

<https://api.parliament.uk/historic-hansard/sittings/1901/may/24>

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 24th May, 1901.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

HAMILTON BURGH PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL.

Order read for consideration of Bill under Section 7, Sub-section (2) of the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) said he wished to raise a matter of very considerable importance with regard to this Bill. The reason they had to watch matters of this kind with some jealousy was that there was a prospect that later on the private Bill procedure now obtaining in Scotland would be extended to Ireland. This Bill passed the Scotch Committee unopposed, but the proposal now was;with, he believed, the consent of the promoters;to put in a new clause dealing with the price of water. This, however, was being done under pressure from the Treasury. Section 7, Sub-section 2 of the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act provided that where there was no opposition to an order, or where the opposition had been withdrawn before the inquiry had been held, the Secretary for Scotland might forthwith make the order as proposed, or with such modifications as might appear to be necessary, having regard to the recommendations of the Chairman of Committees or the Treasury or such other department as might be prescribed. Now, this clause was based on a Treasury recommendation, and he submitted that that recommendation should have been made before the local Committee.

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order&#x0021; The hon. Member cannot deal with that question now. He had better wait till the new clause is proposed.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I will do so.

Bill considered.

A Clause (water supply to public offices).;(The Lord Advocate.)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

MR. T. M. HEALY submitted that a very grave step had been taken by the Government in assenting to the introduction of such a clause at this stage of the Bill. The intention of the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act was, he took it, that all questions should be dealt with locally in Scotland, and that when the Bill came before the House small or pettifogging clauses should not be introduced, and certainly not "after-thought" clauses. If this practice were tolerated the result would be to deprive the Scotch people of all the advantages which the Act was supposed to confer on them by giving them local tribunals. What made this matter far worse was that it was a Treasury clause. They had experience of the Treasury when the Dublin Water Bill was before the House, and when the Treasury, under a threat of stopping the Bill altogether, insisted on the promoters inserting a clause by which water was to be supplied to the troops in Dublin at a cheaper rate than to private consumers. Now the township of Hamilton was being treated in the same way. His point was that the clause should have been laid before the local committee, when every ratepayer

would have been in a position to object if he so desired. But instead of that the Treasury waited until the Bill reached the House, and suddenly, at its final stage, forced the township to give Government troops water on cheaper and better terms than the rest of the citizens were to be entitled to. The clause, too, placed the township in the ridiculous position of having it suggested that it was not willing to supply water to a Government Department on as fair terms as to the rest of His Majesty's subjects. He could not understand why the Scotch Office or the Chairman of Committees had consented to action of this nature. The Irish Members would never forget the insolence with which the Treasury treated the Dublin Corporation in a similar matter, threatening to stop their Bill unless a like clause was inserted. He could only say, in conclusion, that if this conduct was to be allowed it might, when the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act was extended to Ireland, place them in a very disadvantageous position, by enabling objectionable clauses to be inserted behind their backs. They would, in fact, never know where they were.

\*THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Mr. J. W. LOWTHER, Cumberland, Penrith) said he was rather taken by surprise by the hon. Member's objection, and he was sure, too, that the Lord Advocate had not expected this question to be raised, or he would have attended to explain why the clause was prepared to be inserted. He quite agreed that as this was an entirely new procedure it ought to be watched very carefully, especially as it might become a precedent if the procedure were extended to Ireland. Personally he had never been consulted, and he could say nothing on the matter. He moved that the debate should be adjourned.

MR. T. M. HEALY said he was quite satisfied with that, for he was sure their interests were perfectly safe in the hands of the right hon. Gentleman.

Debate adjourned till Monday, 10th June.

ALFRETON GAS BILL [Lords].

CAMBRIAN RAILWAYS BILL.

CLYDE VALLEY ELECTRICAL POWER BILL.

GOLBORNE GAS BILL.

MOND GAS BILL.

OMAGH GAS BILL [Lords].

TORRINGTON AND OKEHAMPTON RAILWAY BILL.

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

LOCH LEVEN WATER POWER BILL.

"To incorporate and confer powers upon the Loch Leven Water and Electric Power Company to enable them to construct, maintain, and work waterworks and water power and electrical generating stations for the supply of electrical energy, and to acquire lands; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 39, 129, and 230 be suspended, and that the time for depositing Petitions and Memorials against Private Bills, or against any Bill to confirm any Provisional Order or Provisional Certificate, and for depositing duplicates of any documents relating to any Bill to confirm any Provisional Order or Provisional Certificate, also all Petitions presented

against any Order under Section 9 of the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, be extended to the first day on which the House shall sit after the recess.:(The Chairman of Ways and Means.)

COMMONS REGULATION AND IN- CLOSURE (SKIPWITH) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 3) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDER (GAS) BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 4) BILL.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 5) BILL.

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

METROPOLITAN COMMON SCHEME (ORPINGTON) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

As amended, considered; Bills to be read the third time upon Thursday, 6th June.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (HOUSING OF WORKING CLASSES) BILL.

Read a second time, and committed.

DUBLIN, WICKLOW, AND WEXFORD RAILWAY (NEW ROSS AND WATER- FORD EXTENSION).

Petition for Bill; referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders.

SOUTHAMPTON AND WINCHESTER GREAT WESTERN JUNCTION RAIL- WAY BILL.

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

PETITIONS.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (HIGHER GRADE AND EVENING CONTINUA- TION SCHOOLS).

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

POLICE SUPERANNUATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

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

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Chorley; Chatham (five); Chippenham (two); Bath (two);

Barton St. David; Street; Cradley Heath; East Leeds; Wake-field; Wigton (two);

Hylton (two); Lacock; Huddersfield; Silksworth (two); South Hetton (two); Hetton

Downs (two); Bank Head; Easington (two); South Hylton; Ryhope; Washington;

Newbottle; Coxgreen; and Murton; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 28th March; Mr. M'Fadden]; to lie upon the Table.

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Rule made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland appointing the places at which Examinations shall be held for 1901 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

EXPERIMENTS ON LIVING ANIMALS.

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 23rd May; Mr. Jesse Collings]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 192.]

ARMY (WAR OFFICE ORGANISATION)

Copy presented, of Report of the Committee appointed to inquire into War Office Organisation [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Minutes of Evidence taken before the Committee appointed to inquire into War Office Organisation, together with Appendices, Digest, and

Index [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

## LAND REGISTRY.

Return ordered, "of the Work done in the Land Registry under the various Acts hereinafter mentioned, namely::

1. Under the Land Transfer Acts, 1875 and 1897::

(a) The number, value, and acreage (where known) of estates the titles to which were registered, on first registration, from the 1st day of January, 1900, to the 31st day of December, 1900, showing the numbers of estates registered with absolute, qualified, and possessory title, and leaseholds; and also the number of estates registered under the Small Holdings Act, 1892;

(b) The total number of separate titles on the register on the 31st day of December, 1900;(i) by first registration, (ii.) by sub-division of estates already registered, and (iii.) by transfer from the 1862 register;

(c) The total number of separate titles which have been removed from the register on the 31st day of December, 1900.

2. Under The Land Registry Act, 1862::

(a) The total number, value, and acreage (where known) of estates the titles to which were registered on first registration;

(b) The total number of separate titles on the register on the 31st day of December, 1898;(i.) by first registration, and (ii.) by subdivision of estates already registered;

(c) The total number of separate titles which had been removed from the register on the 31st day of December, 1900, otherwise than by transfer to the 1875 register.

3. Under both the Acts of 1875 and 1862::

(a) The total number of separate titles on the register on the 31st day of December, 1900;

(b) The total number of transactions registered from the 1st day of January, 1900, to the 31st day of December, 1900, showing the numbers of (i.) first registrations under the Acts of 1875 and 1897, (ii.) conveyances, transfers, and transmissions of land, (iii.) mortgages, charges, further charges, and transfers of mortgages and charges, (iv.) reconveyances of mortgages and cessation of charges, (v.) leases and surrenders of leases, (vi.) miscellaneous.

4. Under the Mortgage Debenture Acts, 1865 and 1870, and the Improvement of Land Act, 1864::

A statement so far as may be practicable of the nature and amount of the work done under these Acts from the 1st day of January, 1900, to the 31st day of December, 1900.

5. Under the Land Charges Registration and Searches Act, 1888::

The number of registrations, official searches, and ordinary searches made from the 1st day of January, 1900, to the 31st day of December, 1900.

6. Under the Middlesex Registry Act, 1708, and the Land Registry (Middlesex Deeds) Act, 1891::

The number of registrations and searches made from the 1st day of January, 1900, to the 31st day of December, 1900.

And, showing the amount of fees received and the amount of salaries and expenses

in the Land Registry from the 1st day of April, 1900, to the 31st day of March, 1901, distinguishing for the purposes of Section 22 of the Land Transfer Act, 1897, the fees received and salaries and expenses paid under the Land Transfer Acts and the other Acts above referred to (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 306, of Session 1900).";(Mr. H. D. Greene.)

#### BOTANICAL WORK COMMITTEE.

Copy ordered, "of the Report of the Botanical Work Committee, with Minutes of Evidence, Appendices, and Index.";(Sir Michael Foster.)

#### QUESTIONS.

#### SOUTH AFRICAN WAR;UNIVERSITY VOLUNTEERS FOR ACTIVE SERVICE.

MR. MOORE (Antrim, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state how many members of Cambridge University volunteered for active service at the front; whether he is aware that the War Office subsequently offered eighty-three commissions in the line to members of the University, which were distributed among members of the University who stayed at home, to the exclusion of those who volunteered; whether it is the intention of the War Office that those on active service should lose by having volunteered; and whether steps will be taken to put them on an equivalent footing with the recipients of the commissions already distributed, who stayed at home.

\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): I am not aware how many volunteered for active service. The War Office placed eighty-three commissions at the disposal of the Vice-Chancellor, who selected and sent in the names. Of those nominated by him at least five were serving in South Africa, and were granted commissions. Any cases of hardship will receive the most favourable consideration possible.

#### REFUGE CAMPS IN CAPE COLONY.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he has yet received information as to the condition of the camps in Cape Colony.

\*MR. BRODRICK: I am informed that in Cape Colony the numbers of refugees in camp on the 14th instant amounted to 365, and up to date four children had died. I have no other information.

MR. DILLON: Cannot the right hon. Gentleman obtain the same information with regard to the camps in Cape Colony as those in the Orange Free State and the Transvaal?

\*MR. BRODRICK: Yes; but I am afraid I have given the hon. Member all the information I possess. I am expecting more by mail.

#### FARM BURNING BY BOERS.

MR. DILLON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can now give the information as to number of farms burned by the Boers in Cape Colony.

\*MR. BRODRICK: No information has yet been forwarded from South Africa as to the number of farms burned by the Boers in Cape Colony.

MR. DILLON: But on the 26th April the right hon. Gentleman told me, in reply to a similar question, that information had been received, and was now in the printers' hands.

\*MR. BRODRICK: Not as regards Cape Colony. The hon. Member must have misunderstood. I was referring to the general question of farm burning.

MR. DILLON: I have looked up the Papers. The question dealt distinctly with the burning of farms in Cape Colony by the Boers, and the right hon. Gentleman's answer was distinctly that the information had been received, and was in the printers' hands.&#x2020;

\*MR. BRODRICK: If I did make that reply I must have intended it to apply to the general question, and to refer to the Return which is now before the House.

MR. DILLON: Will the right hon. Gentleman now obtain the information, which he has frequently promised?

\*MR. BRODRICK: I suppose the hon. Member is referring to the burning of farms by the Boers. I do not know that Lord Kitchener can give that information.

BURNING OF DE WET'S FARM.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for &#x2020; See Debates [Fourth Series], Vol. xcii., page 1428.

War why, in the Return of the farms burnt or otherwise destroyed in South Africa by the British forces, the reason is not given for the destruction of the house of General De Wet; and whether he will state what that reason was.

\*MR. BRODRICK: I must refer the hon. Member to a reply I gave to a similar question put by the hon. Member for South Donegal on the 9th instant, and to the supplementary information I gave at the same time.&#x2021;

MR. DILLON: But you have promised it on two or three different occasions.

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order&#x0021; It is quite irregular thus to refer to answers to previous questions.

MR. DILLON: But I have received a distinct promise on two separate occasions that the information shall be given. Am I to understand that the right hon. Gentleman retracts that promise?

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order&#x0021; The question on the Paper has been fully answered.

MR. DILLON: I say it has not been answered at all.

\*MR. SPEAKER: Yes; the right hon. Gentleman says he is not in a position to add anything to the information previously given.

MR. DILLON: I shall repeat the question.

AN HON. MEMBER: Did the Boers burn any farms at all?

IMPERIAL YEOMANRY EQUIPMENT.

MR. PEEL (Manchester, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to a speech made by Lord Roberts to the Royal Gloucestershire Hussars at Badminton on 20th May, and whether it is to be understood that the Imperial Yeomanry are to be trained to act for the future as cavalry or as mounted infantry.

&#x2021; See preceding volume, page 1138.

\*MR. BRODRICK: I have fully explained the future position of the Imperial Yeomanry. It is probable that cavalry drill will undergo some modifications in the future.

MR. PEEL: Will the right hon. Gentleman kindly say whether the Yeomanry will be armed with swords?

\*MR. BRODRICK: No; they will, as I have explained, not carry swords, but rifles.

GOVERNMENT STOCK FARMS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

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

\*MR. BRODRICK: No information on this subject has been forwarded from South Africa.

MR. LAMBERT: Can the right hon. Gentleman send for the information? We were told a month ago that the stock farms had been established.

\*MR. BRODRICK: I am perfectly willing to get information as to the number of farms established, but in view of the enormous labour involved in getting details, such as the number of cattle on them, I do not think I ought to trouble the military authorities.

MR. LAMBERT: Can we have the number of farms and localities? It is very important.

\*MR. BRODRICK: I am quite willing to get certain information, as I have said, but I cannot get the number of cattle.

TRANSVAAL OUTLANDERS IN THE FIELD.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any record exists by which a computation can be made of the number of Outlanders in the Transvaal signatories to the petition to the Queen who afterwards joined the military forces of the Crown in the war against the Boers.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): I am afraid it would be impossible to make any reliable computation from the material at the disposal of His Majesty's Government. It is within our knowledge that a very large number of Outlanders are serving in the field.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Can you not give us some date which will enable us to acquire the knowledge?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No, Sir; I cannot give any precise data.

MINE TAXATION IN THE TRANSVAAL.

MR. ASHTON (Bedfordshire, Luton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the taxes imposed by the late Transvaal Government are being at present collected from the mines of the Rand, and whether any tax, in addition to any that may have been imposed by the late Transvaal Government, is being imposed either on the mines or on the produce of the mines now being re-opened towards the cost of the war or towards the cost of government of the new colonies.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The taxes are in force, but in the case of mining licences permission has been given from 1st January, 1901, for payment to be deferred. No additional tax is being imposed for the present.

TRIALS OF CAPE COLONY REBELS; EXCLUSION OF REPORTERS.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS (Carnarvonshire, Eifion): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will explain why the reporters of the South African News have been excluded from the trial of alleged rebels before the special statutory court now sitting in Cape Colony; and will he state whether this has been done with the sanction of the three judges who form the court; if not, by what authority.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I have no information; the matter is one for the administration of the Cape Colony alone.

BRITISH INDIAN SUBJECTS AT THE CAPE.

SIR MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGGREE (Bethnal Green, N. E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if, with the British occupation of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State, the various regulations by which the Boer administrations had sought to impose disabilities on British Indian subjects residing in that region are invalidated; and, if not, having regard to the fact that such regulations were in breach of the Pretoria Convention, will he authorise the administrators in those colonies to publicly declare that all such regulations would have no effect from the date of their passing under British domination.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: (1) The legislation of the late Government of the South African Republic remains in force until modified; (2) I have not yet learnt the views of the new administration as to the changes to be made in regard to the regulations in question, and I propose to discuss the matter with Sir A. Milner now that he has arrived.

OFFICERS' HOME PASSAGES; CAPTAIN MAXWELL'S CASE.

COLONEL WELBY (Taunton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that Captain C J. Maxwell, whilst serving in the Royal Scots Greys, was almost mortally wounded at Nitrals Nek on 11th July, 1900; was treated by Sir W. Thompson and Dr. Stokes; sent by them to Cape Town recommended for immediate invaliding home; that an Army Medical Board, on 24th August, invalided him; that as no passage on a hospital ship was given, and no transport sailed for three weeks, he applied for a certificate for a passage on a mail steamer, was refused it, and had to pay his own way; whether he is aware that an unwounded officer returned by the same boat to take up a home appointment, having been granted a free passage; and whether he will cause the cost of the passage to be refunded to Captain Maxwell, seeing that free passages by mail steamers have been granted at the Cape to wounded and unwounded.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton):

The Medical Board of the 24th August reported this officer as "fit for duty on board ship"; if he had been classed as an invalid any one of the three hospital ships would have been available to convey him. A passage could have been given him in a transport proceeding home in about ten days after his arrival; he would not however await this opportunity, and proceeded home in a mail steamer at his own expense. Return passages by mail steamer are only granted on production of a medical certificate stating urgency, and this the medical authorities at Claremont Hospital, to whom he applied, did not feel justified in granting. The officer referred to in the second paragraph is presumably an officer who was sent home to take command of the 2nd battalion of his regiment. I have carefully considered Captain Maxwell's case, and am unable to consent to a refund of the cost of passage.

VOLUNTEER OFFICERS; RETIREMENT REGULATIONS.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, if non-commissioned officers of Volunteers are permitted to retire with



their rank and to wear their uniform on retirement after ten years service, he will consider the advisability of granting a similar privilege to officers of command rank in the Volunteer force on completing ten years service.

\*MR. BRODRICK: No, Sir. There is no reason why Volunteer officers should be treated differently to other officers in this respect.

CADET CORPS COMMANDERS.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the privilege of honorary rank now granted to officers of Volunteers after fifteen years service or on retirement at the expiration of that period will also be conferred on command officers of cadet corps; whether the Volunteer decoration conferred on officers of Volunteers after twenty years good and efficient service will be granted to officers of cadet corps under like conditions; and whether, in the event of these concessions being granted, ex-officers of Volunteers subsequently becoming officers of cadet corps will be allowed to count their past service in the Volunteers towards the qualifying period for such honorary rank and the Volunteer Decoration.

\*MR. BRODRICK: Officers of cadet corps and battalions are treated as regards honorary rank and Volunteer Decoration as Volunteer officers, but they will not be allowed to reckon any service below the age of seventeen.

NIGHT SCHOOLS OF INSTRUCTION FOR OFFICERS.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, having regard to the success which has attended the holding of night schools of instruction for Militia and Volunteer infantry Officers in the home district at Wellington and Chelsea Barracks, he will arrange for similar schools during winter months for Militia and Volunteer artillery officers at the Tower, where armament and stores are available for instructional purposes.

\*LORD STANLEY: There would be no advantage in instituting schools for Auxiliary artillery officers at the Tower, where armament and stores of modern type are not available. The only adequate instruction for such officers quartered in the Home District is obtainable at Sheerness.

WICKLOW ARTILLERY MILITIA.

MR. COGAN (Wicklow, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the Wicklow Artillery Militia are under orders to proceed to Cork for the purpose of being trained there; and, if so, can he explain why they are not trained in Wicklow.

\*LORD STANLEY: The regiment will not train as a regiment this year, but about 160 men who have expressed a desire to be trained will be attached to a regular unit of Garrison Artillery at Fort Carlisle. No units of Garrison Artillery are quartered in Wicklow, so that it is out of the question to train them there.

MALTA;LANGUAGE QUESTION.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has now received and considered the report of the meeting held in Malta on 5th May to protest against the increase of taxation and the substitution of the English for the Italian languages, and has considered other evidences of dissatisfaction in Malta at these changes; and whether he will now

consider the advisability of withdrawing or modifying the proposals of His Majesty's Government as to Maltese administration.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I have received a report of the meeting referred to, which will be considered, together with all other matters bearing upon the question. As at present advised, I see no reason for departing from the decision already arrived at.

#### WELSHMEN IN PATAGONIA.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): On behalf of the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil (Mr. D. A. THOMAS) I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether a report of the Rev. D. Richards, Chaplain of H.M.S. "Flora," on the condition of Welshmen in Patagonia has been received in his Department; and, if so, whether he can state the nature of it, and if it will be laid before Parliament.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The report in question would have been addressed to the Admiralty. I am not aware if it has been received.

