

<https://api.parliament.uk/historic-hansard/sittings/1901/jun/11>

IN THE

SECOND SESSION OF THE TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND, IN THE FIRST YEAR OF THE REIGN OF

HIS MAJESTY KING EDWARD VII.

SEVENTH VOLUME OF SESSION.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 11th June, 1901.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

SOUTH METROPOLITAN GAS BILL. (BY ORDER.)

Order for Third Reading read.

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

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said he was sorry to intervene at this stage, but he thought a very important principle was involved in the point he was about to raise, and felt bound to call the attention of the House to it. This Bill contained a proposal by the South Metropolitan Gas Company to raise additional capital, and the Committee had varied one of the Standing Orders of the House with regard to the conditions under which the capital was to be raised. The Standing Order was perfectly clear and definite with regard to what should be done by every gas company and every water company when it wanted additional capital. It said that in every Bill to authorise the raising of additional capital provision should be made for the offering of such capital by public auction or tender at the best price at which it could be bought, and if the Committee recommended any variation from that condition it was bound to state its reasons. That Standing Order imposed upon the House fundamental principles with regard to gas and water legislation. It provided that whenever any additional capital was issued it should not be offered to any favoured class of stockholders or consumers, but should be offered to the public, and should be sold to the highest bidder. That was known as the Auction Clause, and it was embodied in every Act dealing with this matter. Before the Auction Clause was introduced scandals arose with regard to the allotment of capital in these companies. The shareholders had had a right, whatever capital was required, to claim that it should be allotted to them at par price; and this scandal had been found so serious that the House of Commons in 1876 adopted the Standing Order which was embodied in the Auction Clause. The Standing Order constituted no hardship to the companies, because it gave them the very thing which a company wanted; it gave them their capital at the lowest prices at which it could be obtained; but this Committee had been induced by the company to allow its stock to be offered to the employees of the company, or consumers of the company's gas, at £5 below the market price. That was a very extraordinary clause, and, if the House would look into it, it would be seen that it was not even provided that all the consumers, or all the employees, should have an opportunity of taking the stock. £5 was a compromise. The first proposal had been that it should be offered at £7 10s., and it was only on the inducement of a friend of

his, who was a member of the Committee, that the figure of £5 was decided upon.

This was a very

serious matter, because if £5 was to be adopted in this Bill why should not £10 be inserted in any other Bill? It constituted a most serious infringement of the principle laid down with regard to this legislation during the last twenty-five years. The Committee were supposed to give reasons for making a change in the Standing Order. What were their reasons in the present case? The Committee said that evidence was laid before them that the proposed variation would be such as to carry out very effectually the object of the Auction Clause; namely, to obtain for all capital issued by the company the highest possible price. But that, he submitted, was not a good reason for a variation of the Standing Orders of the House. The Report said that the object of the Standing Order was to secure that capital should be allotted at the highest price obtainable at the time. The idea was to prevent any hole-and-corner work; to prevent any favoured class from securing the stock which a public company under Act of Parliament had to offer. They ought to look at the effect which this proposal would have upon the public. This was a very large company, which had a big capital held by the public, and he believed the Committee were induced to allow the capital to be offered in this manner by the idea that the company was to be converted into a sort of co-operative undertaking. But, as a matter of fact, this was not a co-operative undertaking, because, although there were some two hundred thousand consumers of the gas, the stock-holders only numbered about ten thousand. There was indeed no intention of converting the company into a true co-operative company. The effect of the proposal of the Committee would be that the large bulk of the capital of the company held by the public would be depreciated by the fact that the allotment of the capital had been made at a lower price to a favoured circle. He believed the Committee were induced to pass the clause by the most able gas-manager of the South Metropolitan Company, for whose ability he had the highest respect. He told the Committee that sometimes the auction was not a success. As a matter of fact, of course, the market was sometimes "sick." There might be war rumours about, and consequently it was not always possible to get a good price for this stock. But he was quite willing to meet the company on that point. He would agree that they should be allowed to dispose of the stock in the way they proposed when the auction had taken place. The object which the Committee had in view might have been secured in a better way without the infringement of the Standing Orders of the House, and he therefore begged to move the Amendment which stood in his name.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, West) seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed;

"To leave out from the word 'That' to the end of the question, in order to add the words 'the Bill be re-committed to the former Committee in respect of Clause 5 (Sale of unissued stock), and that the Committee have leave to sit and proceed forthwith.'"; (Mr. Lough.)

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

MR. BANBURY (Camberwell, Peckham) said this was one of those matters which were

extremely awkward, because the House could not possibly understand it unless they had before them the evidence which was laid before the Committee dealing with the Bill. But he hoped to be able to show the House in a very few moments that the argument of the hon. Member opposite was quite illusory. What was really the reason for introducing what the hon. Member called the Auction Clause? It was found in the old days that when the stock of a company was at £150, and new stock had to be issued, it was issued to the shareholders at £100, and the consequence was that they had to issue a larger amount of stock than was actually necessary in order to obtain the money that was required. That was a great disadvantage to those who were permanent shareholders in the company, because it compelled it to pay smaller dividends. It was, in fact, an advantage to no one except to those few people who, having some knowledge of what was being done, would buy up a certain amount of stock in order to obtain the premium which resulted from the allotment. Therefore the Auction Clause was very excellent in its way. Its object

really was that the stock when issued should be sold at the highest price obtainable, and he would like it to be borne in mind that, although it was called an auction, the practice was to issue advertisements for tenders for the stock. It was a very excellent arrangement as long as it secured the end of obtaining the highest possible price, and at a time when there were great demands for this class of stock, and when, so to speak, the people were tumbling over one another in order to obtain it, it resulted satisfactorily. But that was not always the case, and he could mention instances where a parson, a widow, or a foolish person had paid as much as 5, 6, or 7 per cent. over the market value in order to get this class of stock. The London County Council now issued their stock at fixed prices and not by tender, and the only object of the proposal in this Bill was to give the alternative to the company to follow that example. It seemed to have been forgotten that under the Bill, before the company could issue its stock at fixed prices it would have to obtain the sanction of the Board of Trade. He thought that the £5 which had been fixed upon in the Bill was a rather larger margin than was actually necessary. An absolute margin was difficult to fix, but the issue at 5 per cent. below the market price when they wanted to get their money readily was not too much, while, on the other hand, when the Bank rate was 2 per cent., 5 per cent. was too much. But that was subject to the approval of the Board of Trade, which would take into consideration all the facts, and before they gave their consent would have regard to these facts. All that the clauses did was to give the company an alternative in issuing their stock to put it in such a way as would give them the largest price. The hon. Member said that he would be quite content if the company issued the stock at a fixed price after instead of before the auction sale, or before tenders were invited. But supposing tenders were advertised for and nobody tendered. So long as human nature was what it was people would say, "Oh, you offered your stock by public tender and nobody would take it. We do not want it now." That would be the very worst possible manner in which to issue stock. When they wanted to offer a thing to a person expecting to have it accepted they must not offer it to somebody else beforehand. For the reasons

which he had given, and which had been well considered by the Committee upstairs, the proposal could not easily result in injury to any person, but would probably result in advantage to the public, inasmuch as it gave the company an alternative method of issuing their stock; and therefore he hoped the House would reject the Amendment.

\*MR. TAYLOR (Lancashire, Radcliffe) said the hon. Member for West Islington had declared that this most important variation on the Standing Order had been made for no reason whatever, and that the result would be that the stock would go at a lower price. But what interest had the company to take steps to lower the price of their own holding? The very direct contrary was the case. Their desire was to get the very best possible price for their stock, and they would take their own time to realise it. They had found out from recent experience that the best way to get a good price was to offer a chance of obtaining the stock to their customers, to shareholders, and to the servants of the company. The company had already been doing splendid work in the way of profit-sharing with its employees, with the result that they had an interest in the capital of the company to the extent of £100,000, derived from their share of the company's profits. That was a feature which was worthy of the attention of the House. He did not wonder that the Committee had encouraged the company to share profits with their employees, for the price of their gas was lower than that of other companies, and they paid their employees higher wages. Why? Through the business capacity of the manager, Mr. Livesey, and their adoption of the profit-sharing principle on his recommendation. The facts had amply justified the Committee upstairs in making the exception they had done as to the rules and the issue of stock. There was no doubt that in issuing the stock they would depress the value of the stock as little as possible. They all knew that the first effect of the issue of fresh stock was to depress the value of the rest of the shares, but they might safely leave such a company as this, under such able management, with such privileges as the Bill provided.

\*SIR HENRY FLETCHER (Sussex, Lewes) said that as Chairman of the Committee which had considered this Bill, he might be allowed a few words in reply to the hon. Member for West Islington. He had had the honour of sitting on Committees upstairs for over twenty years, and for many years past he had been a Chairman of Committees, and he was free to admit that the decision come to on this question was one which, perhaps, had never been adopted before in regard to the Standing Orders. But still, times varied, and matters varied in regard to company legislation in many respects. The evidence which was put before the Committee as to the very able manner in which this company has been managed by Mr. Livesey was overwhelming. Many hon. Members of the House knew how this energetic gentleman had done more for gas companies than any man living. On the evidence the Committee were perfectly justified in adopting the course they had done. The hon. Member for West Islington had read a portion of the evidence given upstairs, but the effect of another part of the evidence was that the object of the auction sales was to ensure the issue of new capital at market price. It was put before the Committee in the most conclusive manner by Mr. Livesey that raising money by tender or through auction sales had not been in any way a

success. In fact, during last winter and the winter before the South Metropolitan Company had very great difficulty in raising money by tender. It was necessary to fix a reserve price, and if this was done, a large proportion of the stock was not sold. The number of buyers attending the sales by auction was very limited, and it was found that investors preferred dealing at a fixed price. That had also been the experience of the Government and the London County Council. It was the desire of the South Metropolitan Company to place a large number of their shares in the hands of their consumers, who numbered 200,000, the shareholders, who numbered 9,000, and the employees, who numbered 2,000. The Committee were well aware that this was to a certain extent a novel clause which had been inserted in the Bill, but taking everything into consideration they were of opinion that they did right in allowing the clause; and he hoped the House would sustain the Committee in the decision they had come to, reject the Amendment, and read the Bill a third time.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said he was afraid that the speeches of the Chairman of the Committee and the hon. Member for Radcliffe had only convinced him that the Bill ought not to pass the Third Reading. These hon. Gentlemen placed their arguments solely on the ground of the particular merits of the chairman of the company. He did not deny the merits of Mr. Livesey, who had conducted the company to the great advantage of the shareholders and the consumers. He saw no great objection to the issue of capital at a fixed price if the public were allowed to participate in the issue; because there was no doubt the tender system had become very difficult in working. He was afraid that if the House allowed the proposal in the Bill it would be extended to other cases, and the object of the Standing Order, which was that the best price obtainable should be got, would disappear.

\*THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Mr. J. W. LOWTHER, Cumberland, Penrith) said that the question debated had resolved itself into the consideration of whether the Standing Order had been set aside or evaded. He was sure the House would insist upon its Standing Orders being respected; and if he had thought that in this case the Standing Order referred to had been distinctly set aside by the Committee he would have taken upon himself the duty of bringing the matter before the attention of the House. But that was not his opinion on this occasion. The hon. Member for West Islington, who introduced the discussion, cited a recent case, but hon. Members would remember that in that case he took upon himself the duty of bringing before the House the fact that he thought that one of the Standing Orders had been evaded. What was the Standing Order in point? It said;

"In every Bill by which an existing gas or water company is authorised to raise additional capital, provision shall be made for the offer of such capital by public auction or tender at the best price which can be obtained."

If the Standing Order had stopped there the case of the hon. Member would have been complete; but it went on;

"Unless the Committee of the Bill shall report that such provision ought not to be required, with the reasons on which their opinion is founded."

It would be seen that a dispensing power was given by the Standing Order to the

Committee; and the Committee, whether wisely or not he was not prepared at present to argue, for he had not heard all the evidence, had on this occasion exercised that dispensing power. They might have been convinced by the admirable way in which Mr. Livesey gave his evidence as to the past history of the gas market, or as to the present state of the market. There might be a number of other matters which might have induced the Committee to conceive that, in this instance, it was not necessary to insist upon the Auction and Tender Clause. That being so, and the Committee having exercised their discretion after hearing the evidence, he could not ask the House to set aside their decision. Seeing that the Standing Order of the House had not been violated, he ventured to suggest that the motion of the hon. Member for West Islington be rejected, and that the Bill be read a third time. With regard to the point which the hon. Member for West Islington made, that under the clause as it now stood the stock might be offered to certain gas consumers and other persons, Mr. Livesey yesterday informed him that he was perfectly prepared to insert the word "all," so that there was no possibility of the stock being offered to particular individuals or sets of individuals.

MR. STEACHEY (Somersetshire, S.) said he would not have intervened were it not that he thought it right that the House should be made aware that the Committee was not unanimous in the matter. He himself, as a member of the Committee, divided it on practically the matter now before the House. The Committee went very carefully into the evidence, and he had not the slightest doubt that the majority of the Committee were influenced by the able and clever evidence of Mr. Livesey, the chairman of the South Metropolitan Gas Company. He would venture to point out to the Committee that a Select Committee had been appointed by the House especially to consider this question, and he believed it unanimously reported against the proposal in the Bill. Then the question had come on previous occasions before various Committees of the House, and on every such occasion the Committee had refused to abrogate auction clauses. He thought also the House ought to consider the question of price. The hon. Member for Peckham, who was a great authority on financial questions, said that a £;5 discount seemed to be too high, yet the company actually asked for £;7 10s. discount, showing that their real object was to give the consumers stock under the market price, to give them an opportunity of buying stock and then selling it at a profit. In his evidence Mr. Livesey said that he made no secret of the fact that he had purposely evaded the auction clauses, and that the company managed to advertise the auction in such a way that as Mr. Livesey very fairly said, nobody would be aware that stock was being offered. He thought the present was neither the time nor the occasion to go back on previous decisions of Committees, and also the Report of the Select Committee, and to abrogate the, auction clause. In his opinion the South Metropolitan Gas Company were anxious to form themselves into a great society composed of shareholders who were also consumers. No doubt such societies might be very desirable and proper, but they should also consider the interests of the working man who was not able to invest money, and who perhaps was only a temporary consumer. The House should not make gas dearer for the poor consumer, even though it made it cheaper for the rich

consumer who was also a shareholder. He therefore very strongly supported the motion of his hon. friend to recommit the Bill, and he thought the House ought to pause

before departing from previous decisions, and also from the Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider the matter.

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Denny, Colonel

Joicey, Sir James

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)

Kay-Shuttleworth, Rt Hn Sir U.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.

Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.

Aird, Sir John

Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-

Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)

Allsopp, Hon. George

Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield

Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)

Anson, Sir William Reynell

Dorington, Sir John Edward

Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth

Anstruther, H. T.

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers

Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm

Archdale, Edward Mervyn

Doxford, Sir William Theodore

Lawrence, Joseph (Monmouth)

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin

Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.

Lawson, John Grant

Arrol, Sir William

Elliot, Hn. A. Ralph Douglas

Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Ellis, John Edward

Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)

Austin, Sir John

Farquharson, Dr. Robert

Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage

Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy

Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward  
Leng, Sir John  
Bain, Colonel James Robert  
Fenwick, Charles  
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.  
Balcarres, Lord  
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)  
Llewellyn, Evan Henry  
Baldwin, Alfred  
Finch, George H.  
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.  
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W (Leeds  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine  
Balfour, Maj. K. R (Christchurch.  
Firbank, Joseph Thomas  
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)  
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Lonsdale, John Brownlee  
Beach, Rt. Hon. W. W. B. (Hants.  
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose  
Lowe, Francis William  
Bigwood, James  
Flannery, Sir Fortescue  
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)  
Bill, Charles  
Fletcher, Sir Henry  
Lowther, Rt. Hon. James (Kent)  
Black, Alexander William  
Flower, Ernest  
Lowther, Rt Hn J W (Cum., Penr.  
Blundell, Colonel Henry  
Forster, Henry William  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)  
Bond, Edward  
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)  
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)  
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-  
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry  
Macdona, John Cumming  
Boulnois, Edmund  
Galloway, William Johnson  
M'Calmont, Col. H. L. B. (Cambs.  
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)  
Garfit, William



M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.)  
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn)  
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John  
Majendie, James A. H.  
Brassey, Albert  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
Malcolm, Ian  
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John  
Gordon, Hn. J. E (Elgin & Nairn  
Maple, Sir John Blundell  
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.  
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop  
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe  
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)  
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon  
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.)  
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James  
Goulding, Edward Alfred  
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William  
Brymer, William Ernest  
Graham, Henry Robert  
Middlemore, John T.  
Burt, Thomas  
Greene, Sir E. W (B'rySEdm'nds  
Milton, Viscount  
Caldwell, James  
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.  
Gretton, John  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Carlile, William Walter  
Groves, James Grimble  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.  
Hain, Edward  
Moss, Samuel  
Cautley, Henry Strother  
Halsey, Thomas Frederick  
Mount, William Arthur  
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)  
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x  
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.  
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire  
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry  
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute)

Cawley, Frederick  
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.  
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford)  
Myers, William Henry  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.)  
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.  
Newdigate, Francis Alexander  
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r)  
Hay, Hon. Claude George  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry  
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-  
Nussey, Thomas Willans  
Chapman, Edward  
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley)  
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens  
Churchill, Winston Spencer  
Heath, James (Staffords. N. W.)  
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay  
Coddington, Sir William  
Helder, Augustus  
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham)  
Coghill, Douglas Harry  
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H  
Peace, Herbert Pike (Darlington)  
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampstead)  
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)  
Colomb, Sir John Charles R.  
Hogg, Lindsay  
Pease, Sir Joseph W. (Durham)  
Colston, Charles Edward H. A.  
Holland, William Henry  
Penn, John  
Colville, John  
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside)  
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard  
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)  
Horner, Frederick William  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry  
Plummer, Walter R.  
Craig, Robert Hunter

Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham  
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp  
Crombie, John William  
Hozier, Hon. James Henry C.  
Pretymann, Ernest George  
Crossley, Sir Savile  
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.  
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward  
Cust, Henry John C.  
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick  
Purvis, Robert  
Dalkeith, Earl of  
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)  
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert  
Question put.  
The House divided::Ayes, 252; Noes, 112. (Division List No. 242.)  
Randles, John S.  
Sinclair, Capt John (Forfarshire)  
Warr, Augustus Frederick  
Rankin, Sir James  
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside)  
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)  
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne  
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)  
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton)  
Reid, James (Greenock)  
Spear, John Ward  
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd  
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries)  
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich)  
White, George (Norfolk)  
Remnant, James Farquharson  
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)  
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer  
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge)  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)  
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)  
Stevenson, Francis S.  
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(Birm)  
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson  
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart  
Willox, Sir John Archibald  
Robinson, Brooke  
Stone, Sir Benjamin  
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)

Rolleston, Sir John F. L.  
Stroyan, John  
Wilson, John (Falkirk)  
Ropner, Colonel Robert  
Taylor, Theodore Cooke  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter  
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr  
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)  
Royds, Clement Molyneux  
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)  
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)  
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander  
Thorburn, Sir Walter  
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd)  
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)  
Tollemache, Henry James  
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-  
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)  
Tritton, Charles Ernest  
Wrightson, Sir Thomas  
Sharpe, William Edward T.  
Valentia, Viscount  
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)  
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
TELLERS FOR THE Ayes.; Mr. Banbury and Mr. Renshaw.  
Shaw-Stewart. M. H. (Renfrew)  
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.  
Simeon, Sir Barrington  
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)  
NOES.  
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)  
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)  
O'Mara, James  
Allan, William (Gateshead)  
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud  
Jacoby, James Alfred  
Partington, Oswald  
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)  
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire  
Pease, Alfred E. (Cleveland)  
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.  
Kennedy, Patrick James

Power, Patrick Joseph  
Blake, Edward  
Labouchere, Henry  
Rea, Russell  
Boland, John  
Lambert, George  
Reckitt, Harold James  
Brigg, John  
Langley, Batty  
Reddy, M.  
Broadhurst, Henry  
Laurie, Lieut.-General  
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)  
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson  
Layland-Barratt, Francis  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Burns, John  
Leamy, Edmund  
Richards, Henry Charles  
Buxton, Sydney Charles  
Lewis, John Herbert  
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Lloyd-George, David  
Roe, Sir Thomas  
Channing, Francis Allston  
London, W.  
Russell, T. W.  
Cogan, Denis J.  
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.  
Schwann, Charles E.  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.  
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)  
Crean, Eugene  
M'Crae, George  
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel  
Cullinan, J.  
M'Dermott, Patrick  
Shipman, Dr. John G.  
Delany, William  
M'Govern, T.  
Soames, Arthur Wellesley  
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles  
M'Kenna, Reginald  
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (Northants)

Dillon, John  
Mansfield, Horace Rendall  
Strachey, Edward  
Donelan, Captain A.  
Mooney, John J.  
Sullivan, Donal  
Doogan, P. C.  
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)  
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.)  
Duffy, William J.  
Morley, Rt. Hn John (Montrose  
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower  
Duncan, J. Hastings  
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)  
Trevelyan, Charles Philips  
Dunn, Sir William  
Murnaghan, George  
Wallace, Robert  
Edwards, Frank  
Murphy, John  
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.  
Emmott, Alfred  
Nannetti, Joseph P.  
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)  
Fardell, Sir T. George  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
Weir, James Galloway  
Field, William  
Norman, Henry  
White, Luke (York, E. R.)  
Flavin, Michael Joseph  
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)  
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)  
Flynn, James Christopher  
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid  
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)  
Gilhooly, James  
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)  
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)  
Grant, Corrie  
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)  
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)  
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton  
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)  
Yoxall, James Henry  
Haldane, Richard Burdon

O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)

Hammond, John

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

TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Mr. Lough and Captain Norton.

Harwood, George

O'Dowd, John

Hayden, John Patrick

O'Malley, William

Main Question put and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

SOUTH EASTERN AND LONDON, CHATHAM AND DOVER RAILWAYS BILL [Lords]. (BY ORDER.)

Order for Second Reading read.

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

SIR JOSEPH DIMSDALE (London) rose to move that the Bill should be read a second time upon this day six months.

He said that the promoters desired to carry out improvements which would give them facilities for the further development of their passenger, goods, and mineral traffic. Clause 23 enabled the two companies, or either of them, to apply for the whole or any purposes of the Act any money they had now in their hands, or which they had power to raise by shares or mortgage, and which might not be required for the purposes for which the same were authorised to be raised. While it was proposed to develop the line, there was no attempt, there was not even a suggestion for enlarging the London stations, where the accommodation was already in some respects inadequate to meet the expected increase in the traffic. It appeared to him that the companies wanted to enlarge their bottle to the size of a magnum or Jeroboam, leaving the neck at its original diameter. The contention of the Corporation of London was that, while these improvements might be necessary, they could very well wait until the companies fulfilled their far more serious obligations to the public by making their London termini adequate to their requirements. He could name a station, a timber structure, badly lighted, which had rather the appearance of a neglected temporary building than of a station of considerable importance. The approaches to the station and the platforms were badly arranged and quite inadequate, and, altogether, the station was not only inconvenient and inadequate for its requirements, but absolutely unsafe for the public. The attention of the Corporation of London was called to this and another station as far back as 1898, and they called the attention of the railway companies to these defects, but up to this moment nothing whatever had been done except to provide a few extra lamps. The Corporation of London endeavoured to bring pressure to bear upon the railway companies, and only withdrew their opposition to the company's Bill of last session on the understanding that these important and serious matters were to have the immediate attention of the directors. But the company, having got the Second Reading of their Bill, practically told the Corporation that they had gained their

object and that the Corporation had no locus standi, and in consequence the undertaking of the railway companies was nugatory. Another Bill was now before

them, but there was no proposal in it to do anything to further the interests and the safety of the community. The attention of the Board of Trade had been called to the matters of which he had been speaking, but the company had held the Department, as it had held the Corporation, at arm's length for over two years, and now he did not think it was too much to say that they seemed very much disposed to flout the House of Commons. All the Corporation desired was to have a locus standi before the Committee upstairs to which the Bill would be referred, but, as the company refused to meet them in any way, he had no alternative but to move that the Bill be read that day six months.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.), in seconding the Amendment, said he did not speak on behalf of any municipality, but on behalf of the working class community of South London who used the suburban line of the company. The Bill was one to extend the operations of the company, and to extend the time for the completion of certain works and widening its lines, and by Clause 23 to use the money the company had in hand for the purpose. He should vote against giving this company any extension of power, against giving it any further concession, until it had fulfilled the obligations into which it had entered in respect of previous Acts of Parliament. Its station at Ludgate Hill was a filthy and foul-smelling rabbit hutch, which, being in the very centre of the greatest city in the world, was a scandal to those who allowed it to remain there, was a comment on the happy-go-lucky conduct of the cockney in all things, and ought to be swept away as an insanitary area at the earliest possible date. There were other considerations which applied to those who used the line every day. The rolling-stock of the company was filthy and dirty to the last degree, the carriages were ill-lighted, and the whole machinery was of the most slovenly and slipshod character. He had sat in a compartment in one of the trains of this company at Victoria, and within five minutes of the departure of the train an official came and swabbed the windows of the compartment while the passengers were in it. At one station he had seen the carriages being swept while the people were in them. The dirty and filthy character of the second and third class carriages and their overcrowded condition was well known. At Herne Hill Station, if a passenger took a first-class ticket and afterwards managed to get a seat upon a fish-box in the guard's van he was very lucky indeed. On behalf of the working-people of South London, who were bitterly opposed to any extension of the powers of this company, he objected to this Bill being passed until they had carried out their obligations contained in former Acts of Parliament.

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 Joseph Dimsdale.)

