the largest majority I ever secured, and I believe it was given in favour of the policy I have always advocated of securing a pure water supply under the management of the London County Council. I believe it will not be generally disputed that that mandate was given because the view is growing up in London that the County Council is the only body which can be definitely charged with the purposes of this Bill. It is the only authority that has, or could have, power to deal with the question effectually. It is the only body which could be expected to raise the money necessary for the purchase of these gigantic undertakings. I will only quote one authority in support of my opinion of the nature of the mandate, and that is that of Mr. Harris, the able and courteous leader of the Moderate party on the

London County Council. He says that the election was fought on the question of the expropriation of the water companies as soon as possible. That is clear and unmistakable, He also says: "Personally I have no doubt whatever as to the mandate of the Council to get the question settled." I now come very briefly to the history of this question. Since 1880 we have had commissions galore and committees innumerable, and all of them have ended in favour of purchase, while many of them have trended to control. I am glad to say there has been absolute unanimity as to what should be the authority purchasing these gigantic undertakings. The Report of the Water Committee in 1880 said it would be desirable to have some public authority to regulate the water companies. Now we know all that the regulation of the water by a public company is impossible, for these companies have been unable to regulate themselves. The 1880 Committee also said that it would be possible to have an independent supply, and upon that I have just one word to say. I believe to obtain an independent supply would be difficult and costly, and that it is altogether unnecessary, but these Commissions are all agreed that the purchase of the water supply should be accomplished. That is the object of this Bill. This Bill varies very slightly from the one that was introduced in 1890, seeking power to acquire and administer the water companies, which was rejected. In 1895 a similar Bill for the purchase of the companies was carried by a majority. That Bill went to a Select Committee, over which Mr. Plunkett presided. A practical settlement was imminent and possible, but after the Committee had sat for twenty days the dissolution of Parliament prevented that settlement taking place. Since 1895 the Bill had been reintroduced several times, but since then Lord James has added to the difficulty by introducing a Water Board and Trust Bill, which was not proceeded with for a reason which, I believe, will always apply to any such measure if ever it is introduced. In 1897 we had another Bill rejected because a Royal Commission had been appointed to consider the whole question, and it was not considered desirable to legislate while that Commission was sitting. Now I believe in Royal Commissions upon this subject just as much and just as little as Lord Salisbury, and for the reasons he gave. In that we are in strict accord. In 1900 the Commission reported, and in 1901 we find the London County Council still persisting in the policy of purchase, that persistence endorsed by water consumers, the proceedings of the Royal Commission strengthening, rather than otherwise, our intention to carry out this undertaking.

Those are the short and simple annals of the London County Council in respect to water purchase, but it is just as well that we should know what has happened between the appointment of the Royal Commission and the introduction of this Bill. We have had two water famines, a great addition to the capital of the water undertakings, huge reservoirs constructed and storage tanks erected, and we have had Parliament recognising the difficulty and gravity of the problem by insisting that the exceptional nature of the problem demanded that all the companies should be linked up together, and that they should assist each other in times of emergency when there was a shortage of water. I say that the very fact of the Government having been compelled to interfere with private companies

in that way indicates, first of all, how short the water supply of London really is, to what straits that supply is reduced, and also what may some day be imminent, unless the London County Council policy of purchase and a new supply is undertaken. The crowning injustice of the present situation was brought before us in January this year. The water company, seeing difficulties and troubles ahead of them in the matter of water supply, have attempted to impress upon their customers the necessity of storing water, which practically brings back the old cistern system, at the same time making an extravagant charge, and the effect of that has been that the London County Council has received a mandate for the purchase, administration, and management by a public authority of the water supply of London, the like of which London has never before experienced, and which the Council through this Bill demands.

Now the gravity of this problem is indicated by the very sensible words of Lord Onslow, made use of in a speech

when he was a member of the London County Council in 1895. These were his words;

"He thought that since the events of this summer, knowing that they had narrowly escaped a very serious calamity in the East End, there were not many in the council hut would agree with him that the time had come when they could not any longer allow the water supply of London to remain in private hands. He believed they were now almost unanimously agreed that the water companies must be purchased."

What was said in 1895 by Lord Onslow, London has said since by elections, and both the opinion of London and Lord Onslow have been confirmed by the Report of the Royal Commission of 1899, which shortly said;

(a) "That the work of rendering potable by scientific treatment the river-derived water supply of London should be in the hands of a public authority."

(b) "That, if a public authority became the purchaser, water would be supplied at constant pressure to the highest houses."

(c) "That unification of the water undertakings would bring in its train facilities of intercommunication and simplification of extension and enlargement of the water supply."

(d) "That it would tend to the prevention of waste."

(e) "That it would afford greater facility for raising the large sums necessary for the future supply."

(f) "In view of the prospective requirements of water supply in London."

I contend upon those six points that the Report of the Royal Commission is in favour of the London County Council rather than against it, but the Report of the Royal Commission unfortunately stultified these excellent recommendations by others which are not so good. One of those recommendations was that there should be a water trust; well, Trust is dead, the last election killed him. The problem of acquisition was further complicated by the Lands Clauses Act, conditions of purchase being imposed upon London by the Royal Commission of 1899. It is convenient that the House should know what has been the result of all these inquiries. The Committee of 1880 recommended purchase, the Bill of 1891 advocated a single water authority, the Royal Commission of 1896 protested against the present company system, the Bill of 1898 linked all the companies up

together, the Report of the Commission of 1899 recommended purchase, and the London County Council on Tuesday last, by a majority of ninety-one to seven, decided

in favour of this Bill. We may take it for granted therefore that the London County Council is nearly unanimously of opinion that purchase is desirable in the interest of the river, the trade of London, the health, the pleasure, and the fire safety of London generally. In a word, all inquiries end in purchase, all experience leads to amalgamation, and all failures of water supply make for the water supply of London to be, as in Glasgow, Bradford, and Birmingham, in the hands of the rate-paying authority. All these resolutions are in favour of the administration of water being in the hands of a public body, and except for an unreasonable minority all are agreed the County Council is that body. I believe the people who raise the money ought to purchase. The people will have to pay the money, and their trusted representatives ought to be the people to purchase, and that was the mandate of the last election. Now why should the London County Council purchase? Because the London County Council is the only body that can raise the £30,000,000 or £40,000,000 which are necessary for that purpose. No trust could do it. A Parliament should not give power to any irresponsible trust to raise such a sum as that from the public; and, moreover, I believe, if Parliament did give power to a Trust to levy a rate for that purpose, the whole of London would revolt against it, and the scheme would be an absolute failure, if not at its inception, in its subsequent mismanagement. The London County Council is directly elected, and is susceptible, as all such institutions are in England, to popular and proper influence; its financial credit is good, the commercial capacity of the officers of the finance Committee is undoubted, its officers are qualified to carry out the administration of this undertaking, and as London will have to provide four-fifths of the purchase money, I see no reason why Parliament should not give it this power. If the London County Council is allowed to purchase, it is asked what will it do? I think it will display its characteristic zeal and energy, and a typical regard to the outside local authorities with which it has to deal. It will boldly and, at the same time, economically administer a better water supply, and in the administration will serve its constituencies well, and in so doing, I believe, will economically pursue the line of least resistance. It will seek the co-operation of many local bodies now supposed to be its enemies; it will make terms with the outside authorities, as it now effectively does over its outside drainage areas into its system; it will supply to them in bulk any supply which may be required, and generally speaking the County Council and the outside authorities can be left to make reciprocal terms under the Bill.

Some may say, given the Council as authority, what are to be the conditions as to price? I believe that the only bone of contention between the London County Council and the water companies is the conditions of price; and given that the price could be settled, I do not think you would find that the companies would stand up or care for the outside authorities. They give the outside authorities no power of control now; they appropriate their water and charge them whatever

they like. Worse conditions than those the outside areas could not get from the London County Council, and 'they stand to gain more than they can lose. The companies want the highest price possible, the London County Council desires a fair and reasonable price determined by arbitration, which shall take all the circumstances of the case into consideration. This is objected to as being hard upon the companies; submit that to a tribunal such as the Council demands. Before the Land Clauses Act was passed, and water companies bothered, and London County Council promoted Bills, my illustrious namesake made a very true remark. Robert Burns wrote;

"When self the wavering balance shakes
It's rarely right adjusted."

That applies to the companies as forcibly as to the London County Council. I want neither the London County Council nor the water companies to strike the wavering balance. The Land Clauses Act cannot apply, and I want an arbitration to investigate the case with a neutral umpire between the water companies on the one side and the London County Council on the other.

I shall be told, perhaps, that Parliament has never done what the London County Council seeks and asks power to do. Parliament has, and has not, done it. It has partially done it. Parliament sanctioned special terms of arbitration under the Housing of the Working Classes Act in 1890, and I am quite prepared to leave this matter to such a tribunal as they sanctioned under that Act. Hon. Members opposite who object to this particular form of arbitration tribunal in the Council Bill must remember that Lord Plunket's clause, and several of the recommendations of subsequent Committees and Commissions, have been at variance upon the rigid automatic operation of the Lands Clauses Act. The London County Council say that the Lands Clauses Act may mean eight different arbitrations, sixteen different arbiters, and eight umpires. The County Council want to simplify and unify the process of arbitration under this Water Bill, and they want a strong tribunal for the acquisition of the eight companies, so that this matter shall be settled by a competent and strong tribunal with full knowledge of all the facts and circumstances relating to our London Water Supply. What is more, it is not fair to take the Lands Clauses Act, which was not passed for a special undertaking like the water scheme of London. The arbiter ought to take into consideration the question of plant, buildings, pipes, and machinery. All these are fit subjects for special valuation and for independent arbitration. Paragraphs 54 and 56 of the report of the Commission confirm the need for special arbitration by declaring no solatium for compulsory sale. Paragraph 128 of the report of the Commission of 1899 says that the large expenditure established the necessity for some form of special arbitration. Parliament also, by the Sterilisation clauses passed in recent years in regard to new capital, has shown how the water companies differ from those engaged in other matters. What is more, the new expenditure which the companies have undertaken, and the restrictions Parliament has imposed, are all eloquent in favour of the special form of arbitration I have indicated. Whether that be so or not, it is not on the Second Reading that these details ought to be threshed out. The proper tribunal to discuss them is the Committee upstairs first, and then the special

tribunal to which I have alluded, and it is because I believe that a trust, if brought in, will

have to undergo a similar test that I ask Parliament to give the trust to the County Council, which has received so many mandates for dealing with this subject. I wish this subject to go to the tribunal upstairs to be settled in a proper way.

On this point some hon. Members may say, what about severance? Well, the Council has been, I think, put in the worst light with regard to severance. I believe it has been exaggerated rather by certain opponents of the Council and by suspicious friends of the outside areas, who, in my opinion, do not care two pence for the outside areas except as a means of playing them off against the Council, to the detriment of both, and for the betterment of the water companies. But I might say this, as a matter of fact: Birmingham, with a population of 500,000, supplies 180,000 outside; Bolton, with a population of 120,000, supplies 130,000 outside. I could give instance after instance in which it is possible for a central municipal body to get over the difficulties severance implies, and where, generally speaking, it works harmoniously with its neighbours. What the provincial cities have done London will undoubtedly do. But some may say, what experience have we that that harmonious action will take place? I can only give the nearest parallel instance I can find. The Council in spending £200,000 on technical education works with outside bodies most harmoniously, it co-opts outsiders and strangers, and they have done great work between them. It sends six members to the Thames Conservancy, and no one will deny that these six have done some good work. It works with the City Corporation on many public questions, and notably for gas, and on some occasions for municipal water supply. Whilst on drainage, it has solved the question of severance with many outside authorities already. It works with the local authorities of London on such subjects as gas regulation and water control; it is the harmonious convener of the local authorities of London, and is slowly but surely winning its way as the champion of London, and as the buttress against those municipalities which too long have threatened London's existence. It is on the ground

that purchase is desirable that I ask that the Council should have power to purchase; it is because I think a public authority is desirable for this that I think the Council is the best authority, and it is because I think I have proved that the Council will not override the outside areas that I ask that this Bill be passed.

What is the alternative to the Council's Bill? The alternative is the Water Board, and what is the Water Board? It is to consist of thirty members, and there is to be little of the London County Council on it; no direct representative of the water consumers are to be preponderant. London in this respect is to be muzzled by the creation of this Water Board. The Report of the Royal Commission says that a trust of thirty nominated members will be representative. I deny it. It will not be more capable than the Council. I believe it will be less capable than any statutory committee of the London County Council. It will be more costly, because this trust of thirty members

will require salaries, I presume, of from £3,000 a year for the chairman down to £1,800 for some of the other members. It will be more extravagant and less-susceptible to public influence and control. The trust will be above criticism, it will be beyond removal if it does wrong. It will represent nobody but themselves. It will be without mandate and without representation. Now I put to hon. Members opposite, who do not agree with me, How much longer should London be subjected to these nominated bodies? Past experience proves that they are less efficient, more costly, and more difficult to deal with than the popularly elected Borough Council or County Council. But see how this metropolis is being; treated in this matter. How in a descending scale London has been, treated over a number of years. Lord Cross's Bill elected a trust of twenty-one. and 76 per cent, were from London; the City Bill in 1891 gave 53 per cent; the Vestries Bill in 1891 gave 74 per cent. to London; Lord James's Bill of 1896 gave 60 per cent., to London; but the Report of the Royal Commission of 1899 gives London only 33 per cent, of the representation on this trust. That is 33 per cent, of the representation on a body that represents; 80 per cent, of the consumers and will provide 87 per cent, of the money necessary to purchase these undertakings. There are no equal lights for all white men in that. I say it is a slur upon the municipal representation. It is a reproach upon the admitted zeal and capacity of the London County Council, and it is a kind of stigma which would not be attached to any other body but that which for the moment has the honour and pride of the burdensome duty of representing the people against the vested interests of this vast city. But some will say that this trust will probably select a better type of men to manage the water supply of London than the County Council could elect or select. Is that the fact? We have had water directors on the London County Council. I venture to say, from the point of view of ability and capacity and disinterested service to London, they were the least conspicuously able and capable on the London County Council. From the point of view of capacity, they were less commendable than any of the other County Councillors I had the honour of working with. What are the facts? The average water director is not an engineer. If he were an engineer, he would have put the water companies waterworks into better order than they have been on many past occasions. If the water directors were chemists, they would have urged upon the Water Board the necessity of getting a supply of some water better than that from a sewage-polluted watershed. If they had been men of business they would have made their dividends and yet placed London consumers in a better position than had been the case in the past. I believe that if the Council Bill is passed and we have a Statutory Committee or an ordinary Committee of the London County Council, we shall have a competent and capable body of men to manage our water supply. I venture to pit Mr. Dickinson against any director connected with the water companies. I venture to pit Mr. McKinnon Wood against any hon. Member representing water in this House. I venture to say that the chemists, engineers, retired business men, and capable civil servants whom London has harnessed to the chariot of its municipal work, are in every sense better qualified than the average water director, who is elected for other and frequently not such exalted

reasons. Is there any reason to suspect the Council of inefficiency for the management of water affairs? Is there any reason to suspect the efficiency of the management of its fire brigade? Sometimes, however, we do not get enough water at our fires. Our drainage and flood prevention is exceedingly well done, while the purification of the river, which has been undertaken by the London County Council under difficult circumstances, is the admiration of every Member of this House. I hold that for efficiency, capacity, and disinterestedness there is no reason for a trust, and there is no reason for mistrust of the Council. My last point is this. Supposing the Council is the body to purchase, supposing that purchase is decided upon as it must be, and supposing a Committee of this House and the arbitration tribunal take all the circumstances of the case into consideration, is there any reason to suppose that the London County Council will not be equal to the work, while the provincial corporations which have managed the water supplies had done so in a magnificent yet practical manner? Why should London be the Cinderella of all municipalities? Why should it do all the drudgery of municipal work and have none of the remunerative duties to perform? The million a year which the water companies now earn for their shareholders might better go in reduction of rates, extension and improvement of the water supply, the cleaning of streets, and in removing slums and in carrying out other beneficent municipal objects, which other cities to their credit had done. The Empire city is alone to be snubbed in this way. The metropolis alone is to suffer this contemptuous disqualification. London does not lack the engineering skill. Londoners can bridge the Indus, we can ford the Ganges, and we can dam the Nile. We can irrigate the dry places of the earth, and we can make two blades of wheat or grass grow where one formerly could only be produced. All but London is to feel the impulse of engineering talent, of civic zeal, and social reorganisation. This ought not to be. On the contrary, if this Bill is passed, London will be able to attract to the management of her water supply some of the ablest men, some of her most devoted citizens. In moving the Second Reading I appeal to provincial Members, who in their own cities enjoy to-day what London lacks, to help the metropolis, whose hospitality they enjoy, in the struggle against the water monopolist, the water director, and water shareholder, and to give London the means of reducing its death-rate and increasing its health and happiness by securing a cheap, pure, regular, and sufficient water supply.

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

*SIR F. DIXON-HARTLAND (Middlesex, Uxbridge): In rising to move the rejection of the Second Reading of this Bill. I must compliment the hon. Member for Battersea, who moved the Second Reading, upon the very moderate way in which he has stated his case, and I think the London County Council have done the very best thing they could in placing the Bill in his hands. I am very sorry that the London County Council have introduced this Bill now, because practically the same measure was brought in last year, and I think this is an unnecessary wasting of the time of this House. I consider also that it is very hard upon the taxpayers of this Metropolis that money should be wasted upon a Bill which the promoters know very well has no chance of passing. After the Report of the Royal

Commission, and after the undertaking given by the Government to bring in a Bill next year dealing with this question they could have no hope of seeing this Bill pass. The hon. Member for Battersea stated that in the case of any other city or town but London, the Second Reading of such a Bill would have been passed at once. The hon. Member for Battersea spoke of this measure as a London Bill, but it is because it is not a London Bill that it is opposed at the present moment.

The hon. Member for Battersea has spoken about the mandate received at the last election by the London County Council in regard to the water supply of London. I have no hesitation in contradicting that assertion, and I say that they had no mandate of that sort from the electors at the recent elections. What caused the defeat of the Moderate party was the regulations brought in just before the election by the water companies, which I think were obnoxious to almost everybody in the Metropolis. Both sides on the London County Council were, equally opposed to those water regulations, and it was a most suicidal policy. The report went out that it was only the Progressives who were opposed to these water regulations, but that was not the fact, it is well known that if you give a lie twenty-four hours start, it is difficult to catch it up again. Therefore, this mandate spoken of as being in favour of this Bill does not exist. The hon. Member for Battersea has used arguments which have been answered over and over again in this House, and he has not approached the real question when he says that it is a London question. He says that the London County Council is the proper body to have charge of the whole transactions of the water companies, but what did the Royal Commission say upon this point. They reported that;

"Inasmuch, therefore, as all the metropolitan counties, except Hertfordshire, are bent on demanding what the London County Council are pledged to concede, we think that a purchase by the London County Council of the water undertakings must necessarily be followed by that severance and division of the works of supply and distribution into five distinct portions, which appears to us open to so much objection as to be practically inadmissible. On this ground, among others, we have come to the conclusion that the London County Council should not be the purchaser."

I wish to bring before the House the fact that the limits of supply of the water companies extend over 620 square miles, of which only 122 square miles are within the jurisdiction of the London County Council. That leaves nearly 500 square miles outside these limits, which include part of the counties of Middlesex, Surrey, Essex, Hertford, and Kent, and in such parts there are four boroughs and fifty-six urban and rural district councils, a total of sixty local authorities. The area and population supplied by the companies in 1898 were as follows: Inside Metropolitan area, 120 square miles, population 4,478,396. Outside Metropolitan area, 230 square miles, population 1,341,187. These figures, relating to all the companies, bear out the conclusion above stated, that almost the whole future increase of population and water supply will take place outside the area of the London County Council. If the London County Council are permitted to purchase the undertakings of the water companies, they must either supply the other counties and local

authorities with water in bulk, or divide the sources of supply and works of distribution between the five metropolitan counties.

What has taken place in regard to these companies only last year? I will take the case of three companies. The Lambeth Water Company during the last four years increased its inside area to the extent of 6,431, while the outside area increased by 6,857. Therefore it will be seen that the consumption of water is growing faster in the outside area of this company than in the inside. The outside area of this company includes the borough of Croydon and Kingston-on-Thames. and other rural and urban districts which do not want to come under the London County Council. The Grand Junction Water Company as late as February last were actually supplying more water in the county of Middlesex than in London. In the case of the East London Water Company the increase of the supply in the outside area amounted to between 30,000 and 40,000 gallons more each year, whilst the supply in their inside area was diminishing. The population supplied by the East London Company is only 6,360 inside the London area, while the population supplied outside is 648,936. Therefore if the London County Council are permitted to purchase these undertakings they must supply water in bulk to these places outside their own area. Sir Alexander Binnie, the engineer of the London County Council, in his evidence before the Royal Commission stated; "that, as a water engineer, he would not advocate such a severance from the point of view of economy in the administration and construction of the works; and that in his opinion the objections to severance and its cost would lead the outside counties to take water

in bulk from the county of London, contenting themselves with taking over the distribution of that water in their own district."

With regard to these two modes of supply the Royal Commission report; "The system of supply in bulk is not only inconvenient and expensive, but it shuts out the supplying authority from prospective increase of income arising in the district supplied. The price in bulk would no doubt be so fixed as to leave a small margin of profit to the supplying authority; but that would not cover the prospective increase of income it might expect to receive if it dealt directly with the water consumer. If London had to supply water in bulk at a fixed price for the present and future wants of so much of the live adjoining counties as lies within water London, the ratepayers of London would find themselves in a very different financial position from that of the eight companies or from that of a purchaser who took over the whole present system.

"The conclusion we arrive at on this subject is that although severance of the works and sources of supply of the several companies and the division thereof between the Councils of the six counties within the limits of supply are not actually impracticable, they would be very difficult and highly undesirable. They will involve needless waste and expense and can only be carried out with constant friction in working details and at a greatly increased cost of management. All the advantages and economies of concentration and amalgamation will be sacrificed; it will become increasingly difficult to deal with future wants; and no compensating advantage will be secured."

The outside counties strongly object to the London County Council acquiring any

rights of supply within their area, either by supplying the customers directly or by supplying in bulk, and that Council are pledged to effect a severance of the undertakings, if they are allowed to purchase them, between themselves and the five Metropolitan counties. No words can be stronger than those of the Royal Commission on these points, namely;

"To the objections of these county authorities to being placed by purchase under the control of the London County Council we attach great weight, in consequence of the large proportion of the water-consuming population which is under their jurisdiction, and not under that of the London County Council. At the present time it is between one-fifth and one-fourth of the whole population supplied by the water companies. It is increasing at a very much more rapid rate than that of the population of London proper, and when the population of Water London reaches the large figure of 12,000,000, which we have mentioned, it is very possible that the population of this outer ring, for which the additional quantities of water are wanted, may fully equal that of the administrative County of London."

There is no doubt that London, inside and outside, is filling up very rapidly. But I think there is very little chance of an increase in the water supply being required for a long time in the inside London area, whilst, on the other hand, the outside area is growing very rapidly by leaps and bounds, and it will very shortly be quite equal to the area of the county of London.

It is all very well to speak about Bradford, Liverpool, and Birmingham, but those are not similar cases. I have no hesitation in saying that the feeling of the counties is so strong that they will oppose in every possible way any intention to place them under the London County Council. I am speaking in this matter with the authority of the various counties I have consulted. Why should the London County Council interfere with these other counties who consider that they are just as able to manage their own affairs as the London County Council? I think we have as good men on our county councils as are found on the London County Council. Any Minister who tries to put these districts under the London County Council will find himself very strongly opposed by the whole of them and the councils representing them. The question is not whether the London County Council perform their work well, or whether they manage their own affairs well or not; but the issue is that the London County Council are trying to increase their borders and are trying to obtain control of that which does not belong to them. The hon. Member for Battersea spoke about the Royal Commission's reference to the Water Trust, but that was only a suggestion. I think London ratepayers may fairly object to the rates of London alone being pledged as ultimate security for purchasing, managing, and developing undertakings in an area five times the size of the county of London. The Bill gives no power to outside local authorities to purchase water in bulk unless the London County Council assent, and if the outside bodies are not represented they are likely to be treated worse than they are at present by the water companies. I believe that if the Bill promised by the Government is brought in next year and a proper Water Trust is created, in a very short time everybody will be glad that this Bill has not been read a second time. I beg to

move the rejection of this Bill.

Amendment proposed,

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"; (Sir Frederick Dixon-Hartland.)

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

MR. WHITMORE (Chelsea) said the hon. Member for Uxbridge had gone into the reasons which actuated outside bodies in opposing this Bill. With regard to the particular proposals of the Bill the opposition of the outside areas might be pressed into a very small compass. Those who had the honour of being members of the London County Council must welcome the speech made by the hon. Member for Battersea. That speech was well reasoned and was considerate beyond doubt. He felt sure that every Member on the Ministerial side of the House recognised that this was a large question which ought to be approached without any display of petty party feeling or personalities. At the same time he was bound to say that a great part of the speech of the hon. Member for Battersea was in favour of purchase generally, but he submitted that that was not the real issue. The issue which the House had to consider was whether or not it should promote the settlement of this protracted controversy by reading the Bill a second time.

This Bill was substantially the same measure as was presented last year, when it was rejected by a good majority. The main feature of the Bill was to enable the County Council to become the purchaser of the undertakings of the water companies. This proposal was condemned by the Royal Commission. It should be noted that if purchase by the County Council was sanctioned severance must subsequently ensue. The outside authorities would insist upon this, and severance meant that instead of one authority there would be five separate authorities. Therefore one of the great financial and administrative benefits which ought to be derived from purchase would at once be taken away. Severance was, moreover, explicitly condemned by

the Royal Commission. Every one of the main proposals of this Bill had been emphatically condemned by a very powerful Commission. They were part of the Bill brought forward in this House last year which was then opposed by the President of the Local Government Board and rejected by a substantial majority. Why should the House read this Bill a second time, when they rejected it last year?

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): This is a new Parliament and a different Bill.

MR. WHITMORE said those were the main reasons why they were opposing the Bill. He could quite understand that hon. Members on both sides, wishing to bring this unfortunate controversy to an end, were rather tempted to let the Bill be read a second time, in the hope that it might be improved before a Select Committee.

Was that the proper spirit in which to enter upon a matter of this kind? How could they have any assurance that all these things would be remedied in Committee? He did not know whether any hon. Gentlemen had tried to draw up the Instructions they would like to move in order to convert this Bill into one which they would like to see passed into law. It was impossible to draw up an Instruction which would compel the Select Committee to transform the Bill.

Moreover, the scheme would be presented before the Committee by experienced officials in the most admirable way; and how in the world could outside

authorities or others who did not approve of the Bill formulate a scheme which would have a chance of securing equal treatment with the scheme of the County Council? The fact was. this question had become too large to be settled by any Select Committee, however careful; and influential. It must be dealt with by the Government, and the Government alone. He hoped that in opposing the Second Reading of this measure no one was doing it with a dilatory or obstructive motive. [Opposition cries of "Oh, oh."] He was glad to hear that note of dissent, but he was going to give his vote against the Second Reading, firstly because he did not think it was a proper Scheme to settle this great question; and in the second place because he wished to get rid of this system of the London County Council introducing into this House year after year impossible measures. What he wanted was that next year the Government should deal finally and effectually with this great problem.