#### BANK INTEREST ON DEFICIENCY AND WAYS AND MEANS ADVANCES.

\*MR. LOYD (Berkshire, Abingdon): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will state the rate or rates of interest at which Deficiency and Ways and Means Advances were repaid by the Treasury to the Bank of England or Ireland during the financial years ending 31st March, 1899, 1900, and 1901, respectively.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): The rates of interest paid to

the Bank of England for Deficiency and Ways and Means Advances were as follows:;  
Deficiency.

Ways and Means.

per cent.

per cent.

1898&#x2013;1899

1&#x00BD; and 2

nil.

1899&#x2013;1900

2&#x00BC; and 3

4

1900&#x2013;1901

1&#x00BD; and 2

2&#x00BD; and 3&#x00BD;

The only advance by the Bank of Ireland was in 1900&#x2013;1 for Ways and Means, and the rate of interest was 3&#x00BD; per cent.

#### EXPORT COAL DUTY.

MR. JOYCE: On behalf of the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil (Mr. D. A. THOMAS) I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he can now make any statement as to the remission of duty he proposes to allow on coal shipped since 19th April last under contracts entered into prior to that date; and whether this remission will be confined to coal delivered on contracts made by merchants with foreign subjects which the merchants have covered by purchases and on which the margin of profit is less than the duty, or whether all coal shipped under contracts

made before 18th April will be subject to the remission of the full shilling.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I am not yet able to make any general statement on this subject, as the contracts, which are very numerous, and vary greatly from one another, must be first carefully examined. But I may say that I do not think it will be desirable to make the grant of this concession dependent on the margin of profit exceeding the duty.

FORTIFYING WINE IN BOND.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the retail purchaser of a bottle of wine fortified in bond has any means of knowing how much spirit the bottle contains and how much wine.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: It is not possible for the retail purchaser to distinguish in the case of a bottle of wine fortified in bond between the alcohol belonging to the wine and that belonging to the spirits. But, as I stated yesterday, the percentage of spirit which may be used in bond in such a way is strictly limited.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Would it not be reasonable to provide, under the Merchandise Marks Act, that when a person buys a bottle of wine he shall not be served with fusil oil?

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I do not believe they get fusil oil. The hon. and learned Gentleman is mistaken.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Why do the Treasury permit a transaction out of which it gets no profit, seeing that no duty is charged on the spirit thus mixed with the wine?

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The practice is allowed for the convenience of the trade, and I am quite sure that if it were stopped considerable trouble would be the result.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: Do the Custom House authorities keep a list of the merchants who are permitted to;

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

SENGHENYDD COLLIERY DISASTER.

MR. LLOYD MORGAN (Carmarthenshire, W.): I beg to ask the Home Secretary if he can give the House any information as to the deplorable colliery accident in Glamorganshire.

\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): I am sorry to say I cannot add anything to the information which has already appeared in the public press. I am expecting further news almost every moment, and when it arrives will take care to communicate it to the House.

MILK STANDARDS.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he has fixed the standard for milk under the provisions of the Food and Drugs Act; if so, can he state what are the standards fixed.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): The answer is in the negative. I hope, however, to fix the standard very soon now.

MR. LAMBERT: Will it be fixed by 6th June if I postpone the question till then?

MR. HANBURY: No, but I hope to have fixed it within a week after the close of the holidays.

#### CYCLE CONVEYANCE ON RAILWAYS.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the case of a cyclist, of Moseley, whose cycle, although in perfect order when booked by the London and North Western Railway Company to Ireland, was delivered with the gear-case torn off, the wheels buckled, tyres off, and the frame badly damaged; whether he is aware that the cyclist was non-suited in a claim for compensation on the ground that there was no evidence of wilful misconduct, although the state of the machine made it obvious that there had been negligence, and what steps he proposes to take to remedy the present inequitable condition of things as between railway companies and cyclists.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): My attention has been directed to this case by the Cyclists Touring Club and the National Cyclists Union. An amendment of the law would be necessary to meet the point to which the hon. Member refers. I have already stated that I am not at present prepared to introduce legislation, but I am still in communication with the railway companies on the subject generally.

MR. LOUGH: Has the right hon. Gentleman any hope of getting a satisfactory answer from the railway company shortly?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I am afraid I am not in a position to say.

#### CODIFICATION OF COMMERCIAL LAW.

MR. MITCHELL (Burnley): I beg, in accordance with private notice, to ask the President of the Board of Trade, in view of the interests of the commercial community both in England and the colonies, whether he will take steps at an early date to deal with the question of a more complete and systematic codification of English commercial law.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I have received the private notice of the hon. Gentleman. I quite recognise the great importance of the matter raised by this question, but I am afraid I am not at present in a position to make any statement with regard to it.

#### ALLOTMENTS AND COMMON PASTURES IN SCOTLAND.

MR. EUGENE WASON (Clackmannan and Kinross): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether he can state when the Return showing the proceedings of parish and county councils in regard to allotments and common pasture in Scotland will be laid upon the Table of the House.

\*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): I am informed by the Local Government Board that the Return is being proceeded, with, but the particulars required have not yet been received from some of the authorities concerned. No time will be lost in having the Return completed and laid before the House.

#### AFFORESTATION IN SCOTLAND.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether, having regard to the results of the experiments made in Ireland in afforestation, similar experiments will be made in the Highlands and islands of Scotland.

\*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: It is not proposed to carry out such experiments as are referred to by the hon. Member. I may add that such experiments would not fall

within the scope of the Congested Districts (Scotland) Act, 1897.

#### CONGESTION IN THE HIGHLANDS.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, as representing the Secretary for Scotland, whether he is aware of the state of feeling among the landless cottars and fishermen of Bernera, Island of Lewis, Ross-shire, and in the crofting townships of North and South Boisdale, Smerclate, Daliburgh, Kilphedder, Howmore, Inishvale, Howbeg, South Uist, Inverness-shire, in consequence of the delay of the Congested Districts Board in making arrangements for the settlement of the people on the land; and whether, to prevent the danger of these cottars being driven to take the land, he will consider the expediency of taking some steps to provide them with land at an early date.

\*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I have really nothing to add to what I have informed the hon. Member on several occasions in answer to similar questions in this House, namely, that such steps will be taken by the Secretary for Scotland from time to time as he deems expedient.

#### CIVIL SERVICE CERTIFICATES; BELFAST CLERK'S POSITION.

MR. M'GOVERN (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that the present chief clerk in the office of the Surveyor of Taxes in Belfast has been in the service of the department for over eight years, and earned good reports from the surveyors and inspectors under whom he served, and been promoted on account of the efficiency with which he discharged his duties; and, seeing that this gentleman has a certificate from the Civil Service Commissioners which qualifies him to be placed on the permanent staff on the recommendation of the head of his department, can he state what objection there is to giving him the necessary recommendation to be put on the permanent staff of the Civil Service under the Order in Council of the 4th June, 1870.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): The hon. Member appears to be under a misapprehension as to the circumstances of this case. In the first place, the clerk referred to is not in the service of the Board of Inland Revenue, but in the personal employ of the Surveyor of Taxes; and in the second place, he does not hold a Civil Service certificate. It is true that he was at one time registered with the Civil Service Commissioners as a temporary boy copyist, but his employment in this capacity does not qualify him to be placed on the permanent staff of the Civil Service under the Order in Council of the 4th June, 1870.

#### MONAGHAN POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS.

DR. THOMPSON (Monaghan, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he is aware that there is only a tri-weekly delivery of letters at Swan's Cross, county Monaghan; and, as this causes inconvenience, will he give directions to have the service complained of improved.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General will cause inquiry to be made, and will communicate the result to the hon. Member as soon as possible.

#### NEWPORT (MAYO) FISHING INDUSTRY.

DR. AMBROSE (Mayo, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant

of Ireland whether, in view of the importance of the fishing industry to the inhabitants of the village of Rosmurrevagh, near Newport, county Mayo, and of the fact that although there are thirty-seven boats employed by the villagers in pursuance of such industry they are in need of a pier on which to land the fish, he will advise the Congested Districts Board to build a pier there.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The question of the erection of a pier at this place will be considered by the Congested Districts Board at its next meeting.

SLIGO ASYLUM; CASE OF ATTENDANT GAFFNEY.

MR. MOORE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been drawn to the proceedings of the Sligo Asylum Board in connection with the case of attendant Gaffney; whether he is aware that Gaffney admitted having assaulted a lunatic patient under his charge by kicking him in the abdomen, causing serious injuries, but that, notwithstanding this, the asylum board have continued Gaffney as attendant; will he state what steps will be taken to protect

the other lunatics from further violence on the part of this attendant; will any representation be made on the part of the Executive Government to the asylum authorities with reference to their inaction in this case; and will he direct the matter to be brought before the Law Officers with a view to considering a prosecution of this attendant.

MR. WYNDHAM: My attention has been drawn to this very painful case. The assault was committed on the 2nd April, and on the 4th April a sworn inquiry was held at the asylum by the Inspectors of Lunatic Asylums, as a result of which they strongly urged the asylum committee to dismiss attendant Gaffney. The committee, however, merely reprimanded him and warned him against a repetition of the offence. Proceedings were taken by the police against the man for assault, and on the 13th inst. he was convicted and sentenced to two months imprisonment. It is for the committee to decide whether Gaffney will be retained in the service of the asylum; the Executive has no power to remove him.

LABOURERS' COTTAGES IN THE MITCHELSTOWN UNION.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N. E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can explain the cause of delay in the progress of schemes for the erection of labourers' cottages in the Mitchelstown Union, concerning which an inquiry was held by a Local Government Board inspector in January last; and whether he will take steps to accelerate the production of the report on these schemes, and can he state when such report may be expected.

MR. WYNDHAM: There has been no avoidable delay on the part of the Local Government Board in dealing with these schemes. The result of the inquiry into one of the two schemes will, it is hoped, be communicated to the district council next week. The report on the second scheme is daily expected by the Board, and no time will be lost in dealing with it when received.

RETURN OF RENT REDUCTIONS.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can grant a Parliamentary Return

giving the details of rent reductions for the year ended March last, the Return to be made out per estate.

MR. WYNDHAM: No, Sir. All the information apparently desired by the hon. Member will be found in the Returns of judicial rents laid on the Table of the House at short intervals.

DAVID FINLAY'S ESTATE, CO. CAVAN.

MR. M'GOVERN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the receiver and solicitor on the estate of the late David Finlay, in the county of Cavan, have been asked for any explanation as to why they did not lodge the agreements that they entered into with the tenants to purchase their holdings with the Irish Land Commission; whether he is aware that the result of these agreements not having been lodged in court has been that the tenants on this estate have had to pay 25 per cent. more in rent than they would have had to pay in interest, and prevented them making an application under the fortieth section of the Land Act of 1896, and can he explain the cause of the delay in Judge Ross's court in disposing to the tenants of this and other estates that have been in that court for sale for the past ten years.

MR. WYNDHAM: This is not a sale under the fortieth section, as the hon. Member has been already informed. The tenants three years ago signed provisional agreements to purchase. Subsequently disputes arose amongst them in reference to rights of turbary. These disputes have not been settled, and until they have been no progress can be made. The delay is entirely attributable to the tenants themselves, and not to the land judge or Land Commission.

WICKLOW CONSTABLE'S CASE.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been drawn to the case of Constable John Freeman, stationed at Laragh, county Wicklow, who was in November last convicted of an assault upon a Dublin policeman, which arose out of a remonstrance addressed to Freeman by the Dublin policeman for following a young woman through the streets and insulting her; whether he is aware that Freeman is the son of a man who shot an evicted tenant named Kinsella at Coolgreany; and that the clergy and residents of Laragh strongly object to Freeman being stationed in their district, and whether he will consider the desirability of having Freeman transferred to some other county.

MR. WYNDHAM: The facts are as stated in the first paragraph. I have no information, and at such short notice cannot procure information, as to the matters alleged in the second paragraph. The question of the removal of a particular constable from a particular district is one for determination by the constabulary authorities themselves, to whom any representations on the subject should be addressed.

STREET PREACHING AT ARKLOW.

MR. COGAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the case of a man named Thomas Kearon, who was recently sentenced at the Arklow Petty Sessions to a month's imprisonment for an assault upon a policeman, which arose out of a disturbance caused by the attempt to hold an open-air service in the main thoroughfare of

Arklow near a public meeting which was held there on 5th of May; whether he is aware that the evidence given at the hearing of the charge disclosed the fact that the police under District Inspector Hughes formed a cordon across the street to prevent any person proceeding in the direction of the service, and that people were thus prevented from going home or to their church at the hour of divine service; also that the police in evidence gave Kearon a good character, and stated he was a peaceable man; and whether, having regard to the excitement of the occasion, he will consider the case with a view to recommending the shortening of the term of Kearon's imprisonment.

MR. WYNDHAM: Any representations in favour of mitigation of the sentence of imprisonment imposed upon this man should be addressed, in the usual way, to the Lord Lieutenant, by whom the matter will be considered.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware of the circumstances of this particular case? Will he make some inquiry so that he may be in a position to give advice to the Lord Lieutenant? Is he aware that the disturbance arose from the acts of the Rev. Mr. Hallowses, who has been conducting the street preaching in Arklow, and whose attempt to interfere with a public meeting caused a disturbance which gave rise to a great deal of excitement?

MR. WYNDHAM: I am not aware of the facts of the case, and it is for those who have knowledge of the circumstances to place them before the Lord Lieutenant, by whom the matter is usually remitted to me for comments and inquiry. It would not do for me to make a representation to the Lord. Lieutenant in the first instance.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I will ask the right hon. Gentleman to make personal inquiry into the facts, so that when the representations laid before the Lord Lieutenant are sent to him he will be in a position to give advice.

MR. WYNDHAM: Certainly.

#### ROAD MAINTENANCE IN IRELAND.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that inconvenience and some trouble exist in several parts of Ireland owing to the state of affairs in connection with the repairing and maintenance of the public roads by contract labour; and will he, without delay, introduce before Parliament for ratification the proposed Order in Council dealing with this state of things so as to put them on a better footing.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Bill confirming this Order was introduced on the 10th of May.  
CHARITABLE LOANS (IRELAND) ACT.

MR. DILLON: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether he is aware that at Dromore, county Tyrone, the resident magistrate in proceedings for recovery of debt under the Charitable Loans (Ireland) Act, 1900, habitually orders the clerk to calculate amount due at 7½ per cent. interest on amount of bill at last renewal; that, in making out account, the overcharges for the six years period mentioned in the Act are not deducted from amount of the note; and that the Bench refuses in all cases to allow the amount for which decree is given to be paid in instalments as provided in the Act; and whether



any instructions are given by the magistrate to the petty sessions clerk to guide him in making the calculation ordered in the Act; if so, whether he can give a copy of such instructions.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): No general instructions such as are mentioned in the last paragraph have been given by the resident or other magistrates of the Dromore bench, each case being dealt with on its merits. Overcharges are invariably deducted in ascertaining the amount due. These magistrates have almost invariably refused to order payment by instalments. This is a matter entirely in their discretion. They have also decided judicially that in most, if not all, of these cases the loan societies are entitled to interest at the rate of 7&#x00BD; per cent. If they are in error the aggrieved party can appeal.

#### JUDICIAL BUSINESS IN IRELAND.

MR. DILLON: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether any regulations have been made by the judges of the High Court in Ireland under the provisions of the Judicature Acts for the distribution of business.

MR. ATKINSON: The distribution of business in the High Court in Ireland is (where not otherwise regulated by statute) regulated by the Rules of Court made on the recommendation of the judges in 1891. These Rules have been laid before Parliament, Further Rules are in course of preparation.

#### IRISH SUPREME COURT OF JUDICA- TURE;CASH BALANCE.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that the Supreme Court of Judicature in Ireland have at their credit in the Bank of Ireland a cash balance of £;350,000 and securities to the amount of £;6,000,000, and whether he will consider the advisability of appointing a paymaster general in Ireland who would be authorised to advance from this £;350,000 sums towards the assistance of Irish industries and technical institutions upon proper security being given.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I cannot say, without further inquiry, whether the figures quoted by the hon. Member are correct; the matter is not under my control. But whatever the amount may be, it could not be locked up in loans in the manner the hon. Member suggests, for it is liable to be called on at any time for payments to those to whom it belongs. Loans for purposes of the kind suggested might be made from funds at the disposal of the Board of Agriculture or the Congested Districts Board.

#### CLERKS TO COMMISSIONERS OF IRISH LIGHTS.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the Commissioners of Irish Lights have recommended that second-class clerks in their department should be put on the same footing as second-class clerks in Trinity House; and, if so, what are the objections to this arrangement.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The Commissioners of Irish Lights have during the present month applied to the Board of Trade for their sanction to an improved rate of pay for second-class clerks in their Department. The application is receiving careful consideration, but, as various matters have to be taken into account, I am not yet in a position to state the views of the Board as to the proposed arrangement.

#### THROUGH RATES ON IRISH RAILWAYS.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the Great Southern and Western Railway Company of Ireland have failed to provide through rates to certain towns in the South according to statutory requirements; and whether he will take steps to have the company fulfil their legal obligations, seeing that, owing to the absence of these through rates, the Port of Dublin will suffer.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: If the hon. Member refers to through rates within the meaning of Section 34 of 63 and 64 Vict., chapter 247, I may point out to him that in case of default a special remedy is provided by the section. If, however, the question refers to through rates not subject to that provision, the jurisdiction to grant reasonable through rates is vested in the Railway and Canal Commissioners, and not the Board of Trade.

#### KERRY POLICE AND THE UNITED IRISH LEAGUE.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, W.): I wish to ask the Chief Secretary by whose authority a member of the Royal Irish Constabulary in Kerry, on Sunday, the 19th instant, attended while members were being enrolled in a local branch of the United Irish League and took down their names, refusing to desist when asked to do so. I gave notice of this to the clerk at the Table, who found it necessary to cut out some portion of the question, so now I have simply read the substance of it. It is a very important matter to my constituency, but I do not see the Chief Secretary in his place, although I wrote him a letter;

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

#### ROYAL COMMISSION ON IRISH UNIVERSITY EDUCATION.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is yet in a position to name the Members of the Royal Commission on Irish University Education.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg also to ask the First Lord of the Treasury when he can give the House any information as to the composition or appointment of the Royal Commission on University Education in Ireland.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I am sorry that it has been impossible

to make sufficient progress with the appointment of this Commission to enable me to make a statement to the House. One of the reasons for the delay is the large number of Commissioners, Englishmen and Scotchmen, who have been asked to serve, and it would be unfair to expect such persons engaged in education to take evidence in Ireland after the beginning of the next academic term. We are most anxious to get on with the Commission.

MR. T. M. HEALY: That answer forebodes a long inquiry. How soon does the right hon. Gentleman expect to be able to give us the names?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: One of the difficulties arises from the fact that an invitation is sent to a gentleman and he finds he is not able to attend. Then the invitation is sent to someone else, and in such circumstances delays are inevitable.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN asked from whom refusals had been received.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think I can answer such a question as that.

HOUSE OF COMMONS' PRAYERS.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can say who is responsible for the form of the prayer used at the daily meetings of the House of Commons.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have made all the inquiries I can, and I have not been able to obtain any information to satisfy the curiosity of the hon. Member.

THE BEER BILL.

MR. CHAPLIN (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury a question of which I have given him private notice, namely, if he is aware that by the ruling of Mr. Speaker on the question of adjournment for the holidays, and by the moving of the closure, a number of Members on both sides of the House were prevented from expressing their regret that no facilities had been offered for discussing a proposal to refer the Beer Bill to the Standing Committee on Trade, in accordance with the memorial addressed to the right hon. Gentleman some weeks ago; secondly, whether the right hon. Gentleman is aware that, as there was no other business before that Committee, by the concession asked for the Bill might have passed through the Committee by this time; and whether, in making his promised announcement upon business after the Whitsuntide holidays, the right hon. Gentleman will take into consideration the representations made in the memorial referred to.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am very well aware that, owing to the course of the debate last night, my right hon. friend and other Members who take great interest in the Bill were prevented from laying their views before the House and the Government. It is also quite true that no facilities have been given for the discussion of a proposal to send the Bill to Grand Committee. But I am sure the House will feel that it was practically impossible for the Government to take time from such matters as the Finance Bill and the Civil List for the debate my right hon. friend naturally wishes to see brought to a conclusion. Nor would it have been possible, without singling out this Bill for special privilege, giving it advantage over other Bills which will come on for discussion after Whitsuntide. I hope that under the circumstances my right hon. friend will see that the course pursued was the only course open to the Government. I am perfectly well aware of the great interest taken in the subject by my right hon. friend and other Members in different parts of the House, and I will bear this in mind when making my statement after Whitsuntide, and asking facilities for the conduct of business.