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

\*MR. HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton) said he desired to endorse all that had been said by his hon. friend the Member for the City of London in regard to the insufficient accommodation provided by this company. They had been told that this was an innocent Bill, and that it would be unfair for the House to punish the company in respect of this Bill because of its shortcomings in other



respects. Though this might be a small Bill, to buy a portion of a biscuit factory, it had underlying it grave questions of public policy. When they came to discuss those questions they were met by the reply of the company that unless they gave them the Bills as they presented them to the House they would withdraw them. In other words, the House of Commons was to be reduced to being the obsequious servant of the directors of this company. His main objection to the Bill was that it was a tinkering Bill. Those who had studied the system of the South Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railway would agree that the only remedy for what were evils so far as the public were concerned was a statesmanlike reform in the affairs of the company, and in its service to the public. Year after year fresh powers were sought in order that a little bit of land here or there might be added to the property of the company, but nothing was done in the true sense to secure for the two millions-of South Londoners adequate and cheap access from their homes to the scene of their labours. He would refer very briefly to the clauses of the Bill. Clauses 15 to 21 by no means showed or justified the allegation of the supporters of this Bill that it was simply a measure to purchase a portion of a biscuit factory. Those clauses altered the time limit in respect of previous Acts of the company, and when they came to consider how far the company had exercised the powers from which it now sought exemption, they would find that even the facilities given on the South Eastern railway for lads to attend cricket matches had been withdrawn. A very large section of people known as the lower middle class, who had to be punctual in their attendance at their work if they were not to lose their means of livelihood, had been absolutely precluded from any possibility of living upon the line of this company owing to the disgraceful unpunctuality in the train service, and which would continue unless the House of Commons pulled up this company sharply, and made it behave itself. This condition of things would be made far graver and more intolerable if they allowed those clauses to pass than would appear at first sight. The company was persistently defeating the efforts of Parliament to promote the industrial and physical well-being of the people, by forcing vast numbers of the industrial classes to reside in crowded inner London owing to the lack of trains to and from the outskirts and the excessive fares demanded. The company thus actively promoted all the evils to the physique and morals of the urban population which are inseparable from overcrowding and unsalubrious surroundings. In proof of this he referred to Clause 19. The company pulled down houses in Bermondsey, and, when the Home Secretary remonstrated with it for evading its statutory obligations, the company made a hasty temporary arrangement with the Guinness trustees, who had erected a block of buildings near, to relieve the terrible destitution of the population. This was not only a mischievous evasion by the company of the law of the land, but an injury inflicted upon a densely-crowded area, because the company did not build houses in the neighbourhood, and because it appropriated sorely-needed house room which had been provided for that neighbourhood by a philanthropic body. A further injury which this company had inflicted upon the labouring classes of the community was that caused by a sudden, unjustifiable, and an illegal reduction

in the housing accommodation of the district, which had the effect of increasing the already prohibitive rents. An appeal against this state of things was made to the Home Secretary, and then the company bought the site dealt with under Clause 19 of this Bill. The company boasted that it had spent £80,000 in Bermondsey to satisfy the requirements of this House, but the company forgot to say that after having procured that site, and after having obtained all the necessary powers required to deal with it, ever since October last that land had been vacant. He had been told that this land had remained vacant because the company were waiting the approval of the Secretary of State to the whole scheme of which this land formed a part. He thought those who had given any attention to this subject would be very much surprised if his right hon. friend announced to the House that he had been the agency by which for something like nine months this site for the housing of the working classes of London had remained vacant when that site was specifically devoted by him, as the Secretary of State for the Home Department, to rehousing those who had been found to have been neglected by the railway company under its legal powers. He hoped that they would be told why the piece of vacant land had been allowed to remain vacant; he believed it was due entirely to the mischievous evasion on the part of the company of its statutory obligations. The efforts of the directorate and the officials of this company seemed to be directed to trying both in spirit and letter to evade the laws of

Parliament whenever the housing of the poor was concerned. The population of Bermondsey was a wharfside population. It had to live within hail of its work, which was casual and ill paid, and it was in such a district that this company reduced valuable house room. This district was becoming more and more overcrowded, and the public health of the inhabitants was, consequently, being more and more endangered. The district had been aptly described as a wilderness of poverty, and the reduction of house room there had resulted from the acquisition of property by this company.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman is now entering on the general question of the housing of the working classes in London, which on this Bill he cannot do.

\*MR. HAY said that in deference to that ruling he would not pursue the argument he was endeavouring to elaborate. It was obvious, however, that if the land was allowed to remain vacant there would be overcrowding in the neighbourhood. The powers which had been conferred on the company in the immediate past had not been exercised properly or with a due regard to the real intention of Parliament.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY (Kent, Ashford) said he was rather surprised that the extreme strength of the language used against the Bill had not been accompanied by an equal strength of argument. He was afraid they had become accustomed in this House to denunciations of these two railway companies. He was not in any way connected with the railways, but he thought the House ought to pause before taking the extreme step of rejecting the Bill, which carried out the understanding arrived at when the amalgamation was sanctioned two years ago. One of the principal conditions was that the access to London should be improved, so that Kent especially should have the facilities for traffic which it deserved.

The widening proposed had nothing to do with Ludgate Hill Station, but it was an essential feature of any improvement in the line. The supporters of the Bill pleaded for it because they believed these two companies could never have a chance

of improving themselves unless they were given the powers which were asked for in the Bill. It was on that ground alone that he would ask the House to send the Bill in the usual way to a Committee upstairs for consideration. He did not think this was the time to consider the condition of the stock of the Chatham Company, upon which many Members, perhaps, would have something to say. They had been spending a large amount of money in trying to bring up the arrears of very inefficient management in the past. The question of the housing of the working classes had been raised, and he thought he ought, in fairness to the House, to state how that was affected by the Bill. Although the model clause had been put into the Bill the company need not have put it in, because the powers sought in the Bill only affected six houses, making eleven tenements; therefore they had not the limit of twenty required for the clause. That was the sole interference contemplated in consequence of the arrangements that came under this Bill. Delay had been caused in carrying out part of the work owing entirely, he believed, to protracted negotiations with the County Council in connection with the southern approach to London Bridge. These negotiations were now concluded and the plans had been submitted to the Home Secretary. There was no reason why that statement should not go forth. The provisions of the Bill were of vast importance to the great mass of the public who used these lines, and on that ground he with confidence asked the House to pass the Second Reading of the Bill.

MR. JOHN BURNS (Battersea) said that two years ago he had the pleasure of opposing the amalgamation of the South Eastern and the Chatham and Dover Railways. On that occasion the opponents of the scheme were beaten. Mr. Cosmo Bonsor told them that everything would be for the best in the best of all possible worlds if the amalgamation took place. Since that time things had not changed. The Chatham and Dover was as bad as it was before the amalgamation, and the South Eastern did not appear to have made it any better. The amalgamation of these undesirables seemed to have produced the worst rail-

way in the United Kingdom. It had been stated that the object of the Bill two years ago was to improve the London termini. What attempt had been made to do that? Absolutely none at all. Everyone who knew Kent would admit that the way in which these two railways had treated the county was a disgrace to the companies and damaging to the interests of agriculture. The hon. Member for the Ashford Division had spoken about the inefficient management in the past, but in this Bill there was no evidence that the management was going to be rectified. It was a very difficult and, from many points of view, a dangerous thing to throw out a railway Bill. Personally he did not think a railway Bill or a private Bill should be thrown out unless serious reasons were advanced and great causes were stated. The slowness of locomotion, the inconvenience of our railway stations, and the difficulty of housing the poor were serious problems with which the railway companies generally had not grappled as they ought to have done.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is aware that he cannot enter now into these

general questions, which are common to all the railways of London.

MR. JOHN BURNS: continuing, said that the South Eastern and Chatham Company had taken no special steps to deal with this problem, but nevertheless they now came to Parliament to seek power to divert the money which they got by previous Bills for the purpose to carry out other enterprises. It was because there was no evidence that the companies were likely to improve their stations that the City Corporation interfered. The Corporation of the City was not in the habit of worrying capital. It had hitherto been a friend of these particular companies, and had given them special facilities, but now the Corporation had taken up a different attitude. It saw that the Ludgate Hill Station was very dark and dangerous, and contended that the money which ought to be spent upon its improvement should not be devoted to other uses. Now, the City Corporation was the statutory authority and guardian of the public welfare in this respect; but the London County Council, although it had no locus standi, joined with the City Corporation in this matter. It would interest the hon. Member who last spoke to know that no less than thirty local authorities outside of London, and the Mayors of Canterbury, Hastings, Maidstone, and Tunbridge Wells, had approached the companies and asked them to carry out the obligations of their previous Bills, to improve their traffic, reduce fares, and grant further facilities to the trade and commerce of the county of Kent, but without result. When he found the City Corporation and the mayors of those towns and cities making a recommendation in favour of pulling the companies up to a proper appreciation of their responsibilities, he could not help believing that there was a strong case made out for action against the companies. Was it fair, he asked, that Ludgate Hill Station should be left as it was? It was the original terminus of the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway, and it ought to have at least £100,000 spent on it. The company had power to spend that sum, but if the present Bill were passed the money would be devoted to other purposes. The station as it now was was frequently overcrowded, dirty, and dangerous. So overcrowded was it that the usual waiting-rooms and lavatories could not be placed upon the platforms, while the platforms themselves were so narrow that people frequently ran the risk of being forced upon the line by the crowds going up or down. It was true that the Chatham Company said the public had no necessity to go to Ludgate Hill Station. The directors admitted that the station was narrow and inconvenient, but they turned round and said "There is a station at St. Paul's." That was the mischief of the thing. Instead of spending their money on St. Paul's Station the Chatham Company ought to have used the money upon Ludgate Hill Station and enlarged it, thus making one complete and adequate terminus.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! I do not understand that there is any money for the improvement of Ludgate Hill Station which by this Bill will be taken and diverted to any other purpose. The hon. Member is not in order in discussing the policy of the railway company in building another station.

MR. JOHN BURNS said he had no intention to evade any ruling that the Speaker might have made, but there was no schedule to the Bill, or any conditions as to how the money was to be spent. But by sections of previous Acts the company was

empowered to raise money for the purposes specified, and his contention was that the companies now had in their hands the unexpended money which they were seeking to divert by this Bill to extra-metropolitan purposes which should be spent upon the improvement of their stations.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! That is the point which I have previously informed the hon. Member is not in order.

MR. JOHN BURNS admitted that it would be inadvisable and inconvenient to argue the matter any further, but he hoped the House would, at any rate, see that the Chatham Company carried out their promise of two years ago, and would recognise that it was an abuse of private Bill legislation for the company to divert money that they have for other purposes to extra-metropolitan enterprises. The management of the company had, he said, always been bad, and he did not believe that with the present management the company would be enabled to do better in the future than in the past. The company had abused its power and misused its parliamentary privileges, and he saw no hope but compulsory liquidation. An official receiver ought to be appointed, and then the company should be sold to the London and North Western Company or some other capable company, so that the people dependent upon the line might be sure of proper railway facilities. So long as Mr. Cosmo Bonsor and the other directors were at the head of affairs this valuable railway property would be reduced to sterility simply by the incompetence of its directors.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): I do not propose to address the House except for a very few minutes, because I think the consideration of this proposal can be reduced to a very narrow compass indeed. However much I may sympathise with the object of my right hon. friend, I cannot approve or admire the method by which he proposes to attain that object. It is undoubted that the condition of Ludgate Hill Station leaves a very great deal to be desired. That has been proved by the reports of the inspectors of the Board of Trade. But that is not the question which the House has to decide. Because there is an improvement which admittedly ought at some time or other to be made; the sooner the better; is the House to throw out a Bill to the actual provisions of which no objection is or can be made? That is the real issue. It appears to me that if it is to become the established practice of this House to throw out this or any other omnibus Bill on the ground that the clauses of the Bill do not contain something which somebody wants in it, such an alteration of the procedure of the House is not only contrary to the public interests, but is gravely detrimental to those interests. This is not merely a question of the locus standi of the City Corporation before the Committee. My hon. friend must know that, even if the company were willing to grant locus standi to the London Corporation, the question of the condition of the Ludgate Hill Station could not be raised before the Committee. It would be entirely out of order. The question is simply the rejection or the passing of the Second Reading of the Bill. The hon. Member for Camberwell stated he was opposed to any extension of powers to the company, and the hon. Member for Hoxton very strongly complained of the general inefficiency of the company concerned. But these omnibus Bills are not merely for the benefit

and convenience of the companies promoting them. They are for the convenience and advantage of the public. They are almost invariably to increase accommodation and promote efficiency, and if the House of Commons is to throw them out simply on account of reasons such as have been adduced this afternoon, it is not the railway companies so much as the public that will suffer. In regard to the question of the housing of the working classes, I may say on behalf of His Majesty's Government that we do not concur in the view that the various railway companies have not properly fulfilled their obligations in this respect. But, however that may be, I think the House of Commons must look not upon a point of detail, but upon the general principle. The House has already thrown out one omnibus Bill on a similar ground, and if this is also to be thrown out it will be set up as a precedent, and whenever a particular complaint is set up against a railway company it will be considered legitimate to throw out any proposal which they may make, irrespective of its importance. Nothing could be more objectionable. The companies would not then come to Parliament. They would remain inefficient and imperfect, and when complaint was made they would say, "It is not our fault, but the fault of the House of Commons." If we establish this practice; that an omnibus Bill can be thrown out on a question not germane to the Bill itself; it will be the greatest discouragement possible to any company to bring forward proposals to improve the working of their line. It is on this ground, and not on a question of detail, that I earnestly hope the House will agree to the Second Reading of the Bill.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.) observed that the Bill was exactly similar to the Bill thrown out by the House a short time ago, and for precisely the same reason. This company had failed in its responsibilities to Parliament and the public. As the hon. Member for the City had remarked, the company by the Bill was coming into conflict with the local authorities. The local authorities by the Bill of 1891 were responsible for the housing of the working classes, but as regarded this company they were absolutely helpless to interfere. Ten thousand people, taking the metropolis as a whole, had been dishoused by the various railway companies. If any large landlord, either in the metropolis or in the provinces, had attempted to dishouse such a large number of people Parliament would have interfered and prevented the project being carried out.

\*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is now discussing the general question of the housing of the working classes. I have several times ruled that that is out of order.

CAPTAIN NORTON said he only wished to point out that the company had avoided its responsibilities in this respect. In his own district several families had been dishoused, though he did not mean to suggest that this very railway company was to blame.

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member is again discussing a matter which I have ruled out of order.

CAPTAIN NORTON, concluding, said the President of the Board of Trade had pointed out that if the House were to reject every omnibus Bill it would inconvenience the public, but he would remind hon. Members, on the contrary, that this was the only means whereby the House could protect the public. This was a matter of

supreme moment, and he contended that the railway company should be forced to act up to their responsibilities, and he had great pleasure, therefore, in opposing the Bill.

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.  
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir E. H.  
Firbank, Joseph Thorn as  
Agg Gardner, James Tynte  
Cautley, Henry Strother  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel  
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)  
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose-  
Aird, Sir John  
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)  
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond  
Allsopp, Hon. George  
Cawley, Frederick  
Fitzroy, Hon. Edw. Algernon  
Anson, Sir William Reynell  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Fletcher, Sir Henry  
Anstruther, H. T.  
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. (Birm.)  
Forster, Henry William  
Archdale, Edward Mervyn  
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r  
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry  
Arkwright, John Stanhope  
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry  
Furness, Sir Christopher  
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.  
Charrington, Spencer  
Galloway, William Johnson  
Arrol, Sir William  
Churchill, Winston Spencer  
Garfit, William  
Ashton, Thomas Gair  
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.  
Gladstone, Rt Hn Herbert John  
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert H.  
Coddington, Sir William  
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick  
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John  
Coghill, Douglas Harry  
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn

Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy  
Cohen, Benjamin Louis  
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop  
Bain, Col. James Robert  
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc)  
Balcarres, Lord  
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready  
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.  
Baldwin, Alfred  
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole  
Goschen, Hon. George J.  
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds)  
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)  
Goulding, Edward Alfred  
Banbury, Frederick George  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Graham, Henry Robert  
Bathurst, Hon. Allen B  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Greene, Sir E W (B'rySEdm'nds  
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)  
Cripps, Charles Alfred  
Greene, Hy. D. (Shrewsbury)  
Beach, Rt. Hn. W. W. B. (Hants.)  
Dalkeith, Earl of  
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)  
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.  
Dalrymple, Sir Charles  
Gretton, John  
Bill, Charles  
Denny, Colonel  
Greville, Hon. Ronald  
Blundell, Col. Henry  
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-  
Guthrie, Walter Murray  
Bond, Edward  
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph  
Hain, Edward  
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-  
Doxford, Sir William Theodore  
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd.)  
Boulnois, Edmund  
Duke, Henry Edward  
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nd'rry  
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middl'x)



Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin  
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert W  
Bowles, Capt. T. B. (King's Lynn  
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart  
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm  
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.  
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas  
Harris, Frederick Leverton  
Brassey, Albert  
Ellis, John Edward  
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.  
Brigg, John  
Emmott, Alfred  
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale  
Brown, Alex. H. (Shropsh.)  
Faber, George Denison  
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir A. D.  
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson  
Farquharson, Dr. Robert  
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)  
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James  
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward  
Heath, Jas. (Staffords., N. W)  
Brymer, William Ernest  
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)  
Heaton, John Henniker  
Bullard, Sir Harry  
Finch, George H.  
Helder, Augustus  
Carlile, William Walter  
Finlay, Sir Robt. Bannatyne  
Hermon-Hodge, Robert T.

SIR J. BLUNDELL MAPLE (Camberwell, Dulwich) only intervened to point out the absurdity of the argument of hon. Members opposite when they contended that they were acting in the interests of the working classes. Under this Bill the railway company was trying to do its best to widen the lines and increase the number of trains and their speed. That was in the interests of the working men, who would thereby have cheap trains and rapid transit, and it was nonsense to oppose it. Everyone knew that the great thing that was wanted nowadays was wider railway lines and more trains. If the Bill were sent to a Committee upstairs, and it was thought advisable, new clauses could be introduced. He only hoped that the Bill would be passed, and by a large majority.

Question put.

The House divided: Ayes, 277; Noes, 166. (Division List No. 243.)

Hill, Arthur

Middlemore, John Throgmort'n

Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)  
Hoare, Edw. B. (Hampstead)  
Mildmay, Francis Bingham  
Seton-Karr, Henry  
Hobhouse, Hy. (Somerset, E.)  
Milton, Viscount  
Sharpe, William Edward T.  
Homer, Frederick William  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)  
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry  
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy  
Simeon, Sir Barrington  
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh.  
Morgan, Hon. Fred. (Monmths.  
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh.)  
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)  
Morley, Chas. (Breconshire)  
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)  
Hozier, Hon. James Henry C.  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Smith, H C (North'mb, T'neside  
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks.)  
Hutton, John (Yorks., N. R.)  
Morrison, James Archibald  
Spear, John Ward  
Jackson, Rt. Hon. Wm. Lawies  
Moulton, John Fletcher  
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich)  
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick  
Muntz, Philip A.  
Stanley, Hn Arthur (Ormskirk)  
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton  
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bath  
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)  
Joicey, Sir James  
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Kay-Shuttleworth, Rt Hn Sir U.  
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)  
Stevenson, Francis S.  
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir J. H.  
Myers, William Henry  
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart

Kenyon, Jas. (Lanes., Bury)  
Newdigate, Francis Alexander  
Stone, Sir Benjamin  
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Stroyan, John  
King, Sir Henry Seymour  
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens  
Talbot, Rt Hn J G. (Oxf'd Univ.)  
Kitson, Sir James  
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay  
Thorburn, Sir Walter  
Knowles, Lees  
Palmer, Sir C. M. (Durham)  
Tollemache, Henry James  
Lambert, George  
Parkes, Ebenezer  
Tufnell, Lt.-Col. Edward  
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.  
Partington, Oswald  
Valentia, Viscount  
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)  
Pease, Alfred E. (Cleveland)  
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield  
Lawson, John Grant  
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington)  
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)  
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareh'm  
Pease, Sir J. W. (Durham)  
Walrond, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. H.  
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington  
Peel, Hon. Wm. Robert W.  
Wanklyn, James Leslie  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Penn, John  
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney  
Leng, Sir John  
Percy, Earl  
Welby, Lt-Col. A C E (Taunton)  
Leveson-Gower, Fredk. N. S.  
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard  
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.)  
Llewellyn, Evan Henry  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-  
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.

Plummer, Walter R.  
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd  
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine  
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp  
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne)  
Long, Rt Hn Walter (Bristol, S.)  
Pretymann, Ernest George  
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)  
Lowe, Francis William  
Purvis, Robert  
Whitmore, Charles Algernon  
Lowther, Rt. Hn. James (Kent)  
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert  
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)  
Lowther, Rt Hn J W (Cum. Penr.  
Randles, John S.  
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(Birm  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)  
Rankin, Sir James  
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord  
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth  
Rea, Russell  
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.  
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)  
Reed, Sir Edw. Jas. (Cardiff)  
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)  
M'Calmont, Col. H L B. (Cambs.  
Reid, James (Greenock)  
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid)  
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinb., W.)  
Renshaw, Charles Bine  
Wilson, John (Falkirk)  
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire  
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (St'Iybridge  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin  
Ridley, S. F. (Bethnal Green)  
Wilson, J W. (Worcestersh., N.)  
Majendie, James A. H.  
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. T.  
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)  
Malcolm, Ian  
Robinson, Brooke  
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)  
Manners, Lord Cecil  
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.

Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersfd.  
Maple, Sir John Blundell  
Rollit, Sir Albeit Kaye  
Wortley, Rt Hon. C. B. Stuart-  
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe  
Ropner, Col. Robert  
Wrightson, Sir Thomas  
Mather, William  
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel W.  
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)  
Maxwell, W. J. H (Dumfriessh.)  
Royds, Clement Molyneux  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;Mr. Laurence Hardy and Mr. Richards.  
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William  
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander  
Melville, Beresford Valentine  
Samuel, H. S. (Limehouse)  
NOES.  
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)  
Caine, William Sproston  
Dillon, John  
Abraham, William (Rhondda)  
Caldwell, James  
Donelan, Captain A.  
Allan, William (Gateshead)  
Cameron, Robert  
Doogan, P. C.  
Allen, C. P. (Glouc, Stroud)  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Duffy, William J.  
Ambrose, Robert  
Cecil, Lord H. (Greenwich)  
Duncan, J. Hastings  
Austin, Sir John  
Channing, Francis Allston  
Dunn, Sir William  
Balfour, Maj K R (Christch'rch)  
Cogan, Denis J.  
Edwards, Frank  
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)  
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)  
Craig, Robert Hunter  
Fardell, Sir T. George  
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.

Crean, Eugene  
Fenwick, Charles  
Bigwood, James  
Crombie, John William  
Flannery, Sir Fortescue  
Black, Alexander William  
Crossley, Sir Savile  
Flavin, Michael Joseph  
Blake, Edward  
Cullinan, J.  
Flower, Ernest  
Boland, John  
Cust, Henry John C.  
Flynn, James Christopher  
Broadhurst, Henry  
Dalziel, James Henry  
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)  
Brown, Geo. M. (Edinburgh)  
Delany, William  
Fuller, J. M. F.  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)  
Gibbs, Hn. A G H. (City of Lond.)  
Burns, John  
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.  
Gilhooly, James  
Buxton, Sydney Charles  
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
Grant, Corrie  
Mooney, John J.  
Roe, Sir Thomas  
Griffith, Ellis J.  
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)  
Schwann, Charles E.  
Groves, James Grimble  
Morgan, J. L. (Carmarthen)  
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)  
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton  
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)  
Shaw, Chas. Edw. (Stafford)  
Hammond, John  
Moss, Samuel  
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)  
Hardie, J Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)  
Murnaghan, George

Sheehan, Daniel Daniel  
Harwood, George  
Murphy, John  
Shipman, Dr. John G.  
Hayden, John Patrick  
Nannetti, Joseph P.  
Soames, Arthur Wellesley  
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.  
Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.)  
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants-  
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
Strachey, Edward  
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)  
Norman, Henry  
Sullivan, Donal  
Horniman, Frederick John  
Norton, Capt. Cecil William  
Taylor, Theodore Cooke  
Jacoby, James Alfred  
Nussey, Thomas Willans  
Tennant, Harold John  
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.  
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary Mid.)  
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.).  
Kennedy, Patrick James  
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)  
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.  
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth  
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)  
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr  
Labouchere, Henry  
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)  
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)  
Langley, Batty  
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)  
Trevelyan, Charles Philips  
Laurie, Lt.-General  
O'Dowd, John  
Tritton, Charles Ernest  
Lawrence, Joseph (Monmouth  
O'Kelly, J. (Roscommon, N.)  
Wallace, Robert  
Layland-Barratt, Francis  
O'Malley, William  
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)

Leamy, Edmund  
O'Mara, James  
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.  
Levy, Maurice  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)  
Lewis, John Herbert  
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)  
Weir, James Galloway  
Lloyd-George, David  
Philipps, John Wynford  
White, George (Norfolk)  
Lonsdale, John Brownlee  
Pickard, Benjamin  
White, Luke (York, E. R.)  
Lough, Thomas  
Power, Patrick, Joseph  
White, Patrick (Meath, North  
London, W.  
Price, Robert John  
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.  
Macdona, John Cumming  
Priestley, Arthur  
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer  
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.  
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward  
Willox, Sir John Archibald  
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.  
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne  
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)  
M'Crae, George  
Reddy, M.  
Yoxall, James Henry  
M'Dermott, Patrick  
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)  
M'Govern, T.  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir Joseph Dimsdale and Mr. Hay.  
M'Kenna, Reginald  
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries)  
Mansfield, Horace Rendall  
Rentoul, James Alexander  
Minch, Matthew  
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)  
Montagu, Hon. J. S. (Hants.)  
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)



Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 4) BILL.  
(BY ORDER.)

Order for Second Reading read.

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

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.) asked the Attorney General for Ireland how this Bill affected the town of Tralee and the county Kerry.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.) was understood to say that he did not know how it affected them.

MR. FLAVIN asked if the Bill did not refer to an inquiry that had been made as to the relations between the Tralee Urban Council and the county of Kerry at large.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.) said that one of the chief items in the Bill referred to the financial relations between the Tralee Urban Council and the County Council of Kerry, and yet the Attorney General, for Ireland, who was responsible for the Bill, did not know that it had anything, to do with that dispute.