This was a matter of such magnitude and perplexity that it should be dealt with by the Government. That fact was more or less recognised by the Government of 1880, but unfortunately that Government was not allowed to bring the matter to a satisfactory conclusion. Had the question been dealt with then, all of them on both sides of the House, and the ratepayers as well, would have been happier to-day. Ever since that date successive Unionist Governments had recognised that the responsibility for the ultimate settlement of the water question in London rested with them and not with the municipal authorities. In the year 1892 the Royal Commission presided over by Lord Balfour of Burleigh made a very valuable Report, and the Commission presided over by Lord Llandaff also presented an admirable Report. Last year the London County Council introduced a Bill and the President of the Local Government Board on behalf of the Government opposed it, and it was rejected by a considerable majority. It was not, however, enough for them and the Government to go on opposing in that way. The question was now ripe for settlement, and in his judgment the history which he had briefly detailed showed that successive Governments had recognised that they had a responsibility and an obligation in the matter. They were not giving an absolutely negative vote, but they were waiting for a practical measure dealing with the question which would be introduced by the Government next year. He did not think that the treatment of the question by the Government presented insuperable difficulties. After all, there had been a great approximation of opinion on the matter.

Personally, he had for years struggled against the idea of purchase; [Opposition cheers]; yes, he candidly admitted it; but his view had been shattered partly by the conclusions of the Royal Commission and partly by the general tendency of events. Now he was

anxious to see the question settled on the general lines of the Report of the Royal Commission. Who could doubt that even the water companies must now be anxious to have such a settlement? Recent events had shown that they had not the moral power to enable them to carry on their business satisfactorily. Public opinion was unfair to the water companies, and they could not get the powers they required. In the interests of the water companies and their shareholders it was most desirable that this trouble should cease. There need be no great difficulty in the constitution of the new Water Board, and even the Progressive party on

the London County Council had in many ways shown a sweet reasonableness, and he did not doubt that when once the Government showed itself in earnest the end of the long controversy would soon be at hand. He hoped he had not been detaining the House too long. In conclusion, he wished to say that he gave his vote unhesitatingly against the Second Reading of this Bill, and he did so not with any obstructive motive, but in the hope that next session the question would be settled permanently and satisfactorily by a measure introduced by the Government.

*SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.): Everything depends upon what the Government are doing, and, indeed, something more than that; upon what they will do, because the two things, as the House knows on many important social questions, are not identical. If the arrangement as to the London water supply is going to remain in its present position, like old-age pensions, it will not be satisfactory. We would like to hear from the President of the Local Government Board what they are going to do, and form our own judgment as to what the Government are likely to do. I therefore at this stage, until we have heard what the Government are going to do, do not propose to go at any length into this matter. The hon. Member for Chelsea thought it worth while to incidentally attack the Government of 1880. [Cries of "No" and "The Opposition."] There were two Governments in 1880; there was one in which I was interested, and one of my earliest duties as Home

Secretary was to preside over a Committee on this question. There has been a good deal of misrepresentation on this subject, and I will in a few sentences state what occurred on that occasion. I was chairman of that Committee, and received most valuable assistance in its conduct from the present Colonial Secretary; in fact, we together drew up the Report. Among the other members of the Committee were the present Lord Cross, the author of the proposal of the former Government of 1880, and the present Secretary of State for India. Well, that Committee had before it certain agreements upon which the early Government of 1880 had proposed to purchase the water companies, and there attended, by counsel, the Corporation of London and the Metropolitan Board of Works, who represented upon that occasion and for that purpose the consumers of London. Counsel implored the Committee not to sanction the agreements on the ground, so the Report showed;

"that those two bodies have declared to your Committee their opinion that the terms contained in those agreements do not furnish a satisfactory or admissible basis of purchase, and in that opinion your Committee concur."

I do not think that that Committee or any other Committee could reject the opinion of the London Corporation and the Metropolitan Board of Works. The next paragraph of the Report, the author of which was the present Colonial Secretary, was as follows;

"It is obvious, therefore, that the judgment of the public, as evidenced by the market price, coincided with the opinion of the Corporation of London and the Metropolitan Board of Works; namely, that the price stated in the agreements is greatly beyond the estimated value of the property."

The charge made against us was that, being urged by the representatives of the

consumers of London not to purchase the water companies upon those terms, we agreed with the Corporation of London and the Metropolitan Board of Works, and we did not attempt to force the consumers of London to purchase their water at a price far beyond the market price of the commodity. That is the position which has been misrepresented ever since, and the remarkable part of it is that the very author of the proposal in the Conservative Government of 1880 was a member of the Committee. The present Secretary of State for India and Lord Cross never attempted to challenge that verdict of the Committee; they never pretended, after the examination of Mr. Smith, that it was possible to purchase the water companies upon the terms proposed. There was some suggestion that there should be some other terms and some other negotiations, but as to defending the proposal of the preceding Government there was no definite attempt whatever on the part of its author. To the general principle laid down by the Committee I adhere. The principle then laid down was that the water supply of London ought to be in the hands of some public body representing the consumers; and we suggested a body that might be constituted for that purpose, solely upon the ground that there was no municipal authority at that time in existence which adequately represented the community of the metropolis. There is such a body now. The principle of the Report was that as soon as such a body was constituted it should have control of the water supply, and to that principle I adhere. It was then discussed whether the best process was by purchase or by some independent supply. That question was left open; but it will be found in the Report that purchase for certain purposes was regarded as necessary. That is the simple history of the Committee of 1880. I believe that every one of the Committee's conclusions has been justified, and that to blame the Committee of 1880 for having refused to purchase the water of London at a price which was absolutely beyond its value at the time is entirely unwarrantable. I contend that the Committee of 1880 and the Government which acted upon its recommendations were wholly justified in the course they took on that occasion.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.):

Nobody will be inclined to blame the right hon. Gentleman for defending himself as one of those who took part in the deliberations which led to the conclusion arrived at in 1880. At the same time I may be forgiven for pointing out that, valuable as the right hon. Gentleman's observations are, they do not throw any particularly new light on the question we are now debating, in the first place, the contention put forward by my hon. friends behind me is not in any sense disposed of by the criticism of the right hon. Gentleman. What the hon. Member for Chelsea pointed out with irresistible force and unanswerable effect was that, had the suggestion which Mr. Cross, now Lord Cross, made in 1880 been adopted, enormous benefit would have accrued to the ratepayers of London. To tell us now that the representative bodies in London supported the right hon. Gentleman and his friends in their objections to the proposals of the water companies is not to dispose of our contention that if the scheme had been adopted great good would have followed, and we should not have been discussing the Loudon water question

to-day.

The moderate speech of the hon. Member for Battersea deserves all that has been said of it. But the hon. Member looked at the question from the point of view of the London County Council, and from the point of view of that part of London controlled by the London County Council only. I have read the Report of the Committee to which the right hon. Gentleman has referred. Of course I do not pretend to speak of it with the same knowledge as he possesses, who served on the Committee, but I confess it is difficult to realise that in the recommendation about the appointment of a municipal authority the Committee contemplated that that representative authority was to be representative of only a portion and not the whole of London. The hon. Member for Battersea and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouth are a little too apt to talk of London as if it were necessarily limited in these matters to the area of the London County Council. The hon. Gentleman made the mistake of following too closely the suggestions of the Royal Commission. The recommendations of the Royal Commission in the main are those which my hon. friend supported, but it does not follow that the part of the Report to which he refers or other parts will be so closely followed as to do injustice to those parts of London to which he alluded as he seems to imagine.

Now it is my duty to say a few words in advising the House—what course they should take upon the Bill which is under consideration. The hon. Member for Chelsea assured the House that he had no desire to delay or obstruct the progress of this important question. That is the last thing that any member of the Government, and especially the President of the Local Government Board, would be likely to desire to do if he could see his way fairly and honestly to take any other course. Various Committees and Commissions have sat upon the question, and they have made recommendations which varied in some degree. The last recommendation is to the effect that the controlling body dealing with the London water supply should be representative of the area which is to be controlled, and that the terms upon which the companies are to be acquired should be fair and reasonable terms, just alike to the shareholders of the companies and to those who will have to pay the cost of buying the undertakings. In what way does the Bill of the County Council meet the first of these recommendations; that of a representative body for the whole of the area concerned? Clause 44 of the London County Council Bill is a clause which proposes that the authority shall be a committee of the London County Council, and the Bill also gives the County Council a power to co-opt members of other representative bodies. Can it possibly be said that this is adopting the principle laid down in the Report of the Royal Commission? The Royal Commission make it perfectly plain. In Clause 140 of their Report they refer to the possible effect of the London County Council becoming the owners of the water supply upon the outside areas, and they say, among other things, we have come to the conclusion that the London County Council should not be the purchaser, and they give their reasons why; but those are not the only reasons they give, for in another clause there are other reasons which point to the same conclusion, and they go on to give those reasons. Is there any comparison between a,

representative authority appointed to represent the whole of what we may call Water London and a Committee of the London County Council with power, if they see fit to do so, to appoint outside representatives; a Committee which will be, after these outside Members have been co-opted, subject to the control of the Council itself? Can it be contended that there is any comparison whatever between the body proposed to be set up by this Bill and the body proposed by the Royal Commission? The hon. Member for Battersea may say quite frankly that there is no comparison, but that he agrees with the policy of the Bill, and does not agree with the recommendation of the Royal Commission; but that is a reason why we find it difficult to justify the suggestion that this Bill should now be read a second time. The differences are not mere differences of detail. The hon. Member for Battersea said that there was no precedent for a Trust, but I am not quite sure that the hon. Member and the hon. Gentleman who supported him are quite right in their views. What has been the most recent action of Parliament? Not so very long ago a very important water trust was formed in the Midlands in order to deal with the questions arising between different municipalities for the supply of water, and therefore I do not think the hon. Gentleman is justified in drawing the comparison in favour of London which he has.

MR. JOHN BURNS: In that case they were all municipal bodies.

MR. WALTER LONG: Moreover, the hon. Gentleman the Member for Battersea is not only trying to deal with what is apparent, but is also dipping into the future. He might be contented to deal with that part of the subject with which he is thoroughly acquainted, and he will allow me to suggest that in attempting to deal with any future body he is dealing with a matter the conditions of which must to a large extent be imaginary.

Now a great deal has been made in the course of this debate of the demands of London, but in dealing with this most difficult question it seems to me that the London County Council have almost wilfully ignored the evidence brought out before the two Commissions with regard to the population of London within and London without. As closely as they can be arrived at, the figures are these: the population of the administrative county of London in 1899 was 4,568,689, and if you add to that the increase in population since then to the present day you bring up the total to 4,658,000. The estimated number of persons supplied by the water companies throughout what we may call "Water London" is 6,172,320, showing that there are no less than 1,513,000 odd people outside the administrative county of London who are closely concerned with the water supply; so it is not quite fair to compare this question with those municipal instances given by the hon. Gentleman, which refer to entirely different circumstances; which refer to cases where municipalities having the control of their own water supply have, because it was advantageous to outside populations in their vicinity, entered into arrangements undertaking to supply them. This is an entirely different question, this is a case of supplying inside London and outside London; and we are asked to supplant the companies by an administrative body. If we are going to do this we must realise these figures, which are very remarkable, but there is an estimate made by the Royal Commission which is very

striking as to the future population to be supplied in 1931. The Royal Commission estimates that the population to be supplied in 1931 will be 11,192,000, or an increase of 5,000,000 on the present number, of which nine-tenths will be outside the administrative county of London. It is absurd to suggest that in setting up a great body to control this most difficult question of the water supply of this great area that we are to ignore altogether not only the million and a half who already form part of "Water London," but who are outside the administrative county; but the evidence which shows that the growth in the future will be almost exclusively the outer parts of London, and that in a comparatively short time we shall have as great a population outside the administrative county but within "Water London" as we have in London. Yet we are asked deliberately to give the whole control to a body representative of a portion only of the area, and to exclude from control and administrative power and authority in connection with the treatment of this important question a probable population as great as the figures which I have just given to the House indicate.

I might also quote if the House has still any doubt as to the constitution of the authority one further paragraph from the Report of the Royal Commission. It is said that the suggestions of the Royal Commission are worthless suggestions, and that they cannot be given effect to in some respects; but nobody will ever deny or ever has denied that the Commission was composed of men well fitted for the work which they had to perform, and which they did perform with great credit to themselves, and I think we are bound to give very great weight to their recommendations. In regard to the question of the authority they say that in their opinion the Board should be a permanent and not a fluctuating one, consisting of not more than thirty members, selected on account of their business capacity and their knowledge of matters connected with water supply. The hon. Member for Battersea, I am sure, did not intend by his reference to the water directors to draw any invidious distinction as to the manner in which they discharged their duties, and the suggestion of the Royal Commission is one that ought to have met with his entire approval. The meaning of that suggestion was that the men in charge, as they will be, of these responsible and difficult duties, should be appointed in such a manner that they are not liable to be changed from time to time, and that they should be selected for the experience which they have had or ought to have had of a training fitting them for this difficult and peculiar work. I think that is a part of the Report which ought to meet with general approval, whatever may be thought of the claims of the London County Council. The Report then goes on to say that this Board should be so constituted as not to give any preponderance to any of the conflicting interests. Is that borne out by Clause 24 of the London County Council Bill? It is not a question of preponderating influence here, because if the proposals of the County Council were to pass into law the whole control over the water supply of both inner and outer London would be handed over to the power of the County Council. It is not only in connection with the administrative part of the proposal that it is obligatory upon us to criticise this measure; the purchase clause of the Bill is, I frankly admit, an improvement

upon anything that has ever appeared in previous Bills, but it is certainly unfortunate when the London County Council made up their minds to improve this clause in the way they had done that they could not frankly adopt the language of the Report of the Royal Commission, because the recommendations of the Report with regard to the purchase question are very plain, and it is difficult for anybody to disagree with them. The hon. Member for Battersea quoted from the Housing of the Working Classes Act, but that has no analogy to the case, because the suggestion that was adopted in that case was in order to deal with owners of property who had abused their rights by not dealing with their property in the manner in which they ought to have done. The gentlemen who are to take the place of the water companies are to take the place of men who have done their business under very difficult conditions, and even supposing that it could be shown that they had made mistakes, it would not be just to treat them in the same way as owners who had deliberately allowed their property to fall into decay to the injury of the community. The Commissioners in their Report say;

"The companies have upon the whole performed their duties to the public satisfactorily, and most of them have gone through periods of struggle and difficulty during which the shareholders ran considerable risks and received inadequate returns for their money. Some have now reached and others are approaching a more prosperous condition, by the help no doubt of great privileges which Parliament has given them. We see nothing which leads us to suppose that if these undertakings are compulsorily purchased for the public advantage, Parliament will sanction any exceptional provisions or depart from the terms of arbitration usual where the property of private persons is taken from them. We shall, therefore, assume that if the policy of purchase is adopted the price of the undertakings will be determined by an arbitration conducted on the lines of the Lands Clauses Act; although possibly, in view of the magnitude of the undertakings a different constitution of the tribunal may be adopted."

From the drawing of the Bill it is obvious that the County Council is to be the sole authority which in future is to control all these matters, and the question which

we have to ask ourselves is whether under all these circumstances it is possible to allow the Second Reading and let the Bill go to a Committee. Are we not to consider, in the absence of any declaration on the part of the promoters of their intentions, that when the Bill reaches Committee we shall lay ourselves open to the inevitable conclusion that the House has approved the principle.

There are other grounds upon which this Bill is recommended to the House. The hon. Member for Battersea said that the recent County Council Election had settled this question altogether, and that there is no doubt that the opinion of London had been in favour of the London County Council's proposal. I have had to follow very closely some of the elections of the London County Council, and I certainly do not agree with the hon. Member. Among other things there was a speech of Lord Rosebery's, a speech made on the 28th February last, in which he says;

"What has been the result of the policy of the Moderate party? I am not denouncing them. But the policy of that party in support of the Government on

this question of water; you have at last heard the crowning of it; you know the result, the splendid result, of an omnipotent Government; omnipotent in both Houses of Parliament, with its mandate loyally and generously renewed by the whole country; you know the result of their policy with regard to water. It is this. The companies have enjoined on every householder to put down expensive cisterns at his own expense; and at the outcry of universal indignation have had to withdraw it."

It is perfectly true that those recommendations were denounced, although they were made at the instigation of the Royal Commission, but that does not look as if Lord Rosebery was so satisfied with the policy of the Water Committee of the London County Council. If it were not unduly trespassing upon the patience of the House I might quote to them speeches made by hon. Gentlemen with reference to the action of the Local Government Board, but it is not worth while to go back to that, and while I do not seek to deny the importance of the County Council election, I submit the clear issue of whether the water companies should be bought by the County Council or by the municipalities of the whole of the area was obscured by the matter of regulations to such a large extent that it cannot be correctly stated as having been decided. The hon. Member for Battersea relies on the position of the London County Council as compared with other municipal authorities, but that point has already been dealt with by another hon. Member. In the earlier portion of his speech he frankly admitted that the question of the control of the water supply for London had been taken out of the level of the ordinary subjects; that the magnitude of the interests involved, and the amount of the capital required, had removed it from the position of an ordinary municipal question, and, therefore, it would be unfair to say more about that than this one word, that if the London County Council had seen their way to adopt, not every line and word, but the general tone, of the recommendations of the Royal Commission upon this subject this Bill would have been received as other municipal measures had been, and opposition would have disappeared, and because the London County Council had not seen fit to adopt that course they must not cast blame or responsibility on this House for opposing it. The House must have regard for the outside areas and therefore we adhere to the recommendations of the Royal Commission, and not to those of the London County Council.

What is the position to which we are brought? My hon. friend behind me, who seconded the rejection of this Bill, referred to the future area, and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Monmouth said the whole of my hon. friend's speech consisted of references to the Government. That was not a fair description of his argument. He expressed the conviction that this matter would be dealt with by the Government. I quite agree that a complete change has come over public opinion in regard to this question, and anyone who has studied this question as I have will be struck by the fact that, whereas there was a great disagreement in the past as to purchase, there is now a general agreement as to the necessity for purchase, and, roughly speaking, as to the scheme or method by which the purchase should be carried out; there is also a general agreement that there ought not, if it could be avoided, be any further

delay in dealing with it. I entirely agree with what has fallen from more than one hon. Gentleman in this debate, when they said it would be impossible for us to go on year after year advising the House to reject Bills of this description, and take no step ourselves. [Cries of "Six years ago."] Hon. Members who talk so glibly of "six years ago" forget that the Government appointed six years ago a Royal Commission, and they are not to be blamed for not legislating while the Commission was sitting. Or perhaps they think it would be better to legislate first and investigate afterwards. Nobody who has taken the trouble to look into the Report of the Royal Commission will deny that it contains a great deal of new matter, and therefore I say it is not quite reasonable to blame us for not having legislated before; but as the Government is now situated, it is absolutely impossible to bring in a Bill this session, because if we had intended to legislate we must have given notice last November.

I do not underrate the difficulty for a moment of dealing with this problem in a satisfactory manner. I have already informed a deputation that, being unable to recommend this Bill, I am engaged upon a measure based upon the recommendations of the Royal Commission, with an administrative body representative of the whole area of Water London, with full and proper representation to London itself. I shall spare no effort to make the measure a success, and to deal in a final and reasonable way with the water question of London. If I am able to secure the approval of my colleagues, which I do not doubt I shall be able to do, it will be my object and hope to bring in the Bill next session. That is the hope I entertain, and I may say that I confidently believe that we shall be able to settle the question, which has been before the inhabitants of London too long.

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): I think all of us welcome the right hon.

Gentleman's acknowledgment that a great and complete change has come over this question. I am glad that he did not associate himself with the complaint which was made by one hon. Gentleman behind him in respect that the County Council having promoted a similar measure to this, which was defeated last year, had the presumption again to submit that proposal to the House of Commons. A great deal has happened since this time last year. We have now a new Parliament and a new Government; a Government so new that the formal notices in connection with purchase could not be sent to the water companies in November; and, lastly, a new County Council. I have listened with interest and amusement to the speculations and hypotheses put forward from the opposite side of the House as to the true inward meaning of the recent County Council elections. Hon. and right hon. Gentlemen appear to be agreed that the election turned, not upon the question of purchase, but upon certain ill-advised regulations of the water companies put forward at the eleventh hour. I have in my hand here a leaflet. Sometimes leaflets are very useful things to refer to. This was issued for the purpose of the election by the London Municipal Society, and it is a manifesto, or at any rate a summary of arguments why the electors should vote for Moderate candidates. It says;

"The new regulations proposed by the water companies would, if allowed, inflict an unjust expense upon the householder, and must be strenuously resisted." How are they to be defeated?

"By returning a Conservative majority to the London County Council."

Then as an illustration of how evil communications corrupt good manners, I find at the end of the leaflet this pregnant sentence;

"Every vote given to the Progressives is a vote given to the water companies."

I confess that I am in a state of mental difficulty in this matter. This election turned upon the water regulations, but the Moderates, as they called themselves, if this leaflet is to be believed, were the most strenuous opponents of the water regulations. So also did the Progressives profess their opposition. Then what was the issue of the elections? The issue was not the water regulations, on which both sides professed to be in agreement, but whether the water companies should or should not be purchased by the London County Council. [Cries of "No."] I dare say that there are some hon. Members opposite who did not put that issue so plainly and candidly as I have stated to the electors; for while the Progressives were talking about water supply, hon. Members were talking about the war in South Africa. But the electors of London, who made so striking a demonstration less than a month ago as to their views of what municipal Government should be, were not thinking of South Africa; they were thinking primarily and mainly of the water supply. And that I believe is the only true and sufficient explanation of the enormous majority the Progressives received.

What is the question now before the House? The real question is; shall this matter, which has been delayed year after year, be again indefinitely hung up? It is exactly six years since the House of Commons, as then constituted, passed a Bill similar to the present Bill, promoted by the London County Council, for the purchase of the water companies. That Bill was closely investigated by Mr. Plunkett's Committee, and was passed, these two leading principles being expressly affirmed. First, that the companies ought to be purchased, and by the London County Council; and secondly that, in estimating the terms on which the purchase should be carried out, the ordinary system prevailing under the Lands Clauses Valuation Act, which gives, as everybody knows, an excessive bonus for compulsory purchase, ought not to be adopted. But for the accident of the dissolution of Parliament that Bill would have been passed into law, and we should already have entered upon the municipal administration of the water supply of London. What has happened in the interval? The right hon. Gentleman tells us by way of excuse for the delay that this Government, or rather the Government before this, appointed a Royal Commission, and he asks us in terms of indignation how the Government could be expected to legislate until they had inquired. In the opinion of many of us no inquiry was needed at all. The subject had; been inquired into again and again, and all the materials for legislation were already in the possession of any Government which chose to make use of them. I am rather interested by the attitude the right hon. Gentleman has taken up towards Royal Commissions. I wonder if the right hon. Gentleman remembers how the Government of which he was a member passed an Agricultural Rating Act which vitally tampered with the whole of our system of rating, and then appointed a Royal Commission to inquire into the subject of local taxation? The right hon. Gentleman spoke of the Report of Lord Llandaff's Commission as if it were an

inspired and sacrosanct document. We should be very glad if the Government would treat with anything like the same amount of respect the Reports of some other Commissions appointed by themselves. Less than a week ago the Under Secretary for the Home Department, whether in his private or official capacity was never explained, stated to the House;

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. JESSE COLLINGS, Birmingham. Bordesley): I said distinctly that I spoke in my private capacity.

MR. ASQUITH: We know that one member of the Government, in his private capacity then, treated with very scant respect the Report of a Commission appointed by his colleagues, none of whom had the courage to defend it. If the course which the County Council propose to take had been sanctioned six years ago, how much would have been saved? In the interval the companies have been coming to Parliament to obtain fresh capital powers; and the Sterilisation clauses, as they are called, to prevent for a term of years any increase in the amount to be paid for purchase by a public undertaking, have been running out. There have been in the interval two periods also, if not of panic, of a serious shortage in the London water supply, causing great inconvenience. I mention these facts to show that when we say this is a question which should no longer be hung up we are not speaking without some experience of the evil effects of delay in the past.

As to the terms of purchase, I do not think there is any difference of principle whatever. Both Mr. Plunkett's Committee and Lord Llandaff's Commission agreed that the ordinary

bonus given in an arbitration under the Lands Clauses Act ought not to be applied in this case. The right hon. Gentleman did not tell us that when he quoted one passage in this Report on this very matter. He quoted the authority of the Commission that arbitration should take place under the Lands Clauses Act and not by the special form of arbitration proposed in the Bill. I think it would have been relevant to have added the passage which I am now going to quote to the House, and which evidently bears out what I have said. I will just quote one sentence;

"In the present case it is improper for the-arbitrator to give any compensation."

This statement thoroughly justifies that which is the essence of the clause, namely, that the arbitrator, in order to ascertain the purchase money, is to inquire into and consider all the circumstances of the case, and that no allowance is to be made in respect of compulsory purchase. I think I am justified in saying, therefore, that there is no substantial difference of principle on both these points; the urgency of purchase or the terms of purchase. I come now to what is really the outstanding principle, the one which the right hon. Gentleman and those who supported him think is the question; that of the authority. In reference to that let me say at the outset, that there is, to my mind, a broad distinction between the purchasing authority and the management authority. It is not in the least degree necessary that the authority which carries out the process of purchase, and in whom in the first instance the estate of the undertakings of the water companies is vested, should either

immediately or for all time to come be the authority which should exclusively or without extraneous infusion manage the undertakings transferred. I do not commit myself at this stage of the question to a determination of that matter. I will consider in a moment the objections which have been raised. But let me point out first of all that the County Council is undoubtedly at this moment not only the natural but the only possible-purchasing authority. [Cries of "No."]

I should like to know of any other authority now in existence capable of carrying out the transaction. The County Council contains within the area which it represents 75 per cent, of the population which consumes the water supplied by the companies, and somewhere between 80 and 85 per cent, of the rateable value, and this is a most material element, because the companies derive their revenues upon the rateable value of the houses in which the consumers live. It cannot be suggested that there is any other authority in existence, or which could be called into existence, which could possibly be put in competition with the County Council as the purchasing authority for these undertakings. The right hon. Gentleman gave the House some speculative figures as to what is likely to be the increase of the population in 1931. I am not in a position to check the figures. They may be perfectly correct. We are not legislating at this moment for 1931. We are legislating for 1901. ["No, no."] I am sure that hon. Gentlemen will not misunderstand my meaning. Of course we have to look to the future as well as to the present; but the question is how best, most promptly, and most economically, to transfer these undertakings, which everyone says ought to be transferred, to a public authority. What is the authority to whom they ought to be transferred? What is to be their subsequent management? Above all, what are the provisions to be made for the distribution of water in the metropolitan and the extra-metropolitan area thirty years hence, is not a matter of urgency, and may be left to the future. The question of purchase, however, is urgent and ought to be settled at once. In making the County Council the purchasing authority, admitting at the same time that water will have to be supplied to the outlying areas, we are acting strictly according to Parliamentary precedent. Over and over again in the great municipalities of the country, like Manchester, Birmingham, and Glasgow, where the purchasing authority is the supplying authority, those outlying areas which come within the natural district of distribution obtain from the central body, either by purchase or in bulk or by special arrangement, so

much supply as is necessary for their local purposes. If that has been done in the great provincial towns why should it not be done in London also? Can the Government not trust the body which represents the enormous preponderance of interest which has been specified to carry out by proper arrangements the distribution of the outlying supply to those other districts? ["No."] Why not, unless as the hon. Member for Battersea has said, there is a dose of original sin in the composition of the County Council which prevents this House from entrusting to it powers which it entrusts, without reserve or suspicion, to all the other municipal bodies?