MR. CHAPLIN: Arising out of that answer, may I ask my right hon. friend if he is aware that there was no other Bill in a position to be referred to the Standing Committee on Trade before Whitsuntide, and that all that was asked for in the memorial was the sacrifice of a single hour of the time at the disposal of the Government?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, I am aware of that, but that request, modest as it seemed in its character, would have been extremely difficult to comply with in a time of great pressure such as always exists at this time of the session in regard to first-class measures.

WORKS AT GIBRALTAR.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Is there an intention to bring in a Naval Works Bill in which the works at Gibraltar will be dealt with?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is our intention to bring in such a Bill, but I can give no indication of the date.

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: The right hon. Gentleman has made allusion to the necessity he will be under to make some demand on the House for further facilities for Government business. May I ask when the promised announcement on business will be made and what will be its nature.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The announcement will be made on the Monday or Tuesday, and will be of the usual character made by successive Governments when asking for time to facilitate progress of business.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Does the right hon. Gentleman contemplate the House sitting the full time to-night? Will he insist on finishing the Army Votes? Would it not be wiser to allow the business to come to a conclusion at a comparatively early hour and postpone the Army Votes till the first day after the holidays?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I should not like to make any pledge at the present moment. We do not, however, propose to take Report of Supply.

SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): What Supply is to be taken on the Thursday and Friday after the holidays?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I anticipate that the three Army Votes set down will be taken to-night, but if not they will be taken on the Thursday when the House reassembles. Financial reasons require this. After these, the Revenue Votes, beginning with No. 2, would be taken, followed by classes 6 and 7.

SIR HENRY FOWLER: The three Army Votes do not include that for the Secretary of State.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No.

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

Ordered, That the other Government Business have precedence this day of the Business of Supply.;(Mr. A. J. Balfour.)

#### NEW BILLS.

##### BURGH SEWERAGE, DRAINAGE, AND WATER SUPPLY (SCOTLAND).

Bill to amend the Law in regard to the Sewerage and Drainage and Water Supply of Burghs in Scotland, ordered to be brought in by The Lord Advocate, Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland, and Mr. Anstruther.

##### BURGH SEWERAGE, DRAINAGE, AND WATER SUPPLY (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"To amend the Law in regard to the Sewerage and Drainage and Water Supply of Burghs in Scotland," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday, 10th June, and to be printed. [Bill 204.]

##### INEBRIATES ACTS AMENDMENT.

Bill to amend the Inebriates Acts, 1879 to 1899, and to make further provision  
AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

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

Finch, George H.

Allan, William (Gateshead)  
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud  
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Allsopp, Hon. George  
Chapman, Edward  
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond  
Arrol, Sir William  
Charrington, Spencer  
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon  
Atkinson, Rt. Hn. John  
Churchill, Winston Spencer  
Fletcher, Sir Henry  
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy  
Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.  
Flower, Ernest  
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r  
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Fowler, Rt. Hn. Sir Henry-  
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W (Leeds  
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas  
Fuller, J. M. F.  
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin&Nairn  
Blundell, Colonel Henry  
Cripps, Charles Alfred  
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)  
Brassey, Albert  
Dalrymple, Sir Charles  
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon  
Brodrick, Rt. Hn. St. John  
Denny, Colonel  
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim  
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu  
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon  
Goulding, Edward Alfred  
Brymer, William Ernest  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Grant, Corrie  
Caldwell, James

Edwards, Frank  
Griffith, Ellis J.  
Cameron, Robert  
Evans, Sir F. H. (Maidstone)  
Hain, Edward  
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.  
Fardell, Sir T. George  
Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G (Mid'x  
Cautley, Henry Strother  
Farquharson, Dr. Robert  
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.  
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)  
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward  
Harris, Frederick Leverton

for the control and cure of Habitual Inebriates, ordered to be brought in by Dr. Farquharson, Sir Francis Powell, Sir Walter Foster, Sir Michael Foster, and Dr. Thompson.

#### INEBRIATES ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

"To amend the Inebriates Acts, 1879 to 1899, and to make further provision for the control and cure of Habitual Inebriates," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 12th June, and to be printed. [Bill 205.]

#### QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY BOARD.

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 constitution of Queen Anne's Bounty Board, and to report whether economy and efficiency of administration would be promoted by any change in its constitution or by its amalgamation with any other body.

Message to the Lords to acquaint them therewith.:(Sir William Walrond.)

#### CIVIL LIST BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

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

The House divided::Ayes, 149; Noes,. 38. (Division List No. 204.)

Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-  
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)  
Simeon, Sir Barrington  
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.  
Malcolm, Ian  
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)  
Heath, Arthur Howard (Han'l'y  
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe  
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)  
Hickman, Sir Alfred  
Martin, Richard Biddulph  
Spear, John Ward  
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)

Maxwell, WJH (Dumfriesshire  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Hope, J. F (Sheffield, Brightside  
Mitchell, William  
Stroyan, John  
Hozier, Hon. James Henry C.  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
Jacoby, James Alfred  
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)  
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward  
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)  
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)  
Valentia, Viscount  
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.  
Mount, William Arthur  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh  
Myers, William Henry  
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.  
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Warr, Augustus Frederick  
Kimber, Henry  
Norman, Henry  
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan  
Kitson, Sir James  
Parker, Gilbert  
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney  
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.  
Paulton, James Mellor  
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Ta'nt'n  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley  
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne  
Layland-Barratt, Francis  
Pemberton, John S. G.  
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)  
Lee, Arthur H (Hants, Fareham  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Purvis, Robert  
Wills, Sir Frederick  
Leng, Sir John  
Reckitt, Harold James

Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks  
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.  
Renshaw, Charles Bine  
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath  
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine  
Rickett, J. Compton  
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm  
Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham  
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge  
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-  
Long, Rt. Hn Walter (Bristol, S.  
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson  
Wrightson, Sir Thomas  
Lowther, Rt. Hon. James (Kent  
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Lowther, Rt. Hn J W (Cum. Penr  
Ropner, Colonel Robert  
Younger, William  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Russell, T. W.  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
Lucas, R. J. (Portsmouth)  
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)  
Maconochie, A. W.  
Sharpe, Wm. Edward T.  
NOES.  
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)  
Flynn, James Christopher  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, W.)  
Ambrose, Robert  
Gilhooly, James  
O' Kelly, James (Roscommon, N  
Boland, John  
Hayden, John Patrick  
O'Malley, William  
Boyle, James  
Healy, Timothy Michael  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Joyce, Michael  
Reddy, M.  
Clancy, John Joseph  
Leamy, Edmund



Redmond, John E. (Waterford)  
Cogan, Denis J.  
Lundon, W.  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
M'Govern, T.  
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel  
Cullinan, J.  
Mooney, John J.  
Sullivan, Donal  
Delany, William  
Murphy, J.  
White, Patrick (Meath, North)  
Dillon, John  
Nannetti, Joseph P.  
Doogan, P. C.  
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid)  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Mr. Patrick O'Brien and Mr. Haviland-Burke.  
French, Peter  
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)  
Flavin, Michael Joseph  
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)  
Bill read a second time, and committed for Thursday, 6th June.  
DEMISE OF THE CROWN BILL.  
Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

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

Clause 1::

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.), in moving the omission of the words "whether within or," said the purpose of the Amendment was to meet the case so strongly dwelt upon by the Attorney General when moving the Second Reading of the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman laid great stress upon the fact that unless this Bill was passed all the representatives of the Government of the protectorates which had been lately added to the Empire would cease to be officers of the Crown and would require to be reappointed, and that great complications and difficulties might arise in consequence of the interruption of office. The Amendment he proposed would cover the whole of the cases of the protectorates, and would, therefore, remove all the objections which had been put forward by the right hon. Gentleman; he himself did not see the force of many of the objections, but if the right hon. Gentleman accepted the Amendment it would remedy any difficulties with regard to the officials of India and the colonies, and other portions of the Empire. The right hon. Gentleman drew an appalling picture of the results which would follow if this Bill were not passed, but India and the other colonies were in existence at the previous demise of the Crown, and if there was no difficulty in those days in the reappointment of the officials of those

places he failed to see how any should arise now, nor did he believe that any difficulty that might arise from the lapse of office in these portions of the Empire would ever have induced the Government to introduce this Bill. The real reason lay much nearer home. The Irish Members were determined to test this matter at every stage, but he only proposed by this Amendment to deal with the dependencies. As regards the officials of the other colonies, they were in the same position now as they were at the last demise of the Crown, and it was perfectly well known that on that occasion there was no difficulty whatever and no complications arose upon their reappointment.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 1, lines 5 and 6, to leave out the words 'whether within or.'";(Mr. Dillon.)

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

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs) said that he hoped that the hon. Gentleman would not think it necessary to divide the House upon the Amendment, the effect of which would be, if adopted, to establish one rule for offices without the King's dominions and one rule for offices within the King's dominions. It would reduce, in point of fact, the operation of the Bill to the protectorates. In the case of appointments in the colonies and dependencies of the Crown, the inconvenience would remain as at present. Under those circumstances no grounds could be suggested for any alteration in the Bill, and he therefore hoped that the hon. Gentleman would not consider it necessary.

MR. CLANCY (Dublin County, N.) supported the Amendment, and said he saw very good ground for it. The hon. and learned Gentleman had pointed out that it would create two rules with regard to the appointment of officers of the Crown within and without the

King's dominions. There was an exceedingly good reason why there should be a difference between the two cases. There was a very vast difference between the appointment of high officials in the colonies and the appointment of great Ministers of State in this country, and it was obvious that where it might be quite proper to reappoint ambassadors and high officers abroad, it might be absolutely improper to reappoint Ministers sitting in this House, who might hold their position in it through a fluke. The manifest object of the Bill was to legalise the tenure of their seats in the House by several gentlemen sitting on the Government benches, and indemnify them against the penalties to which they had rendered themselves liable by sitting and voting in the House this session.

There was no difficulty about the reappointment of officials outside the dominions of the King. Ambassadors, viceroys, governors and others could be reappointed in a moment by a stroke of the pen, but it was quite a different thing with regard to Ministers of the Crown sitting here that they should bring in a Bill to continue themselves in office, when the law of the land said that they should not continue in office without having sought the opinion of their constituents. These gentlemen were elected by their constituents because they told them that the war was over, and if they had gone to their constituents on

the death of the late Queen, as they should have done, and disclosed the facts contained in the despatches of Sir Alfred Milner published since then, the result might have been very different. It was a scandalous innovation of the practice of Parliament. It was the first time such a thing had ever occurred, and it had been reserved for the first Government of the King to propose a Bill of which any past Ministers would have been ashamed.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) said the General Election was gained by the Conservative party on a misrepresentation of the facts in reference to the state of affairs in South Africa, and it was most desirable that the country should have had an opportunity, on the death of the late Sovereign, of saying whether they still wished the Ministers of the Crown to retain their offices. It was also desirable that they should have had the opportunity of considering whether so many Ministers should have been appointed from one family. If the matter went to a division he would vote for the Amendment.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) thought the Attorney General had failed to supply any adequate reason for the rejection of the Amendment.

MR. DILLON said that after the answer which he had received from the hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General, he should certainly test the matter by a division. The constitutional practice which the Bill proposed to abolish had been in operation for many years, and no inconvenience had been discovered in its operation until the present Ministry landed themselves in a difficulty. The sole reason against the acceptance of the Amendment was that it would deny to Ministers relief from the constitutional obligation of having to seek re-election in consequence of the late demise of the Crown.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said the real sting of the Bill was in its last clause, which made it retrospective. If this was merely a Bill, which every measure ought to be, for the management of affairs in the future, a good deal might be said in its favour, but it was manifestly a measure to relieve some one of some penalty which had been incurred, and to legalise something which had been done since the demise of the Crown. Surely its object must be to relieve Ministers of the necessity of submitting themselves to re-election. That was a safeguard which it would be unwise for Parliament to relinquish. The present rules imposed upon those accepting certain offices from the Crown the necessity of submitting themselves to their constituents. The necessity for a rule of this kind was increasing day by day. Ministers were becoming more and more powerful, and the House less and less powerful; the rules were becoming more and more disregarded, and the Standing Orders of the House scarcely existed, and nobody would recognise

what they did in the House of Commons from the Standing Orders. All these changes gave more power to the Ministers, and took away more power from the House. He thought the House should pause before it accepted the principle of the clause, that acceptance of office should not imply re-election, and should hesitate above all to give to Ministers a Bill of indemnity for something done previous to the passing of the Bill. If His Majesty's Government had really done nothing which required indemnity he thought the Amendment was one which they might reasonably accept.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE (Wiltshire, Cricklade) said he wished to say a few words as to how Liberals ought to vote on this measure. The able speech of the hon. Member for King's Lynn contained a great deal of ancient Tory doctrine, but he wished to submit to the House a totally different view as a Liberal. The effect of the Amendment would be that there would be one law in the United Kingdom and another affecting the dominions of the Crown abroad. The view taken by the Government upon this question was in perfect harmony and consonance with what had always been the view of the House of Commons in regard to its own rights and the position of Ministers, and it was more especially in harmony and consonance with the views and traditions of former Liberal Ministers. In former days the Crown exercised a great deal of control over this House, and Ministers were described as being not Ministers of the people, but servants of the Crown. It was quite natural that, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Thanet wished to keep things as they were.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet): I expressed myself directly to the contrary.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE said the old doctrine was that Ministers were far more servants of the Crown than Ministers of the people and servants of this House.

There used to be an idea that the whole machinery of the Government should stop when there was a change in the person of the Sovereign. Gradually, however, that ancient con-

stitutional doctrine had been curtailed and reduced. There used to be a doctrine that the moment the demise of the Crown took place this House ceased to exist, and there would have to be a General Election. [An HON. MEMBER: In six months.]

Yes, but that was a mere detail. Under the old practice the whole machinery of legislation stopped, and there had to be a new Parliament elected. That system was abolished in 1867 by a Bill introduced and carried by a Conservative Ministry. The Liberal party had always asserted the doctrine that the demise of the Crown was not to terminate the existence of Parliament. The question before the House was simply and solely whether they were to omit the words "whether within or." The effect of that would be that they would have one law in the United Kingdom in regard to the demise of the Crown, and another law abroad in regard to all appointments held under the Crown in foreign countries. That, in itself, would be an absurdity. What they were now asked to do was to assert in regard to appointments held under the Crown the same principle which was asserted by this House, when it said that the life of a Parliament should not come to an end simply because the demise of the Crown takes place.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER said this question had never before been treated in any shape or form as a party question. He certainly took exception to the noble Lord classifying him as having opposed the views which he had just expressed. Thirty years ago he took a prominent part advocating the very principles put forward by the noble Lord. The clause in the Act of 1867 was really introduced in the House of Lords by the late Lord Stanhope and; though there was no record of it in Hansard; approved by Mr. Gladstone, as he distinctly remembered, when the Bill came back to the Commons. He did not intend to discuss at length the question before the Committee, but he felt that it was necessary to clear up the misapprehension of the noble Lord. It was right that the House

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.  
Arrol, Sir William  
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r.  
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud)  
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John  
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds)  
Allsopp, Hon. George  
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy  
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)  
Arkwright, John Stanhope  
Bain, Colonel James Robert  
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.

should bear in mind that these voidances of office came at a time when a Minister had to take over the duties of his Department, and this caused serious inconvenience to the public service. In this House they had had to wait for answers on important questions because the newly appointed Minister was engaged canvassing his constituents, a work which perhaps occupied a fortnight.

\*THE CHAIRMAN said it was not in order to discuss that matter on the Amendment now before the Committee.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER said he did not wish to pursue that subject. He appealed to the Committee whether it would not be better to ask the Government if they were prepared to deal with this question as a whole. If the Government were prepared to deal with the whole question at no distant date in regard to the acceptance of office under the Crown and all the matters that had been raised in this debate, he thought the Committee should not discuss them further at present.

\*THE CHAIRMAN: I have to remind the right hon. Gentleman that it would be quite outside the purpose of this Bill for the Committee to provide that acceptance of office under the Crown shall in no case vacate the seat of a Member of the House of Commons. That ruling was given with respect to the Instruction of which the hon. Member for Mid Lanark had given notice.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER said he was misunderstood if he was supposed to go behind that ruling. He was suggesting that, if the Government were to intimate that the whole question was engaging their attention, and that they intended to bring forward a proposal on the subject, it could be discussed more profitably then.

Question put.

The Committee divided:;Aye, 162 Noes, 78. (Division List No. 205).

Blundell, Colonel Henry  
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.  
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)  
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)  
Harris, Frederick Leverton  
Parker, Gilbert  
Brassey, Albert  
Hay, Hn. Claude George  
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John  
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu  
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.  
Pretymann, Ernest George  
Brymer, William Ernest  
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley  
Purvis, Robert  
Bull, William James  
Heaton, John Henniker  
Remnant, James Farquharson  
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.  
Hope, JF. (Sheffield, Brightside  
Renshaw, Charles Bine  
Cautley, Henry Strother  
Howard, John (Kent, Faversham.  
Richards, Henry Charles  
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire.)  
Hozier, Hon. James Hy. Cecil  
Ridley, Hon M. W. (Stalybridge  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.)  
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)  
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. T.  
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc.  
Kay-Shuttleworth, Rt. Hon Sir U  
Robinson, Brooke  
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry  
Kenyon, Hon. G. T. (Denbigh)  
Ropner, Colonel Robert  
Chapman, Edward  
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)  
Russell, T. W.  
Charrington, Spencer  
Kimber, Henry  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
Churchill, Winston Spencer  
Kitson, Sir James  
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)  
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.  
Lambton, Hon. Fredk. Wm.  
Sharpe, Wm. Edw. T.  
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Simeon, Sir Barrington  
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole

Lawson, John Grant  
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Lecky, Rt. Hn. William Edw. H.  
Spear, John Ward  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham  
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset  
Crombie, John William  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Crossley, Sir Savile  
Leveson-Gower, Fredk. N. S.  
Stewart, Sir M. J. M' Taggart  
Dairymple, Sir Charles  
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine  
Stroyan, John  
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon  
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.  
Thornton, Percy M.  
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore  
Lowe, Francis William  
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward  
Duke, Henry Edward  
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)  
Valentia, Viscount  
Fardell, Sir T. George  
Lowther, Rt. Hon. James (Kent  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Farquharson, Dr. Robert  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Warde, Col. C. E.  
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)  
Warr, Augustus Frederick  
Finch, George H.  
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth  
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Maconochie, A. W.  
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney  
Fisher, William Hayes  
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)

Webb, Col. William George  
Fitz Gerald, Sir Robert Penrose-  
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)  
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (T'nt'n)  
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond  
M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.)  
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne),  
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon  
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)  
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer  
Flannery, Sir Fortescue  
Malcolm, Ian  
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord  
Fletcher, Sir Henry  
Manners, Lord Cecil  
Wills, Sir Frederick  
Flower, Ernest  
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe  
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)  
Fuller, J. M. F.  
Martin, Richard Bidduiph  
Wilson-Todd, W. H. (Yorks.)  
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick  
Maxwell, WJH (Dumfriesshire  
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath  
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin&Nairn  
Mildmay, Francis Bingham  
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm  
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)  
Mitchell, William  
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-  
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Wrightson, Sir Thomas  
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Goulding, Edward Alfred  
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)  
Younger, William  
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Hain, Edward  
Mount, William Arthur  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
Hambro, Charles Eric



Myers, William Henry  
Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G (Mid'x  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
NOES.  
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N.E.)  
Doogan, P. C.  
Leng, Sir John  
Ambrose, Robert  
Dunn, Sir William  
Lloyd-George, David  
Bell, Richard  
Edwards, Frank  
Lundon, W.  
Boland, John  
Elibank, Master of  
M'Govern, T.  
Boyle, James  
Ffrench, Peter  
Mooney, John J.  
Brigg, John  
Flavin, Michael Joseph  
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)  
Caldwell, James  
Flynn, James Christopher  
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)  
Cameron, Robert  
Gilhooly, James  
Moss, Samuel  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
Murphy, J.  
Carew, James Laurence  
Grant, Corrie  
Nannetti, Joseph P.  
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton  
Griffith, Ellis J.  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
Channing, Francis Allston  
Hayden, John Patrick  
Norman, Henry  
Clancy, John Joseph  
Healy, Timothy Michael  
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid)  
Cogan, Denis J.  
Jacoby, James Alfred  
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)

Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.  
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.  
Craig, Robert Hunter  
Joyce, Michael  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Cullinan, J.  
Labouchere, Henry  
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N  
Delany, William  
Lambert, George  
O'Malley, William  
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles  
Layland-Barratt, Francis  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Dillon, John  
Leamy, Edmund  
Paulton, James Mellor  
Power, Patrick Joseph  
Roe, Sir Thomas  
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.  
Price, Robert John  
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel  
Weir, James Galloway  
Reddy, M.  
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)  
White, Patrick (Meath, North)  
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)  
Spencer, Rt. Hn CR (Northants.  
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Sullivan, Donal  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Mr. Patrick O'Brien and Mr. Haviland-Burke.  
Rickett, J. Compton  
Taylor, Theodore Cooke  
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)  
Thompson, Dr. EC (Monagh'n N

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON moved to leave out Sub-section 2, which proposed to make the clause retrospective. They had now passed a clause which laid down the principle of the Bill, so that that was done with; but the Bill went on to provide that it should take effect as from the last demise of the Crown. Now, that was a proposal which he ventured to challenge by the Amendment which he then moved. Why did the Government propose to make this Bill retrospective, and why did they depart from the ordinary channel of legislation, and ask that the new rule should take effect, not from the passing of the Bill, but from an anterior date? No answer had been given to that. So much had been said about the

position of Ministers themselves in respect to this Bill, and the whole subject was so complicated with difficulties and technicalities, that he might be pardoned for a moment for referring to it. The House had not been assisted by any information on the part of the Government as to what had actually taken place in regard to certain Ministers. All Ministers did not fall in the same category. There were two distinct and separate categories of Ministers. In the first were all Ministers of the Crown included in the first part of the Schedule of the Oaths Act of 1868. The First Lord of the Treasury and the principal Members of the Cabinet were required by that Act to take the oath of allegiance, and the oath of office, immediately on accepting office. Now, he believed; and if he were wrong he could be corrected by the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill; that all those Ministers took these oaths on 24th January last. What could be the meaning of that, except that they took these oaths in compliance with the terms of the Act of 1868, and that, having so sworn themselves in on acceptance of office, they had vacated their seats in this House? The second class of Ministers included those who were not named in this Act at all, and to whom the observation he had

just made did not apply, and who, if this Bill did not pass, must, within six months of the demise of the Crown, seek re-election at the hands of their constituents. This Bill would protect the latter, but would not protect Ministers who had gone through certain forms and ceremonies which implied re-appointment to office. He invited Ministers to take the House into their confidence, and, if they required an indemnity, let them ask for it and put it into the Bill in black and white. There would not be such objection to such a provision, as to the Bill in its present form. He contented himself at that moment with putting the matter before the House, and begged formally to move the rejection of the second subsection.