MR. ATKINSON said that there were three Provisional Orders made by the Local Government Board under Section 77 of the Act of 1898, and he did not know exactly to what the hon. Member referred. These Provisional Orders related to the town of Dundalk, the city of Sligo, and the town of Tralee, and they adjusted the respective liabilities between the counties and the urban district councils.

MR. FLAVIN asked how the county of Kerry and the Urban District Council, of Tralee were affected by the Bill, and if the latter was aware that this Provisional Order had been introduced.

MR. ATKINSON said that, of course, the Provisional Order affected both the County Council of Kerry and the Urban District Council of Tralee. The Local Government Board sent down an inspector, who made an inquiry into the financial relations of the two councils, and the result was that this Provisional Order was made.

MR. DILLON pointed out that the right hon. Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland did not seem to know that the Bill dealt with not three, but four Provisional Orders, as one relating to the city of Waterloo was also included. Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed.

ARIZONA COPPER COMPANY, LIMITED, ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL.  
(BY ORDER.)

[UNDER THE PRIVATE LEGISLATION PROCEDURE (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1899.]  
Order for Second Reading read.

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

MR. DILLON said that this was one of the most extraordinary Bills that had ever been brought before the House of Commons within his memory. They had been given to understand by the hon. Member for Partick that he was going to move that the Bill should be referred to the Joint Committee of the Lords and Commons, and in support of that motion a very interesting document had been circulated to all

the Members of the House of Commons yesterday.

MR. PARKER SMITH (Lanarkshire, Partick) said he found it was not competent to move his motion that day, but he intended to move it on Thursday.

MR. DILLON said the Bill ought to be challenged at once, and they ought not to be asked to read it a second time without at least some explanation being given as to its extraordinary nature. They had had an example of the way in which business was transacted in respect to Irish Provisional Orders, and he thought that members of the Government who introduced those Provisional Orders ought to inform themselves as to what was in them. He ventured to say that not for twenty years had a Bill analogous to this been introduced into the House of Commons. It was of enormous complexity and length, and the purport of it would take any man a very long time to understand. It was introduced under the new Scotch Private Legislation Procedure Act and, being of a novel character, it ought to be challenged. The object of the Bill appeared to him to be to pass an Act of Indemnity for a number of gentlemen engaged in a private mining company in Arizona, who had violated for many years past a number of the provisions of the Companies Acts. The Bill dealt with a number of complicated transactions, most certainly unsuitable to be dealt with in a Private Bill in the House of Commons. What he chiefly complained of was that there was no brief statement of its purpose and effects. Surely that ought to have been done, when, as he saw, from the names on the back of it, those of the Lord Advocate and the Solicitor General for Scotland, that it was a Government Bill. He had the strongest possible objection to passing an Indemnity Bill to protect company directors who had broken the law. But he had another ground of objection. From the statement circulated it appeared that this Arizona Copper Company was owned largely in Germany, France, and America, and the Bill would affect the interests of these shareholders to a large extent, and that litigation was pending. In fact, the House of Commons was asked to override the courts, and to destroy private rights, without any notice being given to the French, German, or American shareholders. That might or might not be a truthful statement, but it was monstrous to ask the House of Commons to give approval to such a Bill in the dark.

\*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire) said he remembered very well when the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Bill was passing through the House there was nobody who, in an unobtrusive way, opposed and obstructed it more obstinately than the hon. Member for Mayo, although he had often heard the hon. Member express great anxiety to have the Private Bill Legislation system extended to Ireland as well as to Scotland. He could only say that, if the first results of the Private Bill Legislation system were to be heralded by such statements as they had heard, it would be absolutely impossible to extend it to Ireland. [An HON. MEMBER from the Irish Benches: Why?] Because the whole idea of the Private Bill Procedure system was that of devolution, and the whole spirit of the hon. Gentleman's speech was that the local inquiry was to be overruled by the House of Commons. Every sentence of the speech of the hon. Gentleman showed his utter ignorance of the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act which now stood on the Statute-book.

MR. DILLON said he thought the right hon. and learned the Lord Advocate had stated that he had shown activity in opposing the Bill.

\*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY said that that showed that there might be activity combined with ignorance. The hon. Member had drawn attention to the fact that his name and that of the Solicitor General for Scotland were on the back of the Bill. But the Arizona Bill was of the ordinary Provisional Order character; and this was a Confirmation Bill, hence the names of the Ministers of the Department were on the back of the Bill. He knew nothing of the Arizona Company; he was not a director of it, and he did not consider he was in any way concerned with the provisions of this particular Provisional Order, which the hon. Member rightly said were very complicated. It was the ordinary, at least not unusual, case of a company finding it necessary to ask for special powers to go to foreign courts. What was done under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act of 1899 was that a petition was presented to the Secretary for Scotland for a Provisional Order. That petition was examined by the Chairmen of Committees of both Houses, and they decided whether the legislation should be by way of Private Bill or by way of Provisional Order. Next, the Secretary for Scotland decided whether there was or was not to be an inquiry if there were no opponents of the Bill. At that time there were no opponents to this Bill, but the Secretary for Scotland, looking to its complicated provisions, decided that although there was no opposition there ought to be an inquiry, and that the company ought so to speak, to prove the preamble. Accordingly there was an inquiry, held by two hon. Members of the House of Commons and two noble Members of the other House. That inquiry was held in Edinburgh, and at the last moment certain opponents came forward and, under the powers contained in the Act, they were given, on special grounds, a locus standi, and were heard. The opponents wanted certain alterations in the Provisional Order, but the Commission did not give effect to their wishes. That being so the Provisional Order was issued by the Secretary for Scotland, who was bound forthwith to bring it before this House in the position of a Confirmation Bill. That Confirmation Bill now came up for Second Reading. The hon. Member had declaimed on what he understood were points against the merits of the Bill, founded on a statement which he had received. The points in that statement might or might not be true, but what was the position the hon. Member had taken up? If he were successful in blocking the Second Reading he would bar inquiry as to the truth of the statement. The hon. Member for the Partick Division proposed to make a motion that the Bill be referred to a Joint Committee of the two Houses, and that motion he (the Lord Advocate) would heartily support. It was a procedure provided for in the Act, which, said that an appeal might be made to a Joint Committee of the two Houses. That was the simple and ordinary working of the Act, which the hon. Member for East Mayo could not possibly have mistaken had he taken the trouble to read the Act.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs) said he might perhaps say a word or two on this question, because he was even more extreme in his view than the hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate. Together with the great majority of the Scottish Members he, when the House was engaged in the manufacture of this new system of dealing with private Bills,

strongly objected to having any appeal to either or both the Houses after there had been a full parliamentary inquiry on the spot into the merits of the case. Like the right hon. and learned Gentleman, he knew nothing whatever of the merits of the case. Beyond the mere name of the Bill he knew nothing of it, but he knew that it had been fully considered by a most competent tribunal in Edinburgh, composed of Members of the two Houses. The right hon. and learned Gentleman said that he would support the proposal for a further stage; namely, that of sending the Bill to a Joint Committee of the two Houses. That was where he parted company with the right hon. and learned Gentleman. He objected to it, because it seemed to him that that course would be ruinous to the success of the new system which had been introduced. If, on some plausible excuse, the whole thing had to be gone over again in London after it had been thoroughly threshed out in Edinburgh, let them go back to the old system, with an inquiry in the Lords and in the Commons. He was surprised that his hon. friend the Member for East Mayo should raise an objection to what was merely a formal and necessary stage in a Bill, in charge of a Minister, in order to confirm the decision of a tribunal which sat in the locality of the Bill; which he understood was a procedure his hon. friend wished to apply to Ireland.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said that the hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate had taken his hon. friend the Member for East Mayo to task for his alleged inconsistency in this matter, inasmuch as the Irish Members wished to have Irish private Bills inquired into in Ireland. The Lord Advocate had pointed out that if his hon. friend proceeded to have a discussion at this stage of the Bill, that would destroy the possibility of any form of Home Rule for Ireland. But look at the inconsistency of the right hon. and learned Gentleman! In the next breath he spoke favourably of the proposal which had been made to send the Bill to a Joint Committee of both Houses, and thus to re-open and re-try the whole case. He would respectfully recommend the Lord Advocate not to speak with such an assumption of omniscience on such matters, and not to lecture hon. Members from Ireland as if he were the only Member in the House who understood the provisions of the Private Legislation (Scotland) Act. Hon. Members on the Irish benches thoroughly understood, as they thought, the provisions of that Bill, and what had happened confirmed him in the belief that he was absolutely right when, on a recent Wednesday afternoon, to the astonishment of some hon. Members, he objected to the Second Reading of a Bill moved by his right hon. friend the Member for North Tyrone, which proposed to extend bodily to Ireland the Scotch system. He believed that that system would be found to be illusory and useless. He took the view expressed by the Leader of the Opposition, that if there were to be a devolution of work from the House of Commons to local tribunals, was it worth having, if matters were to be reopened in the House? He thought his hon. friend the Member for East Mayo had rendered a service to Ireland in pointing out how futile the Private Bill system in Scotland was, and how ill-suited it would be to the special demand which Ireland made for the management in Ireland of purely Irish affairs.

MR. CAINE (Cornwall, Camborne) said he knew nothing about the merits of the Bill, but if this was devolution it was strange devolution indeed, and he

protested against it. On previous occasions schemes affecting the company were settled without the intervention of the House, and he did not understand now why the time of the House should be wasted on the present Bill.

MR. DILLON said he might be permitted to say that he would not put the House to the trouble of a division in view of the discussion which would take place on Thursday.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time; to be considered.

BLACKPOOL IMPROVEMENT BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

BRADFORD CORPORATION BILL.

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

WEST CUMBERLAND ELECTRIC TRAMWAYS BILL.

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

NOTTING HILL ELECTRIC LIGHTING BILL.

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

HAMILTON BURGH PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL [Lords] (UNDER THE PRIVATE LEGISLATION PROCEDURE (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1899).

Read the third time, and passed.

ARDROSSAN GAS AND WATER ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL.

Considered under Section 9, Sub-section (4) of the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899; to be read the third time upon Thursday.

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

MILITARY LANDS PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL.

Read a second time, and committed.

NAVAL WORKS PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL. (BY ORDER.)

Read a second time and committed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to, Gateshead and District Tramways Bill, without amendment; Falkirk and District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill, with an Amendment; London Bridge Widening Bill, with Amendments; Amendment to Sheffield District Railway Bill [Lords], without amendment.

STANDING ORDERS.

Resolutions reported from the Committee::

1. "That, in the case of the Handsworth Urban District Council Bill [Lords], Petition for dispensing with Standing Order 129 in the case of the Birmingham Corporation' against the Bill, the said Standing Order ought to be dispensed with."

2. "That, in the case of the Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway (New Ross and Waterford Extension), Petition for Bill, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with::That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill."

Resolutions agreed to.

DUBLIN, WICKLOW, AND WEXFORD RAILWAY (NEW ROSS AND WATERFORD EXTENSION).

Report [this day] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read;

Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. John Redmond, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Viscount Milton, and Mr. Ffrench.

## YORKSHIRE ELECTRIC POWER BILL.

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

## PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP K).

Mr. HEYWOOD JOHNSTONE reported from the Committee on Group K of Private Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Thursday, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

## PETITIONS.

### BOROUGH FUNDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

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

### BURIAL PLACES (EXEMPTION FROM RATES) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

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

### CHINA WAR 1856&#x2013;1861 (PRIZE MONEY AND SEYMOUR FUND).

Petition from Portsmouth, for inquiry; to lie upon the Table.

### CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

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

### COAL MINES (EMPLOYMENT) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Granville; Church Gresley; Reservoir; and Brentby Collieries; to lie upon the Table.

### ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (HIGHER GRADE AND EVENING CONTINUATION SCHOOLS).

Petitions for alteration of Law, from Cardiff; and Spalding; to lie upon the Table.

### HOSPITALS (EXEMPTION FROM RATES) BILL.

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

### HOUSING OF WORKING CLASSES (REPAYMENT OF LOANS) BILL.

Petition from Gloucester, in favour to lie upon the Table.

### INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

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

### LEASEHOLD ENFRANCHISEMENT (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

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

### LIGHTS ON VEHICLES BILL.

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

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

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

### MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Oakengates; Dawley; Donnington Wood; Donisthorpe; Rawdon; Nethaerseal; Granville; Church Gresley; Reservoir; and Brentby Collieries; to lie upon the Table.

### OLD AGE PENSIONS (No. 4) BILL.

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

### ROMAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY IN IRELAND.

Petitions against establishment, from Crieff; West Calder; and Mid Calder; to lie upon the Table.

### SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Attercliffe; and Eccleshall; to lie upon the Table.

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

Petitions against, from Swindon; Horncastle; North Somerset; Newbury; and Bury; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour, from Hull (two); Hatfield; Hendon (five); Birmingham (two); Carlisle (three); Salisbury; Nuneaton; Brades; Five Oak Green; Southsea; Farningham; Sheffield (two); Kingston upon Hull (two); Dudley; Wingate; Victoria Park; Leeds (three); Primrose Hill; Blackheath; Deptford; Carlisle Cross; Westminster; West Ham; West Hendon; Cardiff; Maesteg (eleven); Chatham (four); Sunderland (ten); Silksworth; New Seaham; Pallion; Stanford le Hope (two); Worthing; Hackney (two); Belvedere; Hoxton; Holywood; Maidstone; Reigate; Hereford; Shotts; Manchester; Motherwell; Midsomer Norton; Hebden Bridge; Barrowford; Stocksbridge (two); South Tottenham; Enfield (three); Nelson; Mildmay Park; Bethnal Green; and Loughborough; to lie upon the Table

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

Petitions in favour, from Monimail; Largs; Forgan; Wamphray; and West Linton; to lie upon the Table.

#### SCHOOL BOARD FOR LONDON (SCHEDULE OF PROPOSED SITE OF SCHOOL BETWEEN BROOKLAND STREETS, STEPNEY).

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

#### SHOPS BILL.

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

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

Petitions against, from Watton; East Newport; and Edinburgh; to lie upon the Table.

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

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

#### WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT (1897) AMENDMENT (No. 2) BILL.

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

#### RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

#### ROYAL OBSERVATORY (EDINBURGH).

Copy presented, of Eleventh Annual Report of the Astronomer Royal for Scotland [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

#### ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (STANDARDS OF EXEMPTION).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 6th May; Mr. Ernest Gray]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 202].

#### NAVY (HYDROGRAPHER'S REPORT.)

Copy presented, of Report on Admiralty Surveys for the year 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

#### CAPE OF GOOD HOPE OBSERVATORY.

Copy presented, of Report of the Astronomer to the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty for the year 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

#### GREENWICH HOSPITAL AND TRAVERS' FOUNDATION.

Copy presented, of Statement of the estimated Income and Expenditure of Greenwich Hospital and of Travers' Foundation for the year 1901&#x2013;1902 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 203].

#### TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No 2623 and 2625 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR; FARM BURNING.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can now state when he proposes to lay on the Table of the House Lord Roberts's reports on the burning of the villages of Bothaville, Ventersburg, Dylstroom, and Wilport.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford) The information is contained in the Return of buildings burnt in South Africa recently presented to Parliament. I have no further information.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: The Return does not give the information in the case of two villages named in the question Will the right hon. Gentleman ask for the information, which was promised some months ago?

MR. BRODRICK: We have asked for it, and it is in the Return.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: But not with regard to these two villages.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can say when he proposes to lay upon the Table of the House a Copy of the Correspondence between Lord Roberts and General Botha as to farm burning.

MR. BRODRICK: The correspondence is in type, and will be shortly issued.

MEDICAL OFFICERS ON ACTIVE SERVICE.

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he has now received any answer to his telegram to Lord Kitchener with regard to the possibility of setting free and conveying home the medical officers who volunteered for service in South Africa, many of whom have been out from home much more than a year, exposed to heavy work and risk from contagion and otherwise.

MR. BRODRICK: Lord Kitchener has not yet been able to release civil medical officers apart from those whose engagements have terminated. If circumstances admit of it, all possible consideration will be shown.

GOVERNMENT STOCK FARMS.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state the number approximately of cattle at present in the Government stock farms in South Africa, the number, and locality of such stock farms.

MR. BRODRICK: In response to a telegram Lord Kitchener informs me that with the exception of one Government stock farm at Stellenbosch, our stock farms are temporarily hired for grazing horses and cattle, and continually change. No statistics can be given.

WAR OFFICE ORGANISATION.

MR. NORMAN (Wolverhampton, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state the reason why the Report of the Committee appointed to inquire into War Office Organisation, signed on 9th May, did not reach members until 7th June.

MR. BRODRICK: Some time was necessarily occupied in printing and indexing the



evidence of this Committee, but no delay took place in publication. I would, in addition, remind the hon. Member that the Committee was a Departmental Committee appointed by myself, and I should in any case have required a reasonable time to consider the Report before publication.

MR. NORMAN: Is it not the fact that the members of the Committee expedited the Report in order that hon. Gentlemen might have it before the discussion of the right hon. Gentleman's resolution?

MR. BRODRICK: It only reached me two days before the discussion of my resolution. It was impossible for me to allow it to be published until I had considered it.

MR. NORMAN was proceeding to put another question when;

MR. SPEAKER said he must seek another opportunity of arguing the matter.

RESERVE OF SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION.

MR. NORMAN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that regiments of Yeomanry keep twenty rounds per man of small arms ammunition in reserve at their squadron headquarters for use on mobilisation if called out in aid of the civil power; and whether after the outbreak of the war in South Africa the War Office ordered any of these reserves of ammunition to be returned to Government store; if so, whether the date of this order for the return of the reserve ammunition of the Volunteer forces was before or after the date on which the total reserve of small arms ammunition, in the country stood at 3,300 rounds.

MR. BRODRICK: Twenty rounds per man is allowed to Yeomanry regiments as a reserve. This reserve was called in after the outbreak of war and before the date alluded to.

IMPERIAL YEOMANRY.

MR. RENWICK (Newcastle-on-Tyne): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, as many of the Imperial Yeomanry now returning from active service in South Africa are not members of any Yeomanry force at home, can he state what arrangements are being made to induce these men to join regiments of Yeomanry, so that their future services, may not be lost to the country.

MR. BRODRICK: The recruiting for the Imperial Yeomanry rests with the various commanding officers, who may be confidently relied upon to make every effort to secure those men who have seen service in South Africa. In many cases the measures necessary have already been taken.

HORSES OBTAINED IN SOUTH AFRICA.

\*COLONEL LEGGE (St. George's, Hanover Square): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the Report called for as to the number of horses obtained in South Africa has yet been received.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY Lancashire, Westhoughton): This Report has not yet been received from South Africa.

\*COLONEL LEGGE: May I ask whether, seeing that this Report was called for four months ago, the noble Lord will hurry the officials up.

LORD STANLEY: Everything possible is done to hurry them up, but the collection of Returns in South Africa is a more difficult task than at home.

MILITARY CRIMES; STATISTICS.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will grant a Return showing the number of cases of soldiers committed whilst serving in South Africa to terms of imprisonment since the opening of the war, the Return to show in each case the rank of the offender, his offence, the nature of the court before which he was tried, the penalty inflicted, how far, if at all, the sentence was subsequently commuted, and whether the prisoner was confined in a civil or a military prison.

LORD STANLEY: I must refer the hon. Member to my reply to a similar question put on the 14th March; by the hon. Member for North Louth.

GUERNSEY MILITIA.

\*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether any decision has now been come to as to the future of the Guernsey Militia.

MR. BRODRICK: The proposals of the States for the re-organisation of the Guernsey Militia have been approved, and the necessary alterations in the regulations will be carried out in due course.

\*SIR CHARLES DILKE: Will anything be published in regard to this matter?

MR. BRODRICK: I had not thought of doing so, but I will consider it.

FINANCIAL CONDITION OF ANNEXED REPUBLICS; SIR DAVID BARBOUR'S REPORT.

MR. M'DERMOTT (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the  
&#x2020; See Debates [Fourth Series], Vol. xc, page 1546.

Colonies whether he has yet received the Report of Sir David Barbour on the financial condition of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The Report has been laid.

NEW CONSTITUTION FOR THE ANNEXED REPUBLICS.

MR. BLACK (Banffshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is yet in a position to furnish the House with particulars as to the constitution of the Legislative Councils of the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies, the powers to be conferred and the restrictions to be imposed upon these bodies, and the official who is to preside over each; if he is not yet in a position to make a statement on the subject will the Government, before issue of the Royal Letters Patent, inform the House upon these particulars and afford opportunities for discussion thereon, and will he give approximately the date fixed for Lord Milner's return to South Africa and for the issue of the Royal Letters Patent relating to the constitution of the Colonies.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The House is already in possession of the general outline given by me in debate on 7th December, \* and I have explained to the hon. Member in answer to a question on 6th May; that it would not be in accordance with precedent to submit the instruments themselves to Parliament before they are issued. Lord Milner will probably return in August. I am unable at present to fix a date for the issue of the Letters Patent.

MR. BLACK: Is it according to the right hon. Gentleman's view of the Constitution that these questions should be excluded from Parliament, or is it only his policy which is unfitted for Parliamentary discussion?

VICTUALLING IN THE NAVY.

MR. NORMAN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he

\*See Debates [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxxviii., page 259.

&#x2020; See Debates [Fourth Series], Vol. xciii., page 734.

can state when Vice-Admiral Rice's Committee upon victualling in His Majesty's Navy presented its Report; whether this Report will be published; whether any action has been taken in consequence of its recommendations; and, if not, why no steps have been taken.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport): At the same time may I ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can now state the recommendations of the Departmental Committee appointed last year to inquire into the victualling of the Navy, and what reforms it is proposed to introduce; also whether it is proposed to present the Report, with evidence taken, to the House.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): In reply to the question of the hon. Member for South Wolverhampton, and also to that of my hon. friend the Member for Devonport, I beg to say that the Report of Vice-Admiral Rice's Committee will be presented to Parliament at an early date. The question as to whether the evidence will be presented with the Report can only be decided when the Board of Admiralty have had sufficient time to examine it. No decision has yet been arrived at with regard to any action to be taken in pursuance of the recommendations made in the Report. There has not yet been sufficient time to deal with a matter of so much complexity and importance as the whole scheme of the victualling of the Navy.

EXPLOSION ON H.M.S. "DARING."

MR. LAMBTON (Durham, S.E.): May I ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he can give the House any information as to the boiler explosion on board the ship "Daring" at Portsmouth.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The following telegram, dated to-day, has been received; "Regret to report, owing to bursting of a tube in boiler of 'Daring,' tender to 'Excellent,' last evening, the following man was killed; Alfred E. Reed, stoker, O.N. 278027, and following injured, severely burnt: Fred Paffet, chief stoker; H. Elliott, stoker; Thos. O. Parks, stoker; George Gammon, stoker. All doing well except Parks. Court of inquiry sits this morning."

MR. WILLIAM ALLAN (Gateshead): Was the full pressure on the boilers at the time the explosion occurred?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Before receiving the Report of the court of inquiry I cannot possibly answer that question.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Was this a water-tube boiler?

MR. WILLIAM ALLAN: Yes.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I do not know with what motive that question is asked. My hon. friend knows as well as anyone in the House that all the destroyers have water-tube boilers. This was a Thornycroft boiler of a peculiarly safe type. I ask leave to answer the question, because evidently there was a motive in asking it.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Not at all

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: It was at Thornycroft type of boiler, which is in use in hundreds of vessels, and, as my hon. friend knows, all destroyers are fitted with water-tube boilers, and there is no possible alternative boiler at, present

before us.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I desire, with the permission of the House, absolutely to repudiate any motive save that of obtaining the information I asked for.

H.M.S. "EURYALUS."

MR. RICHARD CAVENDISH (Lancashire, N. Lonsdale): Can the Secretary to the Admiralty give the House any information as to the fire on the "Euryalus"?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: A telegram has been received at the Admiralty to the following effect;

"The Ramsden basin jetty against which 'Euryalus' is berthed took fire about 10 a.m. to-day. Subsequently attacked ship, involving; sheathing from 19 ft. 6 in. water-marks aft, and 17 ft. forward, and plating to top height above this, extending from the after casemates, on starboard side to stem; sheathing very much damaged and plating buckled. Fire under control at present and no fire on board ship. Further report will follow."

INDIAN FAMINE COMMISSION REPORT.

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether the Report of the Indian Famine Commission was signed at Naini Tal on 8th May; and, if so, whether he will undertake to present it to Parliament without delay.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): There will be no undue delay in publishing the Report when finished, but I have not yet received it, nor am I aware that it is complete.

FRANCE AND MOROCCO.

MR. NORMAN: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether His Majesty's Government has consented to any extension of French influence in Morocco.

\*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRANBORNE, Rochester): The answer is in the negative.

MR. NORMAN: May I ask whether the noble Lord can say, without notice, whether this brief but very welcome answer also applies to the desert behind Morocco.

[No answer was given.]

CHINA; GERMAN GARRISON AT SHANGHAI.

MR. NORMAN: Is the noble Lord the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs in a position to give any information or explanation as to the statement that Germany proposes to retain her military force at Shanghai?

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: In September last the German Government landed a certain number of troops at Shanghai for the purpose of assisting to keep order in that region. We understand that the Germans intend to continue the maintenance of a garrison there, at any rate, for the present.. I am not aware that any explanation has been furnished to us of this intention.

INSPECTORS OF MINES.

MR. OSMOND WILLIAMS (Merionethshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in the event of a mines inspector, permanent or temporary, being appointed for a district including any part of Wales or Monmouthshire, regard will be had to the provision of the Coal Mines Act, 1887, according to which persons having a knowledge of the Welsh language

shall be preferred.

\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): The answer is, certainly.

MR. OSMOND WILLIAMS: Is it not the fact that a new inspector has already been appointed to succeed Dr. Foster who does not understand Welsh?

\*MR. RITCHIE: I do not see how that arises out of the question. I think the hon.

Gentleman is misinformed, however.

#### DISPOSAL OF BODIES OF DECEASED INFANTS.

SIR JOHN KENNAWAY (Devonshire, Honiton): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if his attention has been directed to the report of the coroner's inquest, held at Birmingham on 3rd June, on the bodies of thirty-one infants found in a cellar at the house of Mrs. Knowles; and seeing that a Select Committee reported in 1894 that the state of the law with respect to the disposal of the bodies of deceased infants and children is unsatisfactory, and made recommendations in regard to its amendment, whether he can hold out hopes of introducing early legislation to deal with the abuses shown to exist.