What does the Royal Commission propose? It proposes to constitute a water board of thirty members, in which the County Council should only be represented by ten

members; in other words, the body which has three-fourths of the population and four-fifths of the rateable value is to have one-third of the representation on the authority to manage the water supply. I do not like to use hard language about the recommendations of a Royal Commission, but I think that is a grotesque proposal, and, as my hon. friend has already pointed out, it flies in the face of every proposal hitherto made, and in particular of the proposal, I will not say of the late Government, but of the Government which was in office before the right hon. Gentleman came to the Local Government Board, and that is the dividing line in this matter. It is entirely contrary to the proposal of the late Government, which was put forward by Lord James in 1896, who proposed that out of a water board of thirty the County Council should have eighteen members, on the express ground that London had a predominant interest and a predominant claim to representation. The Royal Commission has told us it would not trust those matters to a fluctuating body. Why not? All our municipal corporations are fluctuating the House of Commons is a fluctuating body, and every representative institution in the country which is recruited from time to time by election is fluctuating. The whole advantage which has been found by experience in the past from the result of transferring large undertakings like gas or water from private or corporate management to municipal management has consisted in the fact that you have a fluctuating body, a body of managers responsive to the wishes and appreciative of the interests of those whom they represent, and who, if they disregard those wishes and interests, can be replaced by others. I therefore entirely demur to the notion that you are going to take away from the directors, for whom we have the highest respect, and many of whom are most excellent business men, the management of those companies to hand it over to what apparently is to be a body of experts responsible to the Local Government Board. I do not hesitate to say that I would rather see the water supply of London left in its present position than see a solution of it like that; and I cannot express my condemnation of the suggestion in stronger language than that.

I think I have satisfactorily shown to the House, first of all, that there is universal agreement as to the necessity of the prompt transfer of the companies to a public authority; secondly, that there is no substantial difference of principle as to the terms on which the transfer should take place; thirdly, that both in the nature of the particular case, and on the precedents which have been cited to us in the Parliamentary procedure of the past, the County Council is the natural body, and indeed the necessary body, to whom the transfer should be made; fourthly, that the arrangements for the management and distribution among the various subordinate localities and interests is a matter of detail which can be arranged; and, lastly, that it is all-important in a matter of this kind that the ultimate authority, whether for purchase or management, should be exactly what the Commission said it should not be; that is, a fluctuating and responsible body. If all these propositions are true, what is the reason for rejecting the Bill? Why is the Bill not to go before a Committee upstairs? I say in the most direct and explicit terms possible that, if this Bill is rejected, and if its details are not to be examined by a Committee, the responsibility will rest

entirely on the shoulders of the Government, The Government appear to be prepared to accept that responsibility. It is through their action that this question, which ought to have been settled six years ago, has been hung up until to-day. They have had in their hands the Report of this very Commission, which has been the pretext for delay for fifteen months, and up to this moment we have only vague assurances that twelve months hence the House may be in possession of their proposals. In the meantime London is to wait; and a question on the solution of which the health and comfort of six millions of people depend, and which is one of the most vital of social and economic wants, is to remain in its present highly unsatisfactory state. If hon. Members opposite oppose the motion they will associate themselves in a responsibility which at present rests on the shoulders of the Government.

*MR. HARRY SAMUEL (Tower Hamlets, Limehouse) said he had the honour of representing a constituency which had had a great deal of experience upon this water question. He ventured to say that the ideas put forward by the hon. Member for Battersea in regard to the defeat of the Moderates at the last County Council Election were somewhat erroneous. If it were true that London suffered so much from this want of water, in what part would it have been felt more than in the East End and in the Tower Hamlets? What was their answer to this question? Why, it was the only part of London where the Conservatives won two seats at the County Council Election. They had been told that if this matter was not settled to-day the onus would fall upon His Majesty's Government, He had never expressed or felt any affection for the water companies, and he did not think they had carried out their duties as well as they might have done, for they had inflicted considerable hardship upon the water consumers of London. The people of London had been forced by the Radical party to wait twenty-one years for a solution of this question, and he thought they would be willing to wait one year more in order to have it carried out on a sound and proper basis. He did not think East London had much trust in the London County Council upon this water question. The East London Water Company came down to this House and asked for additional storage powers, and they told the House that unless they got those powers they could not be relied upon to give a proper water supply. What was the result? At the initiative of the Radical members of the London County Council that Bill was thrown out and that action ultimately resulted in the serious water famine in the East End of London. He welcomed the declaration which had been made by the President of the Local Government Board, for he recognised in it the absolute determination of the Government to pass a Bill next session which would once and for all settle this question upon a sound commercial basis. If the London County Council had really cared to settle this question they could have done it in this Parliament by bringing in a perfectly straightforward and honest Bill carrying out the wishes of the Royal Commission, and constituting a water authority which would be representative not only of London but of all the outside areas concerned. It was now twenty-one years since Mr. Cross's Bill was brought in, and the ratepayers of London were entitled to say that whatever extra amount beyond £33,000,000 had to be paid for these undertakings the Radical party were

responsible for. In supporting the Government upon this question he contended that he was carrying out the wishes of his constituents.

DR. MACNAMARA said that when he looked into the history of this and the last Government he had the greatest possible difficulty in believing that anything was intended in regard to this question but delay. On the 22nd of February, 1895, a Bill to purchase the London water companies passed its Second Reading. In 1896, after the General Election, that suspended Bill was reintroduced, but the House threw it out because the Government promised to bring in a Bill the next year. He thought Lord James's Bill was a measure which was never intended to pass. It was a pure abortion, and the history of this question suggested to him that it would be in the same position next year. The Duke of Richmond's Commission in 1869 unanimously recommended that the control of the water supply should be under public authorities.

The hon. Member for Uxbridge had stated that there was no mandate at the last County Council Election for the purchase of the water companies. He quoted from a leaflet issued by a joint committee of the London Municipal Society and the metropolitan division of the National Union of Conservative Associations. This leaflet set forth that "the Conservative policy is purchase and management of the supply by a single public authority," and called upon the members to vote for the Conservative candidate. There was nothing in that about the water regulations, for it was a specific request to vote for the Conservative candidates in order to secure purchase and management of the water supply by a single public authority. But why should they wait until 1902 for the settlement? He believed that, the intention of the opponents of this-measure was to secure delay which would make matters worse for the ratepayers and better for the water company shareholders. The County Council had substantially modified its purchase clause, and the only outstanding question was, who should buy the water companies out and control the future supply. The Government, he understood, had committed itself in general terms to the proposal of the Royal Commission; namely, that there should be a composite trust of thirty persons, ten from the London County Council, twelve from neighbouring county councils, four from the Thames Conservancy, two from the Lee Conservancy, and two from the Local Government Board. From the point of view of population London ought to have twenty-one representatives, and from the point of view of rateable value London was entitled to twenty-three members of that Board, or at least three-fourths. He, emphatically asserted that that was not a scheme for the representation of the ratepayers, and he could, not understand, how anyone could seriously propose to give rating powers to a body so constituted.

In regard to the outside towns, he sympathised with the desire to give them some representation. He had, however, written to many large provincial corporations; and he found that in no single case where they sold water to an urban or rural district did they permit them to have- any representation on the water authority. Cardiff and Glasgow sold, water to outside municipal areas, and permitted no representation. The Bradford Corporation supplied water to 231,000 inside its area and 205,000 outside, and those outside had no representation. In

Bolton they had 120,000 persons inside the area and 130,000 outside, and yet those people outside were not permitted to have any representation. What they did there was to charge them a higher rate instead of giving them representation. He was rather glad to see this tender solicitude for the recommendations of the Royal Commissions. The problem was one of extreme urgency, and the Bill before the House would give them at least twelve months start. The Government policy was one of delay, and as a London Member he emphatically protested against that policy, because it meant more East End water famines and heavier financial burdens upon the ratepayers. Every five years delay meant that the ratepayers would have to pay £2,000,000 more, and they could scarcely expect the promised Government measure to come into operation before the 1906 valuation. If the Bill of 1895 had passed, London ratepayers would have been saved £2,000,000. Last Wednesday the Under Secretary for the Home Department volunteered the statement that he had but a poor opinion of the Londoner. He did not know whether that arose from the fact that out of the sixty-two hon. Members representing London fifty of them sat on the Ministerial side. If the Government assisted to wreck the Second Reading of this Bill he felt sure that Londoners would give the right hon. Gentleman good reason to alter his opinion of them at the next election. As a mere Radical partisan he might view with equanimity the throwing out of this Bill if the issues were not so serious. The issues involved were the health and the comfort of millions of people, and he appealed to the House and to the Government to give the Bill a Second Reading.

MR. PEEL (Manchester, S.) said that as one of the two Members of the London County Council who sat on the Ministerial Benches, and as one of the few remnants of the Moderate party which was left on the shore at the last election, he thought he was entitled to say something in regard to the mandate which had been spoken of, and in reference to the causes of the great Progressive majority. Before this election came on the party opposite were very melancholy, but at the last moment those water regulations came upon them and wrecked the Moderate chances entirely. It was very easy to put various interpretations on that mandate. So far as the ordinary ratepayers of London were concerned, all they wanted was plenty of water at as cheap a rate as possible, and if they got this they did not care two pence what the authority was. The electors had been persuaded by a number of ingenious persons that the only way to achieve this was to purchase the water companies, and that the purchasing body should be the London County Council. He wished to be perfectly fair to the water companies, but anything more inept, more fatuous than their bringing out their regulations within a fortnight of the County Council election the tongue of man could hardly describe.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, W.): It was not we who fixed the date for bringing out the regulations.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Who do you mean by "we"?

COLONEL LOCKWOOD: I am a water company director.

MR. PEEL said he would accept the statement of his hon. and gallant friend, but he hoped the engineering of the water companies would turn out better than their

electioneering. In regard to Manchester, it was true that they supplied water in bulk to twenty-four townships outside their area, but the difference between the case of Manchester and London was that the districts outside London did not want to be supplied in that way, and they wanted representation on the Water Board. If the persons to be supplied lived within the area, then the London County Council ought to control that supply. The outside district around London desired representation, and that being so, they were compelled to ask for an authority which was somewhat wider than the London County Council. He hoped the offer of the President of the Local Government Board in regard to this matter was not a hypothetical one, but that it was one which he would be able to carry out next session. In regard to the suggestion made by the Royal Commission, he was of the opinion that London must have a far larger representation than ten. As one engaged in administrative work in the County of London, for many reasons he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would bring in legislation next year which would solve this problem.

SIR JAMES KITSON (Yorkshire, W.R., Colne Valley) said he was a Member of the Committee which considered the County Council Bill in 1885, and he wished to say a word or two upon this measure. He wished to express his sorrow for London having now to bear the excessive charge caused by the delay since 1895, and the argument of delay now put forward was intended to secure for the companies an additional value. From the point of view of the local authority owning its own water supply, the whole of the points which had been raised by the President of the Local Government Board were dealt with in the city of Leeds. The City Corporation of Leeds supplied outside authorities with water in bulk, and they had no representation on the Water Committee. Politics did not enter into the question of water supply in Leeds, for there both Liberals and Conservatives joined in promoting any legislation or expenditure which, would secure a pure and ample water supply. Leeds was in the first instance supplied by a private water company, but it was bought by the City Corporation, and they had since spent over £2,000,000 in securing a water supply from the moorlands around Harrogate. The result of that expenditure was that the city of Leeds now had a revenue of £128,000 a year from its water supply; the expenditure was £28,000, interest £60,000 on the two millions, which left a profit of £40,000 a year, which was devoted to the repayment of the capital. The consequence was that this great local authority, which now owned its own water supply, was enabled to come to Parliament to ask for powers which a company could not acquire. A company for private gain would not be permitted to do what Leeds had done, for it obtained two sessions ago power to buy the whole of the lands within its water areas. The consequence was that it was able to protect the health of the inhabitants of the city by having a proper system of drainage. He supported the Second Reading of this Bill, because he believed it was in the interests of a great population which was now placed in a very inferior position to the great cities of the north of England.

MR. GRAY (West Ham, N.) said it had been stated that the London ratepayers were strongly in favour of this Bill. He would have been very much surprised to hear that they were not in favour of it, because it would be an admirable bargain for

London at the cost of the inhabitants of Greater London. In West Ham they looked upon it as a measure to destroy eight monopolies and to set up one greater monopoly. Under this Bill 320,000 people in West Ham, without any voice in the management of this great concern, would be compelled to take their water upon whatever terms the London County Council cared to dictate. London was to reap a large profit out of this undertaking, but at whose cost? It was to be accomplished at the cost of those consumers in the outside areas. He welcomed the assurance that had been given by the President of the Local Government Board, and he should vote against the Bill on the clear understanding that next session the Government would pass through Parliament a measure for dealing with the water supply of greater London. He should vote against the Bill under the clear belief that next session they would have a measure dealing with this question and providing a water board upon which the outer districts would have equal representation.

MR. HOLLAND (Yorkshire, W.R. Rotherham) remarked that this was a measure which he should have the greatest pleasure in voting for. He was surprised at the attitude taken up by the Member for South Manchester, for if he consulted his own constituents in the city of Manchester he would find that there the principle of this Bill had been carried out with great success. In the great city of Manchester, under the management of the council, the water supply was better in quality and quantity and cheaper than it had ever been before. To those familiar with the working of provincial councils it did seem strange that the London County Council, which was the greatest council of them all, should be kept in apron strings to a degree which was unknown in any other part of the country.

MR. LOUGH (Islington. W.) said that before the debate closed he wished to point out that upon this question they were having one of the most shocking examples of the mismanagement of public business that they had ever experienced. Instead of allowing the question to be dealt with by this Bill the Government had given a clumsy promise that they would take the question up next year. There could be no serious intention on the part of the Government of fulfilling that promise, and no doubt the farce of 1896 would be repeated. It had been stated that by introducing this Bill the promoters were wasting the time of the House, but they had just got a promise from the Government that they would do all they could to waste more time in connection with this subject next year. The hon. Member for Chelsea had made a most candid speech, and he had stated that he and those who acted with him were in favour more of private enterprise than public control. There seemed to be a sort of conspiracy amongst those in favour of private enterprise to defeat this great public Bill. The water directors would no doubt defeat this Bill, as they defeated the Bill of 1895. One party would be shepherded into one lobby by the directors and shareholders of these companies, while the other party would bring their friends and supporters into the other lobby, where their votes would be given in the public interest rather than in that of private

AYES.

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

Brigg, John
Cogan, Denis J.
Allen, C. P. (Glouc, Stroud)
Broadhurst, Henry
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Ambrose, Robert
Brown, Geo. M. (Edinburgh)
Crean, Eugene
Asher, Alexander
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Cremer, William Randal
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert H.
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Crombie, John William
Austin, Sir John
Burt, Thomas
Cullinan, J.
Barlow, John Emmott
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Dalziel, James Henry
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Caine, William Sproston
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Bell, Richard
Caldwell, James
Delany, William
Black, Alexander William
Cameron, Robert
Dewar, J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Blake, Edward
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Boland, John
Carew, James Laurence
Dillon, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Causton, Richard Knight
Donelan, Capt. A.
Boyle, James
Cawley, Frederick
Doogan, P. C.
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Clancy, John Joseph
Douglas, Chas. M. (Lanark)

enterprise. This was a gigantic question. They, in London, did not enjoy one of the franchises which were the possession of the people in the majority of the

other towns and cities in the kingdom; water, gas, telephones, means of communication, etc. Everything in London was in the hands of the private monopolists. There was no subject on which there was such keen feeling on the part of the people of London; and it was these old companies that made London life almost intolerable. [Cries of "Divide" and laughter.] Hon. Members might smile at his attempts to interest the House on this question, but if the House would not be interested, the people of London outside were extremely interested, and thought the time had come when the reign of the monopolists should be put an end to. He had read a most interesting note in The Times the day before. It was a little quotation from the proceedings of the House of Commons on 25th March, 1801, and was as follows; "If any more Jobs are attempted to be forced through the House of Commons an hon. Gentleman intends to move that they be referred to the Committee on the Scarcity. "He could not but think that when the editor of The Times saw the Water Bill on the Order-book for that day, he had inserted that note as a hint in regard to their proceedings. [Cries of "Divide."] In conclusion, he did not think he asked too much when he expressed a hope that no director or shareholder, or any one who had got a personal interest in these water companies, would take any part in the division.

Question put.

The House divided:; Ayes, 176; Noes. 253. (Division List No. 106.)

Duffy, William J.

Levy, Maurice

Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries)

Dunn, Sir William

Lewis, John Herbert

Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)

Edwards, Frank

Lough, Thomas

Robson, William Snowdon

Elibank, Master of

Lundon, W.

Roe, Sir Thomas

Ellis, John Edward

MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.

Rolleston, Sir John F. L.

Esmonde, Sir Thomas

Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.

Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye

Fenwick, Charles

M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)

Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)

Ffrench, Peter

M'Dermott, Patrick

Schwann, Charles E.

Field, William

M'Fadden, Edward

Scott Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Mansfield, Horece Rendall
Sinclair, Capt John (Forfarshire)
Flynn, James Christopher
Mooney, John J.
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Morgan, J. L, (Carmarthen)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Fuller, J. M. F.
Morgan, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (North'nts
Furness, Sir Christopher
Moulton, John Fletcher
Stevenson, Francis S.
Gilhooly, James
Murphy, J.
Strachey, Edward
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Sullivan, Donal
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Tennant, Harold John
Grant, Corrie
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Grey, Sir Edward (Berwick)
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merth'r
Haldane, Richard Burdon
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)
Thompson, E. C. (Monaghan,N
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Tomkinson, James

Harwood, George
O'Doherty, William
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Hay, Hon. Claude George
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Ure, Alexander
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Dowd, John
Wallace, Robert
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.)
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol. E.)
O'Malley, William
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.)
O'Mara, James
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Jacoby, James Alfred
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Weir, James Galloway
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Palmer, Sir C. M. (Durham
White, George (Norfolk)
Joicey, Sir James
Partington, Oswald
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Pemberton, John S. G.
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Philipps, John Wynford
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Joyce, Michael
Pickard, Benjamin
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Pirie, Duncan V.
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid
Kinloch, Sir John Geo. Smyth
Power, Patrick Joseph
Wilson. Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Kitson, Sir James
Price, Robert John
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Labouchere, Henry

Priestley, Arthur
Wodehouse, Hn. Armine (Essex)
Lambert, George
Rea, Russell
Yoxall, James Henry
Langley, Batty
Reckitt, Harold James
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Reddy, M.
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Leamy, Edmund
Redmond, JohnE. (Waterford)
Mr. John Burns and Mr. Holland.
Leng, Sir John
Redmond, William (Clare)
NOES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.
Blundell, Col. Henry
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Bond, Edward
Cranborne, Viscount
Aird, Sir John
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.
Boulnois, Edmund
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Bousfield, William Robert
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Anstruther, H. T.
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Midd'x)
Oust, Henry John O.
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Brassey, Albert
Dalkeith, Earl of
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Brown, Alex. H. (Shropshire)
Dewar, T. R. (T'rH'mets, S. Geo
Arrol, Sir William
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Dickinson, Robert Edmond

Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Cautley, Henry Strother
Dickson, Charles Scott
Atkinson, lit. Hon. John
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Bain, Col. James Robert
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Baird, John George Alexander
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm
Duke, Henry Edward
Balcarres, Lord
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r)
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart
Balfour, Rt. Hon G. W. (Leeds)
Chapman, Edward
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Banbury, Frederick George
Charrington, Spencer
Faber, George Denison
Barry, Sir F. T. (Windsor)
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Fardell, Sir T. George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen B.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Ed ward
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Beach, Rt. Hon. W. W. B. (Hants)
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Finch, George H.
Bentinck, Lord Henry O.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.

Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Bignold, Arthur
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Fisher, William Hayes
Bigwood, James
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Rankin, Sir James
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Leveson-Gower, Fred'k. N. S.
Raseh, Major Frederic Carne
Garfit, William
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Gibbs, Hn. A. C. H. (City of Lond
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Reid, James (Greenock)
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Long, Rt. Hn Walter (Bristol, S.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Gordon, Maj Evans-(TrH'mlets
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Renwick, George
Gore, Hon. F. S. Osmsby-
Lowther, Rt. Hon. J. (Kent)
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Staly bridge
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Lowther, Rt Hn J W (Cum. Penr.
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thornson
Greene, Sir E W (B'rySEdm'nds
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Robertson, H. (Hackney)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred

Ropner, Colonel Robert
Grenfell, William Henry
Macdona, John Cumming
Round, James
Gretton, John
MacIver, David (Liverpool
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Maconochie, A. W.
Rutherford, John
Groves, James Grimble
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alex.
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Majendie, James A. H.
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Hain, Edward
Malcolm. Ian
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Hall, Edward Marshall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Mid'x
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn W. F.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Max well, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Smith, H C (North'mb, Tyneside
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Smith, James P. (Lanarks.)
Harris F. Leverton (Tynemo'th
Middlemore, Jno. Throgmorton
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Milton, Viscount
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.)
Milward, Colonel Victor
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart

Heaton, John Henniker
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Stroyan, John
Henderson, Alexander
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants)
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotter
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Higginbottom, S. W.
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxford U.
Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampste'd
Morgan, David J. (Walthamstw
Tborburn, Sir Walter
Hogg, Lindsay
Morrell, George Herbert
Thornton, Percy M.
Hope, J. F (Sheffield, Brightside
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Morrison, James Archibald
Valentia, Viscount
Horner, Frederick William
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford)
Vincent, Col. Sir. C. E. H (Shef'ld
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Mount, William Arthur
Walker, Col. William Hall
Howard, CaptJ (Kent, Faversh.
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Walrond, Rt. Hon. Sir W. H.
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Muntz, Philip A.
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Welby, Lt.-Col. ACE (Taunton
Button, John (Yorks, N. R.)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John L.
Jackson, Rt. Hon. Wm. Lawies
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse

Myers, William Henry
Wilson, A. S. (Yorks, E. R.)
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Nicholson, William Graham
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Wilson Todd, W. H. (Yorks.)
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Parker, Gilbert
Wolff, Gustay Wilhelm
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.)
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Keswick, William
Penn, John
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Kimber, Henry
Percy, Earl
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Knowles, Lees
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Plummer, Walter R.
Law, Andrew Bonar
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Lawrence, William F.
Pretymann, Ernest George
Sir Frederick Dixon-Hartland and Mr. Whitmore.
Lawson, John Grant
Purvis, Robert
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham)
Pym, C. Guy
Words added::
Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to.
Second Reading put off for six months.
METROPOLITAN WATER COMPANIES (AMENDMENT OF ACTS) BILL. (By ORDER.)
Read a second time, and committed.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2).

Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, relating to Abertillery, Aspull, Briton Ferry, Cannock, Ebbw Vale, Faversham, Llandaff, and Dinas Powis, Llangollen, Neath (Borough), and Tredegar, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Gerald Balfour and Mr. Austen Chamberlain.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL.

"To confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882

and 1888, relating to Abertillery, Aspull, Briton Ferry, Cannock, Ebbw Vale, Faversham, Llandaff and Dinas Powis, Llangollen, Neath (Borough), and Tredegar," presented, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 120.]

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No.3).

Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, relating to Birstall, Cheshunt, Dorchester, Felling. Frome, Lichfield, Mitcham, New Hunstanton, Northfleet, and Skipton, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Gerald Balfour and Mr. Austen Chamberlain.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No.3) BILL.

"To confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, relating to Birstall, Cheshunt, Dorchester, Felling, Frome, Lichfield, Mitcham, New Hunstanton, Northfleet, and Skipton." presented, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 121.]

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 4).

Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, relating to Atherton, Ben-well and Fenham, Beverley, Burgess Hill, Chesham, East Cowes, Hindley, Honley, Standish-with-Langtree, and Stratford-upon-Avon, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Gerald Balfour and Mr. Austen Chamberlain.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 4) BILL.

"To confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, relating to Atherton, Ben-well, and Fenham, Beverley, Burgess Hill, Chesham, East Cowes, Hindley, Honley, Standish-with-Langtree, and Stratford-upon-Avon," presented, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 122.]

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

London Underground Railways.;That they have appointed a Committee of Five Lords to join with a Committee of this House to consider and report;:

1. Whether the lines of route for underground railways in and near London, proposed by Bills which have been or may be introduced during the present Session, are best calculated to afford facilities for present and probable future traffic; and, if not, what modifications of those lines of route are desirable;

2. What special provision, if any, should be made for the protection of the owners, lessees, and occupiers of properties adjacent to-underground railways from possible damage and annoyance;
 3. What special terms and conditions, if any, as to construction and working should be imposed upon the promoters;
 4. Whether any, and which, of the schemes proposed by the said Bills should not be proceeded with during the present session;
- and request this House to appoint an equal number of its Members to be joined with the said Lords.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to enable Henry Diaper and Company of Liverpool to issue transferable certificates and warrants for the delivery of goods; and for other purposes." Henry Diaper and Company (Delivery Warrants) Bill [Lords].

HENRY DIAPER AND COMPANY DELIVERY WARRANTS) BILL [Lords].

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

BRISTOL CORPORATION (DOCKS AND RAILWAYS, ETC.) BILL [Lords],

Copy ordered, "of the Report of the Board of Trade on the Bristol Corporation (Docks and Railways, etc.) Bill [Lords].";(Mr. Gerald Balfour.)

GLASGOW AND SOUTH WESTERN RAILWAY BILL.

Copy ordered, "of the Report of the Board of Trade on the Glasgow and South Western Railway Bill.";(Mr. Gerald Balfour.)

NORTH EASTERN RAILWAY BILL.

Copy ordered, "of the Report of the Board of Trade on the North Eastern Railway Bill.";(Mr. Gerald Balfour.)

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 1) BILL.

Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill.";(Mr. Gerald Balfour.)

STANDING ORDERS.

Resolutions reported from the Committee::

1."That, in the case of the Kings-court, Keady, and Armagh Railway Bill, Petition of the 'Meath County Council' for dispensing with Standing Order 129 in the case of their Petition against the Bill, the said Standing Order ought to be dispensed with."

2."That, in the case of the Biggleswade Water Board, Petition for leave to deposit a Petition for Bill, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with;; That the parties be permitted to deposit their Petition for a Bill."