Amendment proposed;

"In line 9, to leave out Sub-clause (2)."; (Mr. Edmund Robertson.)

Question proposed, "That Sub-clause (2) stand part of the clause."

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL (Sir EDWARD CARSON, Dublin University) said that the House had already sanctioned the principle that on the demise of the Crown no officer holding under the Crown need be re-appointed. The hon. and learned Member had seriously proposed that the Bill should not operate until the next demise of the Crown; and if that were to be accepted the result would be very foolish. They all hoped that the contingency of the next demise of the Crown was in the very far distant future, and he thought that a discussion on his hon. and learned friend's Amendment; that the rule was not to come into force until an indefinite period in the future; was, to use the phrase of the hon. Member for East Mayo, rather absurd. The Bill was made retrospective in order that all those many officers who held office under the Crown in this country, and throughout the Empire, and even outside

His Majesty's dominions, should not require re-appointment. The hon. Member for East Mayo asked what difficulty was there in having these re-appointments made? The answer was, "What was the use of having these re-appointments made to offices, high or low?" In the olden time they had to go through the mere farce

of sending down a document, at considerable inconvenience, saying to these officers, "You are appointed to hold the same office under the Sovereign as before the demise of the Crown." The reason for the Bill being made retrospective was to avoid that, and that was the answer to the hon. and learned Member. The hon. and learned Member harked back to the old tack that there was some purpose hidden away in the Bill, and said that one class of Ministers had been reappointed on the accession of His present Majesty. He was not going to traverse the ground which had been taken at the Second Reading of the Bill, but he would say that in his opinion there had been no such reappointments. The hon. and learned Gentleman himself admitted that if these Ministers had been reappointed this Bill did not cover them. Well, if the Bill did not cover them, the hon. and learned Member was not prevented, by any law, from taking such course as he thought proper to test the right of those Ministers to sit in this House. It might be contended that continuance in office was to be held as acceptance of office under the new monarch, though he himself did not hold that opinion. But was there any reason why Ministers should seek re-election? The convenience of the House and the country was against such re-election. A great deal had been said in the course of these debates upon the question whether, office having been accepted by a Member of this House, the opinion of his constituents should be taken as to whether he should have accepted that office or not. There might be something in that contention, but, when a Minister had taken the view of his constituents as to whether he should become a Minister or not, it was absolutely puerile to ask him to go down after he had been a Minister for a few months to ask his constituents whether he should take the same office under a new sovereign.

MR. LABOUCHERE said that the right hon. and learned Gentleman did not seem to appreciate the object of the Amendment. He contended that Ministers who took the oath of allegiance to a new Sovereign were reappointed. Under these circumstances, what was the position of those Gentlemen who did not submit themselves for re-election after reappointment? They were not Members of this House, for they had forfeited their seats according to the law, and in order to get them out of the mess, it was now proposed that a perfectly new system should be adopted. For the first time in its existence it was proposed that the House should co-opt Members. Such a practice might be most grossly abused with the present Government in power; a Government which endeavoured to take every vestige of control from the House and make the Executive master of the situation. He had noticed the presence of strangers in the House, but the Deputy-Speaker had ruled that no notice could then be taken of them because they had already strayed into the House, and that, not having taken the first opportunity to call attention to their presence, he (Mr. Labouchere) was not in order. Such a ruling was almost an admission that he was right. The Solicitor General said their constituents were perfectly satisfied. Admitting that, then there would be little trouble; they would be re-elected, and what a glorious thing it would be to show that the country had confidence in the Government. They would not have to take hold of some Pro-consul and try to "boom" him. They would come back at least free from the imputation of having secured re-election on the misstatement as to the war

having been finished. He was upon these matters a very old Conservative. This was an entirely new practice. Such a thing might have happened in the days of the Witenagemot, but it had never happened in any Parliament since. He should vote for the Amendment.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said that when he first saw the Amendment he came to the conclusion that he would have to vote for it, but every hon. Gentleman who had spoken upon it had so given away his case that he had come to a totally different conclusion. The mover of the Amendment had given away his case by admitting that there were some Ministers that the Amendment would not cover. Then the learned Solicitor General had given away his case. He had made a very good case for the law being passed in the extraordinary inconveniences which had recently been brought to light, which had never been observed in any previous reign, but the discovering of which had been reserved for the legal lights sitting on the Treasury Bench; but when the right hon. Gentleman came to that part of the clause which was now being attacked, he made no case whatever. The right hon. and learned Gentleman argued that if it was right that such a thing should be done in the future it was also right that it should be done in the past. With that he could not agree. The House had always set its face against anything in the shape of retrospective legislation. It was a monstrous usurpation to go back and unmake, for the past, the laws which then existed. If it was done it should be on the frank avowal that the law had been broken. The hon. Member for Northampton had given away his case, perhaps, worst of all. He said that the right hon. Gentlemen sitting on the Treasury Bench were not Members of the House at all. If that were so, all he had to do was to go to the courts and have them mulcted in penalties. What a grand opportunity it would be for the hon. Member, and of what a spectacle had he deprived the House by not taking the First Lord of the Treasury and others before the Court, and obtaining penalties against them for many thousands of pounds. The remarks of the hon. Member had convinced him that he ought not to vote for the Amendment, and he was very glad, for he was desirous not to vote for it because the Government disapproved of it. At the same time, he could not see why the Government had introduced the measure unless they believed with the hon. Member for Northampton that they had vacated their seats by the action which they had taken, and if that were the case they should make a frank avowal of the fact, and if they did he for one would grant the Act of Indemnity which they asked.

MR. TAYLOR (Lancashire, Radcliffe) said that he always understood that the Government was opposed to retrospective legislation. The Cockerton judgment referred to a number of hard-worked and underpaid public servants, but so far as he could see there was no retrospective act of white-washing for those gentlemen. Which horse were the Government going to ride? Was this a principle that they were going to lay down for other cases, and if they were going to apply this retrospective principle to public officials of one character would they also apply it to officials of another?

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) said that the Solicitor General had justified the clause on the ground that it would be absurd to ask right hon. Gentlemen to go down again to the constituents for reapproval on taking office. Perhaps that

argument might have some validity when only four or five months had elapsed since the date of their election, but supposing four or five years had elapsed and that new methods of registration, followed by an entire change of public opinion, had come into operation, what would be the value of that argument then? What was the object of compelling Ministers to resign at the beginning of a new reign? The object, he took it, was that there must always be a Civil List for the new Sovereign, and in former times the questions surging round the Civil List were very exciting and important. The idea of Ministers being compelled to go before their constituents on the accession of a new Sovereign was that they should lay before the taxpayers of the country what provision they were prepared to make with reference to the Civil List. That all disappeared under the procedure proposed by right hon. Gentlemen opposite; and, in addition, he observed they were kind enough to make themselves the judges in their own case. They were under no pressure from the House or the country. There had been no meetings of their constituents, no petition from any Gentleman or lady in the land asking for the Bill. The House had heard of petitions with reference to the Sale of Drink to Children Bill, and they knew the kind of attention they received, but at all events no member of the human race had petitioned the Attorney General or the Solicitor General to bring in a Bill to save their own skins. Accordingly, these learned lawyers were engaged in making a provision; to some extent a corrupt provision; to save themselves, and the time of the House of Commons, which they were told was so precious that it could not be given to an Old Age Pensions Bill or an Irish Land Bill, or other important questions which it was stated in the King's Speech would be brought in if time permitted, was to be given to save the skins of gentlemen on the Treasury Bench. The hon. Gentleman the Member for King's Lynn stated that it would be possible, if they thought that right hon. Gentlemen were under a disability, to bring an action against them for £;500 for every day they sat. As a matter of fact, if any gentleman sat in the House without having been sworn his seat was declared by statute ipso facto vacant, and a penalty of £;500 was incurred for every day he sat and voted. But there was one necessary preliminary. As he recollected the Bradlaugh case, when Mr. Bradlaugh came down to the House and voted without having been sworn, and when a gentleman proceeded to adopt the delightful role of a common informer, and sued Mr. Bradlaugh for the penalty, it was held by the House of Lords that the verdict could not stand, because no one could sue for the penalty without the leave of the Attorney General. It was supposed to be not a private matter in which a private individual was interested, but a matter to be vindicated by the intervention of the law officers. In order that the law might be vindicated in the case before the Committee they would have the Pooh-Bah arrangement of the Attorney General versus the Attorney General, and they would have the splendid spectacle of that virtuous officer suing himself. They occasionally saw a magistrate when he was prosecuted for having his dog unmuzzled fining himself half-a-crown. No doubt that was a very Spartan and heroic proceeding, but if he issued a writ against the Attorney General for Ireland, he could scarcely see him committing the splendid act of altruism of giving him a preliminary fiat to

enable him to prosecute the right hon. Gentleman. Therefore the suggestion that there was a legal remedy in the case was utter nonsense. No one went hunting unless there was a fox to be hunted, and no one went into the law courts unless there were damages to be obtained. No one was going to start an action against a Minister when it was perfectly well known, after the Bradlaugh decision, that defeat stared him in the face. It was the constitutional part of the case which brought him to the retrospective proposal in the Bill. They were aware that the British Constitution had existed for 800 or 900 years, but no proposal such as was before the Committee had been made until the twentieth century. Whenever any ordinary change in the law was made it could always be said that the change was necessary because of the changed conditions of the times or because new evils had arisen, or that new conditions required new provisions. But as far as the matter before the Committee was concerned, there had been no change. It was now as it was in the beginning, and there was no change in the circumstances of the times or in any of the conditions which necessitated such a measure. His Majesty's Ministers had brought it in simply on the practical principle that it suited them to relieve themselves of liabilities they had incurred, simply because they were in possession of a majority of the House of Commons. He did not think that any usurpation of authority by any crowned head could equal the usurpation of power which the Government indulged in in this case. Ordinarily, when a monarch took any step of an arbitrary kind; a coup d'etat; he was always able to refer his misconduct to some great human principle, and to say that he acted in the name of humanity, equality, or fraternity, or any of the other great principles which were put forward to justify revolutionary proceedings. But Ministers had not for this Bill a rag or shred of pretence of anything except the selfish necessity to save themselves from the trouble of re-election, and that at a time when right hon. Gentlemen boasted that the heart of the country was throbbing and pulsating on their behalf in every constituency in the United Kingdom. Therefore, it seemed to him that the Bill was the greatest departure from constitutional principle which even the Tory party had ever attempted. In previous legislation they had only attacked contracts or property, or the taxpayer, but in this matter he would respectfully submit that the Crown itself was assailed by the action of the Government. When the smallest private Bill touching a foreshore or Crown lands was brought before the House, it was necessary to bring the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Thanet Division down to go through the sacramental form of taking off his hat to signify the consent of the Crown. But for this Bill, which was an attack on the prerogatives of the Sovereign himself, not even the preliminary consent of the Crown was given.

SIR EDWARD CARSON: Oh, yes, it was given.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Another good point gone; Owing to his absence from the House when, of course, he ought to have been present attending to such high matters, he had not observed that that form had not been gone through. What he respectfully said was that although Ministers had the consent of the Crown they, at any rate, avoided securing the assent of the constituencies, and that at a

time when they said that the constituencies were heartily in their favour, and when most of them maintained that their unopposed return would be a matter of certainty. It seemed to him, on the whole, that even according to the case of the Government it was a Bill without necessity, and it appeared to him to be one of the gravest departures from constitutional practice he had ever witnessed.

\*MR. DUKE (Plymouth) said that the hon. and learned Member had very appropriately introduced some comic opera into the discussion, and he did not wonder at it, because the debate was an idle, or, at all events, a futile attack on members of the Government. The principle of the Bill was the abandonment of the last vestige of the old system of the personal government of the country by the Crown; the abandonment of the last scrap or relic of that ancient system. From the Act of Settlement downwards the people of the country had desired that those who enjoyed their confidence should continue to enjoy it, notwithstanding the accidents of the constitution, and that the forms and ceremonies and incidents which arose from the former state of things should be done away with. The Act of Settlement provided that Ministers should retain office for six months after the demise of the Crown, unless there was an intimation of the will of the Sovereign to the contrary. That continued down to 1867, when Parliament enacted that it should continue to perform its duties not for six months after the demise of the Crown, but until it came to the end of its term in the ordinary way, and the Crown not having happily demised for upwards of half a century, that state of things continued. Now the Government proposed a change which met with the general consent of the House and the country, namely, that Ministers in office at the demise of the Crown should continue to hold office. Hon. Gentlemen opposite professed a desire to except the present Ministry from that change and to have a little General Election in order that they might renew their experience of the great General Election. He thought there was no reason for an exception. He had listened to the debates on the Bill, and he had not seen any hon. and learned Gentleman above the gangway opposite who ventured to tell the House on his credit as a lawyer that any Member on the Treasury Bench had incurred a penalty. He had endeavoured to ascertain what lawyers thought on the matter, and, so far as he could ascertain, there was no lawyer who had the courage to advise any of the multitude of common informers to seek the fiat of the Attorney General to proceed against the First Lord of the Treasury, or that it was worth while trying the experiment. He as a lawyer had his own opinion on the matter, but it was not in the direction of the Amendment before the Committee. There was no constitutional lawyer ready to advise on his credit and responsibility that penalties had been incurred and that an application should be made to the Attorney General for his fiat to recover them. The matter had been before the House of Commons for several months, and many applications for the fiat of the Attorney General could have been made, and if they had not been granted what a weapon hon. Gentlemen opposite would have had with which to trounce the Attorney General and the various members of the Government. He had no hesitation in saying that that was not done because no lawyer of credit or responsibility could be found to advise



that penalties had been incurred. It was suggested that because Ministers took the oath of allegiance they had vacated their seats. He happened to hold a small office under the Crown, and he took the oath of allegiance, but he did not vacate his office. Hundreds of people took the oath of allegiance on the accession of His present Majesty, but they did not vacate their offices. On what ground, therefore, could it be suggested that right hon. Gentlemen had vacated their offices?

MR. CLANCY asked if the hon. and learned Gentleman would say what the Bill was for, if his argument were correct?

\*MR. DUKE said he should have thought it was very plain what the Bill was for. The Bill was to relieve the country from an admitted inconvenience and the House from the discredit of making a great constitutional change without including the present Ministers of the Crown in the effects of that change. [Several hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.] He was glad he was able so easily to satisfy hon. Members. He was sure that anyone who considered the matter would agree that the exception sought to be set up on fictitious and party grounds against the present occupants of the Treasury Bench was not worth discussion as a matter of principle. It was really a sham fight, and for his part he would have the greatest delight in supporting the Government.

MR. DILLON said that if the view of the hon. and learned Gentleman were correct, why should not the Government accept the Amendment? It was the view of the hon. and learned Gentleman, who professed to be a great lawyer, that Ministers would be in no danger or suffer any inconvenience if the Act were not retrospective, and why therefore was not the Amendment accepted? Why should not Ministers face the music, and why should protection be thrown around them? The hon. and learned Gentleman

made one of the strongest speeches he had listened to in support of the Amendment. He described the Bill as a great constitutional change, and he would put it to the Committee, were those the circumstances in which a change should be brought about; above all, a great constitutional change complicated with personal relief and open to the suspicion that it had been dictated in order to relieve Ministers of the trouble and expense of going to their constituents. He did not profess to be an authority on the matter, but the Attorney General, in introducing the Bill, said that the enactments were far from clear, that opinions might differ as to their effect, and that the Bill would put an end to a state of things in which the House might arrive at a conclusion different from that of a court of law. The Attorney General had frankly stated that one of the main objects of the Bill was to relieve Ministers from the position in which they found themselves. That, however, was not the view of the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite, who called the discussion comic opera. Was it not comic opera to have introduced the Bill at all, when they were told night after night that every minute of the time of the House of Commons was precious?

MR. DUKE said he described the discussion of the Amendment as comic opera.

MR. DILLON said that that was not the opinion of the Attorney General, who did not consider it comic opera. The hon. and learned Gentleman had advanced the most extraordinary constitutional doctrine to which he had ever listened. He

described the Bill as removing the last tattered rag and shred and remnant of personal government. He wondered what His Majesty the King would think of that. He was under the impression, until he listened to the learned expounder of the constitution opposite, that the King had power to send for his Ministers. If the Bill swept away the last tattered shreds of personal government, would they be allowed to elect their own Ministers? They had no voice, except most indirectly, in the matter at present, because the King sent for a gentleman, who formed the Ministry without consulting the House of Commons. They were progressing, no doubt, but they had not yet reached the point of eliminating the King altogether. From all he had been able to learn about the prerogatives of the Crown, he would not have described them as a tattered rag. There was some influence left to the Crown, perhaps more than they approved of; but it was strong language to describe the prerogative of the Crown as a tattered rag. That was what the language of the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite amounted to. He regretted it was not open to him to move the Amendment he had on the Paper. He did not in the least challenge the ruling of the Chair, but he thought that although the words were the same as the Amendment of the hon. Member for Mid Lanark, still by inserting them in the second clause the effect would be totally different to the effect of inserting them in the first clause. The first sub-section applied this principle only to the future, but the second was retrospective. His object was to raise the narrow issue of whether, in connection with the great constitutional change proposed in the Bill, private individuals should be relieved from the disabilities attaching to acts which they themselves had committed. The present Amendment raised a somewhat broader issue, but it also covered the one he had desired to bring before the Committee. The Solicitor General for England had dealt frankly with the main issue of whether Ministers should be put to the inconvenience of facing their constituents, and he made a strong appeal against the injustice and unreasonableness of their being required to do so. His whole argument, however, was based on the peculiar circumstances of the present case, whereas a question of principle such as this ought not to be decided on the particular circumstances of any particular case. It might happen that at the demise of the Crown Parliament had been in office for five years, and become completely out of touch with the country. Ministers might know perfectly well that if they faced their constituents they would be defeated, and there would be a strong motive for not going to the country. In such a case this provision might be very wholesome and useful, because it would force the hands of Ministers, and give the electors an opportunity of declaring their will. Even though Ministers were no longer servants of the Crown, as had been argued; he did not agree with the argument; but servants of this House, the provision would still be a wholesome one. There had been instances in recent history of the House of Commons seeking to rule the country against the will of the people, and such cases might occur again. Therefore, this provision would be useful, not only for protecting the House of Commons against the undue influence of the Crown, but also for protecting the electors against the tyranny of the House of Commons itself.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.) thought if the Government were sincere in the attitude they had taken up they ought at once to accept the Amendment. As far as he understood, one of the principal objects of the Bill was to do away with the necessity of Ministers going to their constituents on the acceptance of office. That was a very salutary provision, and it ought to be preserved. The argument that a General Election had taken place shortly before the demise of the Crown was altogether beside the question, because that was a mere chance. A great constitutional question was involved, and it should be argued in a very different spirit from that which had been manifested.