\*THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): The reply to the first paragraph of the question is in the affirmative. The matter reported on by the Select Committee referred to is receiving my careful attention. I should be very glad to be able to deal with it, but I fear I cannot hold out any expectation of legislation on the subject during the present session.

#### RATE COLLECTORS AND DENOMINATIONAL SCHOOLS.

MR. GEORGE WHITE (Norfolk, N.W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that in some districts (for instance, in the parish of Terrington St. Clement, and elsewhere, in the county of Norfolk) the rate collector for the district is accustomed to collect along with the poor rate and other district rates sums of money for denominational schools by placing them upon the rate ticket in the same way as the properly levied rates are placed; and, seeing that money is obtained from the ratepayers without their having been first informed that such payments are voluntary, whether, having seen examples of such rate tickets, he will request that these practices be discontinued.

\*MR. WALTER LONG: I have made inquiry as regards the particular parish mentioned, and I find that the facts are substantially as stated in the first paragraph of the question. The practice complained of is, I think, open to much objection, and I have informed the collector accordingly, and requested him to discontinue it.

#### COLONIAL STOCK AND TRUST INVESTMENT; JAMAICA GOVERNMENT STOCK.

MR. ALBAN GIBBS (London): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, with regard to the conditions prescribed by the Treasury for the security of Colonial Stock, in which a trustee may invest under the Colonial Stock Act, 1900, whether he will say in what respect the Jamaica Government Inscribed Stock issued in exchange for the First Mortgage Bonds of the Jamaica Railway Company falls short of those conditions and when and by what means it will be brought within them; and whether there exists any, and, if so, what reason why the Treasury should

not further prescribe under that Act such conditions as will at once render available for investment by trustees any Colonial Stock which like the Jamaica Government Inscribed Stock referred to, is charged on the general revenues and assets of the colony in priority to advances from the Treasury secured thereon to the satisfaction of the Treasury and the Secretary of State under the Colonial Loans Act, 1899.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): It rests with the Government of the colony to take the necessary steps to comply with the Treasury conditions. I am not aware of anything which need prevent them from doing so.

#### LOANS FOR PUBLIC WORKS.

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL PRYCE-JONES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can say upon what grounds the application of the Newtown Urban District Council was refused for a loan of between £30,000 and £40,000 from the Public Works Loan Board to enable that body to purchase the existing gas works, and can he state when such application may be renewed with a prospect of success, what was the balance standing to the account of such Public Works Loan Board at the end of the past financial year, and what are its commitments for the present year.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: It is not anticipated that the money (£7,000,000) placed at the disposal of the Public Works Loan Board by the Public Works Loans Act, 1900, will be more than sufficient to meet the applications. during the period covered by the Act, for the classes of loans which have the first claim on the Board; namely, loans for works which Parliament has expressly intended to be encouraged, and loans to those local authorities whose powers of borrowing in the open market are comparatively limited. In these circumstances, the Commissioners are obliged to refuse applications for loans for commercial undertakings, such as gas-works. The Commissioners will probably find it necessary to maintain this refusal until the conditions become more favourable for the raising by the State of large sums of money for the purpose of local loans. On the 31st March last the amount still unissued of the £7,000,000 sanctioned for the Board's loans by last year's Loans Act was £2,531,206. The amount now unissued is £1,303,114. The Board's commitments in respect of loans which they have granted but not yet issued amount to £4,764,627, the bulk of which, however, will not fall to be issued during the currency of the present Act.

#### POSTAGE STAMP PERFORATION.

MR. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that the sheets of postage stamps at present issued to the public display a tendency to tear anywhere but along the lines of perforation, and whether he will take steps to have this peculiarity corrected.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: It is undesirable to adopt a system of perforating with larger holes than those at present employed, because the sheets of stamps at the various post offices would not keep entire. The stamps would be liable to become separated whenever the sheets were handled. The dividing of the sheets is

greatly facilitated by tearing them first in the long direction and afterwards across.

MR. ARTHUR LEE: May I point out that the stamps of foreign countries do not tear in the same way, so that the difficulty could be easily overcome.

WELSH MAIL SERVICE.

MR. OSMOND WILLIAMS: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that letters addressed to Llannwchllyn are now conveyed by car from Bala, a distance of over four miles, and that a postman on foot follows the car along the same route to within a mile of Llannwchllyn, when he branches off and works a district, which is also worked or overlapped by two postmen from Llannwchllyn; and, as the train that delivers letters at Bala passes through Llannwchllyn Station on its way to Dolgelly, and in view of the saving to the Post Office Department and the convenience to the parish of Llannwchllyn, would he arrange for the letters for that place to be dropped at the station as the train passes through.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The postal service to Llannwchllyn is arranged very much in the way described by the hon. Member, but no more satisfactory arrangement can be devised, except at an increased expenditure, which would not be justified. With regard to the suggestion that the mail train for Dolgelly should stop at Llannwchllyn to leave mails, the Postmaster General would remind the hon. Member that this question was considered only a few weeks ago. As the result, he was informed that, according to a letter from the railway company, an additional stop at Llannwchllyn would make the arrival at Dolgelly ten minutes later than at present. It would be impracticable for the mails for Llannwchllyn to be put out at that station, as suggested, from the train as it passes through. The Postmaster General regrets that, in view of the inconvenience to the public which would thus be caused, he is unable to adopt the suggestion.

MARAIG BURIAL GROUND.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, as representing the Secretary for Scotland, whether his attention has been called to the fact that the burial ground at Maraig, North Harris, is so overcrowded that the average depth of earth surmounting the coffins is only nine inches; and, in view of similar conditions which prevail in burial grounds in many parts of the Hebrides, will the Local Government Board for Scotland take such steps as may be necessary in the interest of the public health.

\*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): The burial ground of Maraig was closed against all interments by Order in Council made in November last on the representation of the Secretary for Scotland. The Local Government Board for Scotland require every sanitary inspector to report to them annually on the condition of the burial grounds within his district, and, where necessary, action is taken on such reports.

SCOTTISH MEDICAL OFFICERS OF HEALTH.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if he will state the number of medical men holding appointments as medical officers of health in Scotland; and will he say how many of these medical officers possess a public health diploma.

\*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: There are 278 medical men holding appoint-

ments as medical officers of health in Scotland, and of these 61 possess a diploma in sanitary science, public health, or state medicine.

SCOTCH BURGH AUDITORS.

COLONEL DENNY (Kilmarnock Burghs): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether, in the event of any burgh in Scotland having a local Act of its own, the Secretary for Scotland has any power to appoint an auditor.

\*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The Town Councils Act of last year requires the Secretary for Scotland to appoint an auditor for every burgh, except the five large burghs. I am of opinion that this duty, which is an affirmative one, must be exercised notwithstanding the provisions of any local Act.

THE NATIONAL GALLERY.

MR. LODER (Brighton): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether his attention has been called to a report recently made by Mr. W. F. Sherman on the danger from fire to which the National Gallery is exposed; and whether he can see his way to so amend the Bill dealing with the subject which he has introduced into the House, so as to include in it powers to secure a sufficient isolation of the Gallery to protect it effectually from all risk of destruction by fire.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent. St. Augustine's): Yes, Sir, my attention has been called to this opinion, and it is now under the consideration of my Department. With regard to the second paragraph of my hon. friend's question, I do not see my way to an extension of the provisions of the Bill which has this session been introduced.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): When do the Government intend to make some reasonable attempt to pass the National Gallery Bill, which appears on the Orders of the Day?

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: I shall be glad to take the first opportunity of passing it, but I cannot ask my right hon. friend to give it a first place.

VISITORS TO KILLARNEY; ACTION OF POLICE.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that an international boat race between Pennsylvania University and Dublin University will take place next July on the Lakes of Killarney, and if, in view of the fact that this event will cause a number of visitors from America and other countries to visit Killarney, he will give directions to the police authorities at Queenstown and elsewhere to desist from asking the names and examining the persons and luggage of such visitors under the pretext of searching for arms.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): Passengers arriving at Queenstown are politely invited by a member of the constabulary to give their names and destination. The practice has existed for many years, and the information has invariably been freely and cheerfully given by passengers. The action of the police causes no inconvenience to visitors. The police do not examine the persons or luggage of passengers.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Are tourists in Ireland bound to give their names? I hope they will not.

POLICE AND UNITED IRISH LEAGUE MEETINGS.



CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that for some time past police constables from Castle Martyr, county Cork, have made a practice of attending meetings of the United Irish League held in the neighbouring villages of Dungourney and Mogeely, and posting themselves as sentries at the doors of the premises in which the meetings are held; and, inasmuch as English Members are not subjected to police supervision when addressing their constituents, will he state why and by what authority, when the Member for East Cork attended a meeting at Mogeely, in his own constituency, on the 2nd of this month, two police constables stationed themselves at the door of the building in which the meeting took place throughout the proceedings, and declined to inform the Member for East Cork by whose authority they thus acted.

MR. WYNDHAM: The practice referred to was enjoined in respect only of branches which had distinctly committed themselves to acts of intimidation. In such cases the police have been directed to attend in close proximity to meetings with the twofold object of inspiring confidence in the victims of intimidation and of collecting evidence in the event of an attempt being made to renew it.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.): Is not the objectionable practice complained of permanent throughout Munster, and is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the police attend meetings of the divisional executive and try to hear what is going on?

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The question refers to two or three specific cases, which have been answered.

MR. POWER: Will the right hon. Gentleman give specific directions that in the case mentioned and in other cases brought to his notice the police shall discontinue conduct which would not be tolerated in England?

MR. WYNDHAM: The reply is in the negative.

MR. FLAVIN: What act of intimidation was committed by the O'Dorney branch that the police should stand outside the doors and windows of the house where the meetings were held?

CAPTAIN DONELAN: What charge, if any, has been brought against the two branches mentioned in the question?

MR. WYNDHAM: I do not think that arises from the answer, but I may say that reports have been presented stating that resolutions have been passed by the particular branches referred to, which are aimed at individuals, and that is, in my opinion, a sufficient reason for the attendance of the police.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): Will the police attend meetings of the Orange Lodges from now up to 12th July?

DUBLIN POLICE AND MUSKETRY INSTRUCTION.

MR. MOONEY (Dublin County, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if it is intended to send members of the Dublin Metropolitan Police to Hythe to undergo a course of musketry drill; and, if so, is there any intention to arm the force with rifles; and, if not, will he state what is the object of having them trained in musketry drill.

MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member has been misinformed. It is not intended to send members of the Dublin Metropolitan Police to Hythe to undergo a course of drill

in musketry, and it has never been contemplated to arm that force with rifles.

BALTIMORE (CORK) POSTAL DELIVERY.

MR. GILHOOLY (Cork County, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he can now state if an improved postal delivery for Baltimore, County Cork, has been decided on.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General regrets to find that in view of the heavy cost of the present postal service to Baltimore, as compared with the revenue from the correspondence, he would not be justified in incurring further expense for the purpose of improving the service.

MR. GILHOOLY: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the Cork and Bandon Railway Company offered to convey the mails from Skibbereen to Baltimore at the same rate of remuneration?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I am not aware of that, but I will inquire.

PUBLIC SERVICE EXAMINATIONS-MODERN LANGUAGES.

MR. CROMBIE (Kincardineshire): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, with a view to the encouragement of the study of modern languages, he will appoint a Parliamentary or Departmental Committee to inquire whether fuller recognition should be given to these subjects in university scholarships and in the Indian Civil Service, the Navy, and other examinations, which mainly determine the curricula of secondary schools.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): As the hon. Gentleman is probably aware, the Government have no control over the subjects selected for the examination for scholarships in the universities, but no doubt in regard to the other examinations the subjects are chosen with a view to the particular duties which have to be performed, and the importance of the knowledge of foreign languages is recognised by the award of a high rate of marks. I do not think the suggestion of a Committee is at all necessary under the circumstances.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. EDWARD MORTON (Devonport): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is now able to state when the remaining Naval Votes in Supply will be taken, and what is the order in which they will be taken.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I hope to take the Navy Estimates on Friday.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: When will the Vote for the salary of the First Lord of the Admiralty be taken?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am afraid there is not much chance of reaching it on Friday night, but we shall go on with the Estimates in the following week, unless there is a general desire to take some other Vote.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Will the right hon. Gentleman undertake to put it down first on Friday week?

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

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I hope the main business will be Supply, and I shall put down the Board of Trade Vote first, after possibly some uncontroversial Votes.

MR. LUCAS (Portsmouth): Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the possibility of putting Vote 14 down early; the one dealing with naval pensions?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Questions of naval policy must, of course, have precedence.

MR. LODER: May I ask who is responsible for the unprecedented arrangement of the Order Paper to-day? By whose authority have the Government Orders been put down first? Has such a course ever been followed before on a Tuesday?

MR. SPEAKER: The first Government Orders are put down in italics in view of the probability that the Government resolution giving precedence to Government business would be carried. I think the hon. Member will agree that that was a convenient course, and I believe it is usual.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have passed a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend certain provisions of the Solicitors Acts, 1839 to 1894." [Solicitors Bill [Lords].

#### PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

That they have given leave to Viscount Esher to attend in order to his being examined as a witness before the Select Committee appointed by this House on Public Accounts, his Lordship consenting.

#### QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY BOARD.

That they concur with the Commons in their resolution, "That it is expedient that a Select Committee be appointed to join with a Committee of the Commons to consider the constitution of Queen Anne's Bounty Board, and to report whether any economy and efficiency of administration would be promoted by any change in its constitution or by its amalgamation with any other body."

#### ALKALI, ETC., WORKS REGULATION BILL [Lords].

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday, 24th June, and to be printed. [Bill 207.]

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (GOVERNMENT BUSINESS).

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): Sir, there are two occasions after the Whitsuntide holidays on which, according to the almost immemorial

practice of the House, it has been found necessary by successive Governments to ask for privileges in the matter of time. The second of these occasions has been baptised by an irreverent public as "the massacre of the innocents." That occurs, as a rule, at the latter end of July, when the business of the session is, at all events, approaching a conclusion, and I do not propose anything in the nature of a massacre on this occasion, nor is it usual when the Government, about the middle of June, asks the House for further time and facilities for Government business. As regards the general programme of Government legislation, I have not much to tell the House that every Member of the House is not already perfectly familiar with. I have no unexpected or startling statement to make in respect of the Government Orders of the Day. We must, of course, get through the measures which embody our financial policy; the Budget Bill and the Loan Bill. We must pass the Rating Bill, which is, I fear, a controversial measure. We must pass the Education Bill, which I hope will not be a controversial measure. There is the Factory Bill, with which I trust we will make substantial progress to-night, and which I understand, from the best sources of information, is not likely in any case to occupy any very lengthened space of parliamentary time. There are, of course, in addition, the Departmental Bills, with regard to which it is not necessary or usual to make any statement at this period of the

session. I ought to say, however, in addition to this statement, that my right hon. friend the Vice-President of the Board of Education proposes to introduce a Bill on the subject of the dismissal of teachers in elementary schools. I mention that because I gave a pledge some time ago that I would state whether or not such a Bill would be introduced when I made the usual announcement with regard to Government business. I think it will be admitted that that is not an excessive programme of Government business, and that no undue drafts are being made on the time or attention of the House. But I think it will also be granted that, while that is the case, nevertheless there is no reasonable prospect of our being able to get through this amount of business unless the House will grant the

Government the facilities which have been invariably granted to our predecessors when they came at this period of the session to ask for them. It may be that some private Members will object to even this moderate draft on their time; but I may perhaps be allowed to say with regard to the present session that such inroads as have been made upon the time of unofficial Members have not, so far at all events, been made by the legislative programme of the Government as distinguished from their financial proposals, because, as the House is perfectly well aware, practically the whole time at the disposal of the Government has hitherto been taken up either by Supply, or by the Civil List Bill, or by the Finance Bill. [An HON. MEMBER: Questions.] My hon. friend says "Questions," but that is not time at the disposal of the Government. All the time at the disposal of the Government has been taken up in the way I have described. Under these circumstances, I do not think that, even apart from what I am about to say upon the subject of private Members' legislation, there is any substantial grievance this year, at all events, in connection with the claims which we now make upon this House. Two Wednesdays are left by my resolution to be dealt with under the Standing Orders for those Bills which have made most progress, though, in a manner which I shall describe, I propose to retain a third Wednesday for private Members' Bills. The two Wednesdays which are embodied in the resolution carry out the precedents with which the House is familiar, and probably two Wednesdays are, roughly speaking, all that ought to be, or as a rule can be, granted for this particular purpose.

So far I have said nothing the House will not have anticipated, and I hope I have said nothing which gentlemen in any part of the House can raise objections to. So far the demands of the Government are extremely reasonable, and are not in any sense straining the patience of the House or asking for undue or exceptional privileges. I now come to that part of the statement, which has been long promised, with reference to certain legislation which is in the hands of private Members. I have been bombarded by questions from time to time from both sides of the House with regard to the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill and the Beer Bill. It is, as the House knows, the custom for the Government at the end of the session to "star," as it is technically called, those private Bills which are really uncontroversial; uncontroversial in the sense that no Gentleman in any part of the House seriously desires to defeat them; and give them privileges in regard to

order and time. In the treatment of those Bills there never is any difficulty on the part of the Government. But when you come to Bills like those I have mentioned, which cannot, at all events at present, be described as wholly uncontroversial in the full sense in which I have used that term, a much more difficult and embarrassing problem is necessarily raised for those responsible for the arrangement of the business of the House. What does the difficulty in dealing with these Bills arise from? It arises chiefly from the fact that we have an entirely different measure of time when we are dealing with private Members' legislation than we have when we are dealing with Government legislation. It is the established practice, dating long before you, Sir, presided over this Assembly, that on Wednesdays a private Member's Bill, the discussion on which begins at twelve o'clock, is practically closed at half-past five. The Bill may be of a most complicated and far-reaching description, it may deal with the fundamental Constitution of this country, it may affect the interests of a vast class, it may have consequences of the most far-reaching description; but the discussion, beginning at halfpast twelve, and sometimes later, is, by the usages of this House, thought to have run its appropriate time when it arrives at half-past five. And these are Bills which have not been introduced under what is commonly, though inaccurately, described as the ten minutes rule; they have not been discussed on the First Reading, and they have been introduced without a word of explanation on the part of the hon. Members in charge of them. If anybody will compare the fate of a private Bill in these preliminary stages with the fate of a corresponding measure introduced by the Government, he will see that we have a fundamentally different measure for what is considered appropriate discussion on a Bill which emanates from a private source as compared with the discussion on a Bill which emanates from the Government Bench. That system may be a good system or a bad system; on that I should be out of order in commenting. But it has this consequence, which I beg the House to consider; it would enable the Government, unless the House were watchful, to introduce some far-reaching measure as a private Member's Bill, take it over after it had passed the critical stage of a Wednesday afternoon's debate, make it their own, and give it all the privileges of a Government Bill. [A laugh.] I do not quite know why that statement excites a smile. I am giving an account of parliamentary business; it is not meant in a controversial sense. I am speaking as the Minister who for the time being is responsible for the business of this House; and the peculiarity I have adverted to in the different treatment of Government and private legislation is one the public outside do not understand, and, I venture to say, never can be made to understand. It is one of those esoteric secrets which all Members of this House comprehend and practically all who are not Members of this House do not understand. I think it would be a grave abuse if any Government were to allow a really controversial or party measure to be brought in by a private Member, to pass through an often perfunctory discussion on a Wednesday, to be divided upon in the perfunctory manner in which Wednesday Bills are divided upon, and then, after it has passed a First and Second Reading in that manner, to allow it to become part of the Government programme and to have all the privileges of a

Government measure; to have in its infancy all the privileges of being the offspring of a private Member, and in its mature growth all the advantages of being under Government patronage.

This argumentative preface, Sir, brings me to the conclusion which I want the House fully to realise, that it is really a most difficult and delicate matter to deal with the class of private Bills which is not of the wholly uncontroversial type to which I adverted a few moments ago. I have done my best to

consider whether I should be in any way infringing upon the broad principles I have just laid down by giving some further privileges, at all events, to the two Bills in regard to which I have been so often questioned in this House; the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill and the Beer Bill. I propose on Wednesday, the 26th of this month, to put down as the two first Orders of the Day the motions for sending the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill and the Beer Bill respectively to Grand Committees. When those motions are disposed of, which, I think, ought not to take long, the remainder of the day will be devoted to those private Members' Bills which still remain on the Paper, to be dealt with in the order in which they would have been dealt with if Wednesdays had remained in the uncontrolled possession of private Members. That being the proposal, I have to ask myself and the House whether in doing so I have infringed upon the broad principles which I have ventured to lay down, and which, I think, ought to govern the conduct of the business of this House. I hope and believe that I have not. I think, from what I can learn, that the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill is one of those Bills the feeling in favour of which is not simply to be estimated by the magnitude of the majority in favour of it on the Second Reading, and is still less to be estimated by the number of petitions which have been brought up in countless multitudes, and no doubt could be brought up if it were desired, and have been brought up, on the other side. We all know; we have had painful and personal experience of it; the facility with which petitions can be got up, especially when there is any great organised body interested in the legislation affected. Therefore I do not pretend to judge the support which this Bill has in the House or out of it by the majority on its Second Reading on a Wednesday, which is a fallacious test, or by the number of petitions in its favour, which is even still more fallacious. I have done my best to make myself acquainted with the current of feeling in the country and in the House, and to forecast as well as I could the kind of modifications which might be made in Grand Committee on the Bill which,

I believe, would go very far to bring back this measure into the category of really uncontroversial measures with which the House would be able to deal without occupying parliamentary time at all. I hope I am right in that. With regard to the Beer Bill, to which, so far as the Grand Committee is concerned, I think similar privileges should be granted, I cannot forecast with the same assurance what course is likely to be pursued in Grand Committee. I do not know exactly what Amendments are likely to be proposed or adopted. If those in charge of the Bill and responsible for it were fortunate enough; and I trust they may

be; to make that Bill also something very like an uncontroversial measure; I do not say a measure commanding assent in every part of the House, still, having behind it a general body of opinion irrespective of party in the House; I hope that Bill also will in its later stages run a favourable course and be transferred to the Statute-book. But I can give no pledge as to further time as regards either of these Bills. I am giving them every advantage; I am giving them what, of course, they could not have had without the intervention of the Government; namely, the advantage of going to a Grand Committee. I have every reason to believe that as regards one of these Bills there can be little doubt that its course will be prosperous and successful, and I entertain similar hopes, though not such confident expectations, with regard to the other.

Sir, I think that I have succeeded in making the policy of the Government plain. Whether I have been equally fortunate in carrying with me the general opinion on both sides of the House I do not know. But I venture to make an appeal to the House in reference, not to the general business of the session, but to to-night's business. I hope hon. Gentlemen will second me in trying to keep the discussion on this resolution within the narrowest reasonable limits, in view of the Bill which stands first on the Order Paper to-night if I carry my resolution. On both sides of the House there is a great desire to see the Second Reading of that Bill disposed of to-night, and I trust the House will second me in carrying it out. Let unofficial Mem-

bers please bear in mind that this proposal is made in their interests. I have done more for them by this proposal than, I think, any Government has ever done; I have not only given them, practically, three Wednesdays instead of the usual two Wednesdays, but I have also indicated that the Government will in certain very probable contingencies give even further facilities for forwarding these Bills. Under these circumstances I hope I may ask in return that this resolution shall not lead to a long and exhaustive debate, in view of the Second Reading of the Factory Bill, which it is so desirable we should deal with to-night, in order that it may be sent as soon as possible to a Grand Committee. I beg to move the resolution standing in my name.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, for the remainder of the session, Government Business do have precedence on Tuesday and Wednesday (except on Wednesday, the 12th, and Wednesday, the 19th of June), and that the provisions of Standing Order 56 be extended to all the days of the week."; (Mr. A. J. Balfour.)

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): This motion is a motion dealing with the business of the House, and I am constrained by the very vivid recollections of the most recent parliamentary experience to say, when we speak of the business of Parliament, that we have had to-night, I think, an example as flagrant as any we have ever had of one department in which a change in the rules governing our business is certainly required; I mean what we have seen again and again in this session, as well as in previous sessions, but what, I think, is becoming more frequent, the occupation of the most valuable part of the time of the House on some important night, when the House is impatient to proceed with serious business, by private business. I commend to the right hon.

Gentleman that fact as one of the most urgent and most serious with which he can deal. And I think a little light is thrown upon the practice; which is a practice, apparently, beyond anyone's control at present; by the fact, which we can easily dis-

cern, that it is always on those nights when the right hon. Gentleman is going to move some important Bill or motion of this kind, and when, therefore, there is a large attendance of Members, that the agents for Bills contrive to put private business on the Paper. I merely take the opportunity of saying that by the way, before commencing any criticism on what the right hon. Gentleman has said.

In the first place, I wish to say something on that part of the right hon.

Gentleman's speech which concerned itself with certain private Members' Bills.

Although I was glad to hear the proposals he made, I was not quite able to follow the right hon. Gentleman in the distinction which he drew between the experience of Government and private Members' Bills. He seemed to think that private Members' Bills were inadequately discussed on the stage of the Second Reading, because there were only a few hours available, and that then the opinion of the House was taken. But; I speak with due submission to your authority, Mr. Speaker; I am under the impression that that is the case only where the Bill has been before the House on several previous occasions, and that in those cases which the imagination of the right hon. Gentleman conjures up, where some great constitutional change was introduced under the auspices of a private Member on a Wednesday afternoon, the Speaker would allow the adjournment of the debate in order that the matter might be thoroughly discussed, I think the right hon. Gentleman overstated his case somewhat. He told us that there was a great danger in this practice, because the Government might surreptitiously bring forward a measure of their own under the name of a private Member and, as it were, get a start of the House. But I am not sure that we have not had cases recently of the Government taking advantage of a private Member's Bill in even a more extraordinary manner than this, because I believe in another place a Bill introduced by a harmless and unthinking spiritual lord has been taken bodily possession of by the Government and converted into, practically, a measure of their own. So that I think that the right hon. Gentleman need not be afraid that our mode of conducting business gives undue opportunity for such a proceeding. The proposal which the right hon. Gentleman makes as to the mode of dealing with the two Bills to which he referred seems to me a perfectly wise and proper one. I agree with everything said with regard to the Children's Bill, as to the strong feeling, the strong sentiment, that pervades the country on the subject; and I earnestly hope that, by a little give and take, the Standing Committee will be able to make of that Bill such a measure as shall not only give immense satisfaction to the sentiment, but also carry with it the general approval, of Members of the House. Regarding the Beer Bill, I am somewhat in the same position as the right hon. Gentleman. I have not that familiar acquaintance with it which would enable me to measure the volume of sentiment or opinion which may be behind it. But if in that case also it would be possible to come to a harmonious conclusion it would be a very good thing. I rather think, however,



that the Chancellor of the Exchequer will have to be converted in the process, because I have some recollection of the fact that he lodged a very strong protest against the Bill, and I believe he recorded his vote against it, but of that I am not quite so sure.