3."That, in the case of the Watford and District Tramways Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with;;That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that Tramway No.7, and so much of Tramway ways Nos. 1, 10, and 11 as are within the district of the Watford Rural District Council be struck out of the Bill;;That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

4."That, in the case of the Wales and Loughton Railway, Petition for leave to deposit a Petition for Bill, the Standing Orders ought not to be dispensed

with."

5."That, in the case of the Shannon Water and Electric Power Bill, Petition of ' Robert John Quaile and Augusta Anderson ' for dispensing with Standing Order 129 in the case of their Petition against the Bill, the said Standing Order ought not to be dispensed with."

First Three Resolutions agreed to.

Report to lie upon the Table.

LONDON, TILBURY, AND SOUTHEND RAILWAY BILL.

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

HARTLEPOOLS GAS AND WATER TRANSFER BILL.

Reported [Preamble not proved]; Report to lie upon the Table.

PETITIONS.

AGRICULTURAL RATES ACT, 1896.

Petition from Fife, against re-enactment; to lie upon the Table.

BEER BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Ingleby Greenhow; Darlington; Cowbridge; Ramsholt; Neyland; Milford; Acton; Haverfordwest; Tenby; Saundersfoot; Fishguard; Penally; Blymhill; Brigg; Sudbury; Milborne St. Andrews; Dullingham; and Narberth; to lie upon the Table.

CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

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

COAL MINES (EMPLOYMENT) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Leven; Denby; Greasborough; Markham Colliery; Primrose Main; Barnsley Main; Hickleton; Kilburn; Redding; B. Winning; Cliff; Moresby; Harrington; Fords Colliery; Skelton Park; Kilton; Lazenby; and Eston; to lie upon the Table.

COMPENSATION FOR DAMAGE TO CROPS BILL.

Petition from Fife, in favour, to lie upon the Table.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (HIGHER GRADE AND EVENING CONTINUATION SCHOOLS).

Petitions for alteration of Law, from Mexborough; Horwich; and Tyne-mouth; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION BILL.

Petition from Peterborough, against: to lie upon the Table.

MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Leven; Denby; Markham Colliery; Greas- borough; B. Winning; Kilton; Cliff; Barnsley; Primrose Main; Hickleton; Kilburn; Redding; Eston; Lazenby; Skelton Park; Harrington; Moresby; and Ford's Colliery; to lie upon the Table,

OFFICERS OF THE INDIAN STAFF CORPS.

Petitions for redress of grievances, from Alexander Lee; A. Skeen; H. L. Richardson; M. E. L. Bruce; and Colin Finch; to lie upon the Table.

PARLIAMENTARY FRANCHISE.

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

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Holt; and Melton Constable; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

Petitions in favour, from West Thorney; Amlwch; Penyfarnedd; Holyhead; Llangefni; Llanfairpwllgwyagyll; Beaumaris; Bodedern; Menai Bridge; Llan-degfan; Llanlithgowshire; Hull (two); Aspull; Sneinton; Shipley; Kidderminster; Lancaster; Christchurch; Boscombe; Liverpool; Arundel; Saffron Walden; Fenton (two); Blackburn (two); Brynamman; Gwynfe; Llangadock; Blackheath; Penygroes; Felmfoel; Hunslet; Shipley; Wigan; Porth-leven; Goxhill; Prestwich; Berwick-upon-Tweed; Brysley; Barnoldby; Ashby; Stallingborough; Bristol; Old Bolingbroke; Heanor (two); Lang-ley Mill; Riddings; Codnor (four); Penryn; Pendleton; Retford; Sandown; Long Eaton; Marlpool; Ancoats; London; Chester; Newport Pagnell; Doncaster; Scunthorpe; Macclesfield; South Ferriby; and Wolverton; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Finstown: Kirknewton (two); Whitburn; Edinburgh; Leith (two); Nesting (two); Paisley; St. Monance; Bathgate; Fauld-house; Cullen (two); Barrhead; Newtonmore; Grangemouth; Laurence Kirk; Dundonald; Melrose; and Berwick-upon-Tweed; to lie upon the Table.

SOVEREIGN'S OATH ON ACCESSION BILL.

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

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE.

Copy presented, of Annual Reports of Proceedings under the Diseases of Animals Acts, etc., the Markets and Fairs (Weighing of Cattle) Acts, for the year 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

MINES AND QUARRIES.

Copy presented, of Reports of His Majesty's Inspectors of Mines for the year 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

MEDICAL COUNCILS.

Accounts presented, for 1900 of the General Medical Council and Branch Councils, and of the Dental Registration Fund [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

INEBRIATES ACTS, 1879 TO 1899 (RULES FOR RETREATS).

Copy presented, of Rules for Retreats licensed under the Inebriates Acts, 1879 to 1899, dated 28th February, 1901, approved by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in substitution for the Rules dated 18th October, 1900 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 99.]

LAND TRANSFER ACT, 1897.

Copy presented, of Order in Council of 9th March, 1901, further postponing the operation of the Land Transfer Order in Council of 18th July, 1898, as regards the City of London, until the 1st January, 1902 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

SPRING ASSIZES ACT, 1879.

Copies presented, of Two Orders in Council of 9th March, 1901, relating to Spring Assize Counties, Nos. 2 and 3 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY.

Return ordered, "giving populations of the cities of Belfast, Londonderry, Cork, Waterford, and Limerick; number of permanent police force in each city; number of free constables allowed to each city; number of constables paid for by each

city; amount paid by each of said cities during past year for extra police at exceptional periods during the year; amount paid by each of said cities for the ordinary police force last year.";(Mr. O'Doherty.)

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR;THE LINDLEY SURRENDER.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state who are the persons who raised the white flags named in the inquiry into the case of Colonel Spragge.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): I think, perhaps, the House will excuse my giving the names, especially as in one case, owing to the person affected being wounded, there has been a delay in hearing his explanation.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: Can the right hon. Gentleman say whether any proceedings have been taken against them or any punishment inflicted?

MR. BRODRICK: Yes, proceedings were taken.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): Has any punishment been inflicted?

[No answer was given.]

FINANCIAL CONDITION OF ANNEXED REPUBLICS;BEEWAARPLAATZEN.

MR. M'DERMOTT (Kilkenny, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has yet received a report from Sir David Barbour on the financial condition of the Transvaal and of the Orange River Colony; and, if so, whether it includes an estimate of the value of the Beewaarplaatzen; whether His Majesty's Government are aware that the Government of the late South African Republic has decided to sell the mining rights in this property by public auction, the proceeds to be applied to the general revenue of the Republic; and whether His Majesty's Government intend to dispose of those rights by a similar process or by allowing the present mine owners to acquire them at a valuation.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.):Sir David Barbour has not yet completed his investigation, and until he has done so I cannot publish any communication from him. He has been specially asked to report on the subject of the Beewaarplaatzen.

PEACE NEGOTIATIONS WITH GENERAL BOTHA.

MR. BLACK (Banffshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he expects that his or any other Government Department will receive from Lord Kitchener a written Report of his Lordships conversation with General Botha upon 28th ultimo; and whether this Report, with any observations or recommendation which may accompany it, will be published in its entirety as soon as received, even although the House should not be then in session.

MR. BRODRICK: I hope to receive a despatch from Lord Kitchener, and will immediately on its receipt consider as to its publication. It is not customary to give a pledge in advance as to despatches not yet received.

CAPE FIELD ARTILLERY VOLUNTEERS.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): beg to ask the Secretary of State for War-whether any arrangements have yet been made to relieve the Cape Field Artillery

Volunteers, who have been on active service in South Africa since the commencement of the war.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire. Westthoughton): The arrangements relating to the Cape Field Artillery Volunteers are made by the Cape Government. I am not therefore in a position to reply to the hon. Member.

ALLEGED BRITISH ARMY ENLISTMENTS IN SILESIA.

MR. J. F. X. O'BRIEN (Cork): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he has any official information to the effect that in the early days of this month the police commissioner of Zittau, in Saxony, warned the public against attempts made by two English agents to enlist recruits in Silesia for the English Army in the Transvaal and requested that immediate notice of their appearance in any district should be given at the nearest police station; and that 650 young men, who had been enlisted for the English Army, and were on their way from Southern Italy to Antwerp and Liverpool, were stopped by the authorities at the Milan Railway Station.

LORD STANLEY: No, Sir.

IMPERIAL YEOMANRY TRAINING.

CAPTAIN BAGOT (Westmoreland, Kendal): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state what is the total number of officers and men of the Imperial Yeomanry sent to South Africa, and what is the number of officers and men out of that total who had received one or more trainings with a Yeomanry regiment before joining the Imperial Yeomanry; and whether the Colonial mounted contingents are trained as mounted infantry or as cavalry before leaving the colonies.

MR. BRODRICK: 10,717 officers and men were despatched with the original force and 13,702 have been already sent of the force recent by raised. It is not possible to give the information required by the second portion of the question, but I will inquire if the Yeomanry regiments can furnish it. It is not possible to say with accuracy how the Colonial contingents were trained, but I believe there was no general training in cavalry tactics.

YEOMANRY ESTABLISHMENT.

CAPTAIN BAGOT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, in the event of it being found impossible to bring an existing regiment of Yeomanry up to the required strength of four squadrons and 500 men, will any such regiment be disbanded, or will local circumstances be taken into consideration and any exceptions made.

MR. BRODRICK: A regiment of Yeomanry will be liable to be disbanded if it falls below 420, and a squadron if it falls below 100. The question of enforcing the liability will rest with the War Office, and local circumstances will certainly be taken into consideration.

RESERVE OF OFFICERS.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, with reference to the position of officers of the reserve of officers who were called out to serve with Reserve regiments in June last, whether some of such officers were informed that on the Reserve regiments being broken up and Provisional

regiments formed in their places their services would no longer be required, and that this would come into force on the 7th of March, but that instead of this-taking place, some of these officers have now been required to continue their service with the Provisional regiment and others with Regular regiments; and whether such action is in keeping with the promises made to these officers and with statements made in this House as to the intentions of the War Office, and what is intended to be done as to retaining these officers.

LORD STANLEY: The General Officer commanding a district in Ireland allowed certain officers of the Reserve to go on leave pending their release from service. Circumstances have, however, rendered, it impossible to spare these officers, and it has been found necessary to recall them. No promises have been made from headquarters to these officers, but there is every intention to allow them to return to civil life as soon as the emergency will permit.

REGIMENTAL ACCOUNT-KEEPING.

*MR. TOMKINSON (Cheshire, Crewe): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in his new scheme of Army reform, he will include a provision to relieve squadron and company officers from the responsibility of their accounts, and revert to the old system of regimental paymasters.

LORD STANLEY: The old system of regimental paymasters in no way relieved officers commanding companies and squadrons from the responsibility of their accounts. There is no intention of

reverting to the system of regimental paymasters. The question whether any alteration should be made to meet the difficulties connected with the payment of soldiers on active service is now receiving consideration.

ROYAL MILITARY ACADEMY, WOOLWICH; ST. PATRICK'S DAY.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that at the church parade on St. Patrick's Day at the Royal Military Academy, Woolwich, the officer in command ordered all the cadets wearing shamrock to remove it; and can he explain why the cadets at the Royal Military Academy are specially exempted from the permission accorded generally to the Army by the late Queen.

*MR. BRODRICK: The Governor of the Royal Military Academy informs me that cadets were allowed to wear shamrock on St. Patrick's Day at all the parades except church parade. At this particular parade the bunches of shamrock worn in the helmets were of such abnormal proportions, and occasioned so much jocularly and unsteadiness in the ranks, that the officer on duty directed their removal in the interests of the respect due to divine service.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: Did the subaltern in charge give the order on his own responsibility?

*MR. BRODRICK: Yes; and I think that under the circumstances he was probably justified.

SALISBURY PLAIN; POLICE ARRANGEMENTS.

MR. FULLER (Wiltshire, Westbury): beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what arrangements he proposes to make for policing the increasing population that is being attracted to the eastern part of Salisbury Plain in consequence of the establishment of the camps, and whether he proposes to enter into negotiations

with the county authority on the subject.

*LORD STANLEY: Arrangements have already been made with the Chief Constable for extra police. As the population increases the arrangements will be extended.

INFANTRY SOLDIERS' KITS.

MR. KEIK HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will agree to placing infantry soldiers on the same footing as Royal Marines in the matter of underclothing by supplying three shirts to them on enlistment and one yearly thereafter during their period of service.

*LORD STANLEY: I have nothing to add to the reply I gave to the hon. Member on Thursday last.

MARK IV. BULLETS.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL (Mayo, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will state the value of the four-and-a-half millions of Mark IV-bullets that were broken up because of their uselessness; whether he will give the name of the firm that supplied such material; and whether, under the circumstances, any refund has been made to the Government; and, if so, when, and of what amount.

*LORD STANLEY: I have nothing to add to the reply which I gave to similar questions put by the hon. Members for Kilkenny and Ross and Cromarty on Friday last.

ARMY STAFF REORGANISATION.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if his proposals for the reorganisation of the Staff of the Army will extend to the formation of a body of Officers on a basis similar to that of the General Staff in Berlin, solely engaged in preparing for every eventuality of war, unencumbered by administrative duty.

*MR. BRODRICK: This question will be carefully considered, but I am not yet in a position to explain the exact distribution of duties.

ARMY REORGANISATION;THE RESERVE.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, having regard to the fact that the first reinforcements for the Field Army in South Africa, to the number of over

See page 700. See page 849.

13,000 men, were furnished by the Militia Reserve, and that such reinforcements were necessary within three months of the declaration of war to supply the wastage of a campaign, if he will be good enough to state from what source under his proposals such reinforcements will be obtained if the Militia Reserve for the Army is abolished.

*MR. BRODRICK: The Army Reserve will in the normal be considerably increased by the percentage of three years men now taken who give nine years service in the Reserve; and also by the fact that the establishment of home battalions has been raised from 720 to 800. These steps were taken in 1898, and had not come into operation when the Militia Reserve was called up in 1900.

WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY IN THE NAVY.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, in view of the development of Marconi's wireless telegraphy on board the "Ophir,"

the escorting cruisers, and the stations at Gibraltar and Malta, the Admiralty will request the electricians to furnish special reports describing the operations, giving specimens of the messages transmitted from vessel to vessel and between the vessels and the shore, and also stating the distances between which they have been communicated; and will he also state on what number of His Majesty's ships installations of apparatus for wireless telegraphy have been made and arranged for.

*THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): The "Ophir" is not fitted with wireless telegraph apparatus. Wireless telegraphy has been in use in His Majesty's Navy for some time, and it is not expected that any special information will be derived from the operations conducted by the cruisers accompanying the "Ophir," or that any report upon the subject would be of value. Thirty-six of His Majesty's ships have installations of wireless telegraphy, and arrangements are in progress for installing the apparatus on other ships.
NAVY AND NAVAL RESERVE; STATISTICS OF NATIONALITY.

MR. BLACK: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the Return on the Paper of to-day as being moved for by me will be given as an unopposed Return,†

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The preparation of the Return asked for by the hon. Member would involve considerable time, labour, and expense, and, if it were furnished, it would not give the information which it is desired to obtain; the place of birth of officers and men serving affording no certain indication that the parents are natives of the country where the children are born. No inquiry is made by the Admiralty as to the particular locality from which officers and men come, the Service being common to the United Kingdom.

ADMIRALTY CONTRACTS;PENALTIES FOR DELAYS.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the Admiralty, what was the total amount of penalties for delay in the fulfilment of Admiralty contracts incurred during the year 1900, and the amount of the penalties enforced during the same period.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The total amount of penalties for delay in the fulfilment of shipbuilding contracts, during the year ending 31 December, 1900, was £;172,911, and penalties were inflicted to the extent of £;1,177.

WEST AFRICAN GOLD MINING COMPANIES.

MR. M'DERMOTT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any, and, if so, what West African Gold Mining Companies pay tax on their gross receipts; and what are the considerations in respect of which they make such payment.

†The following is the Return referred to:;"Return of the nationality of the personnel in active service in His Majesty's Navy, distinguishing between English, Scotch, Irish, Welsh, and Colonial; also between the Navy proper and the Naval Reserve; and showing the number of each nationality in each, rating."

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Two companies, the Ashanti Goldfields Corporation and the Castle Cold Exploration Syndicate, pay a royalty to the Cold Coast Government on the gross value of all gold got from the lands occupied by them. These payments, which are due under agreements made some years before the passing of the

Concessions Ordinance, are made by the companies in consideration of their having been authorised by the Government to occupy the lands leased to them by the native owners.

ASHANTI; MILITARY OPERATIONS.

MR. M'DERMOTT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can state the number of towns and villages which have been destroyed during the recent military operations in Ashanti; and, whether any steps have been taken to ascertain the extent of the destitution and loss of life caused by the destruction of the habitations of the people and of their crops and other food stuffs.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No; but in reply to inquiries I made at the time, I was assured that the destruction of towns and villages was limited to what was absolutely necessary to produce submission, but that the food supply was practically inexhaustible, and that there was no danger of famine or destitution.

CHINA; RUSSO-CHINESE AGREEMENT.

MR. HARWOOD (Bolton): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if the suggested agreement between Russia and China will affect the interests of British traders in those parts of China which are proposed to be thus brought under Russian influence.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRANBORNE, Rochester): The versions of the proposed agreement which have come under our notice contain provisions which would apparently affect British trade interests in China in those parts of the Empire to which the agreement applies.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT (Sheffield, Ecclesall): I beg to ask a question of which I have given private notice, namely, whether the Chinese Government has at present refused to sign the agreement regarding Manchuria which Russia is now pressing upon her, and will the Government support China in her refusal.

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: His Majesty's Government cannot pretend to be accurately informed as to the precise position of the negotiations, to which this country is not a party, and under these circumstances I must respectfully decline to answer any hypothetical question as to our conduct.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): Is it intended on the part of the Government to intimate to China that Russia will not be allowed to take Manchuria?

[No answer was returned.]

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): Do as you did at Fashoda.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I shall give notice.

ALLEGED LOOTING AT PEKING.

MR. PIRIE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that the Chief Ordnance Officer of the Staff of General Chaffee in China stated that the British looted openly and systematically and sold the plunder by auction each afternoon at the British Legation under the direction of an officer, the proceeds being used for the soldiers; and whether he will cause inquiries to be made from General Gaselee with a view of contradicting such a statement if incorrect, or if not, of dealing adequately with those permitting such a state

of affairs.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR; INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): I am not aware of any statement of the kind said to have been made; but as I have before said, if any specific allegation is brought to my notice I will cause inquiries to be made into it.

CUTTING SUBMARINE CABLES IN WAR TIME.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs

whether he will cause to be presented to this House, as soon as possible, a Copy of the Code of Law issued by the Navy Department and signed by the President of the United States, concerning matters relating to the cutting of submarine cables in war.

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: Inquiry will be made through His Majesty's Ambassador at Washington as to whether there is any objection to publishing the rules in the United States Naval War Code relating to submarine telegraphic cables. If not, I shall be happy to give the hon. and gallant Member the information he requires.

INDIAN MINTS; SILVER COINAGE.

MR. GRENFELL (Buckinghamshire, Wycombe): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been directed to the fact that with the mints closed to the free coinage of silver, no less than seventeen and a quarter crores of rupees have been coined during the past year in India; whether so large a number of rupees were ever coined in a single year when the Indian mints were open to the free coinage of silver, and if so, in what years; and what has been the average profit per rupee coined during the financial year.

LORD G. HAMILTON: The coinage in India during the twelve months from 1st March, 1900, to 28th February, 1901, appears to have been a little over sixteen crores of rupees. This is nearly equal to the amount of the coinage in 1877-78, the greatest hitherto recorded. The average profit per rupee coined cannot yet be stated, but it is doubtless very large; possibly about 30 per cent, of the coined value may be profit. The profit is not being treated as revenue, but is being set apart in a gold reserve fund. There is no intention of again considering proposals for the re-opening of the Indian mints to the free coinage of silver.

ARMY AND NAVY WORKS EXPENDITURE.

SIR CHARLES DILKE: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what is now the Estimate of expenditure in the present financial year, and what the Estimate for the next financial

year of the Expenditure on Capital Account by the Admiralty and the War Office under the Naval Works Acts, the Military Works Acts, or otherwise, in addition to any sums repaid by annuities charged on Estimates.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): The amounts issued on Capital Accounts in 1900-1, which may be taken to represent probable expenditure, are as follows;

£;

1. To the Admiralty, for Naval Works
2,135,000

2. To the War Office, for Military Works

1,200,000

£;3,335,000

To this must be added the Charge for Annuities paid in respect of Loans under the old Barracks Act

286,000

£;3,621,000

It is not yet known what the expenditure is likely to be next year, nor could I make myself responsible for an Estimate for it.

OFFICERS ON ACTIVE SERVICE AND INCOME TAX.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he could consider the possibility of exempting officers serving in South Africa from Income Tax on their pay.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: It would be quite unprecedented to do this. Officers of the British Army serving abroad are by law chargeable on the pay they receive through the War Office, and have never heretofore been exempted by reason of foreign service.

OVERCROWDED RAILWAY CARRIAGES.

MR. GRAY (West Ham, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the overcrowding of many of the trains and the lack of proper accommodation at the stations on the London, Tilbury, and Southend line, particularly

between London and Barking; and whether he can exercise any power to remedy the defects of which complaint is made.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): I am afraid the Board of Trade cannot put a stop to overcrowding on railways; I have, however, communicated with the company on the subject of the Hon. Member's question, and I shall be happy to show him the reply, which is lengthy.

LIGHT RAILWAYS IN THE HIGHLANDS.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that, under The Railways (Ireland) Act. 1896, the Treasury is under no restriction as to the amount of an advance where, the proposed railway is situated wholly or mainly in a congested districts county; and, in view of the fact that, under the existing Act, it is not practicable to secure the construction of light railways in the Highland crofting counties, will the Government consider the expediency of amending the Light Railways Act, 1896, so as to enable the Treasury to give grants to light railways in the crofting counties without the limit imposed by Section 5 of the Light Railways Act.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: No, Sir, I am not prepared to propose an alteration of the Act in the direction suggested. I am not satisfied that the Amendment referred to by the hon. Member is necessary in order to enable Light Railways to be made in the High- lands.

MR. WEIR: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that not a single light railway has been constructed in the Highlands under the Light Railways Act?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: No. Sir.

DUNKELD RAILWAY FACILITIES.

MR. STROYAN (Perthshire, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he is aware of the dissatisfaction among the inhabitants of Dunkeld and district in consequence of the alleged insufficient facilities provided by the Highland Railway Company for this centre on the southern section of the Highland Railway; and especially in connection with the train leaving Perth at 6.15 a.m., which passes Dunkeld without stopping, this arrangement making it impossible for passengers travelling to stations north of Aviemore to leave Dunkeld until 12.15 p.m., and further making it necessary to carry the morning mails and newspapers on to Ballinluig, from which junction they are brought back to Dunkeld; and will he give this matter and the claims of the inhabitants of Dunkeld to better treatment at the hands of the company his consideration.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Questions relating to the reasonableness of the facilities furnished by railway companies for the forwarding of traffic are for the Railway and Canal Commissioners and not for the Board of Trade; but I shall be happy to communicate with the company on the subject of the hon. Member's question, and inform him of the result.

GAMBLING IN GRAIN OPTIONS.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he has had any communication from the German Government upon gambling in grain options; whether he will inquire into the operation of the German law prohibiting such gambling in food stuffs; and whether there is any prospect of the Continental, United States, and British Governments considering the advisability of co-operating to prevent a corner in corn being manipulated in the corn exchange markets by gamblers in futures.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I have had no communication from the German Government on this subject. Reports on the operation of the German law regulating produce exchanges have been received from time to time through His Majesty's Embassy in Berlin. The last, published in the "Board of Trade", Journal for 12th April, 1900, reported the reopening of the Berlin produce exchange. I see no need for a special inquiry. So far as I am aware there is no present prospect of such action as is suggested in the last paragraph.

VENTILATION ON THE METROPOLITAN RAILWAY.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that under Section 23 of the Metropolitan Railway Company Act of the 2nd August, 1898, the Railway Company is enjoined either to adopt a system of electric traction or to arrange artificial means of ventilating the railway otherwise than by openings within a period of three years from the passing of the Act; and will he ascertain what steps the company have taken with a view to carry out these conditions, and will he consider the expediency of enforcing them.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: No, Sir, that is not quite the effect of the section referred to. It is, however, I think, common knowledge that the company are taking active steps to select a satisfactory form of electric traction.

MR. WEIR: Have not this company had three years in which to provide electric traction or to arrange artificial means of ventilation?

[No answer was given.]

FOREHOE (NORFOLK) GUARDIANS.

MR. F. W. WILSON (Norfolk, Mid): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he is aware that owing to differences between the Forehoe (Norfolk) Guardians and the master of the workhouse, forty-four out of forty-seven members of the board resigned their seats, and that practically the whole of these guardians have been reelected by the ratepayers; whether the Local Government Board is sustaining the master against the board of guardians; and, seeing that meetings of the guardians have ceased through inability to form a quorum, what steps the Local Government Board intends to take to replace the public control by elected guardians which has hitherto existed.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): I am aware of the

circumstances of the case referred to in the first paragraph of the question.

The number of members who tendered their resignation was, however, less than that supposed by the hon. Member, and these resignations did not take effect as I did not accept them. The guardians wished that the master of the workhouse should be removed from office; but, after an inquiry had been held on the subject by two of the inspectors of the Local Government Board, I came to the conclusion that there was no sufficient ground for his dismissal. The administration of the affairs of the incorporation devolves upon the guardians, and the responsibility for any difficulty which may arise from any failure to attend the necessary meetings must rest entirely with them. I have caused the guardians individually to be reminded of their duties and responsibilities, and I trust that there will be no further difficulty in the matter.

LEADLESS GLAZE; GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS.

MR. TALBOT (Oxford University): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the War Office have assimilated their practice to that of the Office of Works in the matter of the use of leadless glaze in china and earthenware goods ordered by contract.

LORD STANLEY: The existing War Department contract for earthenware goods, which runs for three years and has been in force since the 1st February, 1900, prescribes the use of leadless glaze.

MR. TALBOT: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the Admiralty have assimilated their practice to that of the Office of Works in the matter of the use of leadless glaze china and earthenware goods ordered by contract.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The matter is now under consideration in connection with the tenders for next year's supply of earthenware goods, the manufacturers having been asked to give alternative tenders for the ordinary and the leadless glaze.

MR. TALBOT: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the use of leadless glaze on china and earthenware goods is now required in the Departments over which the Treasury has control.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): I am obliged to my right hon. friend for calling my attention to this matter. I find that nearly all the china and earthenware required by the Departments referred to in this question is supplied by the Board of Works. In

the few cases in which this is not done I will endeavour to arrange that the use of leadless glaze shall as far as possible be insisted upon. I am, however, informed by the Postmaster General that he has not, as yet, been able to secure sufficient numbers of properly glazed insulators for telegraph purposes treated without lead, but he hopes that before long the present difficulties may have been overcome, and that he may be in a position to give orders that only insulators treated with leadless glaze are to be used.