MR. T. M. HEALY said that after this Amendment had been disposed of he should move to add at the end of the sub-section the following words:—"Provided that nothing herein contained shall relieve the holder of any office of any penalty which he would have incurred but for the passing of the sub-section." He was sure the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Plymouth would vote for that provision, because he had assured the House on his authority as a lawyer that no penalties, whatever had been incurred. The hon. and learned Gentleman had also given the House an assurance which it had not yet received from any occupant of the Treasury Bench, namely, that the Attorney General would be glad to grant his fiat so that anybody could proceed for the recovery of penalties. The fact that a gentleman who was ready to give all these legal assurances still lurked in the shades of a back bench under the gallery made him think there was something wrong somewhere. It was deplorable that so much merit should be thus hidden. He hoped that someone on the Treasury Bench would get up and, on behalf of the Government of

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Greville, Hon. Ronald

Penn, John

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Hain, Edward

Platt-Higgins, Frederick

Allsopp, Hon. George

Hambro, Charles Eric

Pretyman, Ernest George

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G (Middx

Purvis, Robert

Arrol, Sir William

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

Remnant, James Farquharson

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.

Renshaw, Charles Bine

Bain, Col. James Robert

Harris, Frederick Leverton

Ridley, Hn M W. (Stalybridge)

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J (Manch'r  
Hay, Hon. Claude George  
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. C. Thomson  
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W (Leeds  
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)  
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)  
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H (Bristol)  
Heaton, John Henniker  
Robson, William Snowdon  
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.  
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside  
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.  
Blundell, Colonel Henry  
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham  
Ropner, Colonel Robert  
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex  
Hozier, Hon. James H. Cecil  
Russell, T. W.  
Brassey, Albert  
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John  
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh  
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)  
Brookfield, Col. Montagu.  
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)  
Seton-Karr, Henry  
Brymer, William Ernest  
Kimber, Henry  
Sharpe, William Edward T.  
Bull, William James  
Lambton, Hon. Fredk. Wm.  
Simeon, Sir Barrington  
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.  
Lawson, John Grant  
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)  
Cautley, Henry Strother  
Lecky, Rt. Hn. William Edw. H.  
Skewes-Cox, Thomas  
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire  
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareh'm  
Smith, James P. (Lanarks.)  
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Spear, John Ward  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm

Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.  
Stanley, Edward J. (Somerset)  
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r  
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry  
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham  
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart  
Chapman, Edward  
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.  
Stroyan, John  
Charrington, Spencer  
Lowe, Francis William  
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier  
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.  
Lowther, Rt. Hon. James (Kent  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Thornton, Percy M.  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)  
Tollemache, Henry James  
Crossley, Sir Savile  
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth  
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward  
Dairymple, Sir Charles  
Macdona, John Cumming  
Valentia, Viscount  
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon  
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)  
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Doxford, Sir William Theodore  
M'Arthur, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W  
Warde, Colonel C. E.  
Duke, Henry Edward  
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)  
Warr, Augustus Frederick  
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward  
Malcolm, Ian  
Webb, Col. William George  
Finch, George H.  
Manners, Lord Cecil

Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunt'n  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Martin, Richard Biddulph  
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-under-L.  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.  
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord  
Fitz Gerald, Sir Robert Penrose-  
Mildmay, Francis Bingham  
Wills, Sir Frederick  
Fitzroy, Hon Edward Algernon  
Mitchell, William  
Wilson, A Stanley (York, E. R.)  
Flannery, Sir Fortescue  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Fletcher, Sir Henry  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Wilson-Todd, W. H. (Yorks.)  
Forster, Henry William  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath  
Godson, Sir Augustus Fred.  
Mount, William Arthur  
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-  
Gordon, Hn. J. E (Elgin&Nairn)  
Myers, William Henry  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)  
Nicholson, William Graham  
Younger, William  
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Goschen, Hon. Geo. Joachim  
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
Goulding, Edward Alfred  
Parker, Gilbert  
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)  
Peel, Hn. William Robert W.  
NOES.  
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)  
Bolton, Thomas Dolling  
Cameron, Robert  
Allen, C. P. (Glouc., Stroud)  
Boyle, James

Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton

Ambrose, Robert

Brigg, John

Channing, Francis Allston

Bell, Richard

Burke, E. Haviland-

Clancy, John Joseph

Boland, John

Caldwell, James

Cogan, Denis J.

His Majesty, give the Committee the legal assurances which, so far, had only been given them by one of the new members of the House.

Question put.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 152; Noes, 84. (Division List No. 206.)

Condon, Thomas Joseph

Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)

O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N

Craig, Robert Hunter

Joyce, Michael

O'Malley, William

Cremer, William Randal

Kay-Shuttleworth, Rt. Hn Sir U

O'Shaugnessy P. J.

Cullinan, J.

Labouchere, Henry

Power, Patrick Joseph

Delany, William

Lambert, George

Price, Robert John

Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles

Layland-Barratt, Francis

Priestley, Arthur

Dillon, John

Leamy, Edmund

Reddy, M.

Doogan, P. C.

Leng, Sir John

Redmond, J. E. (Waterford)

Dunn, Sir William

Lloyd-George, David

Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)

Edwards, Frank

Lundon, W.

Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)

Elibank, Master of

M'Govern, T.

Sheehan, Daniel Daniel  
Ffrench, Peter  
Morgan, J. L. (Carmarthen)  
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh.)  
Flavin, Michael Joseph  
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)  
Sullivan, Donal  
Fuller, J. M. F.  
Moss, Samuel  
Taylor, Theodore Cooke  
Gilhooly, James  
Murphy, J.  
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n N.  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
Nannetti, Joseph P.  
Warner, Thos. Courtenay T.  
Grant, Corrie  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
Wason, Engene (Clackmannan)  
Griffith, Ellis J.  
Norman, Henry  
Weir, James Galloway  
Hayden, John Patrick  
Norton, Capt. Cecil William  
White, Patrick (Meath, North)  
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-  
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid)  
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer  
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir A. D.  
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)  
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)  
Healy, Timothy Michael  
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Mr. Edmund Robertson and Mr. Charles Spencer.  
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.  
O'Connor, James Wicklow, W.  
Jacoby, James Alfred  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)

MR. T. M. HEALY, in moving to add at the end of Sub-section 2 words providing that the holder of any office should not be relieved from any penalty which he would have incurred but for the passing of the sub-section, said that he could not see how the Government could resist the Amendment. Either the law had been broken or it had not. If the law had been broken, Ministers ought to be penalised. If it had not been broken, then the proviso could do absolutely no harm.

Amendment proposed;



"At the end of Sub-section 2 to insert 'Provided that nothing herein contained shall relieve the holder of any office from any penalty which he would have incurred but for the passing of this sub-section.'";(Mr. T. M. Healy.)

Question proposed, "That those words stand part of the sub-section."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said it was impossible for him to accept the Amendment. If the hon. and learned Member

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Blundell, Colonel Henry

Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.

Allsopp, Hon. George

Brassey, Albert

Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Brigg, John

Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry

Arrol, Sir William

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John

Chapman, Edward

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Brookfield, Colonel Montagu

Charrington, Spencer

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

Brymer, William Ernest

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

Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W (Leeds

Bull, William James

Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse

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

Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.

Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole

Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.

Cautley, Henry Strother

Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)

Bigwood, James

Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire

Crossley, Sir Savile

looked into the statute he would see that the action for penalties lay only in the case of those who were disqualified from holding seats in the House, and did not apply to those who required re-election on the acceptance of office. The section was so worded as to make that clear in the English Act, and it was equally clear in the Act applying to Ireland. To insert this proviso would lure a number of unfortunate people to their ruin, as it would give them an

impression that such an action would lie. They would then, perhaps, look to the hon. and learned Member for an indemnity for having misled them. Therefore, in the interests of the hon. and learned Member, as well as of the law, he opposed the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Motion made, and Question put, "That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 157; Noes, 80. (Division List No. 207).

Cust, Henry John C.

Lecky, Rt. Hon. Wm. Edw. H.

Ropner, Col. Robert

Dairymple, Sir Charles

Lee, Arthur H (Hants, Fareham

Russell, T. W.

Dixon-Hartland Sir Fred Dixon

Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage

Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-

Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.

Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.

Doxford, Sir William Theodore

Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine

Seton-Karr, Henry

Duke, Henry Edward

Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham

Sharpe, William Edward T.

Fellowes, Hn. Ailwyn Edward

Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S

Simeon, Sir Barrington

Finch, George H.

Lowe, Francis William

Sinclair, Louis (Romford)

Finlay, Sir Robt. Bannatyne

Loyd, Archie Kirkman

Skewes-Cox, Thomas

Fisher, William Hayes

Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)

Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.

Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond

Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth

Spear, John Ward

Fitzroy, Hn. Edw. Algernon

Macdona, John Cumming

Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset

Flannery, Sir Fortescue

M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)

Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)

Fletcher, Sir Henry  
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.  
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart  
Forster, Henry William  
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinb'rgh, W  
Stroyan, John  
Godson, Sir Augustus Fred.  
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)  
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier  
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn  
Malcolm, Ian  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S)  
Manners, Lord Cecil  
Thornton, Percy M.  
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon  
Martin, Richard Biddulph  
Tollemache, Henry James  
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim  
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.  
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward  
Goulding, Edward Alfred  
Mildmay, Francis Bingham  
Valentia, Viscount  
Green, Walford D. (Wedn'sbury  
Mitchell, William  
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)  
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Greene, W. Raynond- (Cambs.)  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Warde, Colonel C. E.  
Greville, Hon. Ronald  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Warr, Augustus Frederick  
Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G (Middx  
Mount, William Arthur  
Webb, Col. William George  
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry  
Myers, William Henry  
Welby, Lt.-Col. AC E (Taunton  
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.  
Nicholson, William Graham  
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne  
Harris, Frederick Leverton

Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Williams, Rt. Hn J Powell- (B'rm  
Hay, Hon. Claude George  
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)  
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord  
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.  
Parker, Gilbert  
Wills, Sir Frederick  
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley  
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley  
Wilson, A. Stanley (Yorks, E. R  
Heaton, John Henniker  
Penn, John  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)  
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham)  
Pretymann, Ernest George  
Wodehouse, Rt. Hon E R (Bath)  
Hozier, Hon. J. Henry Cecil  
Purvis, Robert  
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-  
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)  
Remnant, James Farquharson  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Kay-Shuttleworth, Rt. Hn Sir U.  
Renshaw, Charles Bine  
Younger, William  
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)  
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (St'lybridge  
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)  
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
Kimber, Henry  
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Robson, William Snowdon  
Lawson, John Grant  
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.  
NOES.  
Abraham, Wilham (Cork, N. E.  
Gilhooly, James  
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.  
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud  
Goddard, Daniel Ford

O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Ambrose, Robert  
Grant, Corrie  
O 'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N  
Bell, Richard  
Griffith, Ellis J.  
O'Malley, William  
Bo and, John  
Hayden, John Patrick  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Bolton, Thomas Dolling  
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-  
Power, Patrick Joseph  
Boyle, James  
Healy, Timothy Michael  
Price, Robert John  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)  
Priestley, Arthur  
Caldwell, James  
Jacoby, James Alfred  
Reddy, M.  
Cameron, Robert  
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)  
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)  
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton  
Joyce, Michael  
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)  
Channing, Francis Allston  
Labouchere, Henry  
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)  
Clancy, John Joseph  
Lambert, George  
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)  
Cogan, Denis J.  
Leamy, Edmund  
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Leng, Sir John  
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh.  
Craig, Robert Hunter  
Lloyd-George, David  
Spencer, Rt. Hn-CR (Northants  
Cremer, William Randal  
Lundon, W.  
Sullivan, Donal

Cullinan, J.  
M'Govern, T.  
Taylor, Theodore Cooke  
Delany, William  
Morgan, J. L. (Carmarthen)  
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N  
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles  
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)  
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan  
Dillon, John  
Moss, Samuel  
Weir, James Galloway  
Doogan, P. C.  
Murphy, J.  
White, Patrick (Meath, North)  
Dunn, Sir William  
Nannetti, Joseph P.  
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer  
Edwards, Frank  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)  
Elibank, Master of  
Norman, Henry  
Ffrench, Peter  
Norton, Capt. Cecil William  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Mr. Patrick O'Brien and Mr. Warner.  
Flavin, Michael Joseph  
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)  
Fulller, J. M. F.

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

Bill reported, without Amendment, to be read the third time upon Thursday, 6th June.

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

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

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1901&#x2013;2.

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

\*SIR ARTHUR HAYTER (Walsall) made an appeal to the Secretary of State for War to make a change in the direction of decentralisation in regard to allowing general officers commanding districts a further discretion in utilising savings under one head of expenditure for works and repairs in another class without special

reference to the War Office. The right hon. Gentleman declared himself in favour of this principle. He hoped that they might be allowed to make savings on those Votes, and apply them to other works in their own district without any further reference to the War Office. In answer to a question the Secretary of State for War had said that he was in favour of granting more departmental power to the generals commanding districts. He should be extremely disappointed if the right hon. Gentleman did not take this opportunity of carrying out his own proposal to give commanding officers the opportunity of managing their own Votes, and devoting the savings effected to the maintenance of other works in their district.

\*MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) asked for an explanation of the increased expenditure in respect of the military prison at Aldershot, and of the extension of the balloon factory. It was doubtful

whether balloons were any use, and from what he had seen in the papers balloons had not been the success which was anticipated. He had heard from officers in the Army that the balloons had failed in their object in South Africa. He wished to know why there had been an increase in the expenditure on the military prison at Aldershot, because it was already a big building. He pointed out that £2,600 was to be spent in the Cork district for racks and shelves for the uniforms and accoutrements of the Militia; why was so large a sum necessary? He wished to know, also, why £2,000 was being spent only to make Templemore barracks fit for temporary occupation; when the new hospital at Portsmouth would be completed; why it was necessary to increase the Vote for mobilisation stores, clothing, etc., for the Army Service Corps transport reservists? With regard to Gibraltar, the Secretary of State for War had promised that there should be more accommodation provided for officers' wives there. He had been told that a married officer could not get a house upon any terms at Gibraltar. They were told that houses were actually being built, but he had been informed this year that nothing of the kind had been done. This was an important matter, because there would now be a very great increase in the number of married men requiring accommodation, because the garrison regiments were being sent out there. The same arguments also applied to Malta, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would give him an answer upon this point. They knew from past experience that they could not trust the War Office to spend the money upon what it was put down for, and the War Office always gave them to understand that the money was wanted for something which was quite different to the real state of things.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.) pointed out that the vote of £21,000 for incidental expenses of the War Department, lands and property, including working expenses, and sewage farms, at Aldershot and Sandhurst, had increased from £12,900, at which figure it stood last year. He understood that in the last Parliament there was an interesting discussion about the management of the sewage farm at Aldershot, and that then the Financial Secretary said that he preferred butter made on that sewage farm to any other butter in the kingdom. Perhaps the present Financial Secretary preferred his butter made elsewhere. However, he imagined some other people must share this taste for more or less sewage butter, as the vote had been increased by £8,000, or 75 per cent. of the

original Vote. He wished to know what arrangements were to be made for the efficient draining and sewerage of the new barracks to be erected on Salisbury Plain, not far from the village of Ludgershall. He put a question to the Secretary of State for War upon the subject not long ago, and the right hon. Gentleman assured him that, although he was not personally conversant with the subject, it would receive his careful attention. The Government had arranged to spend about £1,500,000 close to this village, and the present condition of the place was insanitary, and the water supply extremely limited. If close by they were going to dump down great barracks, without providing an efficient drainage system, very serious injury would be inflicted on the people there, and also upon the finances of the county of Wiltshire. That county had a right to consideration at the hands of the War Office, because in all the southern counties of England they had taken special care to provide for the efficient sanitation of their counties by appointing a county medical officer of health. Having taken proper care to provide for the proper sanitation of the county of Wiltshire, he thought they were entitled to say to the War Office that they had no right to place a large body of men in their midst without providing that the health of the county should not be injured by such action. He thought they ought to have some explanation as to why this great increase of expenditure was necessary. With regard to the item for the survey of defensive positions, he wished to know whether they were at home or abroad, and if abroad by whom were the surveys to be carried out.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE (Wiltshire, Cricklade) thought he would be consulting the convenience of the Committee if he took this opportunity of stating very briefly the points he wished to put before the Secretary of State for War, rather than by moving a resolution. His hon. friend who had just sat down had called attention to a very important matter affecting the county with which he was particularly connected. The building operations alluded to at this small town were likely to extend almost to another Aldershot, and he wished to call attention to the serious damage done to the roads in some of the southern counties by the enormous traffic consequent on the purchase of Salisbury Plain by the Government. This was a matter that affected more counties than one. No Member of Parliament representing any of these counties had any desire whatever to put forward any extortionate claims, or to try to make profit for the local ratepayers at the expense of the War Office. He fully admitted that, in many ways in the near future, and still more perhaps in the more distant future, the large expenditure by the War Office in the purchase of Salisbury Plain would be of very great advantage to the local ratepayers, but that time had not come yet. At the present time they were only sufferers by the cause referred to. They were sufferers in a pecuniary way from having to spend large sums of money on roads consequent upon the enormous damage done by the traffic, and especially through haulage by steam vehicles belonging to contractors in the employment of the War Office. He would not take up the time of the Committee by going into details, as these were matters of local interest. What he was anxious to argue on behalf of the southern counties was a question of principle. He was anxious to obtain some assurance that the Government was



not going to protect itself behind the technical rights of the Crown, which would entitle it to refuse to meet a claim if made by the county councils and local bodies. If these enormous works had been built by a company or private individual, or if it was the case of some great landowner spending a great amount of money in the neighbourhood and injuring the roads, of course, under the extraordinary traffic clauses of an Act passed in 1878 the county council could take the company or landowner into a court of law, and obtain a decision either for or against their claim. But the Crown could defend itself by refusing to be sued. He fully believed the War Office would treat the counties in a fair and honourable manner. This was not a claim with regard to military manœuvres. There had been a long correspondence between the War Office and the counties of Hampshire, Wiltshire, and Dorsetshire with regard to the military manœuvres, and the claim made was recognised up to a point. That controversy was now entirely closed. His case now related to the financial year just closed, and to the estimates of Wiltshire and the neighbouring counties for the financial year on which they had entered. He desired to put the claim with the most extreme moderation, and to add that the county authorities concerned fully realised that there might be a distinction between what might be called the increase of ordinary damage to the roads through the purchase by the War Office of Salisbury Plain, and that extraordinary damage which had been done in the last financial year by the complete destruction of some of their roads by five or six steam machines hauling enormous loads of brick, iron, and timber over them. There were five steam engines at work, each going on a short mileage no less than three times a day. The result was that several roads abundantly sufficient to carry the ordinary traffic of the district; roads on which bicyclists had travelled for many years with great pleasure; had now been completely destroyed, and had become impassable. He had in his possession photographs which were taken last winter showing that these roads were completely destroyed. Anyone looking at the photographs would doubt if roads had ever been there. He was told there was a risk of the answer being given that the claim ought to be made against the contractor employed by the War Office and not against the War Office itself. He demurred to that. The point had been before the law courts in a case where Epsom County Council sued the London County Council. He had taken considerable pains to ascertain the legal aspects of the case. He thought it had now been practically settled that the contractor was not the person against whom the injured authority ought to go, but the person behind the contractor, who was employing him. In this case it was the War Office; but if they went to the War Office they were met with the risk of being told that the War Office represents the Crown, and if they went to the contractor they would be told that the courts of law had decided against the view that he was liable, and that they could not go against him. They might be told that, the Crown having to build these military huts, there would be an increase in the rateable value in future, but he need not remind the Committee that Crown property was not liable to rates. The counties therefore could not expect a single penny in that way. The Crown generally had consented to give a

payment in aid and in lieu of rates, but that payment was not made regularly or at stated periods. He had done his best to ascertain from the parochial authorities to whom such payment would be made whether anything had been paid, but he understood that as yet they had not received any payment in aid. When Salisbury Plain was purchased by the Government there was a long correspondence with the War Office as to what was to happen if the ordinary land in the vicinity were injured in value. In some cases the agricultural land had fallen in value, and the War Office treated the county authorities in a fair and courteous manner. An arrangement was entered into with the Wiltshire County Council which amounted to this. The War Office undertook that they would accept the rateable value of all these hereditaments at the figure at which they stood at the time of the purchase, and if the local ratepayers stood to lose by the arrangement the local authorities would be recouped. That arrangement had not been altogether successfully carried out. He believed that was more or less admitted by the War Office. He had had some conversation on the subject with the former Financial Secretary to the War Office, who explained to him that certain unforeseen difficulties had arisen. He was making no complaint, but he wished to point out that Wiltshire and the neighbouring counties had been, on account of unavoidable circumstances in all these matters, hardly treated in the way of keeping up the rating value. He hoped the War Office would approach the matter in the way he had indicated, and not treat it as a purely technical one. He asked them to approach the question from the point of view of the broad equities, and if they did so there would be every desire on the part of the county authorities to meet them in a similar spirit.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): Perhaps I may be allowed to reply to the questions put by the two last speakers. In regard to the question of the hon. Member for the Cricklade Division, the circumstances are as follow: A meeting was held yesterday between the Treasury valuer and the representatives of the local district boards. He asked anybody to meet him who had any grievance to urge. They came and stated their cases. He put further questions to them, and asked for further information, which they have promised to provide, and when this is received he is going into the case thoroughly. This is a very big question, which involves not one particular district only. It may mean a very great change, and it could not be gone into rashly, nor could any assurance be given on the spur of the moment. The only thing I can tell the noble Lord is that when this report is received at the War Office we shall be perfectly prepared to go into it with the view and the hope of dealing fairly with the neighbourhood. We will certainly not assume at all a non possumus attitude. That is as far as I can possibly go on such a large question as this is. With regard to the question asked by the hon. and gallant Member for East Bristol, who said the increase of £;8,100 was due entirely to the sewage farm at Aldershot, I have to state that that is not quite the case. The extraordinary expenditure on the sewage farm is £;1,500, and that was due to the necessity of increasing it owing to the greater number of troops in the station. That amount includes the apparatus and the necessary stock, and a little more land for the purposes of the farm. The rest of the

expenditure is for the upkeep of the property which has been acquired on Salisbury Plain, and which now comes on to the annual Estimates. The hon. Member asked me with regard to the drainage and sewerage of the new barracks near Ludgershall. I am afraid I am not myself conversant with the district, and I cannot say what plans are to be adopted. When any troops are placed there by the Government everything that possibly can be done will be done to secure not only their health, but the health of the neighbourhood. I cannot give him any definite information as to the plans which are to be put in execution for this purpose. With regard to the incidental expenses, these include the expenses of men sent to make preliminary investigations for any defence works that may be contemplated. I think I have answered all the questions the hon. Member asked.