So much for these private Bills. Now I come to the proposals of the Government with regard to the general time of the House. No doubt it must be admitted at once to the right hon. Gentleman that it is usual at this time of the year, after the Whitsuntide holidays, to take that measure of the time of the House which the right hon. Gentleman now proposes. The only observation I would make on this occasion is this, that he has already made larger inroads on the time of private Members than I have ever seen made before in any previous session. In itself the motion, however, is in accordance with the practice of the House; but the right hon. Gentleman now, as last year, has not said anything; or has said very little; of the business which the Government propose to submit to the House of Commons for the rest of the session. He spoke of the massacre of the innocents. Unfortunately, it is the innocents that are massacred. There are one or two of his children that we should much rather see massacred. I find a good many measures stated in the King's Speech of which we have heard nothing. There is a Bill for reconstituting a Court of Final Appeal. I think it is time to say whether that is to be carried out. We were told of it last year, but it was suddenly and mysteriously dropped. Again it appears this session. What has become of it? There is also the Sale of Land to Tenants (Ireland) Bill. What has become of that? What is to be its fate? There is a Bill dealing with the lunacy laws; and there are, further, Bills relating to water supply, stopping drunkenness in public-houses; a very good thing if it can be done, and that, I suppose, is to be engrafted upon the episcopal Bill to which I have referred. But there is another Bill, which I think is of first-rate importance; the Literary Copyright Bill, on which the right hon. Gentleman has said nothing. He has spoken only of two great measures, the Rating Bill; the Bill for continuing the grant in aid of rates; and the Education Bill. Unfortunately, these are measures which will occupy a very great deal of the time of the House. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to contemplate that the Rating Bill would be strongly opposed. I do not wish him to lay any flattering unction to his soul as to the Education Bill. It is well to speak plainly; that Bill is one which will undoubtedly require the close consideration of the House, will excite strenuous opposition, and will occupy a great deal of time. And rightly so. I know I cannot discuss that now; I should be out of order in so doing; but we must remember that this Education Bill is really a revolution of the whole educational machinery of the country. It is more than that, because it is not a complete Bill in itself. It is the prelude to something that is to follow. We have been told more or less plainly by the Vice-President, but in explicit terms by the Leader of the House himself in a letter that has been published, that it is intended by the Government that this new authority which is to be set up, and to which many of us have very strong objections, will have entrusted to it next year or at some subsequent time the whole control of the primary as well as the secondary education of the country. That makes this

Bill of unusual importance and difficulty; and whatever objections we may find to the Bill within its own limits and as it stands, those objections are very much increased and the difficulty made much greater when we remember that it is merely the first stage in the process that is to be continued further. It is natural that we should like to be quite sure of the depth of the pool of water before we step into it. I wish it, therefore, to be distinctly understood that there will certainly be a great amount of strenuous opposition to much that is in this Bill, possibly to the whole Bill. At all events, it will give rise to a prolonged and serious controversy in the House. That the right hon. Gentleman should invite the House to embark upon this task in the middle of June, almost within sight of the final recess, seems to me not to imply a proper estimate of what is demanded of the House of Commons. There are one or two other Bills, and there is one of which no mention is made; the Manoeuvres Bill. We were told that, as part of the great improvements which were to be made in our military system, there would be a Manoeuvres Bill introduced this session. What I would say is that no such Bill as that, because of its importance, however urgent it may be, ought to be introduced at the end of the session and hurried through. With regard to Supply, the right hon. Gentleman is giving a day this week to the Navy Estimates. With regard to the Army Estimates, the right hon. Gentleman was asked several questions yesterday as to what he proposed to do in order to give the House an opportunity of discussing the Report of the Committee which has been considering the reorganisation of the War Office, and there is some idea of taking that opportunity on the Vote for the War Office itself. I would venture to point out that that Vote is already heavily burdened. In the first place, there is the ordinary discussion which we have in ordinary years; in the second place, there is the whole question of the conduct of the war in South Africa; and if in addition to that you are to discuss this particular question of the reorganisation of the War Office, I do not think there will be room in one day, or in two days, for the discussion of three such large subjects. The right hon. Gentleman has, as I have said, made this motion, which is the usual motion. Those private Members and others who feel aggrieved at being deprived of their time at the usual periods of the session will, no doubt, blame this further encroachment. I can only say that, although I sympathise with them in that feeling, what the right hon. Gentleman has proposed is only in accordance with practice, and for that reason may be accepted in good faith.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): The Leader of the House stated that he did not intend to enter into the task of the massacre of the innocents, but he went on to say immediately afterwards that the country and the House generally knew what was the programme of the Government, and he then proceeded to say what Bills should be proceeded with this session; the Rating Bill, the Education Bill, the Factories Bill, and so on, clearly by that method performing the task of the massacre of the innocents, and clearly indicating to the House those measures which the Government intended to proceed with, and, by exclusion, those measures it was intended to sacrifice. I noticed, not without interest, but without surprise, that the one Irish measure mentioned in the King's Speech was one with

which the Government proposed not to proceed, and the result is that for the remainder of this session no more time will be given to Irish Members. For that reason I rise at once to express the view that we who sit on the Irish benches hold with regard to this motion, and to explain why we intend to give it vigorous opposition.

The Leader of the House founded his motion, as he said, upon precedent, and the Leader of the Opposition intimated general approval of the motion, also because it was founded upon precedent. Now may I be allowed to say that the precedents of this House in dealing with Irish matters are not likely to have much weight with Irish Members. The uniform precedent with respect to Irish legislation in this House has been to ignore and neglect the interests of Ireland and suppress the voice of the Irish people, who have been brought here to this Parliament against their will, under the pretence that this Parliament had the will, the knowledge, and the time to legislate wisely and justly for Ireland. I venture to say the experiences of this session and the circumstances with which this motion is surrounded this afternoon are conclusive proof that this Parliament has neither one nor the other of those qualifications. There may be, and I do not deny that there is, in the breasts of many Members of this House, a great amount of goodwill towards Ireland, but when it comes to neglecting English reforms in order to secure the passage of Irish reforms, that good will vanishes into thin air. The circumstances surrounding the motion proposed by the Leader of the House are a conclusive proof that this Parliament as at present constituted has neither the will nor the time to legislate wisely and justly for Ireland.

What has been our experience this session? When we first came to this House to formulate Irish grievances we used to be met with the statement that those grievances did not exist, but this session, under the ægis of the present Chief Secretary, that policy has wholly changed. Now the Government admit the grievances and hold up their hands in despair and say, "We cannot deal with them, because we have not the time." If there is one grievance more than another which now oppresses the people of Ireland it is the slow process of the work of land purchase in Ireland under the Land Purchase Act, and a scheme was put forward in the King's Speech for dealing with the grievance. To-day we find ourselves in this position, that that Bill goes by the board, and the Government take up the position that they cannot deal with it because they have not the time. The same remark applies to the grievance of Irish education, which the First Lord of the Treasury himself admits to be a real grievance, but which for want of capacity, or will, or time on the part of this House cannot be remedied. Another grievance which affects the industrial classes of Ireland, and which is also admitted, we are told cannot be dealt with, and the suggestion for the appointment of a Vice-regal Commission cannot, we are told, be adopted this session because there is not time.

Exactly the same answer was given in the case of the Labourers Bill which we introduced; the grievance was admitted, but it could not be dealt with for the want of time. Now we are asked to give our remaining time over to the Government. If the Government proposed to use a portion of this time for

grappling with Irish grievances I would be the last to refuse it to them, but after their having failed to grapple with those grievances during the whole of the session, I think the Irish Members would be very foolish if they did not resist the motion by every means in their power.

Now, I desire to enter a protest against what I call the indecent farce of putting in the mouth of the Sovereign at the commencement of a session a solemn promise to deal with grievances of this kind when there is never the remotest hope or intention on the part of the Government of doing so. I am sure the Leader of the House is too candid a man to stand up and say that when this promise was put in the King's Speech he either hoped or intended to bring this measure forward. No, Sir. It was put in as a blind, as a piece of parliamentary humbug, because the growth of the land purchase movement in Ireland in forcing land purchase has been growing in power, and is strong enough to compel the Government to put this promise in the King's Speech; but it is not sufficiently strong, or turbulent, or menacing to compel the Government to go further than to place it in the Speech from the Throne, and compel them to introduce and push a measure through the House. I certainly hope that when the Chief Secretary comes back to Parliament next year he will find that the events in Ireland have been of such a character as to, as he says, strengthen his hand, but, as I say, to compel the Government to pass a measure through the House. Who can say it is an unreasonable thing to ask the Government to give us this time?

But apart from Irish affairs, as the motion stands, the Government are practically asking for the whole of the time of the session. Never was a demand less justified. The experience of the session has been not merely that there has been no Irish legislative programme, but there has been no British legislative programme. At this period of the session the Government find themselves in a worse position, so far as the necessary business of the House is concerned, than any Government of modern times. Yet there has been no Government which has taken so much time from private Members as this Government this session. There has never been a Government in office which has had so much power in this House as the present; it is not merely that they have had the closure, and have used it more relentlessly and remorselessly than any Government before, but they have forged new rules and taken away the one privilege from the House of raising questions upon Mr. Speaker leaving the Chair upon going into Committee of Ways and Means. They have added more stringent rules to push their business than any other Government in the past, and yet they have used their time with less effect than any other Government. I think altogether upon the question of the treatment of Ireland no case has been made out for this resolution. The Government now find it is impossible for them to get through what they consider the necessary business of the session, and one cannot fail to be amused to hear and read occasionally the ill-informed cry of obstruction to account for the breakdown of the Government. There has been no obstruction. [Ironical cheers.] It is very significant that those cheers come from new Members of this House. Who is the best authority upon obstruction in this House? The First Lord of the Treasury. He was one of the inventors of obstruction. For years I sat at his feet on these

benches learning from the Fourth Party the art of obstruction. The right hon. Gentleman knows what obstruction is, and he has made no claim that there has been any obstruction of public business. He has not done so because he is too candid and well informed in this matter, and he knows from his experience of the last twenty years that this session there has not been anything in the nature of obstruction. What has been happening in this session has been simply the inevitable result of the system of working in this Parliament as at present constituted.

I ask, Sir, is it not time to give up the idle pretence that the House of Commons as at present constituted can ever properly fulfil the important task of attending to the great Imperial affairs of this ever increasing Empire, with its new problems arising from day to day, and from its extension from year to year, and at one and the same time deal effectively with the perhaps more humdrum, but certainly in my opinion equally important problems which arise in the local affairs of England, Scotland, and Ireland? Sir, it is not obstruction. It is the inherent difficulty; the inherent impossibility, I would say; of the situation which has arisen owing to the change, so to speak, of the character of the work which comes to this House, and owing to the enormous increase of the duties and responsibilities of Parliament. Let me take an example. Take the case of any great British reform. Or, I will put Ireland on one side altogether, and say take the case of any great English reform, for which practically the whole of the English people are clamouring, but which necessitates close and prolonged consideration in this House. Under the present system all that is necessary to postpone for years the consideration and settlement of that question is that some great Imperial question should arise, like that which has arisen in connection with South Africa, and at once all great local reforms are blocked and shelved. You are beginning to find out, and you will find it out more and more, year by year, that it is an impossible thing; a thing which has never been accomplished by any nation in history hitherto; for one and the same assembly to fulfil the duties of a great Imperial Senate and at the same time to discharge the duties of the local legislatures of three separate countries. Some foolish people; and, indeed, they are foolish people; attribute what I may call the breakdown of the House of Commons to the Irish Members. They do us too much honour. No, Sir, if Ireland had been disfranchised, if Ireland's voice had not been heard here at all, this process would have gone on just as it has gone on, and you would have found yourselves face to face with the problem, which you cannot solve under your present system, and by the House of Commons as an instrument constituted as it is.

I have read with infinite amusement the statement confidently made that all this can be remedied if only the Government will pluck up heart of grace and call an autumn session, in order to amend the Rules of the House. Some people have gone the length of saying that the whole evil could be remedied if, forsooth, the right of asking questions were taken away from Members, or were limited. A more futile or absurd suggestion was never made. I am one of those who value the right of putting questions. I have never approved of putting irrelevant

questions, or of attempting to occupy the time of the House by asking questions. I have always thought that, from the point of view of the country, from the point of view even of the Government, it is a most valuable right, and I have always deprecated any attempt to prolong questions by unnecessary questions from time to time. But suppose that you attack this right of putting questions, suppose you eliminate it altogether; which is an impossible thing; what do you gain? At the very outside, perhaps an hour or less per day. If instead of destroying the right of questions; which you could not do; you limit it in some way, you will save perhaps half an hour per day. Is it seriously contended that this hopeless block of business of the House of Commons, this hopeless block of the business of the country, this scamping; as you say, the necessary scamping; of Supply, this, as you say, necessary postponement of great British reforms, and all these things which you have seen this session; is it seriously contended that all this can be remedied by gaining half an hour a day by depriving Members of this right of questions, or by curtailing that right? No rules which man can devise can possibly get the House of Commons out of the position in which it is. No depriving of private Members of a little more of their time here and a little more of their time there will enable the House of Commons to rehabilitate itself in the public estimation. No. What is necessary is that the House of Commons should once more be able to exercise its most legitimate and primary function of carefully and fully discussing Supply, and of having sufficient time to deal with problems affecting the wellbeing of the people of England, Scotland, and Ireland. I say that that cannot be done so long as this assembly remains at one and the same time a great Imperial Senate, and also the local Parliament of England, Ireland, and Scotland. You may go on as you are going on at present, session by session, taking more time from private Members, diminishing the right of private Members to speak or to ask questions, and so on; you may go on session by session converting this assembly more and more into an instrument for simply registering the decrees arrived at by the Cabinet; you may do that, and by doing it palliate the state of things temporarily. You will not palliate it very much, but you may palliate it temporarily; but at what cost? For the sake of a momentary lull in the agony of the patient you will be giving the patient a drug which you must know will end in the deprivation of the patient's life. The House of Commons cannot continue to exist if this system of treatment is meted out to it. I say that if hon. Members desire the House of Commons to regain the position which in my belief it has largely lost in the estimation of the people of this country, if it is desired that this House should once more emulate the usefulness and freedom of past days, that desire will be carried out, not by still further limiting the rights and privileges of Members, but by some great system of devolution, whereby there will be devolved from this assembly all those local national affairs which you have not either; I was going to say the will, but I had better not say that; but which you certainly have not the knowledge, capacity, or time to transact here, and the accumulation of which hangs like a millstone around the neck of this Parliament. In saying this I really have been speaking to a large extent more from the British than the Irish point of view. From the Irish point of view, even what I have sketched out would

not go to the full length of our demands. But I say that in that direction lies the only hope of the House of Commons. I am perfectly convinced that year after year, as the House of Commons ceases more and more to be a really free deliberative

assembly, and becomes more and more an instrument for registering the decrees of the Cabinet, more and more you will be approaching to the time when it will be impossible for the House of Commons to exist at all. In my belief, the only hope is that the accumulation of these arrears of national work belonging to the three countries at home, and work arising from time to time out of these great Imperial problems; such as the one which has engrossed the entire of this session; will have the effect of awakening the minds of the people of these countries to the necessity of doing here that which has been done with success in almost every other civilised country in the world, namely, the sub-division of labour, by allowing men to have the responsibility of carrying out the government of themselves, the placing of the responsibility upon the shoulders of the men who have the knowledge.

For the reasons I have mentioned, I take the strongest possible view against this motion. I regret the fact; but I suppose it is almost inevitable; that when these motions are made the members of the Front Opposition Bench will support the Treasury Bench. Of course they have to face facts as they are. They look forward to the date, sooner or later, when they will be called upon to take up the government of the country, and the gentlemen of the Front Opposition Bench no doubt have to think of the time when perhaps in a future Parliament they may have to make similar requests. I suppose, therefore, that it is natural that the Leader of the Opposition should express a qualified approval of this motion, and that he should not walk into the lobby against it. But I am convinced that in his heart and in his conscience he realises substantially, at any rate, the justice of what I have been saying. I am also convinced that it would be better for him and his party if he took a strong course upon matters of this kind, and, in defence not only of the right of private Members, but also, I would say, of the continued existence of the House of Commons itself, walked into the lobby against such motions as this.

\*MR. CHAPLIN (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): As one of those who have watched with much interest the fortunes of the Beer Bill, I naturally listened with the greatest attention to the statement of my right hon. friend, and more particularly to that part of it in which he indicated the intentions of the Government in regard to the future progress of that measure. As I understand, my right hon. friend is willing in any case to grant facilities for the reference of this Bill to a Grand Committee. I cannot help saying that, if that concession had been made when we asked for it some weeks ago, we should have received it with the most cheerful alacrity, because our position then would have been this. The Standing Committee on Trade was at that time absolutely free from all other business. No other Bill was before it, nor was any other Bill in a position to be referred to it, and there would have been ample time to pass the Beer Bill through it before Whitsuntide. The first Wednesdays after Whitsuntide would then have been available for its further stages, and we should have had every reason

to hope and believe that the passage of the Bill into law was practically assured. It is evident, therefore, that we have not got all that we asked for, or all that we hoped for.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I meant to deal with that point. The course which my right hon. friend urged us to take, and which he regrets that we did not take, would have had this fatal objection; that it would have made the Government intervene in the fortunes of the ballot, and disappoint the legitimate hopes of hon. Gentlemen concerned for other private Members' Bills. I do not think it would have been possible for us to do that.

\*MR. CHAPLIN: I do not wish to press this point, nor did I raise it for the purpose of controversy, but rather for explanation. As my right hon. friend said very justly only a few minutes ago, the reasons why measures do not advance as rapidly as their supporters desire are frequently not in the least understood by the country, and I was making that statement very much for that reason. As I was saying, it is evident that we have not got all that we asked or hoped for, as people in this world; at all events in my experience; very seldom do. What I understand is that, unless this Bill returns from the Committee more highly controversial than it is at present, we may have every reasonable expectation that in the natural course of things it will be allowed to go through its remaining stages. I am very glad to think that that probably will be the case, otherwise I should have found myself under the painful necessity of being in direct conflict with the Government upon the motion now before the House. The Leader of the Opposition pointed out that at all events there was one member of the Government; the Chancellor of the Exchequer; who would have to be converted. However that may be, I am encouraged by the knowledge that, whatever the Chancellor of the Exchequer may have done, many of his colleagues voted in favour of the Bill, and I am therefore somewhat more sanguine than the right hon. Gentleman opposite with regard to the fate of the measure. I look forward with confidence to the Bill passing through Committee in a condition which will make it not more controversial than it is at present, and, on the whole, though we have not received all that we desired, I think I may say on behalf of the supporters of this movement that we are not ungrateful to my right hon. friend for the course he has taken.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.): I think there is clearly a hope that the Beer Bill may emerge from the Committee in a less controversial form. The Committee will have the advantage of having before it the report of the committee of experts, of which I saw an account in The Times the other day, and in which they say that the more general form of arsenic in beer is due to malt rather than to sugar. If the Bill is recast from that point of view it will certainly emerge from the Committee in a less controversial form.

\*MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): It is impossible to consider this motion otherwise than in its effect on the whole machinery of unofficial Members' attempts to legislate in this House. I do not find myself very far removed from the position taken up by the hon. Member for Waterford in the powerful speech he has just made on the very much wider aspect of devolution. I hold by the faith with which Mr.



Gladstone inspired many of us in 1885 and 1886 in that matter, and I was glad to hear the point put so forcibly and clearly by the hon. Member this evening. In regard to the attempts of unofficial Members to initiate and carry through legislation, I really think it is time we made up our minds on the matter. I ventured to make a few remarks on the 8th February, 1899, when the usual motion was made at the beginning of the session with regard to the ballot for Bills, and I stated then that on examining the facts for a period of years I found that out of every hundred Bills introduced only about four ever received any discussion on a Wednesday afternoon in this House, while only two made any further progress. For the past ten or twelve years practically no Bill, unless it has been of an absolutely uncontroversial character, has passed through this House on the initiative of an unofficial Member. The reason is not far to seek. When there is put into the hands of every individual of the 670 Members who form this House the power of stopping every stage of a Bill after a specified hour, you are providing a weapon by which anyone is enabled to stop practically all legislation from unofficial sources. We all know that by far the larger number of the Bills now appearing on the Paper, whether they be Government or other, will never receive the slightest discussion in this House. I really think that this is a matter which demands attention. The right hon. Gentleman made an announcement with regard to certain Bills being sent to a Standing Committee. I did not gather whether he promised to grant Government facilities to those Bills when they emerged from that Committee, because that after all is the vital point.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I made no promise. I thought I made it perfectly clear that that depended upon the shape in which they emerged from the Committee.

\*MR. JOHN ELLIS: I only wished to know the fact. I have some experience of those Committees, and, to one who is anxious to see the machinery of this House working effectively, it is a pitiable thing to see Members coming down by the score to attend these Committees, and devoting a great deal of time to passing Bills through, conscious all the while that at the end of their labours nothing further will result. Last year the thing reached what might be described as a farce. Standing Committees met, but were unable even to form a quorum, because Members were aware that the whole of their time would be thrown away. With regard to Bills which have passed through Committee of the whole House, surely it is time some steps were taken to make effective the provision of our Standing Orders which, after Whitsuntide, places Bills in the order of their progress. I remember very well that that rule was adopted in the hope that something would come of Bills introduced by unofficial Members. But let us look facts in the face. Is there any Member who has the slightest experience of this House who will not admit that an unofficial Member, whatever his fortune in the ballot may be, has little or no chance of passing a measure through the House if it has in it the slightest element of a controversial character? We find ourselves this session in a most peculiar position. Finance dominates the whole situation. Everyone knows; the right hon. Gentleman has pointed it out; that, what with Supply, the Civil List, and the finance arising from the war, no legislation of a practical or effective character is possible if it is to have

that reasonable amount of discussion which all legislation ought to have in this assembly. In The Times of yesterday the following remarks were made; "At the same time many people feel that the failure to pass the majority of the Bills that have figured in Speeches from the Throne during recent years would not be an irreparable and paralysing loss to the country. At a time when Parliament and the nation have to grapple with the tremendous political and financial problems involved in the South African crisis, there is no ardent desire on the part of the people to keep fiddling about what are called social reforms."

There is a great deal more truth in that statement than might perhaps be acknowledged as yet in the House. Finance and this terrible South African problem will mainly absorb the time and attention of the House of Commons, in my opinion, throughout this Parliament. I do think we are entitled to have from the right hon. Gentleman a little more specifically a statement of what he really intends to carry through the House of Commons and what he intends to drop. He spoke of the massacre of the innocents at the end of July. Why should we go on wasting our time through another six or seven weeks over matters which may not be further proceeded with? Why should he not tell us exactly the measures the Government mean to press? I regret that we have not time seriously and quietly to consider our procedure with a view to making more effective our rules with respect to legislation by unofficial Members. I recognise that the Government must have the time for the purposes of Supply and the great Finance Bill; and really the right hon. Gentleman might have given us some information with regard to that measure, because that will certainly take three or four weeks. Under these circumstances I do not feel at liberty to oppose the motion of the right hon. Gentleman, but I do earnestly hope that he will see to it, during the remainder of the time he asks us to sit here, that the business should be so allocated that, at all events, at each week-end we may feel we have done something practical.

MR. TRITTON (Lambeth, Norwood): On behalf of a great many Unionist Members who are associated with me on the question of licensing reform, I desire to offer our hearty thanks to the Leader of the House for the arrangement he has made with regard to the Children's Bill. We have been somewhat troublous in that we have put many questions, had many interviews, and sent many memorials, and we now acknowledge with heart-felt gratitude the very handsome manner in which the right hon. Gentleman has met us. When the news is flashed through the country that the Government are going to help on the Bill which will protect little children from the evils of the public-house, there will be a thrill of heart-felt gratitude and joy all through the country that the intensity of the feeling on this subject has been recognised. We thank the right hon. Gentleman for what he has done, and we hope that when the Bill comes out of Committee, amended as the case may be, he will give facilities that the measure, which is so strongly desired by all lovers of children and those who are interested in the sobriety of the country, may be placed on the Statute-book, and by so doing he will earn the everlasting gratitude of a large number of his fellow countrymen and countrywomen.

\*SIR BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.): May I be allowed to make a very strong protest against the action of the First Lord of the Treasury in having for the second time taken the date fixed for the Committee stage of the Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill. The long holidays have deprived the country of a measure which would otherwise have been passed this session. I am of opinion that if the House had met at the usual time, and if we had not had extra long holidays, it would not have been necessary now to take up the time of private Members. I think some consideration is due to hon. Members of this House, and the First Lord of the Treasury might help us to get this Bill referred to the Grand Committee on Law. I may remind the right hon. Gentleman that the House has already expressed its opinion very strongly on the Second Reading, and his remarks about the closure did not refer to the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill, because when the closure was moved the discussion had practically ceased, a number of hon. Members were talking about their own private affairs, and nobody knows what the hon. Member addressing the House at the time was talking about. I believe that the general opinion of the House is that this measure should receive fair and generous treatment. This question has been before the House for at least a quarter of a century, and it has been carried both in this House and the House of Lords. I am aware that this Bill does not excite that enthusiasm which some Bills naturally give rise to. At the same time I think there is a general feeling throughout the country in favour of it, and it is only opposed by a very small section of this House and the country. That same section also opposes the Church Discipline Bill, but the country is thoroughly Protestant and the people are determined not to be priest-ridden. I have received innumerable newspaper articles from the colonies expressing strong indignation as to the way this Bill has been treated this year. I would like to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he thinks that the under, taking given last year by the Prime Minister to the Australian representatives upon this subject has been loyally carried out by the course which the Government have now taken. I do implore the House not to trifle with the very strong feeling which exists in the colonies upon this question. Those colonies have loyally stood by us and fought for us, and they are now more especially deserving of consideration at a time when the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall are honouring ladies of high position in Australia, who, if they came to this country, would be branded as persons of immoral character and would be denied access to the Court of their Sovereign.