SCHOOL ACCOMMODATION IN LONDON.

MR. TALBOT: I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education what basis is taken for calculating deficiencies in school accommodation in the district of the London School Board.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): The basis taken is always the amount of accommodation for which a given school is actually recognised by the Board of Education.

MR. TALBOT: Is the basis of population determined by the last census, or by the present estimate of population?

SIR J. GORST: Perhaps the right hon Gentleman will put the question down for Thursday, when I shall be able to answer it.

IRISH DRIFT SURVEY.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether he can state when the Drift Survey for Ireland was commenced; when it was completed; whether the maps embodying the said Irish Drift Survey have been published; and whether they were six-inch maps similar to those now being published for England.

SIR J. GORST: It was commenced in 1845 and completed in 1887.

PRIVATE POSTAL COLLECTIONS; SHEFFIELD CASK.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether any decision has been arrived at which will meet the claims put forward by Mr. J. G. Graves, of Sheffield, for having parcels of a certain postal value collected at his works.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General has sanctioned an arrangement by which registered letters and parcels of whatever value can be collected under certain conditions from the premises of private firms and others who may desire to post such articles in large numbers. The necessary constructions for regulating this service are now being issued.

SMALL HOLDINGS IN SCOTTISH CROFTING COUNTIES.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if the Secretary for Scotland will consider the expediency of introducing legislation with a view to an amendment and extension of the Local Government Act of 1894, so as to enable parish councils to acquire land compulsorily for allotments and small holdings by an inexpensive process; and will he state the number of allotments which have been secured in the six crofting counties under the existing legislation.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): The Secretary for Scotland cannot come under the obligation suggested in the first paragraph of the hon. Member's question. The information asked for in the second paragraph of the question cannot be obtained from any official Department, but a Return on the

subject of allotments has been moved by the hon. Member for Clackmannan, which will include the information desired.

LOCH CARLOWAY.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the Fishery Board for Scotland has received a copy of a resolution passed at a mass meeting of fishermen held at Carloway, Lewis, on the 11th instant, urging that a beacon should be erected on Tanasgeir, Loch Carloway; and will he state the nature of the reply sent to the fishermen.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: A copy of the resolution referred to was received by the Fishery Board for Scotland, who replied that they were not the body charged by Parliament with the management and control of lights. The Secretary for Scotland has requested the Fishery Board to send the Papers to the Northern Lights Commissioners.

AVOCH HARBOUR.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, seeing that Mr. Fletcher, of Rosehaugh, Ross-shire, has allowed the Provisional Order, granted to him in July, 1894, for the construction of a harbour at Avoch to lapse; and, in view of the fact that Avoch is a fishing station, and that the fishermen have suffered pecuniary loss for the want of suitable harbour accommodation, will the Secretary for Scotland state what steps it is proposed to take in the matter so that the fishing industry in this district may not be further injured.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The matter is not one for the intervention of the Secretary for Scotland, but lies with those locally interested in the harbour; and any proper representation made to the Fishery Board on the subject will no doubt be duly considered.

ROADS IN THE ISLAND OF LEWIS.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if he will state what progress has been made with the arrangements for the construction of a road between Gravir and Cromore in the Park District of the Island of Lewis.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I am informed by the Congested Districts Board that one or more members will probably meet the local promoters on the spot next month, and come to a conclusion as to the best route to adopt.

CONGESTION ON THE ISLAND OF BARRA.

MR. JOHN DEWAR (Inverness): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the Congested Districts Board have succeeded in acquiring land from Lady Gordon Cathcart to relieve the congestion among the crofters and cottars in the Island of Barra.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The land in Barra which has been purchased by the Congested Districts Board from Lady Gordon Cathcart includes North-bay, Groan, Clias, and Ardveenish, approximately about 3,000 acres, with complete possession of a great portion of it during the present year.

CROFTERS' COMMISSION REPORTS.

MR. JOHN DEWAR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, having regard to the fact that the Annual Reports of the Crofters' Commission are frequently required for reference in the various districts of the crofting counties, can arrangements be made for these Reports to be sent to the sheriff clerks' offices in each of the six crofting counties, so that they may be readily available.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The gratuitous distribution of Parliamentary Papers is only sanctioned under exceptional circumstances, which do not appear to exist in the case referred to by the hon. Member. So far as the Secretary for Scotland is aware, no similar demand has been made for them during the fourteen years these Reports have been issued. Each Annual Report is published by the Stationery Office at the price of 11s. 6d. If the Secretary for Scotland were convinced that there is a reason for a somewhat exceptional course he would be willing to approach the Treasury on the subject.

DONEGAL FISHERIES.

MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that loans are issued by the Congested Districts Board to fishermen in congested districts for the purchase of herring nets and for fishing gear; that in June and July the only fishing available along the north coast of Donegal is

for salmon; and that application has been made to the Board by fishermen in congested districts for loans for salmon nets, as at present the fishermen are handicapped by the terms upon which they only can procure nets locally; and whether the Board have determined that the loans for the purchase of salmon nets would be contrary to their policy; and, if so, whether the Government will direct the Agricultural and Industries Department to consider this matter and issue loans in congested districts to fishermen and others requiring them for salmon nets on terms similar to those upon which herring nets are supplied by the Congested Districts Board.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The reply to the first query is in the affirmative. Both the Congested Districts Board and the Department of Agriculture have decided to adhere, for the present, to the policy hitherto adopted by the Fishery Authorities in refusing to make loans for the purchase of salmon nets.

MR. O'DOHERTY: Cannot the Agricultural Department grant loans for salmon nets for fishermen on the same terms as the Congested Districts Board lends money for the purchase of herring nets?

MR. WYNDHAM: No, Sir; and for the reason that salmon nets can be obtained on very favourable terms from the merchants.

LOUGH FOYLE SALMON FISHERY LICENCES.

*MR. O'DOHERTY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the annual licensing duty payable by the fishermen of Lough Foyle for the privilege of fishing for salmon in the open sea outside the lough; how many hours per week do those licences enable fishermen to fish for salmon; what is the annual licence payable by fishermen in inland rivers and loughs for the privilege of fishing for salmon; and to whom does the money thus payable by these fishermen go; do the conservators or those to whom this money is payable apply any of it for protecting the Foyle and Bann fisheries for the Irish Society of London, who receive an annual rent of £3,000 for them; and will the Government take steps to carry out the suggestion by witnesses from the districts examined before the Inland Fisheries Commission that the fishermen who have to fish in the open sea outside the lough

should be granted licences at lesser sums than at present, and that the money at present payable by the conservators or those to whom the licence duty at present goes should not be spent in protecting the fisheries for the Irish Society, who receive annually such a rental out of the property.

MR. WYNDHAM: The licence duty-payable on each drift net for taking salmon in the open sea outside Lough Foyle is £;3. These nets may be used for 120 hours per week, during the annual open season. In inland rivers and loughs the licence duty on drift nets is £;3, that on snap nets ranges from 15s. to 30s. The moneys paid for licences are received by boards of conservators. The funds of these boards are expended in paying bailiffs to enforce the fishery laws; but I have no information as to how far the protection thus afforded is carried out in the special interest of any fishery proprietor, or of the public who fish on their common law rights. The fixing of licences within statutory limits rests with boards of conservators, subject to the approval of the Department of Agriculture. The Department is not at present prepared to apply for legislation enabling it to fix licences for this district in opposition to the views of the conservators.

KINNAGOE BAY, MOVILLE.

*MR. O'DOHERTY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if the attention of the Congested Districts Board (Ireland) has been called to the necessity for the improvement of the landing accommodation at Kinnagoe Bay, near Moville; and, seeing that a report was made by the engineer of said board as far back as 1894 as to the necessity of this work, and a drawing and estimate furnished for the carrying out of this work, that a memorial has been received from the local fishermen pointing out the necessity for the work in question, and as the engineer of the Congested Districts Board estimates the cost at £;190, whether directions will be given to the board to have this work carried out at once.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Board's engineer reported on the nature of, not the necessity for, the work mentioned. The question of undertaking it is at present under consideration by the Board.

IRISH AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRIES.

*MR. O'DOHERTY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland what steps, if any, have been taken by the new Department of Agriculture in Ireland to put into operation Section 17, sub-section (a), of the Agricultural and Technical Instruction (Ireland) Act, 1899; has the Department instituted any investigation with a view to have this sub-section duly administered; and has the head of the Department considered the necessity of appointing a permanent official, such as those appointed by the Canadian and other Governments, for the purpose of having this section properly put into force, and thereby protecting the agricultural and other industries in Ireland.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Department is not yet in a position to take action under the provision referred to. Information on matters coming within the scope of the section is being obtained. The question of the appointment of an official having expert knowledge of the subjects to be dealt with has not escaped the attention of the Department. It has, however, been considered advisable to postpone a

decision in the matter until it can be ascertained to what extent technical assistance of the nature required can be afforded by other Departments.

*MR. O'DOHERTY: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the Vice-President of the Department applied for special permission to appoint an expert to carry out this section of the Act, and that the Treasury refused?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

BUNAGEE PIER.

*MR. O'DOHERTY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the pier at Bunagee, Culdaff, was erected according to plans and upon a site selected by the Board of Works: when was it erected; how much did it cost; how much of the total cost was contributed out of the local rates: whether his attention has been called to a speech delivered by his predecessor in office, on the cutting of the first sod of the Carndonagh line of railway, wherein he designated this construction as a dry land pier: and, whether compensation will be made by the Irish Government for the money thus expended by the Board of Works, either in providing a harbour of refuge for fishing boats along this coast, or in cutting a canal to bring water to this dry land pier so that it may be of some service for the purpose for which it was constructed.

MR. WYNDHAM: The site for the pier referred to was selected not by the Board of Works, but by the Fishery Piers and Harbours Commissioners; a body created by the Sea Fisheries Act, 1883. The plans were approved by the Commissioners, and the pier was completed in November, 1887. The cost was £3,842, of which the sum of £239 was provided by loan payable out of local rates, £3,353 advanced by way of Grant under the Act of 1883, and £250 contributed by persons interested in the locality. I have not seen a report of the speech referred to in the second paragraph. With reference to the third paragraph, I have already informed the hon. Member that the suggested construction of a harbour of refuge on this coast is a project which can only be considered in connection with similar projects of considerable magnitude.

CONTEMPT OF COURT; WIDOW SALMON'S CASE.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will give a Return of the number of cases of contempt of court that have been dealt with in the Westport petty sessions district within the past five years, and the term of imprisonment imposed in each case.

MR. WYNDHAM: There has been only one such case, that of Mrs. Salmon, referred to in the next question of the hon. Member.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will give a Return of the number of times that Widow Salmon, of Carrowkennedy, near Westport, has been convicted at the Westport petty sessions, the date of each conviction, the date of her committal and release from prison, and the term spent in prison on each separate occasion, and the nature of the charge for which she was so convicted: whether he is aware that on a recent occasion this woman got a sentence of one month's imprisonment for contempt of court, in addition to two months imposed upon her for an alleged assault on the man who has taken her holding of land: and whether he will recommend that at the expiration of her first sentence this woman will be

liberated for the purpose of looking after her eight orphans.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Return is in preparation, and will be forwarded to the hon. Member when completed. The answer to the second paragraph is in the affirmative. Any application by this woman, or on her behalf, for a mitigation of sentence should be addressed in the usual way to the Lord Lieutenant.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF IRELAND.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the number of assistant librarians and attendants employed in the National Library of Ireland, and in the British Museum Library of Printed Books, respectively, and the annual attendance of readers at each of these libraries as shown by the latest Returns; whether he is aware that, owing to want of accommodation in the National Library of Ireland, there is no room for the increase in Ordnance Survey Maps and Patent Specifications; and that a free gift of the American Patents Specifications had to be declined for this reason; and, will he state to what extent the recommendations of the trustees have been carried out.

MR. WYNDHAM: The number of assistant librarians in the National Library of Ireland is two, and the number of attendants is twelve (six men and six boys). The number of readers in the Library in 1899 was 154,878. I cannot speak for the British Museum. Accommodation has been found in the Dublin Library for the Maps and Specifications. The offer of the American Patents Specifications has been declined by the trustees, partly owing to considerations of space and partly because a larger staff would be required for the additional work that would arise if the offer were accepted. It is not clear to what recommendations the last paragraphs refer.

MR. BOLAND: Considering that the staff at the National Library is so inadequate, as well as the buildings, will the light hon. Gentleman take steps to have both these matters remedied?

MR. WYNDHAM: If the hon. Member means will I put myself in communication with the Treasury for the purpose, I cannot undertake to do so.

FLAX CULTIVATION IN ULSTER.

MR. M'FADDEN (Donegal, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, if his attention, as President of the Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, has been drawn to resolutions of the county councils of Londonderry and Donegal, passed at their last quarterly meetings, requesting the Government to take immediate steps to have the fishery laws amended so that flax cultivators will not be compelled as at present to retain the flax water in the dams after the removal of the flax from the steep; and, whether, seeing that flax is extensively grown in said counties, and is a remunerative crop which enables farmers to a great extent to pay their rents, and that the farmers of Ulster unanimously demand the change in the law indicated, he will advise the Government to legislate and remove the restrictions imposed on flax cultivators and the alleged grievances at the hands of fishery conservators.

MR. WYNDHAM: The reply to the first paragraph is in the affirmative.

The Department, as at present advised, does not consider it desirable to relax

the restrictions provided by law against the discharge of flax water into rivers frequented by salmon and trout.

LIFFORD BRIDGE.

MR. M'FADDEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Strabane Urban Council, although requested by the County Council of Donegal to contribute to the maintenance and repair of Lifford Bridge, which connects the counties of Tyrone and Donegal, and which should be maintained at the joint expense of those bodies, has refused to comply with the request of the county councils of the counties which benefit by the bridge and are legally liable for its maintenance and repair; and, if he will, as President of the Local Government Board, instruct that body to inform the Strabane Urban Council and the county council of Tyrone that they are liable to the demand of the county council of Donegal.

MR. WYNDHAM: It does not appear (from the information before me) that the Strabane Urban Council have made this refusal (to contribute towards the maintenance and repair of this bridge). The secretary of the Donegal County Council states that the subject will be further considered at a special meeting on the 3rd April. The Tyrone County Council considers that the matter is outside its jurisdiction, the bridge being within the Urban District of Strabane. The Local Government Board has not been asked to advise the councils upon the question, and until a decision has been arrived at by each of these bodies, it does not appear to the Board that the matter is one in which it is called upon to intervene.

WHITE ESTATE, BANTRY.

MR. GILHOOLY (Cork County, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state when the sale of the White Estate, near Bantry, will take place.

MR. WYNDHAM: The rental for the sale of the holdings on this estate was settled on the 18th instant, and it now rests with the solicitors having carriage of the sale to apply to the judge for a request under the 40th section of the Act of 1896.

IRISH BOARD OF WORKS LOANS.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the payment of instalments upon Board of Works loans under present conditions presses upon borrowers; and whether, with a view to lighten the burden, consideration will be given to the desirability of extending the term of repayment and reducing the rate of interest, together with periodical revisions, as adopted under the land purchase system.

MR. WYNDHAM: There is nothing in the representations made to the Board by applicants, or in the way in which repayments are made, to suggest that the terms of repayment involve undue pressure. The rates of interest have been fixed by the Treasury as liberally as a due regard to the position of the local funds will admit. The answer to the last portion of the question is, therefore, in the negative.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: Cannot the suggested change be made without material cost to the Treasury?

MR. WYNDHAM: That is a question for the Treasury.

IRISH LANDED ESTATES COURT.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that there are a number of estates at present under the jurisdiction of the Landed Estates Court in Ireland on which no steps have been taken to make tenants the owners of their farms in accordance with the provisions of the 40th section of the Land Act of 1896; and what action, if any, is contemplated with the view of having the sales of these estates effected.

MR. WYNDHAM: The case of every estate in which a receiver was appointed prior to 1897 has been brought before the land judge for his decision whether the provisions of the 40th section were

applicable. In many of these cases the proceedings have not yet reached the stage when a request can be issued for an inspection by the Land Commission. These cases are not, however, lost sight of but are relisted from time to time in order to see what progress is being made to a sale. In other cases, in which a receiver was appointed since 1897, a similar arrangement is being carried out.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY; SUMMER UNIFORMS.

MR. JOHN HUTTON (Yorkshire, Richmond): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has been able to arrange for the supply of suitable summer clothing for the Royal Irish Constabulary during the present year.

MR. WYNDHAM: Experiments will be made during the coming season with a view to the selection of a suitable material, but it will not, I am afraid, be found possible to arrange for the supply this year of summer clothing to the constabulary.

PORTADOWN DISTURBANCES.

MR. CLANCY (Dublin County, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can now state what the special police protection was which was afforded on the 26th August last to certain Roman Catholic excursionists of Portadown against insult and injury at the hands of the Orange majority.

MR. WYNDHAM: The precautions taken by the local police authorities on the date mentioned consisted in the concentration of seventeen men at various points on the line of route followed by the excursionists in the morning. An additional force of 100 police arrived at Portadown in the course of the day, and these men, with the local force, were also distributed where it was considered their services could be utilised to the best advantage.

MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.): Is there any reason for stigmatising these people as "Orangemen"?

MR. CLANCY: The right hon. Gentleman stated last night that the police had been remiss and that some persons connected with them had been censured. Can he name a single person connected with the administration of justice in Portadown who has been removed from his post?

MR. WYNDHAM: There was no occasion for any such drastic measure.

FACTORY PROSECUTION IN DONEGAL.

MR. M'FADDEN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department

whether he can state the costs of the Crown in the case of Squire V. Sweeney, heard on a case stated under the Factory Acts in the Queen's Bench Division, Ireland, in the months of June, 1900, and January, 1901, and the costs of the defendant in the case paid by the Crown as a result of the decision of the Queen's Bench affirming the decision of the magistrates at Dungloe, county Donegal, Petty Sessions, dismissing the charge against the defendant; and whether the fines imposed on several defendants in similar cases at petty sessions in county Donegal have, since the decision of the High Court in this case, been refunded to the defendants, and the amounts of the fines so refunded. THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): At the request of my right hon. friend, I will reply to this question. The costs of the Crown have not yet been taxed, and I am unable to state what they amount to. The costs of the defendant in the first case amounted to £;42 5s. 1d. The defendant's costs in the second case are at present before the Master of the Crown Office. The answer to the last query is in the affirmative. Fines imposed in eight cases, amounting in the aggregate to £;65, have been refunded.

MR. M'FADDEN: Were not six magistrates brought to Dublin in connection with this case? Seeing that their action was vindicated, will not the Crown pay their expenses?

MR. ATKINSON: I do not agree with the view of the hon. Member. Anyhow, there is no power on the part of the Crown to pay their costs.

CRIMINAL LUNATICS IN IRISH LUNATIC ASYLUMS.

MR. GILHOOLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the maintenance of criminal lunatics confined in Irish asylums is defrayed out of the local rates since the passing of the Local Government (Ireland) Act; and, having regard to the fact that prior to the passing of the said Act a contribution of 4s. per head was paid from the Imperial Treasury, which grant now ceases, the contribution in aid of the rates coming from the local taxation account; and seeing that the cost of criminal lunatics in England is defrayed by the Treasury, whether he will have the Local Government (Ireland) Act amended with a view to assimilating it to the English Act dealing with the subject.

MR. WYNDHAM: The maintenance of criminal lunatics is not defrayed solely out of local rates, as approximately only one-half the cost of such maintenance falls on the local rates, the balance being met out of the local taxation account. The entire cost of criminal lunatics in England is defrayed by the Treasury, and the Government is now considering the question of assimilating the law in both countries.

CORK DISTRICT LUNATIC ASYLUM.

MR. GILHOOLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the cost of maintenance of criminal lunatics admitted from gaols and Dundrum Asylum to the Cork District Lunatic Asylum, with sentences unexpired or confined during the Lord Lieutenant's pleasure, is properly chargeable to the funds available for the maintenance of the lunatic poor of the County Cork district, and, if not, whether he will make provision for refunding the cost from Imperial sources.

MR. WYNDHAM: The cost of maintenance of criminal lunatics in the Cork District Lunatic Asylum is chargeable to the funds available for the maintenance of the lunatic poor of the County Cork district; but, as stated in answer to the preceding question of the hon. Member, the Government is considering the question of defraying the cost of maintenance from Imperial sources.

MR. GILHOOLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whether his attention has been called to a resolution recently passed by the Board of the Cork District Lunatic Asylum in which it was stated that the sum of £3,688 0s. 3d. has been long since certified by the auditor as being due as grant in aid for the three months ended 31st March, 1899; whether he is aware that a supplemental Vote has been passed on the 17th July last to recoup the Local Taxation (Ireland) Account for the grants in aid of Irish lunatic asylums; and, can he state what action he proposes to take in the matter.

MR. WYNDHAM: The reply to the first paragraph is in the affirmative. In answer to the second paragraph, the Supplementary Estimate was not a grant in aid of the maintenance of pauper lunatics. If the hon. Member will refer to the statement made by my right hon. friend the late Secretary to the Treasury on the 30th April, 1900,* he will find the object with which this Vote was taken fully explained.

MR. GILHOOLY: Is this money going to the credit of the Irish Local Taxation Fund at Dublin Castle?

MR. WYNDHAM: If the hon. Member refers to the statement I have mentioned he will get all the information available.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: In view of the fact that nearly every asylum in Ireland has made a complaint in reference to the same matter, will the right hon. Gentleman inquire into the matter and lay some statement before the public justifying his action?

MR. WYNDHAM: I have inquired, and have corresponded at some length with the asylums concerned, but they do not accept the explanation I offer.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND that apply to the Clare Asylum, because;

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The hon. Member is about to argue.

* See The Parliamentary Debated [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxii. page 285.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I will put a question down for Thursday. I only wanted to save time.

SCHULL LETTER CARRIER.

MR. GILHOOLY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether the case of Mr. Dempsey, letter carrier in the town of Schull, has been considered; and, if so, with what result.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General has sanctioned an increase in the wages of the letter carrier at Schull, county Cork.

EYERIES POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS

MR. GILHOOLY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether, in view of the importance of Eyeries, county Cork, as a fishing station, he will reconsider his decision and give a Sunday postal delivery there.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General regrets that, in view of the

large deficiency on the existing postal service to Eyeries on week days, he would not be justified in sanctioning additional expense for the purpose of providing a Sunday post.

NAVAL EXPENDITURE IN IRELAND.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he can state how much of the total Vote for the Navy has been expended for the last year in Ireland, how it has been expended, and how much of the present Vote it is proposed to spend in Ireland.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The accounts of the Admiralty are not kept in such a form as to enable this information to be given. Any statement on the subject is necessarily incomplete, and is nothing more than an approximation.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Arising out of this matter may I ask the hon. Gentleman whether, in view of the interest naturally felt in Ireland in this matter, he cannot take steps to make some arrangement to have it known how much the Irish people are likely to participate in the great expenditure on the Navy?

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I do not think it would be possible to make a forecast of the expenditure. It is impossible to foresee what the movements of His Majesty's ships may be during the year.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: But the latter part of the question asks how much has been spent in Ireland during the last year. Surely that needs no forecast, and can be easily ascertained?

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I do not think it would be possible to give anything more, than the approximate amount. I have no objection to endeavouring to obtain the information from the hon. Member, but I cannot promise to give the exact figures.

MR. JOYCE: Arising out of that answer, are we to understand that the hon. Gentleman will give the approximate amount?

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Yes; if I can.

IRISH PROVISIONS FOR THE NAVY.

MR. JOYCE: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he will state the amount expended for the last year in Ireland in purchasing pork and bacon for the Navy; whether any of this sum has been expended with Limerick city firms; and whether he will state the amount expended on pork and bacon in foreign countries.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: During the current financial year £;850 worth of pork was purchased from foreign countries. The whole of the remainder of the pork for the Navy; to the value of £;13,234; was purchased in Ireland. The contracts for the supply of Irish pork were obtained by Cork firms, none of the Limerick firms having been successful in their tenders. Bacon is not purchased by the Admiralty for the use of the Navy.

CAPTAIN DON ELAN: Has not Irish pork proved superior to foreign pork?

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I have had no opportunity of forming a personal opinion.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: May I ask the hon. Gentleman if he can give an undertaking that no money shall be spent in purchasing provisions in foreign countries when, seeing that they can be obtained in Ireland, there is no justification for it?

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I do not think I can do that.

LONDONDERRY SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRY;ADMIRALTY CONTRACTS.

MR. O'DOHERTY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that the shipbuilding industry has been revived on the river Foyle, at Londonderry, and whether, having regard to the efforts made by the local people in promoting this Irish enterprise, he will have the yard inspected by technical officers of the Admiralty, as was done by his predecessor in 1887, with a view to ascertaining its capacity for executing Admiralty contracts and having it placed on the Admiralty list as eligible for contracts.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: An application has recently been received at the Admiralty that the Londonderry Shipbuilding and Engineering Company may be considered with reference to future Admiralty work, and it is proposed to make arrangements for inspecting the establishment to ascertain its capabilities.

GRAND CANAL, IRELAND.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the Board of Works, Ireland, exact a tonnage rate in excess of the weight carried by canal boats on the Grand Canal, Ireland, and that vessels coming into Irish ports pay upon a registered tonnage less than the cargo carried: and whether he can explain the difference of system regarding the rating of inland waterway boats and ocean vessels.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: If I rightly appreciate the question, the hon. Member is comparing the tonnage rate charged for inland waterways for conveyance of goods with the harbour dues charged in respect of ocean vessels in ports. Conveyance rates and harbour dues do not seem to me to be comparable.

THE EASTER RECESS.

MR. SAMUEL SMITH (Flintshire): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will consider the expediency of shortening the Easter Recess, in view of the pressure it will put on the House in the closing months of the session; and whether he will consider the advisability of utilising any spare time that may be available either at the Whitsuntide Recess or by an earlier adjournment in the autumn.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): The question of the expediency of shortening the Easter Recess in view of the pressure put on the House in the closing months of the session does not seem to be very popular. If the holidays were diminished at the Easter end, it would mean sitting on the Thursday before Good Friday, which would be a very inconvenient day. I do not think that would be for the general benefit of the House. On the other hand, if the holidays were diminished at the Whitsuntide end, that would mean the cutting off of three days;namely, Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday;in order to get one Government day, and I hardly see how that would materially shorten the session, at the end of which Government business is usually congested.

MR. SAMUEL SMITH: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that many Members of the House would prefer to have a longer holiday at Whitsuntide than at Easter?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I doubt if it would be felt generally convenient to sacrifice three days in order to secure an additional day for the Government.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware of the general interest felt in the first Order of the day for Wednesday, 17th April;the Bill of the

hon. Member for Derby affecting employment in coal mines, as to which there is a possibility of some agreement?

MR. HERBERT LEWIS: I would also call attention to the second Order for the Tuesday.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have no doubt that great interest is taken in every Order, but that does not touch the question put to me by the hon. Member for Flintshire.

AGRICULTURAL LAND RATING ACT.