MR. KENYON (Lancashire, Bury) said he understood that the ordinary pressure of boilers at most of the Government works was only 50 lb. That meant a great extravagance in coal, and he was certain considerable economy could be effected in this matter. The subject was very well worth the attention of the noble Lord. He believed twice or three times the required quantity of coal was being used.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green) called attention to the way in, which the work at barracks in Dublin was being carried out by the contractor, and asked whether any deductions had been made when the contractor employed boy labour instead of adult labour. His complaint was that of fourteen persons employed eight were boys. He presumed that the Government in giving out contracts calculated that they would get value for their money. He had in his hand letters received from the War Office in reply to the complaints made by various societies in Dublin on this matter. An inquiry was promised by the War Office, but when it took place the members of the societies directly interested were ignored altogether, although they asked to be heard. He thought when contracts of this sort were to be given out by the Government they should be advertised in the Labour Gazette, so that the particular trades interested would have an opportunity of keeping their eyes on them and seeing that the terms of the fair wages resolution of this House were carried out. Was the noble Lord aware that this very contractor had an action brought against him by one of his workmen who was doing plastering work, and that the defence made by the contractor was that the man was only a labourer? He could not see that labourers had a right to do skilled work the Government was paying for. The contractor should be made to feel his position in the matter. He admitted that a certain number of boys should be employed on the contract work, but his contention was that the contractor had no right to employ an extraordinary number of boys and to discharge regular workmen.

\*COLONEL LEGGE (St. George's, Hanover Square) called attention to the condition of Ballincollig Barracks, in the Cork district. They were old barracks originally built for infantry, extended for artillery, and occupied for some time past by cavalry. There was a want of proper accommodation for the soldiers, the paving was bad, and the light was bad, there being nothing but oil lamps. It was impossible for the men to groom their horses properly in the morning during the winter months. The barracks were swarming with rats, but that was not an

uncommon thing. He believed the condition of these barracks was by no means a solitary instance. If we wanted recruits it was of the greatest importance that proper attention should be paid to the matter of accommodation. He was perfectly aware that some of the barracks in the United Kingdom, such as those at Aldershot, were model barracks. Foreign attachés and Members of Parliament were taken down there, and the barracks were shown off, but it was the barracks in out-of-the-way places he wished to call attention to. Bad barracks made the men discontented, and it was one of the things that deterred those from entering the service who might otherwise be inclined to do so.

MR. GODDARD (Ipswich) said some explanation ought to be given in regard to the large increase in salaries for Engineers' services. The number of men employed had gone up from 712 last year to 779. He could understand that in times of pressure, when the country was at war, every department of the Army probably required more men. There was this large increase on the permanent staff, notwithstanding the fact that the temporary staff had gone up from 3,000 to 8,700. They did not know in the least what these surveyors were getting, or whether the rate which had been fixed for these particular services had been adhered to. He thought this increase was a very important and very large one; and in view of the fact that more than once during the last few weeks they had heard the expression that they ought to see whether the country got good value for its money, he would move the reduction of this item by £1,000.

Motion made, and question proposed "That Item A (Salaries of the Staff for Engineer Services), be reduced by £1,000." (Mr. Goddard.)

\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford) said that the staff for the engineer services had certainly risen on account of necessary work undertaken; and in connection with the war additional clerks, and also additional military foremen of works, had been rendered necessary in the preparation of hutting accommodation for the troops in South Africa, and in repairs to barracks. The hon. Member must remember that all these questions were settled by warrant, and that the rate of salaries was carefully overhauled, not only by the Treasury, but by the Public Accounts Committee. The hon. Member must therefore feel that his criticisms were entirely uncalled for.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) said that he wished to ask a question in regard to the refugee camps in South Africa.

\*THE CHAIRMAN said that that question did not arise under the present Vote.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton) said he wanted to know whether commissions were paid on the work done, or on the value of the work done? If the commissions were paid on the value of the work done, it was a most extravagant system.

\*MR. BRODRICK said that the commission paid generally was 5 per cent., but in connection with the work on Salisbury Plain an increase had to be made in the agent's salary because the work was not sufficiently remunerative.

AYES.

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

Hayne, Rt. Hn. Chas. Seale-O'Malley, William

Allen, C. P. (Glouc., Stroud)  
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Bell, Richard  
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire  
Power, Patrick Joseph  
Brigg; John  
Joyce, Michael  
Price, Robert John  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Leamy, Edmund  
Reddy, M.  
Caldwell, James  
Leng, Sir John  
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)  
Channing, Francis Allston  
Lloyd-George, David  
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)  
Clancy, John Joseph  
M'Govern, T.  
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel  
Cogan, Denis J.  
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)  
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire  
Craig, Robert Hunter  
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport  
Sullivan, Donal  
Delany, William  
Murphy, J.  
Warner, Thos. Courtenay T.  
Dillon, John  
Nannetti, Joseph P.  
Wason Eugene (Clackmannan  
Doogan, P. C.  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
Weir, James Galloway  
Dunn, Sir William  
Norton, Capt. Cecil William  
White, Patrick (Meath, North)  
Ffrench, Peter  
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)  
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond  
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)  
Flavin, Michael Joseph  
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Mr. Goddard and Mr. Lambert.

Grant, Corrie  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Hayden, John Patrick  
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N  
NOES.  
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex F.  
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn  
Parker, Gilbert  
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte  
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)  
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley  
Allsopp, Hon. George  
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Arkwright, John Stanhope  
Goschen, Hon. George J.  
Pretymann, Ernest George  
Arrol, Sir William  
Green, Walford D (Wednesbury  
Purvis, Robert  
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John  
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsb'ry  
Renshaw, Charles Bine  
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A J. (Manc'r)  
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)  
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge-  
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W (Leeds  
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill  
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson  
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.  
Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lrd G. (Midd'x  
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.  
Bigwood, James  
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'donderry  
Royds, Clement Molyneux  
Blundell, Col. Henry  
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.  
Sackville, Col. S. G Stopford-  
Bowles, Capt. H. F (.Middlesex)  
Harris, Frederick Leverton  
Scott, Sir S (Marylebone, W.)  
Brassey, Albert  
Hay, Hon. Claude George  
Seton-Karr, Henry  
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John  
Hope, J. F (Sheffield, Brightside

Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford),  
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu  
Howard, John (Kent Faversham)  
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)  
Brymer, William Ernest  
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil  
Skewes-Cox, Thomas  
Bull, William James  
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)  
Smith, James Parker (Lanark).  
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.  
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)  
Spear, John Ward  
Cautley, Henry Strother  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)  
Lawson, John Grant  
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart  
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Stroyan, John  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.)  
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.  
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier  
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r)  
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
Chapman, Edward  
Lowe, Francis William  
Thornton, Percy M.  
Charrington, Spencer  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward  
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)  
Valentia, Viscount  
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole  
Macdonald, John Cumming  
Warde, Colonel C. E.  
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas  
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)  
Warr, Augustus Frederick

Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.  
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Ta'nt'n  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akeis-  
M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.)  
Williams, Rt. Hn J Powell- (Birm  
Doxford, Sir William Theodore  
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire  
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord  
Duke, Henry Edward  
Manners, Lord Cecil  
Wills, Sir Frederick  
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.  
Martin, Richard Biddulph  
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)  
Finch, George H.  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy  
Younger, William  
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward A.  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Fletcher, Sir Henry  
Mount, William Arthur  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
Forster, Henry William  
Nicholson, William Graham  
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.  
Nicol, Donald Ninian

Original Question again proposed.

MR. LAMBERT said he could not understand the enormous increase of  
Question put.

The Committee divided; Ayes, 52; Noes, 119. (Division List No. 208.).

£;21,000 which had taken place in the working expenses of the sewage farms. He  
confessed that if he had to do with these farms he would discharge a  
manager who raised the expenditure by something like 70 per cent.

LORD STANLEY said that the increase was due to the size of the sewage farm at  
Aldershot and the growth of the large camp. Other items in the increase were  
owing to taking over a farm at Salisbury Plain, to fencing, repairs, and  
maintenance of large properties at Salisbury and elsewhere. If he found that  
there was any waste of money which could be saved he would be only too glad to  
stop it.



MR. EUGENE WASON (Clackmannan and Kinross) asked whether these sewage farms could not be worked with profit for agricultural purposes.

MR. LAMBERT said that there must have been some mistake in the matter, and that the noble Lord had not given all the facts. The upkeep expense of the estate was enormous. Of course, they knew very well, as the right hon. Gentleman had said, that the sums were small, but it was the small sums that mounted up. He had seen Estimates slip through very easily, and it was owing to the lack of vigilant attention on the part of hon. Members that the Estimates increased. He thought it was their duty to call to account the officials who made out the Estimates.

He could not consent to the large increase in the Vote before the

AYES.

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

Grant, Corrie

O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)

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

Hayden, John Patrick

O'Kelly, James (Roscommon N-

Bell, Richard

Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-

O'Malley, William

Brigg, John

Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir A. D.

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.

Burke, E. Haviland-

Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)

Power, Patrick Joseph

Caldwell, James

Joyce, Michael

Price, Robert John

Channing, Francis Allston

Leamy, Edmund

Redmond, J. E. (Waterford)

Clancy, John Joseph

Leng, Sir John

Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)

Cogan, Denis J.

Lloyd-George, David

Sheehan, Daniel Daniel

Cremer, William Randal

M'Govern, T.

Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh'e

Delany; William

Morgan, J. L. (Carmarthen)

Sullivan, Donal

Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles

Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)

Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.

Dillon, John

Murphy, J.

Weir, James Galloway

Doogan, P. C.

Nannetti, Joseph P.

White, Patrick (Meath, North)

Dunn, Sir William

Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)

Ffrench, Peter

Norton, Capt. Cecil William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Mr. Lambert and Mr. Eugene Wason.

Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond

O' Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)

Flavin, Michael Joseph

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

Goddard, Daniel Ford

O' Connor, James (Wicklow, W.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex F.

Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.

Brymer, William Ernest

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Bigwood, James

Bull, William James

Allsopp, Hon. George

Blundell, Colonel Henry

Cautley, Henry Strother

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Bowles, Capt. B. F. (Middlesex)

Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire

Arrol, Sir William

Brassey, Albert

Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John

Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r

Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W (Leeds

Brookfield, Colonel Montagu

Chapman, Edward

Committee, and he begged to move the reduction of this item by £;100.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item D (Incidental Expenses of War Department, Lands, etc.) be reduced by £;100.";(Mr. Lambert.)

MR. BRODRICK said that the increase had arisen in consequence of certain charges for fencing and for buildings on Salisbury Plain. The hon. Member was quite in error in supposing that he objected to criticism in small sums. What he took

exception to was that, having explained the items, the hon. Member thought it necessary to criticise them again.

MR. ALLEN (Gloucestershire, Stroud) said that the right hon. Gentleman had referred to fences on Salisbury Plain, on which a large amount of money had been spent, but he never saw fences of any kind or description on Salisbury Plain. He could not see the necessity for that expenditure. As regarded the farmhouses, a considerable number of them were allowed to fall into disrepair, and were not used at all. He thought some better explanation ought to have been given.

Question put.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 52; Noes, 115. (Division List No. 209.)

Charrington, Spencer

Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)

Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson

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

Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)

Rolleston, Sir John F. L.

Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse

Law, Andrew Bonar

Royds, Clement Molyneux

Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole

Lawson, John Grant

Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-

Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas

Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage

Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)

Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)

Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S

Seton-Karr, Henry

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-

Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S

Sharpe, William Edward T.

Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore

Lowe, Francis William

Sinclair, Louis (Romford)

Duke, Henry Edward

Loyd, Archie Kirkman

Skewes-Cox, Thomas

Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.

Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)

Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks.)

Finch, George H.

Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth

Spear, John Ward

Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne

MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.

Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)

Fisher, William Hayes  
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool  
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart  
Fitzroy, Hon. Edw. Algernon  
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)  
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier  
Fletcher, Sir Henry  
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinb'rg'h W.  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
Forster, Henry William  
M'Killop, Jas. (Stirlingshire)  
Thornton, Percy M.  
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.  
Manners, Lord Cecil  
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward  
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn  
Martin; Richard Biddulph  
Valentia, Viscount  
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Warde, Colonel C. E.  
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim  
Moon, Edw. Robert Pacy  
Warr, Augustus Frederick  
Green, Walford D. (Wednesb'y  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (T'nt'n)  
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)  
Mount, William Arthur  
Williams, Rt. Hn. J. Powell- (Bir.  
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill  
Nicholson, William Graham  
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord  
Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G. (Mid'x  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Wills, Sir Frederick  
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'derry  
Parker, Gilbert  
Wilson, A. S. (York, E. R.)  
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.  
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert W.  
Wilson, John (Glasgow).  
Harris, Frederick Leverton

Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-  
Hay, Hon. Claude George  
Pretymann, Ernest George  
Heaton, John Henniker  
Purvis, Robert

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

Hope, J. F (Sheffield, Brightside  
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne  
Howard, John (Kent, Faversham  
Renshaw, Charles Bine

Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil  
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge

Original Question again proposed.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he desired to call attention to Item 74 in the Vote, which he understood to refer to civil engineers, for the reason that "regular" engineers had already been dealt with under another head. He desired to have some information with regard to the accommodation of the refugee camps which had been founded in various parts of the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony.

Reports had come to this country which reflected the greatest discredit upon those responsible for the condition of these camps, and he thought something more should be done for the comfort of the unfortunate refugees. The figures given by the Secretary for War disclosed a really appalling state of things.

There was a terrible rate of mortality among the children. The right hon.

Gentleman had said that from February the number of children that had died was 261 out of 1,100 in the camps. Was that from the 1st of February or the end of February, and up to what date? These unfortunate people were carted across the country to these refugee camps, and when they arrived there was no accommodation for them; they were huddled together

in huts or tents, and when rain came these places were swamped, and these wretched people were often obliged to be in the wet, and the result was this terrible mortality. The answer given by the right hon. Gentleman seemed to indicate that from a certain date in February up to 21st March 261 children had died. If that was so the death-rate among them was something like 250 per thousand. That must be due to the fact that there was insufficient shelter at these camps. He did not suggest that the Government was altogether to blame. The camps were set up in a great hurry, but these people had now to face the winter, and they were greatly dependent on the charity of America, Holland, and other countries to keep body and soul together, and that in the refugee camps under our flag. Whatever might be done with regard to the men, it was beneath the dignity of a great country like this to inflict any hardship on women and children. He made no insinuation that this was done intentionally, and he was prepared to admit that our soldiers would go any length to prevent the people incurring these hardships, but there was a duty on the part of the Government in this matter. He desired to know what steps were being taken to stop this appalling mortality and to repair the deficiency of

accommodation. Lord Kitchener had allowed independent witnesses to visit these camps as far as Bloemfontein, but no one had been allowed to visit the camps in the Transvaal. From that he was afraid it must be assumed that the state of things in the Transvaal was worse. He begged to move the reduction of the vote by £;100.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Items L, M, N (New Works, etc.) be reduced by £;100, in respect of Engineer Services in the Field of South Africa."  
";(Mr. Lloyd-George.)

MR. DILLON said he felt grateful to the hon. Member for raising this question before the adjournment. It seemed to him a horrible thing to adjourn for the vacation without endeavouring to extract from the Government some definite statement upon this subject. The hon. Member for Carnarvon had pointed out that Lord Kitchener had; allowed independent witnesses to examine these camps; but he wanted to point out this extraordinary matter, that while the right hon.

Gentleman in this House had more than once assured the House that the women and children were comfortable and well cared for, it was perfectly plain that Lord Kitchener, even in the case of the witnesses who went up as far as Bloemfontein, would not allow them to publish anything of what they saw. So that while there had percolated through different channels details of the accommodation of the women and children in these camps, and while they heard the figures, which he hesitated to believe without explanation, so horrible a state of things did they show, the House was entirely without any account from the witnesses who had been allowed to visit these places by Lord Kitchener. He wished to know whether the ordinary comforts which common humanity would dictate were being allowed to these unwilling inmates. Why should not Lord Kitchener not allow these independent persons to give expression to what they witnessed? When people went to these camps for humane objects why were they not allowed to publish a statement of what they had seen? The Committee were in this

position: they had nothing whatever to go upon except these letters from Dutch people and the figures of the right hon. Gentleman. He had himself received letters from Holland declaring that women and children were huddled together in cattle-trucks and brought down to these various camps under circumstances of great hardship. If the statements in these letters were true no language could be too strong to denounce such atrocities. He should have thought that when such stories were in circulation the Government, in their own interests, would have sent out charitable people to visit the camps and give the public an impartial account of the actual state of affairs. The right hon. Gentleman declared that these camps were camps of refuge in the true sense of the word, and that the people were free to come and go as they chose. An answer given a few days previously, however, threw a certain amount of doubt on that statement, because it was then stated that the people in these camps could visit even the neighbouring towns only by permission and with a pass. He desired to know whether the people were really free to come and go as they chose, or whether, as he had heard, the camp at Port Elizabeth was surrounded with barbed wire and guarded by sentries, and was in fact a prison. Over and over again, in reply to questions with regard to the condition of these camps, the right hon. Gentleman

had said he was unable to give any information. Would the right hon. Gentleman give the Committee his own views with regard to the figures of the mortality in these camps? If there was any doubt as to their significance, would he cable at once to Cape Colony and Pretoria, insisting upon some accurate statement being sent? Further, why did the Government object to allow humane people, who had taken no part in the controversies with regard to the war; of whom there were hundreds of thousands in this country; who would be ready to start at once to go out and visit these camps, to organise relief, and to write home to the Press the honest truth in regard to the matter? If, as Lord Kitchener said, the women and children were well looked after, was it not better that it should be known? On the other hand, if these accounts were true, he did not believe there was a man in the House who would not be glad that the truth should come out in order that things might be remedied.