\*MR. PURVIS (Peterborough): I wish to take this opportunity of cordially expressing to the Government my indebtedness for what they propose to do. With regard to some of the remarks made by the right hon. Gentleman on the other side, they remind me of the old saying that that which is true is not new, and that which is new is not true. He has referred to what he calls the lately printed Report of the Commission. Now that is not an official Report, nor is it a report of the Royal Commission. A commission appointed by the brewers is certainly not a Royal Commission, and with regard to arsenic in malt the Report says that it is so infinitesimal that, practically, it need not be taken into consideration at all. I believe I am expressing the opinion of all supporters of

this Bill in this House, and of a great many people in every corner of the country, when I say that we are thankful to the Government for the consideration they have shown us in regard to this measure.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: May I now be allowed to make an appeal to hon. Members to allow the resolution to be decided upon. I make this appeal in the interests of the Bills which are to come before the House

MR. J. A. PEASE (Essex, Saffron Walden): I want to refer to the very strong feeling which exists in the eastern counties of England in favour of this Pure Beer Bill. Farmers and agricultural labourers are united in regard to the necessity for this Bill being passed, but, so far as my experience of this House goes, referring Bills to a Grand Committee at this period of the session means that they will be massacred, and will not be passed into law. Unless we have some better assurance from the First Lord of the Treasury I feel that there will be great disappointment amongst those interested in this Bill because of the danger of its non-passage into law. The First Lord of the Treasury has said that no pledge as to the future can be given by the Government, and I am afraid that will give great dissatisfaction throughout the country not only with regard to this Bill, but also in regard to many other measures which are ripe for legislation.

MR. CROMBIE (Kincardineshire): I cordially join with my hon. friend the Member for Norwood in thanking the right hon. Gentleman for what he has done for the Children's Bill. I only desire to ask one question. I wish to know if the Bill to be introduced dealing with the dismissal of teachers will apply to Scotland.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, it will not apply to Scotland.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport): I would like to know if the promise made by the right hon. Gentleman involves the introduction of the Military Loans Bill.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, that Bill will be introduced.

MR. KEARLEY: I should like to ask when the right hon. Gentleman intends to proceed with it, because I regard it as a pernicious system that these Bills should be introduced at the very end of the session.

MR. REGINALD LUCAS (Portsmouth) said he desired to make a brief statement with regard to the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill. When the Bill was read a second time, he was one of those who spoke and voted against it, and in so doing he felt bound to complain that they were somewhat misrepresented. He must enter a protest against the tone of the hon. Member behind him, who asserted that those who opposed the Bill had no interest in children or in their welfare.

MR. TRITTON: I said nothing of the sort.

MR. REGINALD LUCAS was bound to say that that was what he gathered. He desired to add one word to explain the attitude he adopted. The First Lord of the Treasury had alluded to the habit of hon. Members of pointing out many faults in the measures which came forward on Wednesdays and then voting for the Second Reading. He preferred the doctrine laid down by the late Lord Randolph Churchill in the debate on this subject in 1886, when he said that if one felt so much objection to a measure as this the right process was to vote against it. As he

imagined there would be no further opportunity of speaking in the House on this subject, he rose to say that those who voted against the Bill were not opposed to all temperance reform.

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member will not be in order on this occasion in discussing motives for voting on the Second Reading of a particular Bill.

MR. REGINALD LUCAS: May I make the simple observation in conclusion that, while I was one of those who spoke and voted against this Bill, the course I then took must not be taken as being altogether against temperance reform or the welfare of children.

MR. E. J. C. MORTON (Devonport): Several hon. Members who have spoken have expressed their gratitude that an exception has been made with respect to the Children's Bill. Although I agree with those sentiments, I cannot help feeling that the motion of the First Lord of the Treasury substantially amounts to a proposal to make private Members pay for the sins of mismanagement of the Government. The wasting of time at the disposal of this House by the Government commenced at the very beginning of the session. The present session was summoned on the 17th of February, and I know of no reason why it should not have been summoned a week earlier. We had an unusually long recess at Easter and another at Whitsuntide, and now the First Lord proposes to take all the time from private Members with the few exceptions he has made. The right hon. Gentleman has not told us clearly what he intends to do with the time of the House. There are four Bills in which I feel a very special interest; the Finance Bill, the Loan Bill, the Education Bill, and the Bill for the renewal of the Agricultural Ratings Act. I should like very much to have some indication as to the period at which these Bills will be taken, and which of them is going to be taken earliest.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The Finance Bill.

MR. E. J. C. MORTON: Can the right hon. Gentleman give me some indication as to when he is likely to take the Education Bill?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am afraid I cannot.

MR. E. J. C. MORTON: I hope the First Lord will be good enough to give us the earliest possible information as regards the order in which these Bills are to be taken.

\*MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory) moved his Amendment to the First Lord of the Treasury's resolution, to except Tuesday, the 11th instant. He moved this because he desired to call attention to a matter which affected his constituency very much; he referred to the question of the Barrow drainage.

The Barrow Drainage Commissions of 1886 and the Royal Commission on Irish. Public Works of 1887 both reported in favour of drainage schemes in connection with the river Barrow, and in 1888 the Leader of the House introduced a Bill dealing with the subject, but he afterwards withdrew it. If in 1888 the need for this scheme was so great, why was it abandoned and never introduced again? Widespread suffering resulted from the flooding of the river Barrow. Things have been growing worse from year to year, and at present four or five of the adjacent counties were in a critical condition. The area included some four or

five large towns;

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member will not be in order in dealing with that point.

\*MR. DELANY said the Government were treating private Members very badly, and he thought the First Lord of the Treasury ought to have given them a month's notice in his motion. In Ireland the taxes were already heavier than they were able to bear, and this was a purely domestic question to relieve a large and important portion of the country which might very properly be brought before the House. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would grant them facilities for dealing with this important question, which was one of vital interest to his constituents.

Amendment proposed;

"In line 3, after the word 'on,' to insert the words 'Tuesday the 11th and.'";(Mr. Delany.)

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

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I hope that the hon. Member will not press his Amendment. I do not think that in any case it is possible for anything to be done in the Barrow drainage question this session. I assure the hon. Member however that the subject is engaging the attention of the Chief Secretary.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.) said he was very sorry that a more favourable reply had not been given, and unless the Chief Secretary for Ireland or the First Lord of the Treasury, who knew the gravity of the condition of things in this part of Ireland, gave them some assurance that the question would receive attention, he should urge his hon. friends to proceed to a division.

MR HAMMOND (Carlow), said they had a right to demand from the Government an opportunity to discuss a matter of such grave importance to Ireland as the Barrow drainage scheme.

MR. CREAN (Cork, S.E.) thought the First Lord of the Treasury ought to respond to the appeal which had been made to him from the Irish Benches, in  
AYES.

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

Griffith, Ellis J.

O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)

Abraham, William (Rhondda)

Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton

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

Allan, William (Gateshead)

Hammond, John

O'Dowd, John

Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud

Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil

O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)

Ambrose, Robert

Harwood, George

O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N

Barry, E. (Cork, S.)

Hayden, John Patrick

O'Malley, William  
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)  
Horniman, Frederick John  
O'Mara, James  
Bell, Richard  
Jacoby, James Alfred  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Black, Alexander William  
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.  
Pease, J. A. Saffron Walden)  
Blake, Edward  
Kennedy, Patrick James  
Philipps, John Wynford  
Boland, John  
Layland-Barratt, Francis  
Pickard, Benjamin  
Boyle, James  
Loamy, Edmund  
Power, Patrick Joseph  
Broadhurst, Henry  
Leng, Sir John  
Price, Robert John  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Levy, Maurice  
Rea, Russell  
Burt, Thomas  
Lewis, John Herbert  
Reddy, M.  
Caldwell, James  
Lundon, W.  
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Cawley, Frederick  
M'Dermott, Patrick  
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)  
Channing, Francis Allston  
M'Govern, T.  
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel  
Cogan, Denis J.  
Mansfield, Horace Rendall  
Shipman, Dr. John G.  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Mather, William  
Soames, Arthur Wellesley

Crean, Eugene  
Minch, Matthew  
Soares, Ernest, J.  
Cremer, William Randal  
Mooney, John J.  
Sullivan, Donal  
Cullinan, J.  
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)  
Taylor, Theodore Cooke  
Dalziel, James Henry  
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)  
Tennant, Harold John  
Delany, William  
Moulton, John Fletcher  
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)  
Dewar, J. A. (Inverness-sh.)  
Murnaghan, George  
Wallace, Robert  
Dillon, John  
Murphy, John  
Weir, James Galloway  
Doogan, P. C.  
Nannetti, Joseph P.  
White, Luke (York, E. R.)  
Duffy, William J.  
Nolan, Col John P. (Galway, N.)  
White, Patrick (Meath, North)  
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)  
Fenwick, Charles  
Norman, Henry  
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)  
Flavin, Michael Joseph  
Norton, Capt. Cecil William  
Yoxall, James Henry  
Flynn, James Christopher  
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)  
Gilhooly, James  
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'ry Mid  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)  
Grant, Corrie  
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W  
NOES.



Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.  
Arrol, Sir William  
Balcarres, Lord  
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte  
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John  
Baldwin, Alfred  
Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.  
Austin, Sir John  
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manc'r  
Arkwright, John Stanhope  
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy  
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey  
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.  
Bain, Colonel James Robert  
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds

order that hon. Members might be made aware of the great defects and the destruction of property which took place in those counties. It was no use the First Lord giving them visionary promises, and it would be far more satisfactory if the Member for the Division affected (Mr. Delany) were allowed to move the motion on the Paper upon this question, which he was debarred from doing by the motion of the First Lord of the Treasury. It would be their duty to divide the House if they did not get a definite promise upon this question.

Question put.

The House divided::Ayes, 107; Noes, 146. (Division List No. 244.)

Balfour, Maj K R (Christchurch  
Hall, Edward Marshall  
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col Richard.  
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol  
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert W.  
Plummer, Walter R.  
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-  
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd)  
Pretymann, Ernest George  
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)  
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.  
Purvis, Robert  
Bull, William James  
Hay, Hon. Claude George  
Randles, John S.  
Bullard, Sir Harry  
Heaton, John Henniker  
Ratcliffe, R. F.  
Butcher, John George  
Hill, Arthur  
Rentoul, James Alexander  
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.

Hoare, E. Brodie (Hampstead)  
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green  
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.  
Hogg, Lindsay  
Ritchie, Rt. Hon Chas Thomson  
Cayzer, Sir Charles William  
Hope, J. F (Sheffield, Brightside  
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye  
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)  
Houldsworth, Sir William H.  
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)  
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r)  
Houston, Robert Paterson  
Seton-Karr, Henry  
Chapman, Edward  
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham)  
Simeon, Sir Barrington  
Charrington, Spencer  
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)  
Smith, H C (North'mb Tyneside  
Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.  
Hudson, George Bickersteth  
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.  
Coghill, Douglas Harry  
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)  
Spear, John Ward  
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Kenyon, Hn. G. T. (Denbigh)  
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk  
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)  
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Lambton, Hon. Frederick W.  
Stock, James Henry  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Laurie, Lieut.-General  
Stone, Sir Benjamin  
Crombie, John William  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Stroyan, John  
Dalkeith, Earl of  
Lawson, John Grant  
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ  
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chath'm  
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)

Thornton, Percy M.  
Denny, Colonel  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Tritton, Charles Ernest  
Dewar, T. R. (T'rH'mlets, S. Geo  
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie  
Tufnell, Lt.-Col. Edward  
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles  
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine  
Tuke, Sir John Batty  
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph  
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.  
Valentia, Viscount  
Doughty, George  
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Macdonald, John Cumming  
Wanklyn, James Leslie  
Doxford, Sir William Theodore  
Maconochie, A. W.  
Welby, Lt.-Col. A C E (Taunton  
Duke, Henry Edward  
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)  
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-  
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.  
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)  
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord  
Fergusson, Rt. Hn Sir J. (Manc'r  
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire  
Willox, Sir John Archibald  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Melville, Beresford Valentine  
Wilson, John (Falkirk)  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward A.  
Mildmay, Francis Bingham  
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh, N.  
Flannery, Sir Fortescue  
Morgan, Hn. Fred. (Monm'thsh  
Wodehouse, Rt Hn. E. R. (Bath)  
Flower, Ernest  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Wrightson, Sir Thomas

Garfit, William  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.  
Morton, Arthur H. A (Deptford)  
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)  
Gordon, Hn. J. E (Elgin & Nairn)  
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute  
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon  
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
Goschen, Hn. Geo. Joachim  
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens  
Goulding, Edward Alfred  
Parkes, Ebenezer  
Groves, James Grimble  
Pease, Herbert Pike (D'rtingt'n  
Hain, Edward  
Pierpont, Robert  
Main Question again proposed.  
MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."  
AYES.  
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F  
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol  
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte  
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-  
Corbett, A. C. (Glasgow)  
Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.  
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Arkwright, John Stanhope  
Bull, William James  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.  
Bullard, Sir Harry  
Crombie, John William  
Arrol, Sir William  
Butcher, John George  
Dalkeith, Earl of  
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John  
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.  
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham  
Austin, Sir John  
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.

Denny, Colonel  
Bain, Colonel James Robert  
Cayzer, Sir Charles William  
Dewar, T. R. (T'rH'mlets S. Geo.  
Balcarres, Lord  
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)  
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles  
Baldwin, Alfred  
Chamberlain, J. Austen (W'rc'r  
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph  
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)  
Chapman, Edward  
Doughty, George  
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)  
Charrington, Spencer  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds)  
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.  
Doxford, Sir William Theodore  
Balfour, Maj K R (Christchurch  
Coghill, Douglas Harry  
Duke, Henry Edward  
Question put, "That the Question be now put."  
The House divided::Ayes, 144; Noes, 110. (Division List No. 245.)  
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)  
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r  
Lawson, John Grant  
Seton-Karr, Henry  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Simeon, Sir Barrington  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie  
Smith, H C (North'mb Tyneside  
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward A.  
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine  
Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks.)  
Flannery, Sir Fortescue  
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (Bristol, S.)  
Spear, John Ward  
Flower, Ernest  
Lucas, R. J. (Portsmouth)  
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk  
Garfit, William

Macdona, John Cumming  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.  
Maconochie, A. W.  
Stock, James Henry  
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)  
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)  
Stone, Sir Benjamin  
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.  
M'Killop, Jas. (Stirlingshire)  
Stroyan, John  
Goschen, Hon. George J.  
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire)  
Talbot, Rt Hn J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.)  
Goulding, Edward Alfred  
Melville, Beresford Valentine  
Thorburn, Sir Walter  
Groves, James Grimble  
Middlemore, John T.  
Tritton, Charles Ernest  
Hain, Edward  
Mildmay, Francis Bingham  
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward  
Hall, Edward Marshall  
Morgan, Hn. F. (Monm'thsh.)  
Valentia, Viscount  
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robt. W.  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
Wanklyn, James Leslie  
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.  
Morton, Arthur H. A (Deptford)  
Welby, Lt.-Col. A C E (Taunton)  
Hay, Hon. Claude George  
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute)  
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-  
Heaton, John Henniker  
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)  
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord  
Hill, Arthur  
O'Neill, Hon. Herbert Torrens  
Willox, Sir John Archibald  
Hoare, Edw. B. (Hampstead)  
Parkes, Ebenezer

Wilson, John (Falkirk)  
Hogg, Lindsay  
Pease, Herbt. Pike (Darlington)  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Hope, J. F. (Sh'ff'd, Brightside)  
Pierpoint, Robert  
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh, N.  
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry  
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard  
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath  
Houston, Robert Paterson  
Plummer, Walter R.  
Wrightson, Sir Thomas  
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversh'm)  
Pretymen, Ernest George  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)  
Purvis, Robert  
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)  
Hudson, George Bickersteth  
Randles, John S.  
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)  
Ratcliffe, R. F.  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES.; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
Kenyon, Hon. G. T. (Denbigh)  
Rentoul, James Alexander  
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.  
Ridley, S Forde (Bethnal Green  
Lambton, Hon. Frederick W.  
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson  
Laurie, Lt.-General  
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye  
NOES.  
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.  
Flynn, James Christopher  
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)  
Abraham, William (Rhondda)  
Gilhooly, James  
O'Brien, Kendal (Tip'er'ry, Mid  
Allan, William (Gateshead)  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)  
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud  
Grant, Corrie  
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W)  
Ambrose, Robert

Griffith, Ellis J.  
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)  
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)  
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton  
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)  
Bell, Richard  
Hammond, John  
O'Dowd, John  
Black, Alexander William  
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Blake, Edward  
Harwood, George  
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N  
Roland, John  
Hayden, John Patrick  
O'Mall'ey, William  
Boyle, James  
Horniman, Frederick John  
O'Mara, James  
Broadhurst, Henry  
Jacoby, James Alfred  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)  
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)  
Burt, Thomas  
Kennedy, Patrick James  
Philipps, John Wynford  
Caldwell, James  
Layland-Barratt, Francis  
Pickard, Benjamin  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Leamy, Edmund  
Power, Patrick Joseph  
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton  
Leng, Sir John  
Price, Robert John  
Cawley, Frederick  
Levy, Maurice  
Channing, Francis Allston  
Lewis, John Herbert  
Rea, Russell  
Cogan, Denis J.  
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'Govern, T.  
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)  
Cullinan, J.  
Mansfield, Horace Rendall  
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel  
Dalziel, James Henry  
Minch, Matthew  
Shipman, Dr. John G.  
Delany, William  
Mooney, John J.  
Soames, Arthur Wellesley  
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.  
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)  
Soares, Ernest J.  
Dillon, John  
Moulton, John Fletcher  
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C R (Northants  
Doogan, P. C.  
Murnaghan, George  
Sullivan, Donal  
Duffy, William J.  
Murphy, John  
Taylor, Theodore Cooke  
Duncan, J. Hastings  
Nannetti, Joseph P.  
Tennant, Harold John  
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)  
Nolan, Col John P. (Galway, N.)  
Thomas, David Alfred (Merth'r  
Fenwick, Charles  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
Wallace, Robert  
Field, William  
Norman, Henry  
Weir, James Galloway  
Flavin, Michael Joseph  
Norton, Capt. Cecil William  
White, Luke (York, E. R.)  
White, Patrick (Meath, North)

Wilson, Fred. W (Norfolk, Mid.  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)

Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)

Whittaker, Thomas Palmer

Yoxall, James Henry

Main Question put accordingly, "That, for the remainder of the session,  
Government Business do have precedence on Tuesday and Wednesday (except on  
Wednesday the 12th and Wednesday the 19th of June), and that the provisions of  
AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Flannery, Sir Fortescue

Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Flower, Ernest

O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens

Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud

Garfit, William

Parkes, Ebenezer

Allhusen, Augustus Hy. Eden

Godson, Sir Augustus Fred.

Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn

Pierpoint, Robert

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon

Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard

Arrol, Sir William

Goschen, Hn. Geo. Joachim

Plummer, Walter R.

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Goulding, Edward Alfred

Pretymann, Ernest George

Austin, Sir John

Groves, James Grimble

Purvis, Robert

Bain, Colonel James Robert

Hain, Edward

Randles, John S.

Balcarres, Lord

Hall, Edward Marshall

Ratcliffe, R. F.

Baldwin, Alfred

Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Rbt. Wm.

Rentoul, James Alexander

Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r  
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd  
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green  
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey  
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.  
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. T.  
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds  
Hay, Hon. Claude George  
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye  
Balfour, Maj K R (Christchurch  
Heaton, John Henniker  
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)  
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol  
Hill, Arthur  
Simeon, Sir Barrington  
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-  
Hoare, E. Brodie (Hampstead)  
Smith, H C (North'mb Tyneside  
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middles'x)  
Hogg, Lindsay  
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.  
Bull, William James  
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightsd.  
Spear, John Ward  
Bullard, Sir Harry  
Houldsworth, Sir W. Henry  
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk  
Butcher, John George  
Houston, Robert Paterson  
Stanley, Lord (Lanes.)  
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.  
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham)  
Stock, James Henry  
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.  
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)  
Stone, Sir Benjamin  
Cayzer, Sir Charles William  
Hudson, George Bickersteth  
Stroyan, John  
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)  
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)  
Talbot, Rt Hn J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.  
Chamberlain, J. A. (Worc'r)  
Kenyon, Hn. G. T. (Denbigh)  
Tennant, Harold John  
Chapman, Edward

Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.  
Thorburn, Sir Walter  
Charrington, Spencer  
Lambton, Hn. Frederick W.  
Tritton, Charles Ernest  
Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.  
Laurie, Lieut.-General  
Tufnell, Lt.-Col. Edward  
Coghill, Douglas Harry  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Valentia, Viscount  
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Lawson, John Grant  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow  
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington  
Wanklyn, James Leslie  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Welby, Lt.-Col. A C E (Taunton  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie  
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-  
Crombie, John William  
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine  
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord  
Dalkeith, Earl of  
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.  
Wilcox, Sir John Archibald  
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)  
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth  
Wilson, John (Falkirk)  
Denny, Colonel  
Macdona, John Cumming  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Dewar, T. R. (T'rH'mrts, S. Geo.  
Maconochie, A. W.  
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh, N.)  
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph  
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)  
Wodehouse, Rt Hn. E. R. (Bath)  
Doughty, George  
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)  
Wrightsb, Sir Thomas  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire)

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Doxford, Sir William T.  
Melville, Beresford Valentine  
Young, Commander (Berks, E.  
Duke, Henry Edward  
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton  
Fellowes, Hn. Ailwyn Edward  
Mildmay, Francis Bingham  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Finlay, Sir Robt. Bannatyne  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford  
Fitzroy, Hon. Edw. Algernon  
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute  
NOES.  
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.  
Ambrose, Robert  
Bell, Richard  
Abraham, William (Rhondda)  
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)  
Black, Alexander William  
Allan, William (Gateshead)  
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)  
Blake, Edward  
Standing Order 56 be extended to all the days of the week."; (Mr. A. J. Balfour.)  
The House divided:; Ayes, 144; Noes, 111. (Division List No. 246.)  
Boland, John  
Hayden, John Patrick  
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N  
Boyle, James  
Horniman, Frederick John  
O'Malley, William  
Broadhurst, Henry  
Jacoby, James Alfred  
O'Mara, James  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Burt, Thomas  
Kennedy, Patrick James  
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)  
Caldwell, James  
Layland-Barratt, Francis

Philipps, John Wynford  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Leamy, Edmund  
Pickard, Benjamin  
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton  
Leng, Sir John  
Power, Patrick Joseph  
Cawley, Frederick  
Levy, Maurice  
Price, Robert John  
Channing, Francis Allston  
Lewis, John Herbert  
Rea, Russell  
Cogan, Denis J.  
Lundon, W.  
Reddy, M.  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.  
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)  
Crean, Eugene  
M'Crae, George  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Cremer, William Randal  
M'Dermott, Patrick  
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)  
Cullinan, J.  
M'Govern, T.  
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel  
Dalziel, James Henry  
Mansfield, Horace Rendall  
Shipman, Dr. John G.  
Delany, William  
Mather, William  
Soames, Arthur Wellesley  
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)  
Minch, Mathew  
Soares, Ernest J.  
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles  
Mooney, John J.  
Sullivan, Donal  
Dillon, John  
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)  
Taylor, Theodore Cooke  
Doogan, P. C.  
Moulton, John Fletcher  
Thomas, David Alfred (Merth'r

Duffy, William J.  
Murnaghan, George  
Wallace, Robert  
Duncan, J. Hastings  
Murphy, John  
Weir, James Galloway  
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)  
Nannetti, Joseph P.  
White, Luke (York, E. R.)  
Fenwick, Charles  
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway N.  
White, Patrick (Meath, North)  
Field, William  
Nolan, Joseph (Loath, South)  
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)  
Flavin, Michael Joseph  
Norman, Henry  
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer  
Flynn, James Christopher  
Norton, Capt. Cecil William  
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid  
Gilhooly, James  
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)  
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'ry Mid  
Yoxall, James Henry  
Grant, Corrie  
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)  
Griffith, Ellis J.  
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.  
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton  
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)  
Hammond, John  
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)  
Hardie, J Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)  
O'Dowd, John  
Harwood, George  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Ordered, That, for the remainder of the session, Government Business do have  
precedence on Tuesday and Wednesday (except on Wednesday the 12th and Wednesday  
the 19th of June), and that the provisions of Standing Order 56 be extended to  
all the days of the week.  
FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.  
Order for Second Reading read.

\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): In introducing this Bill to the House for First Reading, a short statement was made as to the main provisions of the measure, and in moving the Second Reading I propose, without unduly taking up the time of the House, to enter in rather more detail into those provisions. There seems to me to be a general disposition on the part of the House to grant this Bill a

Second Reading to-night, and as time is somewhat limited I will endeavour to restrict my observations to a comparatively narrow limit. The Bill is largely founded on the proposals of that which was introduced by my predecessor last year, and, although there are many important modifications proposed in this Bill, I feel convinced that if my predecessor had had the opportunity of explaining some of the provisions of his Bill to the House it would have been ascertained that some of the objections to it were founded on misapprehensions as to some of its provisions. There are in this Bill a number of important though minor points involving changes, and there are several proposals that make considerable alterations in the law. In the first place, as regards ventilation, the existing law applies only to the removal of noxious gases, dust, &c. My inspectors, however, have found bad cases which do not come within this description; for instance, girls are crowded in rooms heated by gas jets and full of impurities in the air which is never practically changed. The Bill, while

not laying down what shall be the particular form of ventilation, requires that there shall be sufficient ventilation in all such premises. Then, in regard to machinery, the Bill prohibits the employment of children in cleaning beneath moving machinery. We propose to prevent children from cleaning beneath moving machinery because we know that children bending down under a moving machine are very liable to be caught.