MR. LEVY (Leicestershire, Loughborough): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can now inform the House when the proposal to renew the Agricultural Land Rating Act will be made, and if it will be by a separate motion or by inclusion in the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I cannot give the hon. Gentleman any information as yet with regard to the date at which this matter will be dealt with by the House, but in all probability it will be by a separate motion, and not by any modification of the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill.

BIMETALLISM.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether any steps have been taken to call together an international conference to consider the currency question with a view to reestablish a bimetallic currency.

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

POET LAUREATESHIP.

MR. EDWARDS (Radnorshire): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the post of Poet Laureate became vacant on the demise of the Crown; and, if so, whether he will consider the advisability of abolishing the office.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: We do not propose to make any change.

LAND TAX COMMISSIONERS' NAMES BILL.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Government intend to introduce a Land Tax Commissioners' Names Bill this session.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir. I understand that it is not necessary.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS: Is it not the custom at the commencement of each Parliament to introduce a Land

Tax Commissioners' Names Bill? Why has that practice been departed from?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Perhaps the hon. Gentleman had better give notice of that question. I am informed that it is not necessary to do as he suggests.

SUPPLY;ARRANGEMENT OF VOTES;PROPOSED COMMITTEE.

SIR WALTER THORBURN (Peebles and Selkirk): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, whether, in the interests of the adequate discussion of the Votes in Supply, he will appoint a Committee of the House to consider and report upon the appropriation of a specified time for each class of Votes, with the view of securing reasonable discussion for the most important Votes during the period allotted for Supply.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am greatly in favour, as my hon. friend is aware, of a proposal which would lead to a Committee of this House being appointed for the allocation of the successive Votes in the business of Supply. I think my hon.

friend proposes to go rather further than that, and to entrust to this Committee the determination of the exact length of time which each discussion should occupy. I see much greater difficulty in that proposal than in my more modest suggestion.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: Will the Committee be moved at an early date?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Very probably.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection: That they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures:;Sir Charles Dalrymple; and had appointed in substitution: Colonel Williams.

Report to lie upon the Table.

NEW BILLS.

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES AND RATING.

Bill to amend the Law relating to the Housing of the Working Classes, to establish Fair Kent Courts, and to amend the Law of Rating, ordered to be brought in by Dr. Macnamara, Mr. John Burns, Captain Norton. Dr. Shipman, Mr. George White, Mr. Stuart Samuel, and Mr. Bell.

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES AND RATING BILL.

"To amend the Law relating to the Housing of the Working Classes, to establish Fair Bent Courts, and to amend the Law of Rating," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday, 18th April, and to be printed.

[Bill 123.]

ELECTRIC LIGHTING (LONDON).

Bill to provide for the adjustment, in accordance with changes of boundary effected under The London Government Act, 1899, of the areas within which Local Authorities and Companies are authorised to supply electricity, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Gerald Balfour and Mr. Austen Chamberlain.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING (LONDON) BILL.

"To provide for the adjustment, in accordance with changes of boundary effected under The London Government Act, 1899, of the areas within which Local Authorities and Companies are authorised to supply electricity," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday, and to be printed.

[Bill. 24.]

HOME INDUSTRIES.

Bill for the better regulation of Home Industries, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Charles Douglas, Mr. John Burns, Mr. Churchill, Colonel Denny, Mr. Emmott, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Munro Ferguson, and Mr. J. W. Wilson.

HOME INDUSTRIES BILL.

"For the better regulation of Home Industries," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday, 6th May, and to be printed. [Bill 125.]

CONSOLIDATED FUND (No.1) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

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

ADMINISTRATION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT IN IRELAND.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): We wish to take this opportunity of drawing attention to the condition of Local Government in Ireland. At this moment the situation in regard to local administration in that country is sufficiently serious to engage the attention of Parliament. Grave dissatisfaction exists, is increasing, and is likely to increase, owing to the policy of the Local Government Board towards the local authorities. As a consequence of this dissatisfaction the efficiency of Irish Local Government will be seriously compromised. Irish local bodies are animated with a sincere desire to administer the Local Government Act to the greatest advantage of the community. I can speak from my own experience. Since I have had the honour to be associated in the administration of the local affairs of my own county with the County Council of Wexford and the District Council and the Board of Guardians of Gorey, I can speak of the zeal, energy, and self-sacrifice with which the members of these bodies have since the inception of the Irish Local Government Act endeavoured to do their duty to the public. The same may be said of the local bodies all over Ireland. Their members have cheerfully sacrificed their time, their convenience, and their money to discharge their duties to the greatest possible public advantage. The Local Government Act is a complicated and badly-drafted measure. The Irish local authorities have worked hard to make the best of it, and, in spite of the imperfections of the Act, and in spite of the complexity of the Act, they have succeeded to a wonderful extent. Our local bodies are universally and specially anxious to diminish the expense of administration, but, notwithstanding all their efforts, we find that the expense of local administration in Ireland increases every year by leaps and bounds. One would have thought that in their endeavours to administer the Act efficiently, and to keep down the expense of administration, the Irish local authorities would have had the assistance of the Local Government Board for Ireland, but at every point they have been hampered and obstructed by the Local Government Board, with the result that intense dissatisfaction prevails all over the country at their unwarranted interference.

The action of the Local Government Board, speaking generally, is quite unconstitutional; we believe that it is in many cases illegal. A significant case in point is that of the Wexford County Council, to which I mean shortly to refer. Hitherto the high-handed action of the Local Government Board has been allowed to pass unchallenged. This is not so likely to occur in the future, as the result of certain cases which have been recently decided in the Law Courts. I foresee in consequence an enormous increase of litigation throughout the country, with a corresponding waste of public money, unless the authority of Parliament is immediately used to stop the evil.

The case of Wexford proves the necessity of thoroughly examining, and as far as possible resisting, the mandates of the Local Government Board. The last stage of this Wexford dispute is set out in a Return presented the other day which is in the hands of Members. But before dealing with the case may I say a word about the Return itself? The Return is drawn up in a confusing manner; for instance, Exhibits D and E (the statements of the county council), on page 25, are in

answer to exhibits B and C on page 31 (the statement of the county surveyor); the statements in Exhibits D and E on page 25 are in answer to the statements similarly numbered in Exhibits B and C on page 31. These Exhibits should be examined together to explain the case of the county council. Similarly Exhibit I) on page 43 (the statement of the county council) is in answer to Exhibit C on page 42 (the statements of the assistant surveyors). The Return is also confusing in other respects. But I make no complaint as far as the Chief Secretary for Ireland is concerned in relation to this Return. He deserves credit for the promptness and the courtesy with which he laid this Return upon the Table. I do not propose to go into the Return in detail, or to answer the points which were put forward by the Local Government Board; these points are easily answered, but there is no necessity to deal with them now, since the claims of the Local Government Board were unanimously rejected by the judges. I may remind the House of the history of the case. The Local Government Board claimed the right to increase the salaries of certain officials employed by the County Wexford County Council from 33 per cent, to 90 per cent., speaking roughly; an additional tax of something about halfpenny in the pound, sufficient, at all events, to put the Technical Instructions Acts in force throughout the county. Against these increases of salaries the council protested, and gave reasons for its protest. No attention was paid either to its reasons or to its protest. Then the Irish Government was asked to receive a deputation from Wexford and other counties interested in this same question, with a view to an amicable arrangement. This request was refused. Then the Local Government Board served the Wexford County Council and the other county councils with a Sealed Order commanding them to pay these increased salaries. This is the first instance in which the Sealed Order has been used in the case of county councils. The Sealed Order, it is worth noting, is an instrument unknown in England; it has been specially invented for the benefit of Ireland. It would not be tolerated for a moment in England, where public opinion is in favour of respectful treatment of local governing bodies by the central government Department in London. But the Sealed Order is a, favourite instrument of administration in Ireland. Then in July last I moved the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing this new and unprecedented form of dealing with Irish county councils by serving them with Sealed Orders, and with a view also to a general ventilation of the case for the purpose of inducing the Government to adopt a moderate course. My motion came to nothing. I was told that my proceeding was an abuse of the privileges of the House; and so the matter rested as far as Parliament was concerned. All their attempts at conciliation having failed, and having been driven into a corner, the County Council of Wexford, together with other county councils, decided to go to law with the Local Government Board with a view to securing a revision of the case, Unfortunately, in the Court of Queen's Bench the trial went against us, mainly owing to certain affidavits of the Local Government Board to which I propose to refer later. An important point was gained, however, in this trial, namely, that the Orders of the Local Government Board can now be put aside on certiorari.

Previous to this trial the Local Government Board evidently considered themselves above all law. Undeterred by the failure of this action, the Wexford County Council carried their case to the Court of Appeal, and there they gained a complete victory. The decision in this matter is the most important judicial pronouncement made in Ireland for years, and one of the rare instances in Irish history in which the people have found the law on their side, and not on the side of their oppressors. The case undoubtedly will have an important bearing on the future of Irish administration. It will make for peace if the Government have sense, or it will make for further turmoil if the Government so elect; and if the Government wish for further fighting I can assure them we are ready to oblige them in this respect. The decisions of the judges in the Court of Appeal are given fully in the Return to which I have referred. I would ask English Members to read the judgments in the case, and form their own opinions upon them. As I have already said, I do not propose now to go into the details of this Return, or to answer the arguments put forward by the Local Government Board. It would be easy to answer them, but there is no need. They did not weigh with the judges, or prevent the case being determined in our favour. I may, however, be permitted to touch upon one or two points to illustrate how Irish local bodies are treated by the Local Government Board for Ireland.

One contention of the Wexford County Council was that the Order of the Local Government Board increasing the salaries of their officers was unjust. Let me quote on this point Chief Baron Palles;

"It was argued that the Order was made in disregard of natural justice, because the Council had not a proper opportunity of hearing what was alleged against them and of being heard in reference to it. This second ground raises a question so important that I prefer not to express my opinion with reference to it."

It will be noted that the Chief Baron does not express disapproval of our contention. Later on I will quote Lord Justice Holmes on the same point.

From this Return the House will see that the Judges unanimously decided that the action of the Local Government Board was in excess of their jurisdiction. This is a serious reflection on a Government Department holding the extremely responsible position occupied by the Local Government Board, and if in this Wexford case the Local Government Board have exceeded their jurisdiction, in how many other cases may they not have exceeded it; cases which have never been brought into the Court of Appeal? And if they have so exceeded their jurisdiction to-day, what is to prevent them exceeding their jurisdiction upon some other question to-morrow? I will ask leave to quote shortly from some of the judgments upon this point;

"This brings us to the third ground, that the decision was based upon a wrong principle I cannot think that the arguments in this Court upon this part of the case were identical with those which were presented in the Queen's Bench Division. I gather from the judgment of Mr. Justice Gibson that the ground of impeachment there relied on was that the determination proceeded on the application of a predetermined general scale, without due consideration of the facts and circumstances of the particular case, and no doubt that argument was one of those presented to us upon this portion of the case.

"It was, however, further argued before us that the matter determined by the Board was a matter different from that which they had jurisdiction to determine. Their jurisdiction, it was rightly said, was to determine increase of remuneration in proportion to increase of duties. What they did determine, it was alleged, was the total amount of remuneration for all duties, including those which were performed before the Act. It is clear, indeed it is admitted, that if they did this they exceeded their jurisdiction.";(Chief Baron Palles, p.9, in Return.)

I quote further from the Chief Baron;

"There is no doubt that in the case under consideration (Leary's case) the increase of salary was arrived at by deducting his former salary, £;80, from the £;150 fixed by the scale."(In the Board's letter of the 23rd February, 1900.)"Thus what they have fixed is the total salary and net the increase of salary. In determining as they have done a material point must have been the remuneration which ought to be received for the duties these officers performed before the Act, but the Board has no power to determine this…The action of the Board as described in this letter was in excess of their jurisdiction.

And the Chief Baron goes on to say;

"In Mr. Webster's case I therefore hold that the Board determined a matter wholly outside of their jurisdiction."

I will quote now from Lord Justice FitzGibbon, page 15 of Return::

"In the case of Assistant Surveyor Leary, it is hard to believe that the Act of 1898 can have doubled his work, and nothing appears to explain this doubling of his salary except a determination to pay him more for his old work as well as for his new. The same principle seems to have been adopted in the case of the Council Surveyor Webster, and there is no evidence to the contrary. Upon this ground and in this respect I think the Orders now before us are made in excess of jurisdiction and are therefore bad. The Board converted Section 115 (18) from being a protection of vested interests into an occasion of raising salaries all round, and this it had no jurisdiction to do."

I now wish to direct attention to another point. In this case the Judges were at considerable pains to reconcile the affidavits filed on behalf of the Local Government Board with the letters written by the Local Government Board to the Wexford County Council. It will be remembered that the previous trial in the Queen's Bench, in which the Wexford County Council was defeated, was to a large extent ruled by these affidavits. I will quote from Chief Baron Palles, page 9 of Return;

"Let us therefore see what was the action of the Board in this matter. The relevant material before us are four letters of the Board;namely, those of the 7th and 23rd of February, the 27th June, and 6th July, and the affidavits of the Vice-President. It is suggested by Mr. Matheson" (the Counsel for the Board)

"that the letters of the Board were inaccurate, having been written hurriedly in consequence of an alleged insufficiency of the staff. The affidavits from Sir H. Robinson do not allege or even hint at any such mistake, and it is to be remembered that they were filed in answer to affidavits on the part of the prosecutor (the County Council of Wexford), which referred to and relied upon

the letters in question. Such a statement, before I could act upon it, should be supported by clear and satisfactory evidence, and of such evidence I do not find a trace. I consequently find myself coerced to hold that they truly represent the action of the Board."

On the next page of the Return the Chief Baron says::

"The answer presented by the Counsel for the Board. …. is that the affidavit.…. shows that the Board did not do what is stated in this letter that it did do."

(The letter was written to the Wexford County Council on the 23rd February, 1900).

I quote again from the Chief Baron;

"As to the county surveyor, Mr. Webster, the ground of impeachment is not so clearly I made out. That mode does not appear as clearly from the letters of the Local Government Board in this case as it does in reference to the assistant surveyors, and he Board within whose sole knowledge it is, have not thought it proper to bring before us as fully in my opinion as was desirable in proceeding under the Act of Parliament, which contemplates the individualism of each county. Prima facie, neither uniformity nor scale should have any place."

On page 18 of the Return Lord Justice Holmes says::

"We have here letters deliberately written by the official whose duty it is to make known the views and decisions of the Local Government Board."

I leave to the apologists of the Local Government Board to explain the difference between their letters and their affidavits, which evoked such comments from the Judges of the Court of Appeal, but in view of the criticisms of the judges it would be interesting to know who wrote the letters in question. Was it anyone in authority in the Local Government Board, or was it an irresponsible clerk? I would suggest an inquiry into this matter; I think we have a right to be informed upon it, and I would further suggest the transfer of this officer to some other sphere where his talents would find proper and fitting application, say to Tientsin or to the Yang-tsze Valley, for his methods savour very strongly of those of the heathen Chinees.

I come now to the judgment of Lord Justice Holmes. I doubt if this judgment gave much satisfaction to the Local Government Board, but it certainly gave intense satisfaction to those interested in Irish Local Government. It is the most important and most instructive comment on the methods of administration in Ireland that I have ever read from the Irish Bench. On page 18 of the Return Lord Justice Holmes says::

"It might have been more prudent if, before considering the Memorandum and Petition (of officers interested) the Board had called the attention of the council to these documents, and invited their comment thereon; but if the letters of February were, as I should have regarded them myself, and as the county council regarded them, not a final determination of the matter, but a statement of what was in contemplation, no harm would have resulted On the receipt of these letters the council took a judicious course; it forwarded a statement of the reasons against the increase of salaries, which, whether they were good or bad, were at least worthy of

consideration. The replay to this document has caused me much surprise, and I feel myself bound to say that if it accurately reflects the spirit in which the Local Government Board has undertaken the important duties imposed upon it by the Act, no one can wonder if the result be friction and unpleasantness with the local authorities, I suppose that if the arguments put forward in support of their protest … had been furnished to the Board in the previous autumn … it (the Board) would have weighed very carefully the council's opinion before deciding upon the increased salaries to be allowed. This must mean, if it has any meaning, that arguments, relating to the performance of a public duty involving the rights and liabilities of officers and ratepayer, submitted by one of the interested parties, which would or at least might have deserved to be weighed very carefully, were to be wholly disregarded because they had not been submitted at an earlier period. When it is remembered that the only notice of any kind given to the council was a letter of August;" this was not a letter at all, but a badly printed circular, numbered 317, to which nobody would be likely to pay any attention unless their notice was specially directed to it;

"received at a time when the newly constituted Indies had only begun to learn their duties, that the board had never informed the Council of the Memorandum and Petition of the officers, and that the inquiry consequent thereon was conducted behind the back of the parties interested; above all, when it is remembered that it was not until two months later that the sealed orders were issued, and that therefore the matter was still sub judice, the April letter must be regarded as a very curious contribution to official literature."

I will now quote from this letter of April this very curious contribution to official literature;

"Local Government Board,

"Dublin, 30th April, 1901.

"Sir,;The Local Government Board for Ireland have had before them the resolutions of the Wexford County Council of the 28th ult. and 3rd inst. on the subject of the salaries fixed by the Board for the county surveyor and the assistant surveyors in the county, and in reply the Board desire to state that if the arguments put forward by the council in support of their protest against the increased salaries of the county surveyor and his assistants had been furnished to the Local Government Board last autumn, when they invited the views of the council upon the

claims of these officers, the Board would have weighed very carefully the council's opinions before they decided upon the increased salaries to be allowed in this case. The council, however, did not intervene in the matter, either by supplying the Local Government Board with any statement of their views or by coming to an agreement with these officers, and the Board had under these circumstances only to fulfil the obligations imposed upon them by Section 115 of the Act."

I would like to say, in the first place, that in December previous the county council had put their views before the Local Government Board, and, secondly, that it was not possible for the county council to come to any agreement with

their officers, for their officers were looking to the Local Government Board to settle their case, and no agreement with them by the county council would have been possible.

"With regard to the council's resolution the Board have only to remark that while the council admit that these officers have certain increased duties to perform, they nevertheless propose to allow them no increase of salary whatever" Here I must remark that the Local Government Board apparently did not read the communications they receive from the Wexford County Council. That council never admitted that there was any increase of duties devolving on their officers, while they expressly stated that they had no objection whatever to paying increased remuneration for increased duties if increased duties could be proved. I may now quote the reply of the Wexford County Council, which epitomises the entire case;

"That we declined to comply with the demands of the Local Government Board for increased remuneration in the case of our county surveyor and assistant surveyors, no reason having been advanced by the Local Government Board for increasing the salaries of these officers. That the notice of the trans-action received by this council from the Local Government Board was quite insufficient, the only intimation being the receipt of a badly-printed circular which was sent to the secretary of the County Council instead of being-sent, as it should have been, to the chairman and every member of the council and in the extreme pressure of business connected with putting the Act into operation and the effort made by this council to deal with the deluge of circulars which poured in upon them last year, the urgency of the matter escaped our notice. That as a simple matter of equity and ordinary courtesy the council had the right to expect that a question of such importance would not have been decided by the Local Government Board without their taking further steps if necessary to ascertain the views of the representatives of the rate-payers upon it. This consideration has been admitted to weigh with the Local Government Board in their subsequent correspondence with this council, in which they are pleased to intimate that if they had known what the true state of the case was when they delivered their judgment, that judgment would have been different from what it was."

I invite English Members to read this reply of the county council in conjunction with Lord Justice Holmes's judgment, and form thereon their conclusion as to whether that reply is not both appropriate and correct. And now the contest has entered on another phase. Instead of allowing the matter to rest, the Local Government Board have decided to reopen the case, and their explanation for this proceeding is quaint in the extreme. They admit that their proceedings have been informal; informal in the face of the unanimous decision of the judges, expressed in terms unprecedented in Irish law; Informal; Wholly unconstitutional and grossly illegal would have been nearer the truth. Their proceedings, they say, have been informal, and so they intend to begin again. They propose to hold an inquiry with a view to increasing the contested salaries. I invite the Government to consider seriously what they are about to do. There is quite sufficient ill-feeling already over this business, and do

they wish to aggravate it? There is such a thing as law, no doubt, but there is also such a thing as policy, and the Government should consider if it is worth while to insist upon their pound of flesh with the result of reducing Irish local administration to a condition of chaos. The Attorney General will tell us that the law gives no alternative; I tell him that it does. You have your Orders in Council which have the effect of law; you have other remedies besides; you can make use of them if you choose, and so make your selection. It is utterly immaterial to me and to my hon. friends what you do. The Irish people are quite as ready to fight you on the Local Government Act as on any other question. We have no doubt as to who will win in the end, and, as I told the Government last July that the people of Wexford, though not anxious to fight, would fight if com-

pelled, so I tell you now that they will fight you again if necessary, not for the sake of the few hundred pounds yearly in question, but for the sake of the principle at stake. The principle at stake in this contest is the right of the people to manage their own affairs. If we are not allowed to manage our own affairs, we will allow nobody else to manage them; so make your selection. I protest against the reopening of this case. I protest against the proposed inquiry by the Local Government Board; in the face of the judgment of the Court of Appeal the proceeding is simply indecent. I protest against the inquiry on the grounds that the Local Government Board are interested parties and incompetent to do justice in the matter. I protest against the inquiry for another reason, which is found in the Act itself. I quote from Chief Baron Palles on page 7 in the Return;

"The determination of the Board as to the increase of duties and fixing the increase of remuneration in due proportion to the increase of duties so determined, if made within jurisdiction, will bind the council and impose liability upon them whether the amount so determined be right or wrong; if, for instance, the increase in duties was in fact 20 per cent., and the Board determined that it was 50 per cent., and accordingly determined that the increase of remuneration should be equal to 50 per cent, of the former remuneration, that decision would bind the council."

Now it is obvious that Parliament never intended this injustice. This is a blot in the Act which must be removed before any inquiry can take place. My county council have recently held a meeting to consider this question of inquiry. They have acted with singular moderation, considering the provocation they have received. They have passed the following resolution;

"In reply to the Local Government Board's request that we name a date for an inquiry into the question of the future remuneration of the county and deputy purveyors, it is hereby resolved that the Local Government Board, having previously fixed the remuneration of these officers illegally, as decided by the Court of Appeal, we hold that the Local Government Board is thereby prejudiced, and consequently in our opinion incapable of doing justice as between us and our officers; and we claim that the proposed inquiry be remitted to arbitrators selected by those interested."

If we are to have an inquiry, let us have an impartial inquiry in this case of

Wex-

ford as well as in the other cases. There will be no difficulty in finding arbitrators in Ireland who will command the confidence of both parties interested in this dispute, and whose decision will be accepted as final.

And now one word as regards the cost of this inquiry. We are told that the Local Government Board has no option but to charge us with the costs of the inquiry.

Let me quote again from Chief Baron Palles;

"Under Subsection 3 of the Application of Enactments Order, the Local Government Board may direct the costs of the inquiry to be paid by councils, and such orders may be made rules of the High Court."

The Local Government Board may direct the costs of the inquiry to be paid by the local authorities, but there is no compulsion in the matter; the clause is purely permissive, and it is just as easy for the Local Government Board to direct that the costs of these inquiries shall not be paid by the local authorities as to direct that they shall. The costs can be defrayed out of public funds. Our fighting with the Local Government Board has already cost us in the county Wexford a considerable sum of money. As we have been declared in the right, we should be indemnified for the expense to which we have been put already, and if there is to be a further re-opening of the case, it should not be at our expense. I therefore claim on behalf of my county council, first, that the issue between us and the Local Government Board shall be decided by arbitration unless the Government will give me a pledge that we shall have the right of appeal in the event of our finding the result of the proposed inquiry unjust; secondly, that the expense of this contest so far, and the expense of any further inquiry or appeal from that inquiry, shall not be a charge upon the ratepayers of the county of Wexford. Consider for a moment what is the character of the county council which the Local Government Board invite you to attack. If it were an improvident council or an incompetent council, a dishonest or a self-seeking council, there might be some excuse for crippling it with law costs. I go to the Local Government Board itself for the character of the County Wexford County Council, and what does the Local Government Board say?

"I am happy to state that the county council (of Wexford) and its finance committee appear to manage their business with judgment and discretion, and to exercise a careful supervision over the management and disbursement of the funds entrusted to their charge. I have only to add that the secretary's accounts have been most accurately and carefully kept.; W. Gibson, Auditor, Local Government Board Dublin; 8th February, 1901."

We have had a similar certificate of character on the conclusion of each year since the administration of the Local Government Act began, and this is the council which is to be penalised for its defence of the rights of local government in Ireland. I earnestly invite the attention of the Chief Secretary to this matter. I have now done with the case of the Wexford County Council. I leave it to the judgment of the House, and I leave it to the House to say if a body acting as the Local Government Board has acted is fit to be entrusted with the far-reaching powers, conferred on it by the Act of 1898.

In conclusion, I wish to give expression to my views upon the general question

of administration of local affairs in Ireland as affected by the Local Government Board. It is notorious that the Local Government Act has not fulfilled the promises which were made in its behalf. We were promised equal rights with England. We have been given nothing of the sort. Apart from the concession of the elective principle we have gained nothing. We are only doing now, at a vastly increased expenditure of time, and money, and energy and convenience, what was done before in a quarter the time and at half the cost. The business of Irish local administration has been enormously complicated, for no reason that I can discover except to enable the Local Government Board to posture as a sphinx. The time of our local councils is perpetually wasted in discussing Local Government Board conundrums, to which, very often, the Local Government Board itself cannot supply an answer. The councils have no control over their officers. The Local Government Board controls the officers. The Local Government Board is the master of the officers. The officers look to the Local Government Board and

not to their councils, and this is destructive to local government. It is a notorious fact that we had no trouble with our officers until the Local Government Board sent out its ill-omened circular of August, 1899. Since the issue of that circular there has been unceasing trouble; that circular has cost the ratepayers of Ireland thousands of pounds. The object of the Local Government Board apparently is to establish a new garrison in Ireland of civil servants. They find that unless they can control the officers they will be unable to control the councils; hence their frantic endeavours to supplant the councils in the loyalty of their officers. I have said that thousands of pounds of the ratepayers' money have been spent on needless law since the issue of that circular. Thousands of pounds more will follow. This new law tax is only beginning to grow. One of these days, I propose to move for a Return giving the amount expended in law by Irish local bodies since the inception of the Local Government Act. and if I am granted this Return it will be a startling revelation as to the waste of money of the ratepayers.

On the whole, Sir, it seems to me that there is no way of dealing with this question except by the appointing of a Commission to inquire into the working of the Local Government Act in Ireland, into the operations of the Local Government Board, into the increased expense of administration, and into the status of Irish councils compared to English and Scotch, and to suggest remedies, if possible, for the condition of things which prevails with us; for, as things go now, Irish local government is becoming just as great a farce as it is a misnomer. We are growing sick of it, sick of continual dictation and interference. We have our own business to attend to, and we cannot submit to perpetual worrying by a clique of unknown officials without either responsibility or stake in the country, who pay no rates, who only raise them, and who apparently have as much knowledge of as they have sympathy with the people.