\*MR. BRODRICK: I am perfectly ready, whether on this Vote or any other, to enter into any question which can properly be brought within the compass of the Vote, and as money is being taken for engineers' services, and it is out of my power to say that engineers' services in South Africa may not have been used in some way in the erection of these camps, I cannot say that a discussion on these camps is outside the Vote. At the same time, for the convenience of Parliament. I would venture to call attention to a practice which I think is growing, and which is in itself undesirable from the point of view of the House of Commons; the practice of bringing forward, on Votes on which perhaps they might not be anticipated, serious questions of this kind without any notice at all. I speak entirely from the point of view of the convenience of the House. It is perfectly immaterial to me when they are brought on, but I cannot come down here with the whole of the archives of the War Office stacked in a room so that I can call for or produce them. Nor is it possible; and I make no apology for it; with the immense labour I have at present to undergo, for me to remember all the statistics I have given in reply to the thirty or forty questions addressed to me daily in the House. Therefore, it would be more advantageous to the House if, on these questions which are argued wholly upon statistics, and in regard to which, of course, it is desirable the statistics should be as accurate as possible, hon. Members would exercise a little special courtesy by giving the Minister in charge, at all events, a few hours' notice. At this particular moment I cannot for the life of me say even what the statistics are, because the only copy is in the possession of the hon. Member opposite. But I can assure the House that I am fully seized of the circumstances of these camps. I think hon. Members opposite sometimes hardly weigh the circumstances under which these camps have been established and maintained. In the first place, why are they established?

To a very large extent they are established for two of three classes of persons. One class are the women and children, who are unable to maintain themselves in the present state of the country in their own dwellings, and who come into these camps for refuge, to be fed, and to have protection against Kaffirs. The second class are women and children from parts of the country which have been used as depots and halting places by Boer commandoes, and which have to be cleared out

in the ordinary course of military operations. Finally, you have; notably in Cape Colony; a certain number of women and children who have been found to be in communication with the enemy, and who have had therefore to be removed from their own districts. In all these cases, we; or, rather, the military authorities, for we have given them no injunctions on this particular matter; have had to undertake these liabilities in a country in which, to a large extent, every article of food, and everything that is necessary, has to be brought up from the base. One must remember the difficulties under these circumstances of bringing up supplies, not only for an immense force in the field, but also for 20,000 or 30,000 or 40,000 individuals who have, either placed themselves or have had to be placed under our charge. Hon. Members, of course, fall back upon the statistics which I have furnished to the House. I might perhaps say that many erroneous and unfounded inferences have been drawn in recent discussions from the absence of particular statistics. It is not possible in reply to a question to make plain the general position. The general position in the matter is this. The officers in South Africa are worked up to the extreme limit of their powers at the present time. You cannot scrutinise a variety of different items by telegraphic communications. Not a day passes but demands for information are made upon me either by Members on the other side of the House, who think the conduct of our commanders in the field may have been defective, or by Members on my own side of the House, who think the Boer leaders have shown less consideration than they might have shown towards our soldiers. All these inquiries involve statistics; they mean endless demands for returns. To supply these statistics with an army of 250,000 men in the field, scattered over an area as large as that of France and Spain together, naturally makes an extreme demand upon the powers of all our officers. For that reason it is often impossible to get for several days the reply to a simple question even by telegraphing, more especially as the officers themselves are constantly moving about in the pursuance of the campaign. So far from concealing anything, I have been giving to the House with regard to these camps the statistics as rapidly as they have come into my possession. Let the House remember the circumstances under which these camps were first formed. They were formed principally in the months of January or February. In the month of January our communications were cut by General De Wet. The incursion of General De Wet involved the diversion of a very considerable force not only from the Orange Free State, but even from the Transvaal, in order to check the advance into Cape Colony; an advance which had been so ably planned, but which we are glad to think was so well frustrated by Lord Kitchener. That involved an absolute dislocation of traffic. It was at the moment when all these troops were being moved, when every kind of store was required to be brought up, when the line was constantly being put out of action in one place or another, for eight or twelve hours at a time, causing a most hopeless congestion of traffic; it was just at this time that these camps, involving 15,000 or 20,000 people, had to be formed at different places. I believe there was no occasion on which at any of these camps food actually ran short for a single day. I do not attempt to say that the original accommodation under these circumstances was all that we should



have desired. No doubt there were hardships. But war is war.

MR. DILLON: But you should not make it on women and children.

\*MR. BRODRICK: I have no doubt that in the fulness of their hearts some hon. Members believe that war can be war qua soldiers, and that war can be something other than war qua the inhabit-

ants of the country. But that is impossible. There must and will be great hardships to be borne by the inhabitants of a country in which war is being carried on. But I say, further, that I do not believe there is in history any case in which an invading army has endeavoured to feed the inhabitants of the country invaded as we have done.

MR. DILLON: But you burnt their food first.

\*MR. BRODRICK: Of course. The supplies of the enemy are always destroyed. In every war the first thing to do is to prevent the enemy obtaining the necessary supplies and forming a base from which to make an attack. I cannot imagine a greater impeachment of Lord Kitchener than would be contained in the fact that he left the enemy the supplies with which they could advance and attack his own troops. Obviously, the first thing you have to do is to make matters as difficult for the enemy as you possibly can under the laws of war. One of the laws of war is that you have an absolute right to deprive the enemy of his supplies and anything of that sort. For the inhabitants this prolongation of a hopeless war must be a matter of hardship. We have endeavoured by all the means in our power to mitigate that hardship, by providing adequate food and, as far as possible, the necessaries of life for these people. I do not contend that the food or the accommodation in any way represents luxury. It cannot be that it should. But we have given to our prisoners and the refugees the same rations that we have given to our own soldiers in the field. We cannot do more. Every British soldier has a right to as much as is given to a prisoner or refugee. All I can say is this. I have heard from both sides; I have had a good deal of correspondence with those who have been in South Africa; I have heard of the original state of the camps being in some cases unsatisfactory, although I could not admit the justice of the deduction which the hon. Member for Carnarvon has drawn from some of the statistics; but I have heard nothing but a consensus of opinion from both sides that there has been an immense improvement in these camps as the circumstances of

the war have permitted it. That is our desire. I have been asked as a last question why we do not allow the hundreds of thousands of people mentioned by the hon. Member for East Mayo to go out from this country to organise relief.

MR. DILLON: What I said was, Why were not some people allowed to go out from this country? I described the class from which they might be drawn, namely, those who had not taken an active part on either side in the war controversy, of whom I said there were hundreds of thousands.

\*MR. BRODRICK: Our position with regard to sending out relief of this character is this. The philanthropic people of this country are willing to subscribe money for providing necessaries for these unfortunate people who by the accidents of war have found themselves obliged to leave their homes and to collect in these camps. We are only too glad to welcome the distribution of these funds. We think

that by means of local committees, on which the Dutch element can be represented, very valuable work may be done. We think that these committees should be formed inside the camps in many instances; but we are not desirous of seeing a large number of individuals going out and travelling up country, and placing themselves for this or any other purpose in a country for which at this moment we are responsible under military law. Every person who goes up has to be fed; every pound of luggage that they take means delaying something else which might be sent up for another purpose, and this on a single line of railway, crowded with stores and munitions of war, and with horses and troops going up for reliefs or other purposes. This is no exaggerated picture. The authorities even at Cape Town have issued the fullest possible injunction that nobody who is not employed in the war is welcome at this moment in South Africa. There is now an enormous population employed by the war; they have to be fed and provided for, and we are not desirous of any increase in the number. But we shall be very glad to welcome any relief which can be given by money administered by proper local committees. May I just say before I sit down that we entirely dissociate ourselves from any

suggestion that we are anxious to make the circumstances of the war more onerous to the refugees than they are at present. On the contrary, we have shown by every means in our power that we desire to mitigate their lot. We desire from every point of view that these people should be well treated, and that every means should be used to mitigate their lot. But at the same time we shall not in consequence of the attacks of hon. Gentlemen opposite, or for any other reason whatever, take any step which will tend towards the prolongation of the war. We are not going to invite people who have been in communication with the enemy in the past to come where they can resume communication with the enemy again. So long as the war lasts those places which have been used as bases for military operations by the enemy or have formed resting places for commandos must be kept clear, and no argument based on the fact that this must cause suffering to the inhabitants will induce a change of policy that will cause more suffering to our own troops and prolongation of hostilities. I know that in the long run the best and most humane course which we as a Government can adopt is to take all steps within the laws of war which in the shortest possible time will tend to bring about the termination of this war, the continuation of which we all so deeply deplore.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE thought no complaint could be made against the hon. Member for Carnarvon because he had availed himself of one of the few opportunities Members had for raising such questions. Nearly the whole time of the House and the Committee was taken up by the Government, and therefore he thought such rare opportunities as the present one might legitimately be taken advantage of to call attention to facts which under the old procedure of this House could have been brought forward in the ordinary course of business. The right hon. Gentleman had delivered a friendly lecture or sermon on the inconvenience of raising questions that might embarrass the Government, but there was a time when the right hon. Gentleman did not scruple to bring forward any question at any time and in any manner to embarrass the Government. He

assured

the House that he was not going to follow the bad example which the right hon.

Gentleman used to set to the House in those days.

MR. BRODRICK: What does the noble Lord mean? Will he kindly give me the dates of the occasions he alludes to?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE said it was in the years 1882, 1883, and 1884, when he himself held the office of Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs.

MR. BRODRICK: In those years I never touched foreign affairs.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE said he was not speaking about foreign affairs, but about the general business of the House. He was alluding to the general conduct of those hon. Members who sat at that time on the Front Opposition Bench and upon the Opposition bench below the gangway.

MR. BRODRICK: I never sat on either of those benches at that time.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE said the right hon. Gentleman must have sat somewhere.

He thought nobody had any right to complain of the hon. Member for Carnarvon for bringing forward this question under circumstances which the right hon.

Gentleman would not have hesitated to have taken advantage of in past years. He desired to say, however, that although he thought the hon. Member for Carnarvon was justified in raising this subject, he would not advise a division being taken, for the statement of the right hon. Gentleman, under the circumstances, was a perfectly fair and reasonable one. The Secretary of State for War had pointed out that he had had no notice that this question was going to be brought forward, and he had told the House that it was impossible for a member of the Government in charge of a very heavily worked Department to give a full and satisfactory answer to inquiries of this kind unless he had sufficient time allowed him to obtain full information. He thought his hon. friend the Member for Carnarvon had attained his object in directing public attention to the grave facts

he had stated to the House, which were undoubtedly causing a very unfavourable impression not only in many parts of this country but also abroad. There was a great deal of hostile public opinion abroad, and foreigners were too anxious to make the most of everything detrimental to this country. There could be no doubt that a painful impression had been created by stories circulated by those who were unscrupulous in the expression of feelings of hostility to this country, and we could not wholly disregard the public opinion of Europe. The answer and explanation might be summed up in the phrase of the right hon. Gentleman that horrors were the necessary accompaniments of war. He had himself been witness of such horrors when acting as commissioner at the Turkish refugee camp, when the inhabitants were driven by the Russians across the Balkans. Then, as now, he recognised that these horrors were the necessary consequences of war before which humanity felt helpless. He felt certain that an inquiry would be made, and that whatever was humanly possible would be done by the right hon. Gentleman and his colleagues. However much they might differ about the causes of this war, after all they were all Englishmen; [Nationalist cries of "No, no," and Ministerial laughter]; well, they were all subjects of his Majesty the King, and they believed that no British Government would desire that there should be any

inhumanity or cruelty which could possibly be avoided. The right hon. Gentleman had promised that every inquiry would be made, and he had given the Committee the assurance that upon some future occasion he would be prepared to give every information on this subject. Therefore he thought the reply of the right hon.

Gentleman was quite satisfactory.

MR. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam) said the noble Lord had thrown his &#x00E6;gis over the hon. Members below the gangway opposite to very little purpose. He himself had been a Member of the House in the period referred to by the noble Lord, and he remembered that at that time they used to challenge the Government of the day by fair votes of censure, with full notice, on their foreign policy, a thing which the present Opposition in the imperfect state of its structural organism was physically incapable of doing. The noble Lord's argument rested upon a hopeless fallacy; namely, that what was called Government time on Supply nights was Government time, and not private Members' time. Theoretically it might be so, but practically and substantially the whole of it was private Members' time, and it was because of the incapacity of the Opposition to organise themselves as an effective force in the State that such accusations as these were made in circumstances under which they could not be answered. The noble Lord had referred to foreign opinion, and yet fostered the practice of making statements of this sort under circumstances under which they could not be answered. The noble Lord had told the Committee that he had travelled abroad under Her Majesty's Commission. He, too, had travelled abroad with Her Majesty's Commission; he was in Belgium in December, when the House was sitting, and he remembered how in the Belgian newspapers everything that was said in this House by the critics of the Government was set forth in spicy paragraphs isolated from the context, so that the result should be the worst for the reputation of this country. Those spicy paragraphs were generally headed "The English painted by themselves." The noble Lord appeared to be more Welsh and more Irish than the hon. Members below the gangway, and he doubted whether he had rendered them any great service. Such was the practice to which the noble Lord had lent the protection of his high parliamentary authority. Such questions as this rested very largely on details and statistics; there was opportunity to give notice of them, and if that opportunity was not taken great injustice was done.

\*MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.) said he understood that what the House and the country were interested in, and what this discussion turned upon, was the practical question whether those refuge camps could be so conducted as to minimise the terrible sufferings of the women and children who were being forced into these camps. No one could doubt he was one of those who firmly believed that the officers who had charge

of those camps had acted, and intended to act, with the utmost mercy and consideration towards the people in those camps. The fault did not lie with them. He thought his hon. friend the Member for Carnarvon would be justified in pressing his Amendment, because he did not think that the speech of the right hon. Gentleman had sufficiently cleared up the matter or thrown enough light upon it. The figures of the mortality amongst the children recently admitted by

the right hon. Gentleman in reply to a question were simply appalling. He was astonished to hear from the right hon. Gentleman that he was not aware of many of the facts recently disclosed, although he had had the advantage of a great deal of correspondence from persons on the spot. He wished to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he was not aware that one of the chief causes of the terrible mortality among children in these camps was the absolute impossibility of providing the fuel necessary for cooking food, and that much of the food had to be consumed in a practically raw state. The right hon. Gentleman had said the women and children were being treated as well as the British troops, and this might well be so, for they knew of the terrible sufferings of the troops in the hospitals, and that those scandals had largely been due to the failure to bring up proper supplies and equipment and to the gross mismanagement of the railway line from Cape Town to Bloemfontein.

\*MR. BRODRICK: The Commission denied that there had been gross mismanagement.

\*MR. CHANNING said he had listened to the speeches of the hon. Member for Westminster upon this question, and they were quite sufficient to convince him that there had been gross mismanagement. He had seen letters from officers with General Rundle's forces in one part of the campaign where those poor men were forced to fight day after day upon half a biscuit a day. No doubt this was largely due to official mismanagement and miscalculation. When this war had been so prolonged, and these poor women and children had been kept in camps in these conditions, Members had the right to challenge the right hon. Gentleman to lay before them the facts that would justify them in passing these Votes. They had a right to insist that some steps should be taken to mitigate these evils in the future. The whole cause of this trouble was that nine of these families out of ten never need have left their homes. What was to blame was that their homes had been destroyed and they had been driven out by the same ruthless policy that had brought about all this misery and human suffering.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS (Carnarvonshire, Eifion) said the Secretary of State for War had omitted to deal with one point which had been pressed on his attention; namely, the complaints that women and children were kept in the camps against their will. He hoped the omission was due to inadvertence; if not, one could only conclude that the complaints were well founded. He hoped they would be given some assurance that it was a fact that these women would be allowed to leave the camps if they chose to do so. He had been informed that a large number of these women and children would be readily taken out of the camps by Dutch sympathisers in Cape Colony, and would be provided for if they were permitted to leave the camps. He had heard complaints made that the military authorities would not permit money to be remitted to South Africa for the purpose of alleviating the hardships and miseries of the people in these camps. He hoped the Secretary of State for War would be able to give them a satisfactory assurance that all money, whether subscribed here or in Holland, would be readily transmitted for this purpose. The right hon. Gentleman had justified the existence of these camps on the ground that they were a military necessity. He had said that war was war, and always resulted in the hardships which had been brought to the attention of the Committee. He thought that was an extreme

statement. He did not think refugee camps, denudation of the country, destruction of farm buildings, supplies, and standing crops were features of the Franco-German War. [An HON. MEMBER: Yes they were.] There was no removal of the inhabitants and non-combatants in that war, nor in any other European war. It was not so in the Danish War, nor in the Peninsular War. [Cries of "Yes."] The American precedent had been cited, but that was really not a case in point at all. That was fifty years ago, and he thought they would agree that humanity and civilisation had made some progress since the American Civil War. They had had within the last two years the Hague Convention, which had met in order to formulate and stereotype rules in relation to such matters as they were now discussing, which were absolutely prohibited under the rules drawn up two years ago. [Cries of "No, no."] In support of this assertion the hon. Member quoted several of the articles drawn up at the Hague Convention. There was absolutely no meaning in the sections he had read if private property could be confiscated whenever they liked. Under Article 53 of the Convention even private property which was taken for military necessity must be restored at the conclusion of peace and an indemnity paid for it. In these circumstances it was not very ingenuous for those gentlemen who knew what the rules were to say that private property could be confiscated.

MR. STUART WORTLEY dissented.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS said the hon. Gentleman delivered a speech which was irrelevant from beginning to end. He recognised that it would be impossible to allow anybody who chose to visit the camps, but there would be no inconvenience in allowing half-a-dozen or a dozen people accredited by the friends of the Dutch to go there. The hon. Gentleman had spoken as if those who asked an independent investigation of the camps wished some thousands of people to be sent, but nobody expected that even a dozen would be required. Those who asked for an independent investigation had been treated as if they suggested that the hardships endured by the people had been wantonly and willingly inflicted. Nobody had suggested anything of the kind, but what they said was that a little carelessness, a little over-attention to the necessities of war, and too little attention to the consequences attendant on the war, might have resulted in hardships. What was wanted was that the exigencies of war should not be allowed to interfere with the dictates and the calls of humanity.

When we had regard to the fact that we had stolen all the private property of the combatants among the enemy, it was strange that any gentleman in this House should claim credit because we fed the women and children. If a man swindled another of his entire property it would be little credit to him if he afterwards gave a dole to the wife and family of the man he had swindled. The right hon. Gentleman mentioned the causes why these people had been removed from their homes. One was that they had been in communication with the enemy. Was that a cause for removing women from their husbands, fathers, brothers, and fellow-countrymen? These women were living in their own country. They were not spies who had been removed into the refugee camps. Of course it was impossible to prevent them from getting information. He supposed that no army had ever invaded another country without being subjected to the inconvenience of the inhabitants

giving information. That was part of the necessary difficulties in connection with every invasion, and because these necessary difficulties had occurred in South Africa that was given as a reason why a policy of Weylerism should be resorted to in civilised warfare.

MR. FULLER (Wiltshire, Westbury) said it had been admitted that great hardships existed in the refugee camps. He earnestly appealed to his hon. friend the Member for Carnarvon not to press his Amendment to a division, in view of the promise of the Secretary for War that the women and children would be properly cared for so far as the necessities of war allowed.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he would very much like to respond to the appeal not to press the Amendment. If the Secretary of State for War had confined himself purely to the question addressed to him, and had not gone into the general policy of the refugee camps, he thought he would have responded to the appeal. He felt the justice of the complaint of the Secretary of State for War that this question had been sprung upon him without notice. Notice ought to have been given, and he regretted that he had not foreseen that this debate would arise.

He could not accept the right hon. Gentleman's view in regard to the whole policy pursued in connection with the refugee camps, and therefore he was driven to the division lobby to protest against that policy. He had to call attention some time ago to the treatment of the wives and children of men who were out on commando, and although the Secretary of State for War at the time indignantly denied the complaint which was brought on the authority of The Times, he afterwards made inquiry, and as the result of his investigation he put a stop to what was complained of. Therefore, he thought there would be very good ground merely on that account for believing that the right hon. Gentleman would do everything in his power to see that these camps were conducted with due regard to humanity. He had given his honest assurance that so far as he was concerned he meant to see that the war was carried on with the utmost humanity possible. The hon. Member for the Hallam Division had complained of the action of those who called attention to this without notice, because it was a means of discrediting our country abroad. He did not see what difference notice would make in so far as discrediting the country abroad was concerned. If he had quoted anything which was not within the knowledge of the Secretary of State for War there would have been a good deal of justice in what the hon. Member said, but he had confined himself exclusively to quoting answers which the right hon. Gentleman had himself given in the House.