\*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): And women too.

\*MR. RITCHIE: Quite so. There is an important provision relating to bakehouses. In the existing law as to bakehouses there is no definition of "underground," and there has consequently been great difficulty in enforcing the prohibition of underground bakehouses; but this Bill defines an "underground" place as a place where the floor of the room is 3 ft. below the surface of the ground. The Bill does not actually prohibit rooms being used for this purpose even if they are more underground than 3 ft., but it places on the local authority the responsibility of seeing that where there are such places they shall be sanitary and otherwise suitable, and shall require to be licensed. Further, electrical works and sundry other dangerous works are now brought within the law by the Bill.

I will say no more upon these details, but will proceed to the larger proposals of this Bill. I have been vastly impressed with the fact, as to which I think everyone will agree with me, that the present provisions as to regulations dealing with dangerous trades are of an unsatisfactory character. They would admit of separate rules for each factory and workshop in the same industry, even where the conditions are exactly similar, and one extremely weak point in the present law is that every occupier has a separate appeal to arbitration, and



generally the law is unsatisfactory, though I should be sorry to say it is absolutely unworkable. In a number of cases indeed, arrangements have been made by which some of the difficulties are obviated. But the difficulties are very great, and one of the worst features of the existing law is that the decision is left in the hands of an arbitrator, who has practically no responsibility, and; his decision is binding on the Secretary of State. The proposal of the Bill is that rules should in the first instance be made in draft form by the Secretary of State and for the entire trade; that all parties, both employers and employed, may make representations with regard, to them; and that the Secretary of State shall be bound to take all objections into consideration, and may, if so advised, amend the draft rules accordingly. Before these rules become operative there will be the fullest public inquiry by a competent person on behalf of the Secretary of State. I attach myself considerable importance to this public inquiry, because it is most desirable that, before such important rules as can be made with regard to dangerous trades come into force, the fullest publicity shall be given to them. The Secretary of State will not be bound by the decision of the person who presides at the inquiry, but will form his own judgment; and, after having come to a decision, will make the rules formally. Lastly, the rules will be laid on the Table of both Houses of Parliament, and be open to objection according to the rules of the House. There will, therefore, be ample public inquiry, and the fullest responsibility will rest on the Secretary of State, to which I attach the greatest, importance. I cannot dwell too strongly on the fact that in the interest of all parties the man who makes these rules should be a man who can stand up before the House of Commons, and be responsible to the House of Commons. At present he is not responsible, and that is one of the weakest parts of the existing law. There is no doubt that it will be an improvement in the law, and I hope it will be satisfactory to all parties concerned. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife said, I think, that this proposal was his own. I only wish to make it clear that in that case it is the product of two independent brains. I arrived at it after great consideration, and I am glad to find that both of us, having considered the subject with an open mind, have arrived at the same conclusion.

Then there are important proposals with regard to laundries. People employed in laundry work are employed in an undertaking which necessitates very hard labour and much discomfort, and the existing state of the law is anything but satisfactory. The Bill introduced by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife in 1895 proposed to make laundries factories and subject to the provisions of the factory law. But the Committee to which the Bill was referred did not accept the proposal in its entirety, for although it was not the intention of the Committee to remove laundries from the operations of the sanitary provisions, they thought that the nature of the operations carried on in laundries required some relaxation of the law with respect to the daily distribution of the hours of labour. However, the clause embodying the regulations approved by that Committee was drawn in so hazy a fashion that it did not carry out what I believe were the intentions of the Committee, and, as a

fact, it has been found practically incapable of enforcement for many reasons. Take the question of hours. Why, very often the modified provisions with regard to hours could not be enforced, because, as there were no fixed hours of employment or meal hours the inspector could never tell whether any person in a laundry at the time of his visit was legally employed or not, and hence an almost complete failure as regards the working of the Acts with respect to laundries. That state of things ought not to continue. The proposals in this Bill are to make laundries factories and workshops, as the case may be. But as there is great pressure of work in laundries on particular days of the week and practically no work on other days, our proposal is that while the total weekly number of hours of employment should not exceed sixty, there may be elasticity with respect to the daily distribution of these hours. In the order which the Secretary of State would make for this purpose there would be a further proviso that there must be fixed periods of employment and fixed hours for meals. Laundries in religious and charitable institutions are at present outside the law altogether. Neither the law as to hours nor the law as to sanitation applies to them; but it is not my intention to leave them out of this Bill. These provisions are intended to protect workers in laundries from being overworked, and to see that they work under sanitary conditions, and I cannot for the life of me see why these provisions should not apply to laundries in religious institutions of an ordinary character. I am aware, of course, that there is a difficulty in the case of these institutions with respect to inspection. For many reasons inspection is not regarded by the managers of these institutions with favour. I have made modified proposals as to them which I hoped would have met the case, but I understand that even those modifications do not meet with favour from the managers. It is represented to me that while the general provisions of the Factory Acts are applicable, and ought to be applicable, to laundries carried on by those institutions, the work in some of them is done by persons who almost approach the criminal classes; or, at any rate, who are penitents of a character which require reformation; and there is a fear that the discipline, which it is sometimes difficult to maintain in some of these laundries, would break down altogether if inspectors, however appointed, could go when they chose to inspect these institutions. I should be one of the last to do anything which would in any way militate against the charitable and useful work of these institutions, and, if I can possibly, without excluding them from the sanitary provisions of the Factory Acts, meet the objections raised I shall be glad to consider any proposals in their interest made in Committee on the Bill.

One word with regard to the exemption proposals. Under the present law fruit preserving is exempt from the provisions of the Factory Acts in the months of June, July, August, and September. I can understand that it is desirable there should be some relaxation in the hours of employment in these months, when it is essential that the work of fruit preserving should be done in order to prevent the fruit from being spoiled; but I cannot understand why the workshops should be exempt from the sanitary provisions. Therefore, while we allow the exemption so far as the hours of labour are concerned, we bring the

processes of fruit preserving within the sanitary provisions of the Factory Acts. The same arguments apply to fish curing. The present law exempts from the provisions of the Factory Acts fish curing immediately on the arrival of the fish from the fishing boats; but the Bill, while maintaining the exemption with regard to the hours of labour, extends the sanitary provisions to fish curing establishments. Another point which I wish to mention is that the sanitary provisions of the existing law have been found quite inadequate with respect to domestic workshops, owing to the difficulty of discovering and inspecting these workshops, and the impossibility of enforcing the requirements. The Act of 1895 no doubt strengthened the law materially by prohibiting employers from giving out work to insanitary and affected houses, but it has proved practically inoperative. This Bill proposes to throw the responsibility of seeing after the sanitary condition of these domestic workshops upon the local authorities, who, it is clear, are the proper bodies to discharge that duty. I have every confidence that the Bill will be regarded as an honest attempt to place the law affecting factories and workshops upon a sound and workmanlike foundation. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

\*SIR CHARLES DILKE: The House will agree that the right hon. Gentleman is justified in saying that this Bill should go to the Grand Committee on Trade, and should be fully discussed there, though I am afraid that the work of the members of that unfortunate Committee and of the fifteen Members who will be added for the purposes of this Bill will be very serious indeed. The right hon. Gentleman has expressed his regret that the Bill of last year was not fully discussed in order that the objections which some of us entertained might be removed. That is a very natural expression on his part, on taking the place of a former Home Secretary in what is virtually, though not strictly speaking, the same Government. But

I can assure the right hon. Gentleman that the objections to the Bill of last year were insuperable, and that we should have fought that Bill. One of the merits recognised in the present Bill is that it avoids some of the difficulties of the Bill of last year, and gives satisfaction to the demand of those who opposed it in six or seven most important ways. A great improvement in the present Bill over the Bill of last year, although it may be still open to some doubt, is contained in the first eight clauses to which the right hon. Gentleman devoted the first portion of his speech. We are all agreed that the existing system of arbitration on special rules is unsatisfactory. We objected to the remedy proposed in the Bill of last year, and we prefer the remedy which is proposed this year; but even in the present Bill the right hon. Gentleman will find that he will not carry the Committee with him as completely as he seems to expect. As regards the first eight clauses of the Bill, the right hon. Gentleman said that on the introduction of the Bill the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife said that the plan adopted was his plan. It was, however, only described on that occasion in very general language, and I very much doubt whether the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife would support the Home Secretary in all the details of the first eight clauses. The fact is that Clause 1 gives us all we ask for. It gives us the Home Secretary supreme in this

matter; the whole responsibility will rest upon him. But by the last sub section of Clause 2, and by Clause 3, a system of ultimate inquiry is set up which resembles in form the present arbitration under the special rules, and a great many of us are disposed to think that may in practice undo what is provided for in Clause 1. Certainly that is a matter in which I doubt whether the right hon. Gentleman will carry the Committee completely with him. What we believe is that the authority of the Home Office over the inquiries which they are able to make in connection with draft rules, the hearing of both sides, and the subsequent approval of Parliament is sufficient, and we do not think that it is necessary to have the enormous complexity, cost, and delay of a local inquiry such as is proposed in this Bill.

The right hon. Gentleman will gather that the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Congress and many others authorised to speak on these matters are on the whole, of opinion that the Bill is a great advance on the Bill of last year and in some matters an advance on the present law. But there are great omissions in the Bill which we regret, and which we shall endeavour to remedy, and there are also certain clauses which are specially open to objection. We must remember that it is our duty to supervise this Bill on the present occasion. That supervision will take place in Committee, but it is our duty to make it very thorough and not to scamp our work. The Bill is intended to consolidate the law, and we must remember that we shall not get another Bill with reference to factories and workshops for perhaps a period of ten or fifteen years. There were many points on which we carried the Committee with us in 1895, but which remain untouched in this Bill. There were other points which were rejected by the Committee of 1895 by only one or two votes, but which are dealt with in this Bill in a wholly new and different direction. I allude in this connection to the sweating clause, and also to the group of clauses which immediately follow the first eight clauses. The right hon. Gentleman sang the praises of local authorities in connection with sanitation. I am the last person in the world to run down local authorities. I am a fanatic for local authorities, and I would trust them with almost all powers. But this is a case where two sets of persons must take part in the transaction, and there are large portions of the factory laws which cannot fall on the local authorities, but which must remain with the factory inspectors. We cannot solve the question as between what the right hon. Gentleman calls two conflicting authorities by deciding in favour of the local authority. The right hon. Gentleman told the House that it was a fact that the principal section with reference to home work was spoiled in 1895 in passing through Committee by the insertion of Sub-section 3 in Section 5, against which I ventured to divide the House on Report. That nullified the section. No prosecution has ever taken place under it, and the Home Office has been advised by the law officers that the section cannot be acted on. This Bill proposes in this particular respect; and I think it is the one respect in which it is inferior to the Bill of last year; in four different clauses to substitute local authorities for the factory inspectors. Now, I am in favour of local authorities, but there is a great difference between the local authorities of great cities and the local

authorities of small rural districts, and the latter have to deal with factories, because, as everyone knows, there is an increasing tendency to plant down factories, especially for certain trades, such as printing and stationery, in small rural places, and therefore the local authorities in these places must deal with the factories within their areas. The local authorities do not already in certain districts properly discharge duties of a similar description to those which would be thrown upon them by this Bill even in sanitary matters. We have only to look at the Annual Report of the Local Government Board to see an appalling example which is held up to public reprobation. There is a special Report by the Local Government Board on the municipal authority of the city of Chichester as regards sanitary matters. They had actually forgotten the existence of their own bye-laws, and not only had never acted on them, but were unaware of their existence. If these things can happen in connection with public health, which is particularly the business of the local authority, what would happen in regard to labour which local authorities consider to be still less their business? I do not often agree with Mr. Justice Grantham, but he made some remarks in a recent case; *Tracy v. Pretty*; in which he stated the view, which many of us hold with reference to this matter, in most trenchant language. The Inspector of the Home Office, if this Bill passes as it stands, will still have charge of large duties in connection with outwork. Many of the provisions with reference to outwork will have to be enforced by him, and both as regards the existing powers and also as regards the powers to be conferred by this Bill, the factory inspector must continue to be brought into the outworker's home. What we ask is that the factory inspector should have power to do the work where the local authorities fail. The matter arises in Clauses 9, 10, 11, and 13. By Clause 9 the inspector will be hampered. He will have to obtain under that clause a list of outworkers from the local authority, and I confess I think it would have been far better not to go through that form. Clause 10 gives power which it is right that the local authorities should have, but it should also be possessed by the factory inspector. New powers should be given concurrently to the inspectors and to the authorities. Take an example which applies both to Clause 10 and Clause 11. A London tailor gives out work to be done in a rural district. The London inspector becomes aware in London of a very serious breakdown in the case of the work given out to these local tailors. If there is not an active local authority in the district it is important that the factory inspector should have power to prosecute in such cases. Under Clause 13 the abstracts are handed over to the local authorities. The Home Office makes them up, and is responsible for their being an accurate statement of the law, but by giving them to the local authorities we are increasing the difficulties of the inspector's work, because when he comes to prosecute he will have to show that the work has been done locally. There, again, we have thrown a fresh difficulty in the inspector's way. These are the grounds which have induced me to place my Amendment on the Paper, which I hope will induce the right hon. Gentleman to admit that there is something to be said on the other side, as regards these four clauses at all events.

Now, Sir, I should like, briefly, to mention the points in which we still think

this Bill falls short of the requirements of the time. The matter which the right hon. Gentleman mentioned earliest in his speech referred to laundries, which I should like to leave to the hon. Member for Berwickshire, who has done such good work in connection with the matter. With reference to what fell from the Secretary of State as to a special proviso for charitable institutions I should like to say a word. Roman Catholics Members of this House, and certain Members connected with High Church institutions, are anxious to have some special provision to meet their particular needs. If I thought that a special clause would be confined to the very painful case stated by the right hon. Gentleman I should agree, but to extend it to all so-called charitable institutions would be very dangerous. I am speaking without prejudice, but there are a great number of laundries in the suburbs of great towns which have charitable names, but which are entirely commercial institutions, and just as Irish Roman Catholic factories managed by sisters freely admit factory inspectors, so I think that these institutions ought to accept inspection also. No doubt where the inmates are all of one sex, an arrangement might be made for a woman inspector in such cases, but I am not myself satisfied with a general exception in the case of charitable institutions, or that they should be allowed to name their own inspectors. Some of the establishments connected with various churches in London have been thoroughly unsatisfactory from the point of view of inspection, and they cannot in all cases be trusted to name their own inspectors. I should hope on the lines of these general views that we might come to some agreement. I am sure there is no prejudice in the mind of any hon. Member. Certainly there is no prejudice in the minds of those who are taking the most active part in these matters. We may have a different view as to what is quite safe, but we must try to keep up the general standard of inspection. There is one matter which excites great attention in the textile districts, and regarding which the right hon. Gentleman has greatly improved last year's clause. He confines his Particulars Clause to the extension to outworkers. The extension which he has given is a valuable extension, and is not accompanied with the portion of the clause to which we had great objection last year. But what the working classes have always asked for, and what the Trades Congress has pressed for for many years, is the general extension of the principle to all piece work trades, and we shall certainly press on the Standing Committee that the power which the Home Secretary now has of extending the clause from the textile to other trades is a dilatory process, and that instead of that it should be extended to all trades by law, with special power to the Home Office to except trades. Then there is a clause which the right hon. Gentleman did not mention, and to which many of us very strongly object. That is the notice of Accidents Clause. I will not say more than a word on it, because I admit that it is a matter for the Committee. As the right hon. Gentleman did not explain or defend it, I should, however, like to say that we have the strongest objection to the clause as it stands. If there is no other reason for altering the present law than that the Home Office is embarrassed by the large number of accidents now reported, the mere fact that any change must vitiate the whole of our statistics is enough to condemn it. If

that is the reason, the Home Office should induce the Treasury to increase their clerical staff, so as to be able to cope with the accidents reported to them. The right hon. Gentleman did mention the exemptions portion of this Bill, but I do not think he made it perfectly clear to the House that the proposal in this Bill is a great improvement on that of 1898. Even now I do not think the right hon. Gentleman quite grasps our position. With regard to the special exemption in the case of fish, his words are not acceptable to us. Our objection is that the present law as regards fish has not been applied for many years by the Home Office, and that they have allowed a view to be taken up which is not in fact the law. That exemption was most carefully considered, and was most limited, but it has been allowed in practice to cover cases never intended to be within its terms, and we shall try to re-introduce, in fresh words perhaps, what we believe to be the present law. With regard to the jam exemption, the hon. Member for the University of Oxford has made that question his own, and it will be brought before the Standing Committee. The other exemption is also one which is open to abuse. It is called the "khaki" clause, and it extends to Government contracts the principle which is now law with regard to Government works themselves, which are exempted from the Factory Acts in circumstances of national emergency. There is great danger in this exemption, and the clause in the Bill is open to objection from that point of view.

As to complete omissions from the Bill, there seem to be three things which were expected. Hitherto in every Factory Bill we have had some reduction of the overtime principle. There has been some cutting down of the very large amount of overtime allowed in every previous Bill, but in this Bill there is no proposal as regards overtime. In 1895 Mr. Byles, who was then Member for the Shipley Division, divided the Committee twice upon the question of a complete stoppage in the textile trade from Saturday to Monday morning. It is usual in the trade, but it is not the law, and in the West Riding of Yorkshire a practice has grown up of employing a fresh staff on Saturday afternoon. We tried to avoid that by proposing a complete stop from Saturday to Monday morning, and were defeated by only a small majority in the Committee of 1895. Since that time many hon. Members representing Lancashire constituencies have pledged themselves to that principle, and I had hoped that the right hon. Gentleman might have seen his way to have introduced into this Bill such an Amendment. The only other matter which seems to me of sufficient importance to mention now is that the dock labourers expected that some attempt would have been made by the Government to deal with the great difficulties of their situation, which have led to much painful conflict and a large amount of litigation. I know the difficulties in the matter, and I do not wonder; we are all human beings; that the Secretary of State failed to take upon himself the embarrassment of this very dangerous and difficult task, but still the omission is one of which we must complain. Sir, I beg to move the Amendment of which I have given notice, because I think it is necessary to direct attention to the substitution for the factory inspectors of local authorities in many cases where many of us think that substitution would be dangerous.

\*MR. TENNANT (Berwickshire): In rising to second the Amendment, I am reminded of

a period six years ago when I had the honour of first addressing this House. It was upon the Second Reading of the Factory Bill of 1895, and it was the first day upon which we were privileged, Mr. Speaker, to use a Scottish ecclesiastical phrase, to sit under you. You, Sir, will not have failed to notice the difference between your case and that of the Scottish divine: that whereas it is our privilege to listen to the divine, it is your melancholy duty to sit through our discourses. In making a Second Reading speech on a Bill of this character it is difficult to give a general survey without straying into details which should rather be left to the Committee stage of the Bill; but in dealing with a measure affecting diverse subjects, such as the age at which children should be employed, the amount of time during which they should be employed, the nature of their work, the sanitary and other conditions, and the hundred and one other minutiae, I think the House will agree that, although it may be a difficult task, some survey of existing legislation is necessary, useful, and indeed inevitable. The main features of the Bill we are now discussing divide themselves under three heads. There are the proposals relating to arbitration and dangerous trades, the proposals for the transference of responsibility from the Home Office to the local authority, and the proposals with regard to laundries. To those and the omissions from the Bill I propose to direct my observations.

With regard to the district council clauses, to which this Amendment relates, there seem to be certain considerations which one ought to take into review in any scheme of administration by local authorities. I agree that the local authority has certain advantages. In the first place it is on the spot for public health purposes, and being there it is familiar with local needs and circumstances. Its officers are experts upon certain subjects in regard to which it is very likely the Home Office officials have not had special training. Many of the local authorities are extremely active and zealous; they have displayed an activity and zeal which might well be copied even by such an admirable department as the Home Office. It might well be said that when such authorities have had to deal with nine matters connected with the public health, when a tenth arises which is closely allied to questions of public health it should also

be put in the charge of those authorities. Local authorities may help the central authority in the discharge of such duties; they may be the right people to take the tenth particular subject into their charge; and a recognition of these facts ought to lead to a healthier co-operation between the local and the central authority. But there are certain disadvantages. This ideal co-operation is not always possible. Indeed, in the majority of cases, it is not possible at all. Local authorities are subject to local influences. Although you may give some of these matters connected with factories and workshops into the charge of the local authorities, you ought to lay down an absolute rule that supervisory power; that is, the ultimate power; should be retained by the Home Office, and that, above all, there should be no derogation of existing powers. I remember that when I had a humble position at the Home Office as private secretary, it used to be our pride that we would not give away any of our responsibilities. No



doubt the officials of the Home Office have had an enormous amount of detail work cast upon them, and they have discharged it in a manner deserving the highest praise. But if you meet this difficulty by a delegation of duties from the Home Office, you will be making a mistake. You ought rather to increase the staff of inspectors, and especially you should increase the clerical staff. To take one example: it would surely be a disadvantage to the Home Office Inspectors to have to ask leave of the local authorities to consult their lists of outworkers. It is very important that the local authorities should have the lists, but they should keep them in addition to and not instead of the Home Office.

Coming to the clauses dealing with the question of arbitration, I must confess I approach the subject with somewhat mixed feelings. There are two things we have always hoped and clamoured for, namely, uniformity and the abolition of what has been called "the man in the street." The outsider who has been brought in to arbitrate upon the questions ought in my judgment to be abolished. As the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Forest of Dean has stated, we are somewhat doubtful whether these two objects will be achieved. So far as the man in the street, the arbitrator, is concerned, you get rid of him only partially, because you are going to put in his place a "competent person";

\*MR. RITCHIE: He will not have the decision.

\*MR. TENNANT: I am very grateful that the right hon. Gentleman is going to take the decision into his own hands. That is a distinct step in advance, but I am afraid that that portion of the Bill must meet with a great deal of criticism.

As regards uniformity, there is a clause in which it is stated that there should be power of exemption of any specified class of factory. What is the reason for this? I can understand that there are certain classes of factories in which there is a modification of the dangerous process. Take a white lead factory, for instance. Some people are so advanced in the manufacture of white lead that they do not use white-beds or stoves, two of the most dangerous parts of the process.

The rules governing these parts will, automatically, not apply to those factories, and therefore it is not necessary to have such a clause as this. I cannot help thinking that such a clause will lead to all the delay and confusion against which we have been inveighing so long. There are two other points in connection with the arbitration. One is that the Home Office is going to take power upon itself to prohibit the use of any substance or any process. I personally rejoice that it is going to take that power. Some people will say that it is a monstrous thing to put such a power into the hands of any official.

But if they will look at the Act of 1895 they will see that by Section 28 the Home Secretary has power now to prohibit the employment of all or any classes of persons in any particular handicraft or process which he schedules as dangerous. Therefore, you are really only doing the same thing in another way. The other point is the power to discuss these rules. You may remember, Sir, that a year or two ago we had some rules laid upon the table of the House, and we were anxious to discuss them. You laid down a ruling which, owing to the complexity of the subject, was very difficult for most Members to carry in their heads. I cannot help thinking that if these rules are to lie upon the Table of

the House it is of the utmost importance that Members should be able to raise the subject after 12 o'clock, and not only to raise it for the purpose of rejecting the rules en bloc, but to be able to discuss them individually. At present we have no such power, and I think it is important both for the manufacturers and the workpeople that that power should be given.

The third division is in regard to the laundry proposals. I am glad the Home Office has now recognised that the present position is, to use the words of the right hon. Gentleman, far from satisfactory. We welcome the proposal in Sub-section 1 of Clause 26, but the right hon. Gentleman has said nothing about Sub-section 2. Sub-section 2 appears to take away a good deal of what Sub-section 1 gives. The right hon. Gentleman says he takes power to make special exceptions. These special exceptions creep too often into our factory law, and I should like to see a great many of them swept away. In this case these special exceptions are wholly unnecessary, because under Section 39 of the Act of 1895 the Home Office has power to make certain departments of the same factory separate Factories for the purposes of the Act. Therefore the Home Secretary could, if he would, make the separate departments in laundries into separate factories, so that under a certificate subject to conditions prescribed by himself there would be a separate period of employment, separate abstracts and separate rooms; these rooms would be under separate management, and there would be separate workpeople. For example, the washers would begin, say, on Monday morning; the ironers would begin after the washers have prepared their work; then the sorters and packers could begin at other hours. I believe that if that were done it would be quite unnecessary for the right hon. Gentleman to take this power to give special exceptions, which have been a bugbear to the whole of our factory legislation. I would like to

emphasise the point that in laundries young persons and children must be certified as fit for employment by the certifying surgeon. Also, in my opinion, the meals, which are now taken at any hour, at ten o'clock in the morning or at four o'clock in the afternoon, should be taken at some specified hour before three o'clock, and the time allowed should be a whole hour. With regard to religious institutions, I have had letters from the managers of these institutions saying not only that they would welcome, but that they absolutely desire Home Office inspection. There are certain other details which I am quite ready to admit require some give and take on both sides, but which are not fitted for a Second Reading discussion.

With regard to the omissions, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Forest of Dean has mentioned the question of overtime. That was one of the things most of us thought would be brought into this Bill. Then the Secretary of State has said nothing at all about docks or wharves; they are in an extremely unsatisfactory condition. I may also point out that, with regard to the use of inflammable paint, the Committee over which I had the honour to preside reported that it only required the introduction of a very short clause to protect the lives of a certain number of people who are constantly dealing with this most dangerous article. There is another point omitted from the Bill which I wish the right hon. Gentleman had dealt with. I have suggested in speeches and in letters that

it would be a great advantage if the deaths of all persons known to have been employed within three or six months of their death in any trade scheduled as dangerous were reported to the coroner, and the coroner were thereupon to order an inquest. I am persuaded that an enormous number of deaths take place the initial cause of which is the industrial employment in which the persons have been engaged, though this is not the cause certified. I believe that if such a clause were inserted it would lead to a great saving of life. With regard to the reporting of accidents, I believe the present position to be eminently satisfactory. Here, again, I seem to see that the Home Office is overburdened with labour. Too many accidents have been reported. Accidents which the Home Office really considers not to be worth reporting have been reported, and the Department is swamped with work. If that be so, again I say, let the Home Office increase its staff, especially the clerical staff. Let us take care lest in altering the standard the statistics may not be rendered absolutely useless. If the proposal of the Bill is carried out, all the valuable information which we have obtained during the last five or six years will go for nothing.