There are two courses which Irish local bodies are likely to be tempted to adopt. First to give up local government altogether, and to let the Local Government Board carry on the business and

collect the rates, in which event I wish the Local Government Board joy of their undertaking; or, secondly, for the local bodies to come together, and join together and set the Local Government Board at defiance. This I think the better policy. If the local councils will go on in their own way, disregarding the Local Government Board, never minding Local Government Board circulars, letters, Sealed Orders and all the rest of their tomfoolery, never minding their inspectors or their auditors, the Local Government Board will be extremely angry, but it will be powerless in the face of a general policy to this effect. The Local Government Board may perhaps succeed in coercing a single board of guardians, but the Local Government Board cannot coerce an Irish county, much less an Irish province or combination of counties. My last word to the Government is, reform the Local Government Board. It is an anachronism in its present shape, and it must be changed. My advice to the Government is to make the Local Government Board representative and Irish; to introduce the elective principle into its constitution, and in that way to bring it into touch and sympathy with the people whose concerns it is now mismanaging. I would urge upon the Government not to delay, otherwise the Local Government Board will surely land them in further trouble. It has come to this now with us, that the Government must choose between the Local Government Board in its present shape and local government in Ireland, for the two cannot exist together.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.) declared that the action which had been shown by the Courts to be illegal was not confined to Wexford. He had had communications from various councils showing that the Local Government Board had increased the salaries of officers by seventy-five per cent, over the original amounts, and fifty per cent, beyond the sum the councils were prepared to give. Surely the elected representatives of the people, who were mostly large ratepayers, living in the different counties, were the people who best understood the needs and requirements of the districts, and realised whether the duties of the officials had been increased to an extent to warrant such increases of salary. Take the case of the county surveyor in South Tipperary. His salary was £600 a year; the county council were willing to increase it by £100; but the Local Government Board stepped in and ordered a salary of £852 to be paid. The county council refused to pay it, they defeated the Local Government Board in the Courts; a few days afterwards the board withdrew from the matter, and nothing had been heard about it since. But what had been the consequence? The officials instead of being the servants, now wanted to be the masters. The county surveyor of South Tipperary attended the last meeting of the finance committee, and instead of accepting £800 a year declared he wanted £1,200 and would fight for it. That was the teaching of the Local Government Board. Officials were now telling county councils that they would do as they liked in regard to certain matters, and that in so doing they would have the protection of the Local Government Board. A question of great interest was whether those cases in which county and district councils had made arrangements with their officers under a false impression as to the real state of the law, would be reopened in consequence of the decision of the Court of Appeal. The Local Government Board would certainly have to be reformed. The Local Government Act

would never ' work properly unless there was a change of administration. The hoard was composed of gentlemen taken exclusively from the landlord section of the community. Under the Local Government Act the occupiers, not the landlords, paid the greater portion of the rates, and certainly the section who paid the largest proportion of the rates ought to have the largest representation upon the central controlling body. What was the qualification of the gentleman who, immediately after the passing of the Act, was placed on the board in command of the councils? Simply that he was the leader of the landlord party in county Tipperary, and that when the Home Rule movement was strong in England, he came over and on every possible

platform defamed his countrymen, and tried to prove their unworthiness to govern themselves. The medical officers, the poor-law inspectors, and the auditors, employed by the Local Government Board to carry out the Act, were either lawyers without briefs, doctors without practice, Orangemen, Army pensioners, or sons of Unionist representatives of Ulster. When some time ago a few representatives of the popular class were appointed on the board, and had to visit the different boards of guardians and the various institutions, there was never the slightest trouble with the officials or with the boards, simply because these gentlemen were in sympathy with the poor and with the representatives who had been elected.

Until 1880, boards of guardians in Ireland were controlled by the ex officio and landlord element. In 1880 the national element obtained the control, and when they came to discharge their duties they found the workhouses in the most disgraceful state; bad ventilation, unplastered walls, unceiled rooms, dirt and filth of every description, wretched straw heaps on the floor for the poor to sleep on, and dirty vessels out of which they had to take their food. That was the legacy bequeathed by the landlord element. The first step of the popular representatives was to improve this wretched system, but as soon as they did that the officials of the Local Government Board stepped in and declared that they were not doing half enough. The record of the board was one of discredit and disgrace. It pandered and played to an insignificant minority who were troublesome in Ireland. Any person with popular leanings who was connected with the board was bound to be victimised by the minority, as was proved at the last General Election, when a right hon. Gentleman lost his seat in this House because he went in for popularising the board with which he was connected. He would take as an instance the county of Tipperary, with which he was connected. It was the only county in Ireland which had two county councils. It was ordered that the gentleman, Mr. Bailey, who had been Grand Jury Secretary, should be secretary to both councils, but his manner of doing the business was so absurdly inefficient that on the

plea of the work being too heavy he resigned the secretaryship of one, South Tipperary, and retained the other. He left the accounts in such a state of extreme confusion that it was necessary for the council to pass resolutions ordering him to employ an accountant to put things in order. In the end that was done. The secretary who was then appointed, Mr. Shee, soon had affairs in a satisfactory condition. But, what happened? The auditor came down, and required

that within a couple of days Mr. Shee should stand an examination by a Mr. Saunderson; son of the light hon. Gentleman opposite, who did not object to getting fat salaries for his friends and children. Then this Mr. Saunderson who had passed no examination himself, and who would sneer at poor Irishmen because their countrymen supported them whilst they fought their battles in the House, examined Mr. Shee on the 22nd March, with the result that on the following 5th April there came down an order stating that Mr. Shee had not passed an examination, and the council should proceed to appoint another secretary. They found that his writing was bad, and that his spelling was not good. But the council's knowledge of Mr. Shee's capacity was such, that they pressed the Local Government Board to allow him a six months trial, at the end of which time the accounts and business of the council were put upon a footing of the most excellent order. Then came down an auditor (Mr. Courtney Croker), who himself had never passed an examination as auditor, and who made a note that the accounts showed the most careful supervision by Mr. Bailey; Mr. Bailey, who had left the accounts in the state which he had described, and who had never as much as seen them after that time. The Government persevered in rejecting Mr. Shee, notwithstanding the fact that men like General Massy, famous as Redan Massy, the chairman of the county council, and Mr. Grubb had proposed resolutions in favour of Mr. Shee's retention, and that those resolutions were supported by the members of the council, a representative body of men who he ventured to say were as competent in such a matter as any that could be found in an English or Scotch county. They represented the people, and had the interests of the country at heart. They were satisfied with Mr. Shee, yet they were told that the Local Government Board would have none of him. The board insisted that he should be called upon to resign; threatened the council with a mandamus, with a Scaled Order, with legal proceedings of every description. Yet the council stood by Mr. Shee, and the consequence of the Conservative gentleman on the board holding to the same view was that the hands of the board had been stayed. They had not, however, given in, and their last contemptible resort, after failing to intimidate the council, was not to bring them into open court, for that would be too manly and honest a course, but to threaten that if he was retained any longer as secretary, the auditor would surcharge the members of the council. The explanation of all this was that Mr. Shee was a staunch Nationalist, whilst his predecessor was a staunch Unionist and Freemason. This gentleman, who was not competent to open accounts for them in South Tipperary, who could not read the minutes of the meetings properly, had been granted by the Local Government Board an increase of salary of £150 a year in North Tipperary. That was the kind of administration which it was necessary to expose, for he believed there were a great many English Members of the House who believed that there was in Ireland the same kind of local government as in England, where he was informed the county councils had practically a free hand in the management of their own affairs. In England the Local Government Board exercised a judicious control and did not unduly interfere with the county councils, but in Ireland they could not appoint or dismiss an officer, or even pay away £5, without first getting the permission of the hostile assembly in Dublin Castle. Those examinations had been

instituted simply to disqualify Nationalists and force into office the nominees of the Local Government Board.

Why was it there was to be an examination of officers in Ireland and none in England? It was an insult to the intelligence of the Irish county councils. Was there any general standard of examination, and would the right hon. Gentleman publish the questions which were put? As a matter of fact, there were different kinds of examinations adopted, for in some cases a very severe test was imposed, whilst in others candidates got through by a small conversation. It was an outrage to say that the County Council were not the best judges of who was best qualified to serve them as clerk, and they should not be interfered with by the Local Government Board. Why should these examinations not be the same as Civil Service examinations? Petty sessions clerks were given six months notice to prepare. Why should not council secretaries be given the same opportunities? He certainly thought it was an outrage to say that the County Council of South Tipperary were not the best judges as to who was best qualified to serve them as clerk, and they ought not to be interfered with by the Local Government Board. A good deal had been heard about the benefits the Local Government Act would confer upon Ireland by allowing the people to elect their own representatives, but all those councils were handcuffed by the instructions sent down by the Local Government Board. They had had a good deal of discussion in the House recently upon the South African war. At the time of the outbreak of the war the Colonial Secretary had said that the war was entered upon because the Government of the Transvaal would not give the Uitlanders the franchise, and place them in the same position as the burghers. They had spent a hundred millions and sacrificed thousands and thousands of lives to give freedom to the Uitlanders, but they treated the Nationalist majority in Ireland far worse than ever Mr. Kruger treated the Uitlanders. He maintained that the Government by their action in Ireland belied the excuse they gave for embarking on the war in South Africa. He was perfectly satisfied that when the right hon. the Chief Secretary, and possibly the Attorney General for Ireland, got up to reply, they would tell the House that the members of the Local Government Board were fine gentlemen, most competent gentlemen, and most honourable gentlemen. He was not going to say that the members of the Local Government

Board were not honourable gentlemen in their own sphere; but he would certainly say that they were not honourable gentlemen in the sphere which they occupied as controlling the county and district councils of Ireland, in the interest of a section of the community, and in order to please an insignificant minority whenever it rattled upon the Orange drum. The cause of all these troubles in Ireland was the constitution of the Local Government Board; and it was perfectly useless to think that the Local Government Act would be popular in Ireland until the Government realised that they must do away with a Castle board, and substituted for it an elective body which would administer local government in the interests of the people. It was just as well that the Government and other hon. Members opposite should know that this tinkering with local government was not going to settle the question of complete self-government for Ireland. This

tinkering with the Local Government Act was only meant to satisfy the Unionist representatives, to try to preserve for their sons and friends the plums of office, to keep what influence they had in their own hands, and to crush the popularly-elected councils.

MR. CLANCY (Dublin County, N.) thought that no one who had listened to the speech of the hon. Member who had just sat down could help coming to the conclusion that there was scarcely any exaggeration in anything that had been said from the Irish Benches as to the domineering spirit of the Irish Local Government Board. He thought that the Wexford case was an even more striking example of the action of the Local Government Board than that brought forward by the hon. Member for South Tipperary. He would recall some of the facts mentioned by the hon. Baronet. The Local Government Board, at least so their contention was, had, on the passing of the Act, to determine whether an increase of duty was imposed on any existing officer, and if so, to fix the increase of salary he was to receive in consequence of that increase of duty. Who would imagine that there was any difficulty in interpreting that instruction of the Local Government Act? The Local Government Board, having at its disposal a large amount of legal talent, should have made no great mistake in discharging their proper function. But what was the judgment of the Court of Appeal in Ireland on that point? It set forth that, instead of fixing the increase of salary to which these officers were entitled, they went on to revise all the old salaries so that if they came across any officer of the Grand Jury whom they thought insufficiently paid in the past, they took advantage of the Act to pay them a sufficiency in the future, although the Act gave them no such authority whatever. He congratulated the hon. Member for North Wexford on having had the prescience to ask for a Return giving the judgment of the Court of Appeal, because he was very suspicious of the acts of the agents of the Government in Ireland, and if that judgment had not been before the House the illegality committed by the Local Government Board might have been denied by the Chief Secretary on the authority of some of his underlings in Dublin Castle. A great hardship existed in the case of those councils which, unlike that of Wexford, did not carry their cases to the highest Court of the land. He thought that the question put by the hon. Member for South Tipperary ought to be put again and again to the Chief Secretary, namely, whether those councils on whom illegal salaries had been imposed were to be put to the expense and trouble of going, each of them, to the Court of Appeal to have these illegal salaries re-adjusted. He maintained that there had been a total disregard by the Local Government Board of the opinion of the new local bodies, although one might have imagined that quite a different course would have been pursued. The Unionist Government of England in setting up these local bodies by Act of Parliament presumably thought that they were competent for the discharge of the duties imposed upon them, and surely they ought to be treated with respect and confidence by the Local Government Board as competent for the discharge of those duties, but it was only in the last resort, and when compelled by legal proceedings, that the Local Government Board had acted according to law.

What was the procedure of Dublin Castle as illustrated by the case of the

Wexford County Council? In August

1899, the Local Government Board brought to the knowledge of the county councils the fact that the salaries of the old grand jury officials would have to be revised, or, rather, that they would have to be increased or decreased according to the duties imposed on them in consequence of the passing of the Local Government Act. As might well be imagined, the county councils, having been only a few months in office, had a great deal to do; new and important duties had to be discharged, some of which, it was reasonable to suppose, they scarcely understood. At any rate they were hard at work when they received a circular from the Local Government Board, to which a great many of them gave no answer. They simply put the circular aside intending on a future day to make a full answer. Well, the Local Government Board received a communication from a county council official in regard to his salary, and the Board having heard only one side of the story, and without seeking for further information from the county council, issued a notice laying down that certain salaries were for the future to be paid by the county council to that officer, and if they did not pay such salary the officer would compel them to do so. The county council of Wexford woke up to the situation and submitted a series of reasons why the salary should not be increased. The Local Government Board themselves admitted that that list of reasons was of great importance and worthy of the greatest consideration. But, having that list of reasons before them, they actually wrote a month after, and three months before they issued the Sealed Order, and said that if they had got them sooner they would have taken them into consideration; meaning thereby that they could not take them into consideration because they received them too late. He thought that if the county councils in England were treated in that fashion by the English Local Government Board there would be an uproar in England and a demand for a change in the English Local Government Board. It was no wonder that Lord Justice Holmes, a gentleman who could not be accused of any Nationalist feeling or leaning, stated that the Wexford Council had taken a judicious course. He said;

"It forwarded a statement of the reasons against the increase of salary, which, whether

they were bad or good, were at least worthy of consideration. The reply to this document has caused me much surprise; and I feel myself bound to say that if it correctly reflects the spirit in which the Local Government Board has undertaken the important duties imposed upon it by the Act, no one can wonder if the result be friction and unpleasantness with the local authorities. Its purport is that if the arguments put forward by the council in support of their protest, against the increased salary of the county surveyor and his assistant had been furnished to the Board in the previous autumn, when the views of the council were invited upon the claims of the officers, it would have weighed very carefully the council's opinion before deciding upon the increased salaries to be allowed, but that as the council did not intervene, either by supplying any statement of its views or by coming to an agreement with the officers, the Board had only to fulfil the obligations imposed by the sub section."

Then Lord Justice Holmes went on to express his opinion that the Board's letter

of April "must be regarded as a very curious contribution to official literature," which was another way of saying that it was a most incompetent document to issue to any local body. Was it any wonder that there were differences between the Local Government Board and the local bodies? Some of the details of this case were really amusing. One of the reasons given in a letter by the Local Government Board for holding to its decision to increase the salaries, was that after all to increase the salaries of the officers would not add a half-penny to the rates. What business had the Local Government Board to take into consideration whether it would add a half-penny or a penny to the rates? Their business was to act according to law. It appeared from the affidavit of Sir Henry Robinson that the county of Wexford required extreme skill and attention on the part of the county surveyors, because it had a large seaboard, with piers and harbours and several roads running down to strands and landing places, and that there were a number of important bridges. But the large sea-board and the piers and harbours and bridges were there before the Act of 1898 was passed, and the surveyor was obliged to do all that inspection before the passing of the Act; and yet this great Department actually indulged in that ridiculous ground of excuse for increasing the salary of the county surveyor. He wanted to draw attention

to a claim made by the Local Government Board both in the Queen's Bench and in the Court of Appeal. That claim of the Local Government Board was that they were above the law. They said; "We are a great Department of State; we are like the Lord Lieutenant, or the Lord Chancellor in the distribution of legal patronage, and our acts, no matter what they are, cannot be inquired into in a court of law." In that case, as was pointed out by one of the counsel, if they declared Li Hung Chang to be an existing officer, entitled to an increase of salary, their order could not be investigated or set aside in a Court of law. All the judges of the Queen's Bench Division had decided against that contention, and the Court of Appeal had also unanimously decided against it; but the mere fact that such a claim was made by the Local Government Board in Ireland showed more clearly than anything else the spirit in which they administered a remedial Act of Parliament.

Speaking as an Irish Nationalist representative, he was of opinion that several good acts had been passed by this Parliament for Ireland, which, if they had been properly administered, would have done great good and settled probably great questions sooner than they would otherwise be. The Land Act of 1870 was, in his opinion, a great Act and contained great principles, and if it had been administered so as to give full effect to the intentions of Parliament they would never have seen the agitation of the last ten years. In the same way, if the Land Act of 1881 had been administered in a spirit calculated to give effect to the intention of its framers, they would never have seen the agitation which compelled the passing of all the Amendments of that Act. The truth was, that the best Acts might be passed with the best intentions, but as long as they left in Ireland a bureaucracy out of sympathy with those for whose benefit they were passed to administer these Acts, there would never be anything but failure. So also in regard to the Local Government Act. He did not agree with some of his

colleagues in their criticisms of the Local Government Act. He thought that Act did give to Ireland the same rights and privileges as the English Local Government Act gave to England, and in his opinion it was a great work of legislation, and he would not be candid or telling the truth if he did not say so. At the same time the Board which set to work to administer that Act was composed of persons out of all sympathy with the people, and with the spirit in which the Act was conceived, and were consequently determined in their own minds to frustrate the objects of that Act and all other remedial measures passed for Ireland. He, for one, deplored this state of things, and he must confess that he despaired of seeing any remedy. This led up to a bigger question than that they were now discussing, namely, national self-government for Ireland. As long as Home Rule and the management of Irish national affairs by a free Parliament elected by the people in Ireland was refused, they must maintain these English agents in Ireland, for no matter who went into Dublin Castle he was speedily corrupted. Therefore, he had not the least hope, from these debates, that any radical reformation would ensue. All the same, it was their duty to make perfectly plain the state of affairs that now existed, and if that state of affairs could be defended he would be greatly surprised.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE (Wiltshire. Cricklade) said he wished to say a few words on this subject, because when the Irish Local Government Bill was passing through the House he called the attention of the Committee on the Bill to the extraordinary character of the clauses that were practically the subject of debate now, especially when compared with English legislation. He ventured to prophesy that at a very early stage trouble would arise in Ireland over these clauses, and that was what had occurred, although he would rather have been a false prophet in the case. As a matter of fact, it was perfectly clear that these wide clauses, giving such large powers to the Local Government Board, had already been a cause of mischief; a greater cause of mischief even than he anticipated. The Irish Local Government Board apparently by some of these unfortunate motives had failed to administer the Act properly, and had used the powers given to them to put a construction upon the Act which had been questioned before the law. As a matter of general principle, he rejoiced when a court of law put its foot down against the most gigantic attempt ever made to set up administrative law, a law conceived in the secret rooms of a Government Department, to over-ride the law of the land. There were clauses and schedules in the Irish Local Government Bill which undoubtedly did arm the Board with gigantic powers, and he and others had at the time pointed out that that was an unprecedented attempt to set up administrative law as distinct from the law of the land. He must say that he thought the Government had been successful in doing so, and that it would not be in the power of a court of law to escape from the loose declarations in the Bill, by which apparently it was put in the power of the Local Government Board to do anything in the world in bringing the Act into operation. But seemingly a limit had been reached, and an Irish Court had been found strong enough to say; thus far and no farther. He ventured to say that the Irish Court had rendered a service not only to Ireland but to England, because Government boards had done injury to the

public by obscure amendments of administrative law.

He would take the particular case under discussion. The County Council of Wexford, it appeared, imposed certain new duties upon one of its officers, and that officer, under the terms of the Local Government Act, was entitled to have his salary increased in proportion to the new work placed upon him, and if he was dissatisfied with the salary offered, he had a right to go to the Local Government Board as a sort of arbitrator. But the Local Government Board attempted to go beyond that, and said that they would inquire into the whole question of the salary, and would practically decide, not only whether the percentage of increase of salary represented the percentage of increase of work, but whether the original salary was or was not adequate. Now, the Government should trust the county councils to arrange these questions of salary. If they could not trust them in matters of that kind they might as well not have called the county councils into being at all. The one chance of improving the administration of Ireland was to trust the local bodies which had been called into existence. Of course there would be mistakes; there were mistakes even in local bodies outside Ireland. After all, if they could not trust the county councils, whom were they going to trust? These were the most important of all the local bodies, and the bodies to which all of them looked to lay the foundation of a sound public opinion in Ireland. They on that side of the House looked to the county councils of Ireland as paving the way to something, as they thought, larger, higher, and better; to what they called Home Rule. They knew that hon. Members on the Government side of the House did not believe in that view, but looked to the county councils as being able to do such great things for administration in Ireland as to make Home Rule unnecessary. It was part of the great plan to kill Home Rule in Ireland by concessions and kindness; but how were they going to do that unless they treated these local bodies which they had created with some amount of confidence and goodwill? After all, what was it that these county councils wanted? Who were the officers of these councils? There was no chief constable, because the police were entirely centralised; and there was no county medical officer of health. The only leading officers were the county clerk, the county treasurer, and the county surveyor. Did they mean to tell him that Ireland was such a backward country that they could not trust the Irish county councils to settle the salaries of these three officers? If they were not able to do that, what were they fit for? He agreed with what fell from the hon. Member for North Dublin, that a strict eye must be kept on the administration of this Act, for it was a fact that whenever a Bill was placed on the Statute Book there were, at headquarters in Dublin, a set of men whose object was administratively to reduce and, if possible, destroy the wise concessions to Ireland which had been made in this House either by a Liberal or a Tory Government; the only difference being that they regarded the Liberals as enemies and the Unionists as traitors to their cause when they made any concession. In his opinion the hon. Baronet was perfectly justified in bringing up this case. He remembered when he last had the honour of a seat in the House there was an inquiry as to the Irish Board of

Works, which was shown to be determined to stand in the way of any reform or of being reformed itself, and the Commission recommended what ought to be done. That was during Mr. Gladstone's first administration; but when Mr. Gladstone came into power again the Board of Works was just exactly as it was when the Commission reported upon it. What was true of the Irish Board of Works was true of other bodies. There was nothing in the world so difficult to fight as the accumulated prejudices of a Government Department. The departmental official was always there; the parliamentary official came and went. If the permanent official only lasted long enough he was bound to outlive the Parliamentary official. He did not attack the Chief Secretary, because he was aware of the difficulties which the right hon. Gentleman had to face; but whether they were favourable to our rubor not, it was necessary to make Dublin Castle understand that when Parliament passed an Act it was intended that the officials at the Castle should obey the Act in the spirit as well as in the letter. In nine cases out of ten, though the officials carried out an Act to the letter, they never carried it out in the spirit. He considered the establishment of the county councils in Ireland the greatest reform which had been placed on the Statute Book for ten or fifteen years, and everyone should unite in seeing that the benefits that Parliament decided three years previously should be granted to Ireland should not be given with one hand and taken away with the other.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The noble Lord will forgive me for saying that his speech was not so closely addressed to the question before the House as some of those to which we have listened in the course of this debate. It was rather in the nature of a disquisition into the nature of government in Ireland. The noble Lord told me he brought no charge against myself or my predecessors, but he drew a gloomy picture of Irish officials banded together for the purpose of destroying the benefits just given by this Parliament to Ireland. He said that the Local Government Board was inspired by unfortunate prejudices. I hope to prove that in this matter the Local Government Board has been inspired solely by the motive of discharging the strict obligations imposed upon it by this House in the year 1898, and I can prove that out of a speech to which we have listened this evening; the speech of the hon. Baronet who brought this matter before us this evening. I was much, struck by a sentence which fell from him towards the end of his speech. He said in the most emphatic terms, "We are bound to have the Act amended." That is the whole point. This attack, which I admit is justified, against the Local Government Board, is founded upon a mistake in the Act of 1898. It is an attack against provisions which are vital to the Act, and in the absence of which the Act never would have been passed by this House or any similar assembly.

Let me come direct to the point. In the Local Government Act of 1898 there is one part; part 8; which is specifically labeled "Transitory Provisions." The Local Government Act of 1898 effected a revolution in the government of Ireland. It transferred from the grand juries greater [powers than had ever been held by similar bodies in the country. Almost all power of local government had accumulated in 200 years in the hands of the grand juries, and those powers were

transferred to elective bodies. No such Act could have been passed without providing protection for the officers who had been employed by the grand juries; and in these transitory provisions it was provided that the officers who had served the grand juries; secretaries, surveyors, and others,; should have certain rights, after the period of a year, as they were bound to go on serving So that they should not embarrass the new body by immediate resignation. They were to serve on at the same salary, and for any increase of duty they were to have an increase of emolument, and the Local Government Board, and no other any body was to determine the in-

creased emolument. That is in the Act, and if that is desired to be altered, hon. Members must come into the House and argue that the law is faulty.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: That is quite understood, but my point was that the Local Government Board went beyond that. They tried to gauge the salary without going into the question of whether the percentage of increased emolument represented the percentage of increased work, and it was decided by the Irish courts that their action was illegal.

MR. WYNDHAM: I was coming to that immediately. It was for that reason that the hon. Baronet who opened the discussion was driven to the conclusion that until the Act was amended nothing could be done. I can go as far as anybody in believing that when you give power to local bodies you should not wreck that power with unnecessary restraints, but this is not an unnecessary restraint. This is a transitory provision similar to the provisions embodied in the English Act, and which is always embodied in Acts of this kind. It might be galling to have to employ a man whom you do not like, or to have to pension him off at Civil Service rates in order to employ the man you prefer. But this is part of the necessary sacrifice which must be made in order to carry through a great revolutionary and beneficial change in local government. It was put up with in this country without a murmur, and also in a great part of Ireland; and where objection is taken it is taken in order to make another attack on the Local Government Board; ["Certainly not"]; because it embodies in the minds of hon. Members the emblem of British rule. [Cries of "British misrule."] I am not surprised to hear that cheer, but how factious is this attack. The Vice-President of the Local Government Board, who is principally arraigned, is a distinguished Irishman and the son of a distinguished Irishman. He is a man who enjoys the warm respect of most Irishmen; and he deserves that respect, for the energy and devotion with which he applied himself to the work placed on the Local Government Board when called upon to interpret and to administer this great Act. In these difficult two years in every act he has been considerate, and his every word has been courteous. Yet the action of the Local Government Board is called into question as though he was naturally inclined to wreck the Act.