MR. BRODRICK dissented, and was understood to say that the hon. Member's argument was based on statements contained in answers which had been misinterpreted.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said if the right hon. Gentleman gave an answer in the House of Commons which was capable of an interpretation other than that which was meant he must not blame the Opposition if the Continental journals put the wrong interpretation on the answer. He had quoted the official report in Hansard of the answer which was given to the House. That was what appeared in the Continental journals, and the right hon. Gentleman had been subjected by the hon. Member for the Hallam Division to the terrible

imputation of discrediting and slandering his country abroad. If they were not to call attention to any of these things lest the gutter press of Paris, Belgium, and elsewhere should misconstrue their action, and tear their words away from the context, what would be the use of the House of Commons at all? They were sometimes told in this House that the guns of the artillery were not good, that the rifles were not good, that the ammunition was worthless, and that the Navy was armed with muzzle-loading guns. If the Continental press began to quote these criticisms from men who belonged to the profession which was specially patriotic, it would say that the British Navy was not good, and that the British Army was worthless. The men who made the criticisms would be liable to the charge that they were discrediting their country in the eyes of the world. Criticism became impossible if such puerile suggestions were allowed to be made. After all, the Continent was not governed by this wretched press, which the right hon. Gentleman thought it worth while to quote in the House. What we had to consider was the opinion of the more rational people abroad. What precipitated the row between Spain and America was in a great measure the question of the treatment of the reconcentrados in the camps. Who was doing the greatest

AYES.

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

Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.

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

Lambert, George

Power, Patrick Joseph

Ashton, Thomas Gair

Leamy, Edmund

Price, Robert John

Bell, Richard

Leng, Sir John

Redmond, John E. (Waterford)

Brigg, John

M'Govern, T.

Rickett, J. Compton

Burke, E. Haviland-

Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)

Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)

Caldwell, James

Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)

Sheehan, Daniel Daniel

Channing, Francis Allston

Murphy, J.

Sinclair, Capt John (Forfarshire)

Clancy, John Joseph

Nannetti, Joseph P.

Sullivan, Donal



Craig, Robert Hunter  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan  
Cremer, William Randal  
Norton, Capt. Cecil William  
Weir, James Galloway  
Delany, William  
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)  
White, Patrick (Meath, North)  
Doogan, P. C.  
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)  
Ffrench, Peter  
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Mr. Lloyd-George and Mr. Dillon.  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Grant, Corrie  
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N)  
Hayden, John Patrick  
O'Malley, William  
NOES.  
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.  
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John  
Charrington, Spencer  
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte  
Brookfield, Col. Montagu  
Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.  
Allsopp, Hon. George  
Brymer, William Ernest  
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Arkwright, John Stanhope  
Bull, William James  
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole  
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John  
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.  
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas  
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W (Leeds  
Cautley, Henry Strother  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.  
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)  
Crossley, Sir Savile  
Bigwood, James  
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Blundell, Colonel Henry

Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc')  
Doxford, Sir William Theodore  
Brassey, Albert  
Chapman, Edward  
Duke, Henry Edward

service to the country; the man who threw his weight over the Secretary of State for War and tried to keep back information from the House of Commons, or those who were doing their best to improve the condition of the refugees? The facts could not be withheld. There was no doubt that constant communication between the Continent and South Africa was going on, and he had no doubt the information would be exaggerated to a large extent. That was why he thought it was important that they should get the real facts in the House of Commons from Ministers. The best answer to any slander circulated on the Continent was to get the real facts in the House of Commons. Anyone who had the interest of the country at heart should rather welcome any discussion which elicited the facts on the question.

MR. NANNETTI said he had not received a reply to the question he asked earlier in the evening about the barracks in Dublin.

\*THE CHAIRMAN said that could not be raised on the Vote now before the Committee. The hon. Member could ask the question afterwards.  
Question put.

The Committee divided:; Ayes, 46; Noes, 123. (Division List No. 210.)

Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward  
Lawson, John Grant  
Ropner, Colonel Robert  
Finch, George H.  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Royds, Clement Molyneux  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Leveson-Gower, Fredk. N. S.  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (Bristol, S.  
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W-)  
FitzGerald, Sir R. Penrose-  
Lowe, Francis William  
Seton-Karr, Henry  
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)  
Fletcher, Sir Henry  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)  
Skewes-Cox, Thomas  
Fuller, J. M. F.  
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth  
Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks.)

Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.  
Macdona, John Cumming  
Spear, John Ward  
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin&Nairn  
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)  
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.  
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier  
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.  
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim  
Manners, Lord Cecil  
Thornton, Percy M.  
Green, Walford D (Wednesb'ry)  
Martin, Richard Biddulph  
Tollemache, Henry James  
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)  
Maxwell, WJH (Dumfriesshire  
Valentia, Viscount  
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Greville, Hon. Ronald  
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy  
Warde, Col. C. E.  
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.  
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Ld G (Midd'x  
Mount, William Arthur  
Webb, Col. William George  
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nderry  
Nicholson, William Graham  
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. CE (Taunt'n  
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert W.  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Whiteley, H. (Ashton un. Lyne  
Harris, Frederick Leverton  
Parker, Gilbert  
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord  
Hay, Hon. Claude George  
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley  
Wills, Sir Frederick  
Heaton, John Henniker

Penn, John  
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)  
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield Bright side  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh.)  
Pretymann, Ernest George  
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)  
Hozier, John James Hy. Cecil  
Purvis, Robert  
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-  
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)  
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)  
Renshaw, Charles Bine  
Younger, William  
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)  
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
Keswick, William  
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. T.  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.

Original Question again proposed.

LORD STANLEY said he had not got the particulars at the present moment as to the case of the contractor referred to by the hon. Member, but the matter was being inquired into, and he could assure the hon. Member that if a mistake had happened he would be happy to rectify it.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE said he wished to direct attention to the fact that proper provision had not been made for the families of the garrison regiments at Gibraltar and Malta. The troops of the garrison regiments were going out to the Mediterranean stations under circumstances utterly different from those in which they had enlisted. The men were to be allowed to take out their wives and families; for it was well known that it was a very bad thing to separate soldiers from their wives and families. But at Gibraltar 50 per cent. of the families had to be left behind; and at Malta it was impossible to accommodate the wives and families of the garrison. Not only that, the accommodation of the single soldier was bad, not only in quantity but in quality. He hoped the Secretary of State for War would give some satisfactory answer as to the provision that was to be made for the accommodation of the wives and families of the men of the garrison regiments.

MR. GODDARD said he wished to draw attention to a most important matter in connection with the financial arrangements of the War Office. He noticed that there was a growing tendency to make use of certain Votes for other purposes than those for which they had been granted. In looking over the Votes he

discovered that in no fewer than twenty-two cases money voted for certain uses had been transferred to other Votes. That system naturally led to extravagance. It was a dangerous policy, and in order to show his objection to it, he moved to reduce the Vote by £;100.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Items L, M, N (New Works, etc.) be reduced by £;100, in respect of Boat and Ireland Island Sea Walls and Piers Repair, Storm Damages.";(Mr. Goddard.)

\*MR. BRODRICK said he had not a word of apology to say as to their conduct under the system against which the hon. Gentleman protested. If there was an urgent service which

had not got parliamentary sanction, were they to wait fifteen months until they obtained parliamentary sanction? A Minister was in the House to take responsibility, and so long as he held his present office the criticisms of the hon. Member opposite would not deter him from taking that responsibility. As to the question put by the hon. Member for East Bristol he had to say that the War Office had endeavoured, and with some success, both at Gibraltar and Malta, to extend the accommodation for the wives and children of the soldiers of the garrison regiments. He hoped also that when things settled down in South Africa and a garrison was stationed there the same class of soldier would be found sufficient for garrison purposes, and also for laying the foundation of good settlers in that country. The hon. Member for Lichfield had made an attack on him which was, he thought, not only unmerited, but discourteous. He had complained of an answer he had given with reference to desertions from garrison regiments, and had said that Ministerial replies were intended to be evasive, and that there was no intention of giving a direct answer. The hon. Gentleman was entirely in error. He had answered every question put to him during the session, and had made the answer, of which the hon. Gentleman complained in all good faith, on the information supplied to him.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER said he thought the right hon. Gentleman quite misunderstood him, and he was glad to hear that further accommodation was to be given to the married men of the

AYES.

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

Griffith, Ellis J.

O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)

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

Hayden, John Patrick

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

Ashton, Thomas Gair

Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir A. D.

O'Malley, William

Brigg, John

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

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.

Burke, E. Haviland-

Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)

Power, Patrick Joseph  
Caldwell, James  
Lambert, George  
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)  
Channing, Francis Allston  
Leamy, Edmund  
Rickett, J. Compton  
Clancy, John Joseph  
M'Govern, T.  
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)  
Craig, Robert Hunter  
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)  
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel  
Cremer, William Randal  
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)  
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R. (N'th'nts)  
Delany, William  
Murphy, J.  
Sullivan, Donal  
Dillon, John  
Nannetti, Joseph P.  
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)  
Doogan, P. C.  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
White, Patrick (Meath, North)  
Elibank, Master of  
Norton, Capt. Cecil William  
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)  
Ffrench, Peter  
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Mr. Goddard and Mr. Warner.  
Fuller, J. M. F.  
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)  
Grant, Corrie

O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)

garrison regiments of the Mediterranean. What he objected to was not the system, but the abuse of the system.

MR. ALLEN said he thought a better explanation should be given of such large increases, because otherwise the Committee would lose its hold over the Estimates, especially at a time when they were all so economical.

MR. WEIR (ROSS and Cromarty) said the hon. Member for Ipswich was only doing his duty in calling attention to the matter before the Committee. He wished to know whether the sum of £3,100 would complete the work at Ireland Island, or would the Treasury at a later stage have to provide further funds at the request of the Secretary of State for War. It was their duty to protest against a system under which a Minister went to the Treasury and obtained unlimited supplies of

money.

LORD STANLEY said that the sum asked for would complete the work. The damage was done by a hurricane, which visited the island without the sanction of the Treasury.

MR. GODDARD said he thought it right to direct attention to the fact that he had a Treasury letter which supported his contention as to the way in which the Estimates were put forward, and the want of finality in them. The explanation was altogether inadequate.

Question put.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 49; Noes, 115. (Division List No. 211.)

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)

Platt-Higgins, Frederick

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)

Pretymann, Ernest George

Allsopp, Hon. George

Greville, Hon. Ronald

Purvis, Robert

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill

Rasch, Major Frederick Carne

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

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

Renshaw, Charles Bine

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

Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nd'y)

Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge

Balfour, Rt. Hon. Gerald W. (Leeds

Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robt. W.

Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson

Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.

Harris, Frederick Leverton

Rolleston, Sir. John F. L.

Bigwood, James

Heaton, John Henniker

Ropner, Colonel Robert

Blundell, Col. Henry

Hope, J. F. (Sheffi'ld, Brightside

Royds, Clement Molyneux

Brassey, Albert

Howard, John (Kent, Faversham)

Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John

Hozier, Hon James Henry Cecil

Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)  
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu  
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)  
Seton-Karr, Henry  
Brymer, William Ernest  
Kenyon, Hon. G. T. (Denbigh)  
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)  
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.  
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)  
Smith, James P. (Lanarks.)  
Cautley, Henry Strother  
Keswick, William  
Spear, John Ward  
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)  
Lawson, John Grant  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc' r  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Sturt, Hon. Humphrey Napier  
Chapman, Edward  
Leveson-Gower, Fred. N. S.  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
Charrington, Spencer  
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.  
Thorton, Percy M.  
Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.  
Lowe, Francis William  
Tollemache, Henry James  
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Valentia, Viscount  
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Corbett, T L. (Down, North)  
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsm'th)  
Warde, Colonel C. E.  
Crossley, Sir Savile  
Macdona, John Cumming  
Webb, Colonel William George  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)  
Welby, Lt.-Col. A C E (Taunton  
Doxford, Sir William Theodore  
M'Calmont, Col. H. L. B. (Cambs  
Whiteley, H. (Aston und. Lyne



Duke, Henry Edward  
M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.  
Willoughby d'Eresby, Lord  
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.  
Manners, Lord Cecil  
Wills, Sir Frederick  
Finch, George H.  
Martin, Richard Biddulph  
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Maxwell, WJH (Dumfriesshire  
Wilson, John (Glasgow  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)  
FitzGerald, Sir Rbt. Penrose-  
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy  
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-  
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward A.  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Fletcher, Sir Henry  
Mount, William Arthur  
Younger, William  
Godson, Sir Augustus Fred.  
Nicholson, William Graham  
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)  
Parker, Gilbert  
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon  
Peel, Hon. Wm. Robert W.  
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim  
Penn, John

Original 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 A. F.  
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Greville, Hon. Ronald  
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte  
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas  
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill  
Allsopp, Hon. George

Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G. (Mid'x  
Arkwright, John Stanhope  
Crossley, Sir Savile  
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'ndry  
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.  
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r  
Doxford, Sir William Theodore  
Harris, Frederick Leverton  
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W (Leeds  
Duke, Henry Edward  
Heaton, John Henniker  
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.  
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.  
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightsd.  
Bigwood, James  
Finch, George H.  
Howard, John (Kent, Favers'm.  
Blundell, Colonel Henry  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil  
Brassey, Albert  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)  
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John  
FitzGerald, Sir Rbt. Penrose-  
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh  
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu  
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward A.  
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)  
Brymer, William Ernest  
Fletcher, Sir Henry  
Keswick, William  
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.  
Godson, Sir Augustus Fred.  
Lawson, John Grant  
Cautley, Henry Strother  
Gordon, Hn J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire  
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, South  
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.  
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc.  
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir J. Eldon

Long, Rt. Hn Walter (Bristol, S.  
Chapman, Edward  
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim  
Lowe, Francis William  
Charrington, Spencer  
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.  
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)  
Question put, "That the Question be now put."  
The Committee divided::Ayes, 115; Noes, 49. (Division List No. 212).  
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth  
Purvis, Robert  
Valentia, Viscount  
Macdona, John Cumming  
Rasch, Major Frederick Carne  
Walker, Col. Wm. Hall  
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)  
Renshaw, Charles Bine  
Warde, Colonel C. E.  
M'Calmont, Col. H. LB (Cambs.  
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge  
Webb, Col. Wm. George  
M' Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinb'rgh W  
Ritchie, Hn. Chas Thomson  
Werby, Lt.-Col. A C E (Taunton  
Manners, Lord Cecil  
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.  
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne  
Martin, Richard Biddulph  
Ropner, Col, Robert  
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord  
Maxwell, WJH (Dumfriesshire  
Royds, Clement Molyneux  
Wills, Sir Frederick  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
Wilson, A. Stanley (Yorks, ER.  
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy  
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Seton-Karr, Henry  
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)  
Mount, William Arthur

Sinclair, Louis (Romford)  
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-  
Nicholson, William Graham  
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Spear, John Ward  
Younger, William  
Parker, Gilbert  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Peel, Hn. Wm. Rbt. Wellesley  
Sturt, Hn. Humphry Napier  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
Penn, John  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Thornton, Percy M.  
Pretymann, Ernest George  
Tollemache, Henry James  
NOES.  
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)  
Griffith, Ellis J.  
O'Malley, William  
Allen, C. P. (Glouc., Stroud)  
Hayden, John Patrick  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Ashton, Thomas Gair  
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.  
Power, Patrick Joseph  
Brigg, John  
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)  
Redmond, J. E. (Waterford)  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Lambert, George  
Rickett, J. Compton  
Caldwell, James  
Leamy, Edmund  
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)  
Channing, Francis Allston  
M'Govern, T.  
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel  
Clancy, John Joseph  
Morgan, J. L. (Carmarthen)  
Spencer, Rt. Hn. CR (Northants)  
Craig, Robert Hunter  
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)

Sullivan, Donal  
Cremer, William Randal  
Murphy, J.  
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan  
Delany, William  
Nannetti, Joseph P.  
Weir, James Galloway  
Dillon, John  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
White, Patrick (Meath, North)  
Doogan, P. C.  
Norton, Capt. Cecil William  
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)  
Elibank, Master of  
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)  
Ffrench, Peter  
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Mr. Warner and Mr. Charles Hobhouse.  
Fuller, J. M. F.  
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Grant, Corrie  
O'Kelly, J. (Roscommon, N.)  
Original Question put accordingly.  
The Committee divided:;Ayes, 119; Noes, 38. (Division List No. 213.)  
AYES.  
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh.)  
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte  
Doxford, Sir William Theodore  
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil  
Allsopp, Hon. George  
Duke, Henry Edward  
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)  
Arkwright, John Stanhope  
Elibank, Master of  
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh  
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John  
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward  
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)  
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r  
Finch, George H.  
Keswick, William  
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W (Leeds

Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Lawson, John Grant  
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Bigwood, James  
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-  
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.  
Blundell, Colonel Henry  
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward A.  
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S  
Brassey, Albert  
Fletcher, Sir Henry  
Lowe, Francis William  
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John  
Godson, Sir Augustus Fred.  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu  
Gordon, Hn. J. E (Elgin & Nairn)  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestof)  
Brymer, William Ernest  
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, South  
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth  
Caldwell, James  
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon  
Macdona, John Cumming  
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.  
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim  
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)  
Cautley, Henry Strother  
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)  
M'Calmont, Col. HLB (Cambs.  
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)  
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)  
M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.)  
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r  
Greville, Hon. Ronald  
Manners, Lord Cecil  
Chapman, Edward  
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill  
Martin, Richard Bidduph  
Charrington, Spencer  
Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lrd G. (Midd'x  
Maxwell, W. J. H (Dumfries-sh  
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.  
Hamilton, Marq. of (Lond'nd'ry

Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert W.  
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy  
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas  
Harris, Frederick Leverton  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Heaton, John Henniker  
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)  
Crossley, Sir Savile  
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield Brightside  
Mount, William Arthur  
Nicholson, William Graham  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne)  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)  
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord  
Parker, Gilbert  
Seton-Karr, Henry  
Wills, Sir Frederick  
Peel, Hn. Wm Robert Wellesley  
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)  
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)  
Penn, John  
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Spear, John Ward  
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)  
Pretymann, Ernest George  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-  
Purvis, Robert  
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier  
Wyndham, Rt. Hn. George  
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
Younger, William  
Renshaw, Charles Bine  
Thornton, Percy M.  
Rickett, J. Compton  
Tollemache, Henry James  
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge  
Valentia, Viscount

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

Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson

Walker, Col. William Hall

Rolleston, Sir John F. L.

Warde, Colonel C. E.

Ropner, Colonel Robert

Webb, Colonel William George

Royds, Clement Molyneux

Welby, Lt.-Col. A C E (Taunton)

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.

Hayden, John Patrick

Power, Patrick Joseph

Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud

Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)

Redmond, John E. (Waterford)

Ashton, Thomas Gair

Lambert, George

Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)

Brigg, John

Leamy, Edmund

Sheehan, Daniel Daniel

Channing, Francis Allston

M'Govern, T.

Sullivan, Donal

Clancy, John Joseph

Morgan, J. L. (Carmarthen)

Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan

Craig, Robert Hunter

Murphy, J.

Weir, James Galloway

Cremer, William Randal

Nannetti, Joseph P.

White, Patrick (Meath, North)

Delany, William

Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)

Dillon, John

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

Doogan, P. C.

O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Mr. Patrick O'Brien and Mr. Haviland-Burke.

Ffrench, Peter

O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)

Goddard, Daniel Ford

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

Grant, Corrie



O'Malley, William

Griffith, Ellis J.

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.

Resolution to be reported upon Thursday, 6th June; Committee to sit again upon Thursday, 6th June.

SENGHENYDD COLLIERY DISASTER.

On the Motion for Adjournment;

\*MR. RITCHIE: I take this opportunity of reading to the House telegrams which I have received, and which I told the House I would read. They are not at all satisfactory. The first telegram is from Mr. Robson, the mining inspector on the spot;

"Regret to report serious explosion at Universal Colliery, near Caerphilly, this morning about five o'clock. Seventy-eight men were supposed to be down at time. Two have been brought up, one alive. Explorations are proceeding, but up to present moment the fate of others is uncertain."

The next telegram is from the mining inspector also, and is as follows;;

"The ventilation is being restored as fast as possible, but many large falls are impeding rapid

progress. No more persons have been seen, and it is impossible to say when workings can be thoroughly explored. Plenty of willing helpers."

The third message is a telegram from the managing director of the colliery, sent at five minutes past eight o'clock. The managing director says;;

"Mr. Robson, inspector of mines, and three assistants here. Every effort is being made to explore the underground workings, which are very badly damaged by force of explosion. Seventy men were down at time of explosion. One has been recovered alive and three bodies have been brought out. Have the gravest fears as to the fate of those still in the pit."

In pursuance of the Order of the House of the 23rd day of this instant May, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned accordingly at five minutes after Twelve of the clock, till Thursday, 6th June.