I said six years ago, and I still hold the opinion, that a subject such as this is one of the best to which any Member of Parliament can devote his attention and his energies. I congratulate the right hon. Gentleman on having produced these proposals; proposals such as too rarely come before Parliament. I think these proposals are largely in advance of anything we have had before us, certainly during the last six years. I hope that if, and when they have been subjected to free discussion upstairs, and to the Amendments which we shall move, and, I trust, in many instances carry, this Bill will go to augment that code of legislation to which a large and ever-increasing class of the wage-earners of this country are looking and have looked for support and protection. Amendment proposed;

"To leave out from the word 'That' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'while welcoming many of the changes introduced into the present Bill, this House regrets the tendency displayed in the outwork clauses to transfer power from the factory inspectors to the inspectors of local authorities.'"; (Sir Charles Dilke.)

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

\*MR. RITCHIE I should like to make an appeal to the right hon. Gentleman and his seconder. They have expressed general approval of the Bill, and as their criticisms are criticisms which I will undertake shall be fairly considered in Grand Committee, I would ask the right hon. Gentleman not to press his Amendment, because the effect of that Amendment being before the House will be to confine the discussion to the particular point raised therein, whereas the House, in the short time at its disposal, would like rather to say what it has to say upon many other points. I will not attempt now to answer the arguments of the right hon. Gentleman, or to explain why I think this great responsibility must be thrown upon the local authorities. I would simply ask the right hon. Gentleman not to press his Amendment now, but

to allow the discussion to proceed on general lines.

\*SIR CHARLES DILKE said he so strongly felt the force of the appeal of the Home Secretary that he was prepared to go even beyond his request. If the Amendment were withdrawn it would leave the way open for another Amendment to be moved. ["No."] If it was understood that no other Amendment would be moved, he was prepared to withdraw his Amendment; otherwise it was better that it should be negatived.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question again proposed.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY (Yorkshire, Shipley): I agree with the hon. Member for Berwickshire that no more important question could be brought before the House than the one covered by this Bill. It seems to me that the Bill contains wise and moderate proposals for dealing with a question which is so large that only those who are concerned in industrial operations can appreciate its importance. With regard to the discretion of the Home Office, tempered as it is by this Bill, I think the House would well believe that it might safely be left in the hands of the present Home Secretary; but in future Home Secretaries the House may not have the same confidence. The public inquiry to which objection has been taken has been likened to the old arbitration inquiry. It is not of the same character at all, because whilst the arbitrator under the existing clause, has the decision entirely in his own hands as to any question between employer and employed, the officer or inspector who makes the inquiry under the present proposal will have the duty

only of receiving evidence and reporting to the Home Secretary, with whom alone the decision will lie. There is a weakness in that portion of the Bill. The Home Secretary must lay upon the Table of this and the other House any new regulations before they become operative, and he must direct an inquiry if one is demanded by either employer or employed affected. The initiative rests with the Home Office, and the Home Office alone. No matter how widely it may be recognised by any particular trade that a change of rules for the benefit of the employer or the employed or the whole trade is necessary, there is no power according to this Bill by which any new rules or regulations can be brought forward unless the initiative is taken by the Home Office. New legislation might be initiated, but under the Bill as it stands the initiative lies solely with the Home Secretary, and I cannot help thinking that that power might be tempered by enabling either the employer or the employed, or both, to move the Home Office towards the formulation of rules which it might be thought desirable should at all events be laid upon the Table of the House for consideration.

With regard to the proposed delegation of authority to the local authorities, it appears to me that the local authorities are the only persons capable of forming the lists of persons employed and so on. The main duty which is positively cast upon the local authorities is to record and publish those places where work is carried on and where the workpeople reside. The medical officer, through the local authority, has to report to the Home Office every case that he meets with, and he has to keep the Home Office fully in touch with all he does under the section, and under the authority of this Act. The factory inspector will have

power to supervise the local authorities and see that they are not lax in carrying out the duties delegated to them under this Bill. The Home Office has practically accepted the recommendations of the Committee appointed by the last Parliament. There is one operation which I think will be necessary, and that is the examination of boilers by competent persons once a year. Who is "a competent person"?

There are instances on record of men of the most ignorant character having been employed to examine boilers. I think the person who examines boilers ought to be a competent engineer of some particular standard of knowledge and competency. Perhaps upon this matter my right hon. friend the Home Secretary may see his way to make some Provision in Committee. There is no doubt that this Bill is an enormous step in advance of other measures of its kind, because it includes laundries within the scope of the Factory Acts, although small domestic laundries are excluded. The Act will only apply to those large laundries where enormous abuses with regard to sanitation and extended hours of work are rampant at the present time. There is one little defect, I think, in that portion of the Bill which refers to bakehouses. The first matter in the Bill referred to by my right hon. friend was the question of bakehouses. There is a provision which enables local authorities within certain limits to deal with bakehouses which are underground, and here in this Bill we have what seems to me to be a retrograde step; for this provision will enable the local authority to pass any bakehouse just as they may please. We shall have one local authority passing a bakehouse which is much deeper underground than another, and thus we shall get a want of uniformity throughout the country. I think that the powers of local authorities should be considerably reduced in regard to this clause. As regards the provision for purer air, there is no doubt that it is a wise one, and it is an enormous advance. I think the provision providing for separate places for meals is also a wise one, and will bring up to the level hitherto adopted by good employers those employers who have never come up to that level, and who employ their working people unfairly. I have followed with great interest the statement of the right hon. Baronet opposite, but there was one point in connection with the Bill which I think he failed to grasp. The Bill provides that an exception may be made with regard to the fish trade, where it is necessary that the fish upon the arrival of the fishing boats must be dealt with immediately in order to preserve it. There is a safeguard against any abuse of this by unscrupulous employers. If the employer immediately the fish arrives deals with the matter, then it is proper that he should be allowed to employ his workers for longer hours.

\*SIR CHARLES DILKE: Those words are in the present law.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY: There is a clause here under which an employer can extend overtime in these necessary circumstances as regards fish. With regard to fruit, I find that there is no safeguard of a corresponding character, and the practice which exists at the present time of jam-makers waiting until the fruit is almost ready for dissolution, so that they may get a favourable market for themselves, and then go in for extensive overtime, is not guarded against by the Bill as it stands. Just as the employer in the fish trade can only obtain

extensive overtime if he proceeds at once immediately the fish arrives, so the employer in the jam factory should be allowed an extension of overtime if he proceeds at once when the fruit arrives from the place where it is grown. I think that, whatever safeguards are introduced to prevent an abuse in the fish trade, the same safeguard should also be introduced to prevent any abuse in the fruit trade. I welcome this Bill as one who is most anxious for progress in social legislation. I welcome this measure as a moderate and, on the whole, a satisfactory contribution to a very wide and difficult subject. I believe the Bill will pass readily into law, and no doubt it will have its Second Reading to-night. There will probably be a very large number of Amendments, but I am inclined to think that a very large amount of the work which my right hon. friend suggests will have to be done in Grand Committee will prove considerably more easy than he anticipates. I have no doubt that, whatever the record of this Parliament may be, we shall in this Bill place upon the Statute Book a measure which will advance the cause of working men, and which will be an example of the advanced policy of my right hon. friend, and a worthy record of his businesslike capacity for dealing with difficult subjects.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): With the general principles of this Bill I am in cordial agreement, and I should be very sorry if anything occurred which prevented me from giving it my support. I have not, however, risen to take part in the general considerations raised by the Bill, I have risen to occupy a very few moments of the time of the House, in order to put before it a claim which we desire to urge, and which was alluded to in the speech of the right hon.

Gentleman when he moved the Second Reading of the Bill to-night. We desire to make a claim for the exemption from the operation of this Bill of a certain limited class of charitable institutions in Great Britain and Ireland. I

listened with great interest to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Forest of Dean, because I know by the record of 1895 that upon this point he was not in agreement with us. I gather from the speech he made to-night that he is practically in agreement with the claim we now put forward. When I speak of a certain limited class of charitable institutions, I refer to the Refuge

Laundries These are laundries conducted by charitable institutions, really for the purpose of saving and reforming a certain class of the community, where the labour employed is the labour drawn from this particular class, and where the laundry is not in the ordinary sense of the word a real factory at all. I find that there is a common misunderstanding upon this point amongst some hon.

Members of the House. Within the last few days I have made it my business to elicit the views of many hon. Members upon this subject, and I have been met by the statement that they could not agree to our claim, because they imagined it was one put forward on behalf of conventual institutions in Ireland, which we desired to put above the law, and above the provisions of the Factory Acts. That is not so. In the first place I desire to point out that the charitable institutions to which I allude are not entirely conducted by convents, and not entirely conducted by Catholics. Some are conducted by charitable ladies of the Protestant religion, and both in Great Britain and Ireland there are at this moment a considerable number of these institutions which are Protestant in their

character, and not connected with the convents at all, and we make this claim equally for them. I have reason to know that these Protestant institutions to which I am alluding have just as great objections to being put under the provisions of this Bill as those conducted by convents and by Catholics. But more than that, we have never put forward the claim that conventual institutions should be placed above the law, or should be exempt from the provisions of the Factory Acts, or any extension of them. What is actually taking place at this moment is an answer to that, because the industrial schools conducted by convents and the laundries connected with these industrial schools are at this moment subject to the provisions of the Factory Acts, and are subject to inspection. Moreover, other institutions, such as the Foxford woollen factories, to which my hon. friend the Member for East Mayo called attention, are also subject to the provisions of the Factory Acts, and this, too, without any objection on their part to inspection.

Therefore, I make this double statement. We are not putting forward a claim simply on behalf of Catholics or convents, and, in the second place, we are not making this claim because they are conventual institutions. The claim we put forward is of an entirely different character, and it is based upon entirely different grounds. It is based entirely upon the character of the labour employed. The claim we make is confined to those institutions, reformatory in their character, in which the labour employed is the labour of fallen women who have been taken by these charitable ladies, who have brought them into these institutions and provided them with work and with means of salvation from continuing in their evil courses. We limit our claim strictly to these institutions, and I think I am right in interpreting the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Forest of Dean that so far he is with us, and so far as we limit our claim to these institutions he has no objection to an exception being made in their favour. I am sure that it is quite unnecessary for me to emphasise the fact that the kind of charity which is exercised by the ladies in these institutions is probably the noblest charity which anybody could possibly engage in. I do not think it is necessary for me to go another step further and say that this particular charity is not only the noblest that the wit of man can conceive, but it is also the most difficult of all charities to conduct. The great object of these ladies is to keep these girls in those institutions. The organisations I refer to are great societies like the Society of the Good Shepherd, which exists in every country in the world, has been employed for years and generations, and perhaps centuries, in carrying on this work, and it has, therefore, the most experience in the carrying on of this work. The members of this Society of the Good Shepherd are unanimously of opinion that the introduction into their institutions of an outside authority in the shape of Government inspectors would completely destroy the discipline of their institutions, and make their already almost impossible task absolutely impossible. When that is remembered, I think the House ought to hesitate before it forces upon these institutions provisions which, however necessary they may be in ordinary factories, are not suitable for, and ought not to be forced upon institutions of this kind. It is not as if any case had ever been made out in

support of the inspection of these institutions. No one urges that they are insanitary, or that an improper number of hours is imposed upon the inmates. We all know that in these institutions there is inspection, although not Government inspection. There is an inspection by the superiors of the religious orders to which they belong, which makes it impossible either for insanitary arrangements to exist or improper hours of labour to be enforced.

I do not understand why the Home Secretary has introduced the clause which stands in the Bill at this moment. Perhaps I may be allowed for one moment to refer to what occurred in 1895. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife was then Home Secretary, and in the Bill which he introduced there was a clause which applied the Factory Acts to these institutions. The matter was discussed in this House, and on the Second Reading of the Bill Mr. Henry Matthews, who subsequently was Home Secretary in a Conservative Government, raised the question, and he said;

"He felt bound to say a word in reference to convent laundries, a considerable number of

which would come under the Bill. They were kept going by ladies whose lives were devoted to works of the noblest charity, and who eked out their want of fortune by the small assistance which they could derive from these laundries. He would take, for instance, the Order of the Good Shepherd, the members of which devoted their efforts to the reformation of fallen women. The ladies of these institutions viewed the intrusion by the Government inspector with feelings of pain and almost horror, and he thought they certainly ought not to be subjected to such treatment unless some strong case was made out. But what case had been made out? Again, when he referred to the Home Office Report, he found nothing whatever in it in condemnation of the convent laundries. In no case was it stated that the factory hours were exceeded, and he knew this from his own experience. In none of them, moreover, was there any night labour. To apply the Factory Acts to such institutions as those of the Order of the Good Shepherd; to require, for instance, that on certain days holidays should be given to the inmates whether they deserved them or not; would, it seemed to him, be a wanton interference with the work of charity."\*

The right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife, did not precisely take that view on the Second Reading of the Bill. He rather took the view that it was impossible to make an exception in those cases. When the Bill went before the Grand Committee, and when a real opportunity was given for thoroughly discussing all the aspects of this case, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife changed his mind, and in that Grand Committee on the Amendment which was moved by Mr. Sexton, after a very long discussion, it was finally decided to exclude those institutions from the Bill; to exclude, in the words of the Amendment, "the inmates of institutions conducted in good faith for religious or charitable purposes." These words were accepted by the Standing Committee by an enormous majority. At that time the right hon. Gentleman had become converted to the view which was pressed upon him at the end of the Second Reading. The Amendment was accepted by the Grand Committee by thirty-eight to ten. In the thirty-eight votes there were leading representatives of every section in this House; Mr.



Gerald Balfour, Sir J. Gorst, Mr. Matthews, Mr. Tennant, Mr. Asquith, Mr. Wyndham, the present Chief Secretary for Ireland. The minority, which was ex-  
\*See Debates [Fourth Series], Vol. xxxii., page 1484.

ceedingly small, included the right hon. Baronet the Member for Forest of Dean, and I am glad to find that the view which caused him to vote against that Amendment was that the words were too general, and that, if words can now be devised to limit the exception to the class of institutions I refer to, even the right hon. Baronet will be in favour of it. I confess that I cannot see how the question has been raised at all in this Bill. In 1895 a settlement was arrived at after the most mature consideration with practical unanimity. Since 1895 what case has arisen to cause you to reopen this question? I want to know whether since 1895 there has been the slightest evidence;

\*SIR CHARLES DILKE: There was a very bad case in a woman's home for the cure of drunkenness in London.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I do not understand that at all. I am not talking of places shut up for drunkenness at all. Surely I have made myself plain. I am not talking of any institutions except the particular kind of institutions I have described, and with reference to those institutions I want to know what case since 1895 has been made, or what case can be made either from the point of view of the sanitary appointments or from the point of view of the work the girls are called upon to do, to necessitate the reopening of this question, I say there has been absolutely no case made, and I think it is regrettable that this clause has been introduced in the Bill at all. But my colleagues and myself have had some opportunity of discussing this matter with the Home Secretary and, owing to his kindness, of meeting also the Leader of the House, and I am bound to say that we have found both of them thoroughly sympathetic with the object we have in view, and I am convinced that, if no definite arrangement has been come to for the omission of this clause, they desire to exempt these institutions. What I would urge upon them very strongly is that they ought not to attempt to exempt these institutions by a side wind. I think it would be a misfortune, from the point of view of the Factory Acts as a whole, if by any device they applied nominally a system of inspection to these institutions under such circumstances, and that this inspection should be a mockery and deliberately made a nullity. It would be far better to exempt the institutions from inspection than to apply a system of inspection on the understanding that it would be merely a nominal one.

\*MR. RITCHIE: I understand the hon. Member is referring only to laundries connected with charitable institutions.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I am speaking entirely of that class of laundry, conducted as a charitable institution, which is, so to speak, reformatory in its character. It is very hard to get a word to describe exactly what I mean. They are Magdalene asylums, such as those which are conducted by the Order of the Good Shepherd in Ireland, and other orders in this country. If you exempt these refuge laundries I believe you will have dealt with every case of a laundry conducted by a charitable institution except those connected with industrial schools, where you have already inspection. The points I desire to impress upon

the right hon. Gentleman are these: firstly, that the exemption we ask for applies to a clearly-defined and very limited class; secondly, that it is strongly desirable not to upset the arrangement which was come to with reference to these laundries in the Bill of 1895, after full deliberation and practical unanimity; and, thirdly, in the very exceptional circumstances of these institutions you ought, in my opinion, to exempt them from the provisions of this Act. I have endeavoured, as shortly as I could, to make this claim, and I do not desire to labour it. This Bill will come before the Grand Committee, and I would most earnestly urge upon the Home Secretary and those who are responsible for the Bill that between now and the assembling of the Grand Committee they should carefully consider this matter, and that, being, as I believe they are, almost entirely in agreement with us, they ought to be able to frame words which would meet our view. Finally, let me again impress upon them that the way to meet it is not by providing a nominal inspection, which will be a mockery, and which will reflect upon the whole system of the Factory Acts, but by exempting these laundries from the operation of the Bill.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): The Government are very anxious to meet any legitimate case which can be made out on the subject so eloquently dealt with by the hon. Member for Waterford. There will be no attempt to finish the case to-night against the will of any important section of the House. I quite agree that if the House desire, or if any important section of the House desire, that the debate should go over to another day, it would be impossible to press the Second Reading to-night. But I would venture to say that it would be a very great advantage from the point of view of the Bill if we could get the Second Reading to-night, and send it to the Grand Committee. My idea of the business next week may be modified, but at present it is to take the Finance Bill. I leave it to the House to decide entirely what they ought to do in regard to the Bill now under consideration.

\*MR. EMMOTT (Oldham) said he did not see what was the use of the inquiry suggested in Clause 3 of the Bill. If the result of the inquiry turned out unfavourably to the rules of the Home Secretary, would the opinion be worth very much more than the expert opinion on which the original rules were based? The only possible difficulty he could see in the matter was that in the future there might be some regime so favourable to the ideas of labour as to harass capital, but that was not a very likely state of affairs to happen. He did not think the power of exemption to be granted to the Home Secretary under Clause 4 was a wise one. With regard to the question of the administrative authority, he did not like the substitution of the local authority for the factory inspector. The system had been tried before, and it had failed. To his mind it would lead to great inequality of administration. In many local authorities the chairman and the members were the very individuals chiefly likely to be sinners under this Act. Clause 40 proposed to exclude magistrates from sitting in cases connected with trades in which they were engaged. He asked, if that was a right principle for justices who had to deal with infringements of the law, whether it was not a right principle for those who had to administer the law. Speaking from the point of view of manufacturers, he ventured to say that they, as a

whole, would prefer the uniformity of administration of the Home Office to the laxity of the local authority in one place, and, perhaps, the unreasonable requirements of some jack-in-office who might be appointed by the local authority in another. He hoped the local authority would be dropped out of this matter, and, if not dropped altogether, he hoped the factory inspector would have the power of intervention when called for. Clause 19, which dealt with the question of boilers, was practically, if not actually, a repetition of the clause in the Bill of last year which came before the Boiler Committee, and was approved by them. He believed if this became law it would lead to some diminution of explosions; but, as a matter of detail, it was a question whether twelve months was the right time. He believed it was the custom of many people who had no extra boilers to have boilers cleaned and inspected at Easter or Whitsuntide, and it was possible that fourteen months might be a better period than twelve. He heartily agreed with the general principle of the clause. Referring to the clause dealing with the question of escape from fire, the hon. Member said he did not see any magic in the number forty. It was possible to have death-traps in factories where less than forty persons were employed. With regard to the question of laundries, he wished they could be treated as factories, and in reference to the question of exceptions, he confessed it was a very difficult one, but he would simply say as a general principle that it seemed to him that the onus to prove a case for exception should be on those who desired it. In reference to Clause 32, dealing with particulars, was it not time that particulars were given for all piece-work and all out-work? The fears in regard to this matter had been shown to be illusory, and it was time the principle was extended. He was told that the change proposed by Clause 34 with reference to returns of persons employed was necessary in order to save money, and also that the Factory Reports might be got out at an earlier period of the year. If these returns were only to apply to periods of three years, they would be of

comparatively little value. Scientific sociology was to a large extent in its infancy, and statisticians were using the figures in the annual Factory Reports for the purpose of founding on them conclusions which in a few years would be of considerable value. He believed the statisticians viewed with some dread the possibility of these figures only being given triennially. He appealed to the Home Secretary to ascertain what was the opinion in this matter of the Royal Statistical Society. He thought the right hon. Gentleman would find that they would regret any step whereby the statistical returns were only to be given once in three years. He could not see in reference to the Accidents Clause (35) why the Secretary of State should have power to exempt certain classes of accidents from the returns. In this matter also it was unadvisable to alter the statistical basis without good reason. He could not himself interpret the legal phraseology of Clause 40, but he wished to know whether a person engaged in the same trade would include a director of a company and a shareholder in a joint stock company. The principle was perfectly right, but there were some districts in which this clause could hardly be carried out, and he asked the Home Secretary to inquire into it. In his own petty sessional division of the county

of Lancashire, having looked through the list of justices, he could not see how a court could be constituted which would be unconnected with the cotton trade. He hoped the Bill would be passed with the necessary Amendments, and that it would do much good to those whom it was intended to serve.

\*MR. TALBOT (Oxford University) supported the claim for the exemption of laundries connected with religious and charitable institutions. Such exemption might safely be allowed without detriment to the persons employed. The demand did not come from one side of the House only, or from the adherents of one religious community. The persons engaged in the fruit-preserving industry were not at all adequately protected by the Bill. This was a matter to which he had in former sessions drawn attention, and he intended to move amendments in that direction. He was sure that the defects of the Bill would be remedied in the Grand Committee, and he anticipated a speedy and successful passing of the measure.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland) said he represented a constituency which consisted largely of dockers, and he regretted that that body of labourers was not included in the provisions of the Bill. He had hopes that the right hon. Gentleman would favourably consider the request that they should be included in the Bill. There was scarcely any body in the country who were more entitled to sympathetic consideration than the dock labourers. Their work was extremely precarious, and he was told that in his constituency fifteen shillings a week was very often the average sum these men obtained. The docker at present had practically no protection under the Factory Acts. He would call the attention of the Home Secretary to a set of figures which he had received from Mr. Sexton, of the Dock Labourers' Union at Liverpool. He did not think the House was aware of the extraordinary mortality which existed amongst dock labourers. As a matter of fact, the mortality among them was far higher than that among miners, but he was bound in honesty to acknowledge that the number killed in the case of miners was far in excess of the number in the case of dockers. There was a considerable amount of insufficient, worn-out, and dangerous plant and machinery used by the dockers, and accidents were of daily occurrence. He impressed on the Home Secretary that what the docker wanted was not compensation, but prevention from danger in the performance of his work. Many suggestions could be made by which accidents could be very considerably lessened. He asked the Home Secretary to consider what could be done to protect the dock labourers.

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.) moved the adjournment of the debate.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I cannot refuse the right hon. Gentleman's request, though I confess I regret it.

Debate adjourned till Thursday.

CIVIL LIST BILL.

Order for Third Reading read.

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

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid) said the House should not be asked at two minutes to twelve to pass the Third Reading of this Bill without a word of discussion. He had voted in favour of the Civil List, but he thought an opportunity for making remarks upon it should be afforded on the Third Reading.

He did not object to the amount given to the Duke of Cornwall, but he objected very strongly to his having the revenues of the Duchy of Cornwall, and to his having revenues which constituted him a landed proprietor in London. It was unfortunate that the Duke of Cornwall, or any member of the Royal Family, should be placed in the position of a landlord, because questions of non-payment of rent and eviction must necessarily arise. He could not conceive any position more injurious to the Royal Family.

It being midnight, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed upon Thursday.

WAYS AND MEANS (10TH JUNE).

Resolution reported.

MOLASSES AND GLUCOSE.

"That there shall be charged on and after the eleventh day of June nineteen hundred and one the following Customs duties::

s.

d.

Molasses and all sugar and extracts from sugar which cannot be tested by the polariscope;

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

2

9

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

2

0

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

1

0

Glucose:

Solid

the cwt.

2

9

Liquid

the cwt.

2

0

And that there shall be charged on and after the same date on glucose excise duties equivalent to the Customs duties charged on that article."

Resolution agreed to.

Ordered, That it be an Instruction to the Committee on the Finance Bill that they have power to make provision therein pursuant to the said resolution.:(Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.)

## HOUSING OF THE LABOURING CLASSES.

Resolved, That it is expedient that a Select Committee of this House be appointed to join with a Committee of the Lords to consider the Standing Orders relating to houses occupied by persons of the labouring class and the Clauses usually inserted in Private and Local Bills and Provisional Order Confirmation Bills in pursuance thereof; and to report whether any amendments should be made in such Standing Orders and Clauses, and especially whether any and what provision should be made for better securing the re-housing of all persons of the labouring class who may be displaced in connection with the undertakings to which the Bills relate, whether displaced under the powers given by the Bills or otherwise.

Message to the Lords to acquaint them therewith.:(Mr. Secretary Ritchie.)

## STEAM ENGINES AND BOILERS (PERSONS IN CHARGE) BILL.

The Select Committee on Steam Engines and Boilers (Persons in Charge) Bill was nominated of;Mr. William Allan, Mr. Baldwin, Sir John Brunner, Mr. Crean, Mr. Galloway, Sir Alfred Hickman, Mr. Jacoby, Mr. Nannetti, Lieut.-Colonel Pilkington, Sir Francis Powell, Mr. Renshaw, Colonel Royds, Mr. Tomlinson, Mr. John Wilson (Durham), and Sir Thomas Wrightson.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That five be the quorum.:(Sir William Walrond.)

Adjourned at ten minutes after Twelve of the clock.