Let me come at once to the charge that is brought against the Board. The action of the Local Government Board is arraigned because it was illegal, and also because its action has been hasty, arrogant, and unjust, inasmuch as it has imposed a charge on the Irish ratepayers which it was not justified in imposing, and which was not entertained by the framers of the Act. I feel the charge of

illegality, but I am not one of those who ask this House to constitute itself into a Court of Appeal, and I shall say little about that, but to the charge of illegality there has been added the charge that the actions of the Board have been hasty, arrogant, and unjust. I think as to the illegality I plead guilty at once, but I may remark upon this point, as the hon. Baronet upon the point of illegality addressed himself exclusively to English Members of the House, who may be horrified to hear that a great public department has been cast in the High Court of Appeal in Ireland, that consideration should be given to the circumstances. The Lord Chief Justice, who gave the judgment, insisted upon the great heaviness of the burden thrown on the Local Government Board in its duty of interpreting for the first time and applying to the whole of Ireland this new law. It is a fact that during many months that Department, which has been taunted with neglecting its legal work, had to write 3,000 official letters per week on matters involved in the Act, and it was on one of those letters that the Local Government Board was cast. When the case was brought before the court of first instance it was unanimously decided that the Local Government Board was technically right, and I need not labour the point of illegality further than to say that the House must understand that it does not follow because the Local Government Board was wrong on this occasion that therefore the county councils are to decide as to the salaries of the existing officers. The legal points were very ably argued, but few were decided. The Lord Chief Baron, Lord Justice FitzGibbon, and Lord Justice Holmes all agreed in saying that the Local Government Board under the Act had final, conclusive, and uncontrolled power to determine whether there had been an increase of duty or not. And if the Local Government Board has that right and is charged with that duty, who is to decide the increase of salary for such increase of duty? The three judges of the Court of Appeal also agreed that that duty was obligatory on the Local Government Board. It might be asked, if upon these two great questions of substance the Local Government Board was in the right, why was their action found to be illegal? Because the learned judges decided; and, I think, quite rightly; that the decision of the Local Government Board was based upon a wrong principle. The ground upon which they were cast was that in the terms of the letter they so expressed themselves as to leave the judges of the Court of Appeal no option but to believe that they had taken into account the adequacy of the original salary as well as the amount of increase and the emolument for that increase. That is the whole matter. I accept the decision of the High Court, but I must tell hon. Members that this is not as a matter of fact the principle which guides the action of the Local Government Board. The words in the Act are not too clear. They are that these officers should receive such increase or diminution of remuneration in proportion to the increase or diminution of their duties as the Local Government Board might determine. That is not a very clear phrase, and the judges in the High Court gave various views as to what such proportion would mean. The intention of the provision, however, is clear. The intention was that the Local Government Board, and no one else, should have a discretion to give added remuneration which should be more or less proportionate to the added work

imposed on the officers. I have only dwelt upon this legal point to show what a melancholy prospect is before us if the hon. Baronet persists in his determination to test every one of these technicalities in a court of law, and to make the Irish ratepayer pay for that intellectual exercise. But is the action of the Local Government Board in honestly attempting to carry out the duty placed upon it arrogant or unjust? The Act was passed in August, 1898, and declared that the new salaries of these officers were to begin from 1st April, 1899. From that date they were entitled to increase of pay, and the Local Government Board was responsible to Parliament and to eternal justice to see they received their due. It was not until August, 1899, that a courteous letter, to which no reference has been made, was addressed to the county councils of Ireland. That letter points out to the county councils the provisions existing in the Act, and invites their co-operation in giving any information at their command in order to assist the Local Government Board. That was a year after the passing of the Act. The hon. Member read a letter which, for the purposes of my argument. I am glad to find is in close juxtaposition to the affidavit of Mr. Piggot. This letter was written a year after the other letter to which I have referred, and two years after the passing of the Act, and Mr. Piggot swears in his affidavit that it is especially inequitable to fix these salaries on ex parte evidence. That is a year after the expression of their views was invited. From the Wexford County Council we have received no assistance or expression of views on this subject whatever.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE: They replied in December of the same year.

MR. WYNDHAM: Then that letter is not printed in the Return. But I take the hon. Baronet's word. In December the Wexford County Council demurred altogether to the course the Local Government Board was taking. How many of these officers are there in Ireland? There are thirty-three secretaries, thirty-three surveyors, and 170 assistant surveyors, the duties of the surveyors and assistant surveyors being to inspect the roads in the counties of Ireland. Ten counties in Ireland, not on the motion of the Local Government Board, but of their own free will, came to an agreement with all their officers which entirely fulfilled all the intentions of the Act.

MR. CLANCY: In consequence of an illegal circular.

MR. WYNDHAM: The circular was not illegal, and the hon. Member is quite in error in supposing that the counties to which I have referred acted on the suggestion of the Local Government Board.

MR. CLANCY: It was on the basis of the circular of the 7th February that the Court of Appeal decided that the Local Government Board had committed an illegality, and that was the circular which dictated the agreement to which the right hon. Gentleman refers.

MR. WYNDHAM: I say that that is not so. The circular of the 7th February was the document which led the Court to hold that our action was illegal, but I say that ten county councils in Ireland agreed with all their officers irrespective of and anterior to the issue of the views of the Local Government Board; seven other counties came to an agreement with their officers at a time when I am not sure whether or not they were in possession of the views of the Board; six

counties undoubtedly made agreements in accordance with the terms issued by the Board; and ten counties refused to act in accordance with the wishes of the Board. Indeed, the circular of the Board, which is chiefly impugned, was largely based upon the terms of the agreements which had been arrived at by the various counties in Ireland, and especially in the case of the assistant surveyors. I would point out that under the grand juries the assistant surveyors with one or two exceptions, had the same emoluments; namely, £80 a year; but by voluntary agreement county Cavan gave its assistant surveyor £170; county Dublin, £150; county Meath, £160; county Galway, £120; county Tipperary, one £200, and two others £140; and so forth. By voluntary agreement these counties gave higher salaries than that to which the hon. Baronet takes such exception. We did not take the highest of those, but we took £150 as the maximum and £120 as the minimum, and we felt that the discretion which we believe we have ought to be exercised within those limits. Under the grand juries the assistant surveyors, who had uniform duties and uniform salaries, had to inspect the roads twice and to make two reports to the grand juries each year. When this Act was passed their work was doubled, because instead of two meetings per year of the grand juries, it provided for four meetings of the county councils, and, therefore, four inspections of the roads, four reports, and so on. On that ground the Local Government Board undoubtedly took mileage into account, because if the work was doubled the man who travelled most miles had a larger increase of work than the man who travelled a smaller number of miles. Was it unreasonable to say that the man who had 800 additional miles to do should have £30 a year more than the man who did only 500 miles? The officer upon whose case these proceedings were taken by the Wexford County Council had to inspect 554½ miles of roads. The effect of doubling his work was therefore to impose upon him the duty of inspecting an extra 1,109 miles. For that his salary was raised by the Local Government Board from £80 to £150. I doubt whether anybody would say we had gone beyond the actual dictates of common justice or even been guilty of a technical illegality if they understood that that is the whole head and front of our offending. We were bound to take the action we did. We based it upon our construction of the Act, and fixed the scale upon the agreements voluntarily come to by various county councils, and, above all, upon the fact of the increased duties which we were directed by the Act to take into account when fixing these increases of salary. We may have been guilty of a technical illegality, but I doubt whether anybody with justice can say that the action of the Board was at all precipitate, arrogant, or unjust towards the ratepayers of Ireland. We did break the letter of the law, but the Wexford County Council and the hon. Members opposite are seeking that we should break the spirit of the law. ["No."] Yes, for what are the pleas which have been advanced? They are that the old salaries were ample even though the men have to make four inspections instead of two. [Hear, hear.] That proves my whole contention. That is precisely what we are precluded from doing by the explicit provisions of this Act. Hon. Members from Ireland are asking, and the hon. Baronet is driven by his own argument to ask, that we should repeal certain provisions of the Act.

Correspondence on this matter went on in courteous terms, and it was not until July, 1900, two years after the passing of the Act, that the Local Government Board issued a mandate to say that these gentlemen were to receive the money due to them for fifteen months and guaranteed by Parliament.

I do not know that I should labour the matter any more. I would ask the hon. Baronet to consider where we now stand. I have said enough on the legal point involved to show that we could go to law about every phrase and technical point in the Act; but surely that would not be a wise thing to do. We are to have an inquiry into the Wexford case, and I suggest that it should be treated as a test case, and, if it should turn out that the Local Government Board have made some error in their calculation, of course the Local Government Board will take that into account. But, whatever happens, nothing can alter the fact that the officers who have honourably served the grand jury are entitled to continued employment at the same emolument and to increased emolument for increased duty, and are entitled to retire on pensions calculated on the Civil Service scale. These propositions embody the substance of my contention; all the rest is form and technicality, upon which may be opened an almost illimitable vista of litigation. I hope the hon. Baronet will not encourage those who trust in him to take so disastrous a course. When is an existing officer not an existing officer, which proposition is not a rule of three sum, and if not, why not; these are questions of the deepest speculative interest; but I doubt whether the Irish people should be called upon to pay for their elucidation.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.) said he had seldom listened to a more characteristic speech from an Irish Secretary than that which they had just heard. At the end of his speech and in the course of an eloquent appeal to the hon. Baronet who had earned the thanks of every county council in Ireland in respect of the action he had taken on this question, the right hon. Gentleman declared that he did not understand the clause under which the operations had been carried on so long. It had been argued in a court of law, and the judges had been utterly unable to understand what it meant. In the long debates which took place when the Local Government Act was before the House he ventured to say that it was a badly drafted Act, and that some of the provisions- and this would apply also to the orders and rules which had since been made; would lead to enormous and endless litigation in Ireland. He thought the prophecy he then made had been more than justified by the speech to which they had listened.

He came now to the substance of the speech. What did the Chief Secretary say at the very outset? He admitted frankly that the action of the Local Government Board was illegal, but he contended that that illegality was a question of form and not of substance. The statements which the right hon. Gentleman made with regard to the principle on which the Local Government Board acted on these occasions were absolutely contradicted by the judgment of the learned judges in the Court of Appeal. The Chief Secretary went on to say that certain action would be legal but idiotic; rather an extraordinary phrase. In fact his speech bristled with extraordinary phrases. The hon. Member contended that the action of the Local Government Board had been illegal and idiotic, because they not

only fixed these salaries without proper local inquiry and without proper consultation of the county councils, but in their eagerness to do so they broke the law. Undoubtedly the Act conferred excessive powers on the Local Government Board of Ireland. That was one of the blots of the Act. He raised that question on the Second Reading and again several times in Committee. He complained that the Act as drafted conferred on the Local Government Board; a body utterly out of touch' with and irresponsible to the people of the country; powers enormously in excess of those conferred on the Local Government Board of England, which was directly responsible to the representatives of the people, and which would never dream of entering on the career of dictatorial assertion of its powers which was practised constantly by the Local Government Board of Ireland. He ventured to say that if the Act was passed in that form they would find in Ireland before it had been working long a revolt on the part of the population against its excessive powers. That was exactly what had happened. The Chief Secretary had entered into a long argument to show in reference to the increase of salaries and the other acts complained of that the Local Government Board had simply done its duty and carried out the law. The whole question was the spirit in which they had carried out the law, and the discretion which they had shown. Nobody objected to any official in Ireland left by the grand jury obtaining a just increase of salary in respect of a real increase of work. He believed there was not a single county council in Ireland which had raised any objection. What they objected to was that the Local Government Board had approached the consideration of this question in a spirit of partisanship, and that they had in many cases ignored the fair and reasonable opinion of the councils. By approaching the consideration of this question in a spirit of partisanship they had stirred up all this trouble. They ought not to give to the Local Government Board in Ireland so wide a discretion as to say that they were entitled to raise the salary of any officer employed by any local body in Ireland without considering local feeling and without consultation with the local representatives of the people who were entitled to form an opinion on the subject. The local bodies who had to find the money were the only men in a position to know what increase there had been in the duties, and this action on the part of the Local Government Board would almost lead to a revolt in any other country in the world but Ireland.

He would turn for a moment to the assertion made by the Chief Secretary, in which he laid down the principle on which the Local Government Board considered these salaries. He distinctly understood him to say that this did not involve going back upon the question as to whether the officers had been paid previously too much or not. Here was an extract from the judgment given by Lord Justice Fitzgibbon;

"I am certain of the fact upon the evidence, and it is the ground of my decision, that the

Board assumed the jurisdiction of considering the existing remuneration for the existing duties, and to lay down scales of payment for the future which were to regulate the pay for the old as well as for the new duties."

It was clear from this evidence that the board did assume the discretion which

the Chief Secretary now denied. The same principle appeared to have been adopted in the case of county surveyors, and yet the Chief Secretary came down there and declared that there was no foundation for that statement. Another judge; Lord Justice Holmes; said;

"The Board has recast and revised old salaries."

That was what the Chief Secretary said they never did.

MR. WYNDHAM: I stated that although the terms of their letter which was laid before the judges drove them to that conclusion, really as a matter of fact the Board did not act in that way.

MR. DILLON said he saw in the Chief Secretary's speech abundant evidence of what they were to expect from him, and he was going to be the mouthpiece and conduit pipe for the officials of Dublin Castle. It was stated that there was not a shred of evidence to show that the Board had acted upon any other principle than that which he had stated, and yet they were asked to ignore the opinion of two judges and accept the statement of the Chief Secretary.

Coming to the question of discretion on the part of the Local Government Board, he heard the Chief Secretary state that by a calculation it was found that the county surveyors had to inspect twice as many roads as before. What evidence was there of that? None at all. He was not a county councillor, but he was assured by his colleagues who were members of these councils that there was no foundation for that statement. There was no provision in the Act requiring the road inspectors to go over the road twice as often as they did before. All the extra work they had to do was to attend the meetings of the councils four times a year, instead of twice under the Grand Jury system. On that point he preferred to take the information of his own experienced colleagues rather than the opinion of the Chief Secretary. The

Local Government Board having, according to the Chief Secretary himself, interpreted this extraordinary clause, drafted as it was in a way which no human being could understand, in the sense of giving them the widest possible discretion, had exercised that discretion in the silliest and most idiotic way possible. The complaints on this score were made not only by the Nationalist Councils, but also by the councils on which the Unionists were in power. They had heard of the Tipperary and Wexford County Councils, which could compare with any county councils for administrative efficiency. But let them take the case of the county council of Derry. (He might say parenthetically that the Northern counties cut down the salaries of their officers to half what was given in the South). The Local Government Board declared in their knowledge and wisdom that the secretary of this council should get a large increase of salary on account of his increased work. But in this case the worthy man had never done anything at all. He was one of the class of Rois fainéants or "dead heads" under the old grand jury men, who did very little themselves, but who sweated some poor devil at £100 a year to do their work for them. This intelligent gentleman hardly did anything but sign his name, and yet the Local Government Board ordered his salary to be increased 50 per cent, on account of the increase of his labours; He never did any duty and never wanted to do any duty. There was another bitter dispute in the case of the secretary of the Antrim County

Council. He alluded to these cases to show that this was not a party question. The substance of complaint was that the Local Government Board were given this power of discretion, and that they used it in a partisan, unfair, and outrageous manner. In the Wexford case the Local Government Board did not take sufficient pains to consult the men on the spot who knew the circumstances of the case, and who had to provide the salaries, and when their views were before the Board they treated the council with impertinence and neglect. It was idle for the Chief Secretary to fall back on the letter of the law in this case. He admitted that he was unable to tell what that was; but, even supposing it was quite clear, the letter of the law was nothing as compared with the administration. Would the Chief Secretary contend that the Local Government Board could so far exercise this power of discretion, as to go about the country doubling and trebling the salaries of officials? The Local Government Board had the power and discretion to do that, and would the Chief Secretary defend such action? Before exercising their discretion in this case, the Local Government Board should have hesitated, and thought twice, and three times, rather than come into collision with popular sentiment in the country, unless they were convinced that deliberately and of set purpose the representatives of the ratepayers meant to penalise and hunt down some old officials. He was of opinion that the Irish county councils in the South as well as in the north approached this question of dealing with existing officers in an honest spirit, and with a really sincere desire to carry out the spirit of the Act. The late Chief Secretary had said that this action of the Local Government Board had been taken under provisions in the Act to which the Irish party had assented. That was absolutely untrue. The Irish Members protested against all these provisions.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): I affirm most distinctly that we were pressed by the Irish Members to give more favourable terms to these officers.

MR. DILLON: I deny that that was the attitude of the Irish party.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): And I affirm most distinctly that we proposed a dozen Amendments in the contrary direction.

MR. DILLON said the late Chief Secretary was wrong in attributing to the Irish party any desire to press for more favourable terms. What that party did was to appeal to the Government to extend to other officials the same treatment as was proposed to be given to the old grand jury officials. The Irish Members always protested against the giving of this extravagant power to the Local Government Board; and as far as he was concerned himself he could quote for the House an extract from the speech he delivered on the Bill, in which he warned the Government that this clause would lead to endless litigation and to something like revolt on the part of the local bodies. The Chief Secretary now challenged them as to what they would do in this case, and wanted to know would they take it to a higher court. He again warned the Government of the danger of arousing in Ireland such a combination on the part of the councils as would make the working of the machinery of this Act very difficult. The Chief Secretary argued that there should be some ruling body to decide these matters. That might be admitted, but while the Bill was passing

through the House the Irish Members warned the Government that if they packed the Local Government Board in the interests of the landlord party and the old grand jurors it would be sure to provoke a collision. That was what had been done by the Government. There was no representative of the people on the Local Government Board. But the Government had brought in to assist in the working of the Act a representative of the landlord class instinct with all the bitterness of that class; a gentleman, moreover, who had denounced the Act just at the time it was being passed, and even after he had been appointed, as an Act that had been so badly drawn that no human being could understand it. The Board would always remain incompetent in the present atmosphere of Dublin Castle. If the Government had wanted to give the Act a chance of working what they should have done would have been to say, "Here, we are going to work a great popular machinery. Let us bring in on the Board two nominative gentlemen; (the Irish Members would rather have had them elective); not Orange landlords, but two popular gentlemen who, without salary, will act along with the Board and keep it in touch with the local bodies." If the Government had done that, none of those troubles would have arisen, because these popular gentlemen who were in touch with popular sentiment would have kept the Board straight. The condition of Ireland was peculiar, and it was perfectly clear that the Local Government Board was not responsive to popular opinion, and that the local bodies had no more influence on the Board in Dublin Castle than on the Yamen. Therefore, he maintained that in Ireland they had a totally different condition of things to deal with from what they had in England, and if the Government wanted to work the system of local government in Ireland smoothly and successfully they should bring the Local Government Board more into touch with popular sentiment. The Local Government Board was already a Department of Dublin Castle,, and as such in the existing atmosphere of Dublin Castle, was incompetent to work the machinery of an Act of this kind. When the Government nominated Mr. Bagenal to the Local Government Board, why did not they also nominate representatives of the Nationalist sections in the country? If they had done that none of these troubles would have arisen. The Chief Secretary knew that the conditions in Ireland were peculiar. He knew that the Local Government Board was not responsible to Irish public opinion, and treated with contempt the views of the Irish Nationalist Members. Therefore if the Government had wished to work this Act successfully they should have appointed to the Local Government Board some representatives of popular opinion in Ireland.

In conclusion he would refer to one other case, that of Mr. Nicholas Shee, the secretary of the county council of South Tipperary. The Chief Secretary gave this case the go-by, probably because he was ashamed of the action of the Local Government Board. What happened in this case? Mr. Shee was a Nationalist, and a most respectable farmer in the County Tipperary. He was elected secretary of the county council against the opposition of the Unionist Members. He put the affairs of the Council on a business footing, and the Local Government Board refused, against the wishes of all sections in the Council, to sanction his appointment on the ground that he was not competent. A more grotesque piece of oppression he never heard of. The Local Government Board sent down the son of

Colonel

Saunderson to examine Mr. Shee, the secretary to this council. They might as well send the grand-master of an Orange Lodge in Belfast to examine a Catholic priest, and see if he was qualified. This young gentleman was sent down to examine a prominent Nationalist of Tipperary, and to report upon his qualifications. The hon. Member protested against the introduction of this system of examination in Ireland, when there was no examination in England for corresponding positions. What right had the Government to put upon the councils a test which was not exacted from the old grand juries when they were administering the country? He hoped the Chief Secretary would give some explanation of this case. The treatment of Mr. Shee was grotesque and outrageous, and he was compelled to think, unless the spirit and disposition of the Local Government Board was altered, they would never have a smooth or successful working of the machinery of Local Government in Ireland.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT (Sheffield, Ecclesall): I venture to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, having regard to the lateness of the hour, whether it would not be possible to find an opportunity for discussing the subject of affairs in the Far East on the third reading of the Appropriation Bill on Thursday.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): Of course it does not in any way rest with the Government to say what topics should be taken on the Third Reading of the Appropriation Bill. That depends on the Members of the House of Commons, and the order in which they are called upon to take part in the debate. The hon. Gentleman has asked whether I might not ask the House to meet earlier on Thursday, so as to increase the time given for the Third Reading. I think such a course would be very unusual, if not unprecedented; but I believe it would be possible, perhaps, at the cost of some inconvenience, to try to get the House of Lords to meet on Friday morning instead of Thursday night. If that is thought desirable, and if I can make that arrangement on separating to-night, we might take the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill now, without a division. I am sure the House will recognise that I am doing my best to meet their desire for the discussion of the Appropriation Bill, and also that all that can be done has been done by the Government.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): think the suggestion that has come from the First Lord of the Treasury is a reasonable one. The debate has not been so long and exhaustive as we could have wished. Indeed, I know that a number of my hon. friends here were anxious to take part in the discussion. Still one must recognise the fact that

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)

Godson, Sir Augustus Frederi'k

Mount, William Arthur

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir AlexF.

Goschen, Hon. George Joachim

Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Green, Walford D (Wednesbu'y
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Gretton, John
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Arrol, Sir William
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Asher, Alexander
Groves, James Grimble
Parkes, Ebenezer
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Pemberton, John S. G.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Hamilton, Rt Hn LordG. (Mid'x
Pierpoint, Robert
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Hardy, Laurence (KentAshfo'd
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Bain, Col. James Robert
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Plummer, Walter R.
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynemo'th
Pretymann, Ernest George
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Banbury, Frederick George
Hayne, Rt. Hn. C. Seale-
Purvis, Robert
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.)
Rankin, Sir James
Beaeh, Rt. Hn. Sir M H. (Bristol)
Henderson, Alexander
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Hope, J. F- (Sheffield, Brightsi'e
Rentoul, James Alexander
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Ridley, Mat. W. (Stalybridge
Bill, Charles
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)

Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Bond, Edward
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Brassey, Albert
Keswick, William
Rutherford, John
Brigg, John
Knowles, Lees
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Brodrick, Rt. Hn. St. John
Lambert, George
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Bullard, Sir Harry
Lambton, Hon, Frederick Wm.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)
Butcher, John George
Law, Andrew Bonar
Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks.)
Caldwell, James
Lawrence, William F.
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire)
Lawson, John Grant
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Spear, John Ward
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Leveson-Gower, Fredk. N. S.
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
Levy, Maurice
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Charrington Spencer
Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H. A. E.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Valentia, Viscount
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Walker, Col. William Hall

Compton, Lord Alwyne
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Cranborne, Viscount
Macdona, John Cumming
Webb, Col. William George
Dalkeith, Earl of
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Welby, Lt.-Col. A C E (Taunton)
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham)
Majendie, James A. H.
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und Lyne)
Digby, John K. D. (Wingfield)
Malcolm, Ian
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield-
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Milton, Viscount
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Fellowes, Hn. Ailwyn Edward
Milward, Colonel Victor
Wodehouse, Rt, Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Finlay, Sir Robt. Bannatyne
More, Robert J. (Shropshire)
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Fisher, William Hayes
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
FitzGerald, Sir Rbt. Penrose-
Morrell, George Herbert
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)

the debate has been a substantial and important one. But we are dissatisfied with the result of the debate so far as the answer of the Government is concerned, and therefore we will mark our dissatisfaction by taking a vote. It will really be a division on the question of Local Government in Ireland which has been raised. We can reserve until the Third Reading, on Thursday, such other topics of discussion as may remain. Under these circumstances I would suggest to my hon. friends who feel keenly on this subject that it would be right for us now to take a division.

Question put.

The House divided::Ayes, 143; Noes, 51. (Division List No. 107.)

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)

Hayden, John Patrick

O'Doherty, William

Ambrose, Robert

Jameson, Major J. Eustace

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

Burke, E. Haviland-

Joyce, Michael

O'Dowd, John

Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)

Leamy, Edmund

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

Clancy, John Joseph

Lundon, W.

O'Malley, William.

Cogan, Denis J.

MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.

O'Mara, James

Condon, Thomas Joseph

M'Dermott, Patrick

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.

Crean, Eugene

M'Fadden, Edward

Power, Patrick Joseph

Cullman, J.

M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)

Reddy, M.

Delady, William

Mooney, John J.

Redmond, J. E. (Waterford)

Dillon, John

Murphy, J.

Redmond, William (Clare)

Doogan, P. C.

Nannetti, Joseph P.

Sullivan, Donal
Duffy, William J.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Thompson, E. C (Monaghan, N.
Ffrench, Peter
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Field, William
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)
Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.
Gilhooly, James
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)

Bill read a second time, and committed or to-morrow, at Twelve of the clock.

WIDOWS AND ORPHANS OF SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.

Lords Message [1st March] relating to the appointment of a Joint Committee on the Widows and Orphans of Soldiers and Sailors considered.

Ordered, That a Select Committee of Five Members be appointed to join with a Committee to be appointed by the Lords to consider the various Charitable Agencies now in operation, and the funds available for relieving Widows and Orphans of Soldiers and Sailors, with a view to ensuring that the funds subscribed by local and private benevolence are applied to the best advantage in supplementing a scheme of Government pensions for Widows and Orphans of Soldiers and Sailors who have lost their lives in war.

Ordered, That Two Members be added to the Select Committee.

Message to the Lords to acquaint them therewith.

Ordered. That Mr. Bartley, Mr. Hozier, Mr. Hayes Fisher, Mr. Kearley, and Mr. Lambert be nominated Members of the Committee.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That Three be the quorum.;(Sir William Walrond.)

PRESENCE OF THE SOVEREIGN IN PARLIAMENT.

Lords Message [19th March] considered: ;

Ordered, That a Select Committee of Five Members be appointed to join with a Committee to be appointed by the Lords to consider the accommodation available in the House of Lords when the Sovereign is personally present in Parliament, and the advisability of substituting Westminster Hall on such an occasion for the House of Lords (King's Consent signified).

Message to the Lords to acquaint them therewith.

Ordered, That Mr. Akers Douglas, Sir William Hart Dyke, Mr. Herbert Gladstone, Mr. Holland, and Mr. James William Lowther be Members of the said Committee.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That Three be the quorum.:(Sir William Walrond.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS ACCOMMODATION COMMITTEE.

The Select Committee on House of Commons Accommodation was nominated of; Sir John Aird, Mr. Akers Douglas, Sir Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett, Mr. Cochrane, Mr. Jacoby, Colonel Lock-wood, Dr. MacDonnell, Mr. Malcolm, Mr. Arthur Morton, Mr. Edward Morton, Mr. Newdigate, Mr. William Redmond, Sir Barrington Simeon, Mr. Soames, and Mr. Frederick Wilson.:(Sir William Walrond.)

Adjourned at a quarter before One of the clock.