

[Search Help](#)

[HANSARD 1803–2005](#) → [1900s](#) → [1901](#) → [June 1901](#) → [17 June 1901](#) → [Commons Sitting](#)



## SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—MORTALITY IN CAMPS OF DETENTION.

*HC Deb 17 June 1901 vol 95 cc573-629*

*[MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.]*

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE, Member for the Carnarvon District, rose in his place, and asked leave to move the Adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, "the condition of the camps of detention in South Africa, and the alarming rate of mortality amongst the women and children detained there"; but the pleasure of the House not having been signified, Mr. SPEAKER called on those Members who supported the motion to rise in their places, and not less than forty Members having accordingly risen

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE After the answer which the Secretary of State has given this afternoon, I do not think that any apology is necessary for this motion. About three weeks ago the hon. Member for East Mayo and myself called attention to this subject, but the facts which have been revealed since showed that we considerably understated the case at that time. On 2nd May the right hon. Gentleman said that in the Transvaal there were 284 deaths from 1st January, and on 7th May he said that the deaths in the Orange River Colony camps since February had been 41 men, 80 women, and 261 children. The answer given to-day proves that, so far from this being the result of temporary conditions, it is growing worse. The deaths in these camps in the Transvaal in a single month were 336—that is a mortality rate, according to the rough computation I have made, of 120 per thousand. For the sake of the credit and good name of this country something should be done to put an end to this condition of things, which is going from bad to worse. A newspaper published last week the details of mortality in one camp. Full particulars were given, including the names of those who had died; a question was based on them, and the right hon. Gentleman consented to ask Lord Kitchener as to the facts. We are constantly hearing of the calumnies of the pro-Boer press. But it is not for hon. Gentlemen opposite to talk about calumnies in view of those recently circulated by their own press. Lord Kitchener, it turns out, confirmed every figure of the Return which had been published in the newspaper, and admitted that the death-rate in this one camp had been 450 per thousand. A deputation went out to these camps from this country. One was a former Member of this House—Mr. Joshua Rowntree—and everyone who knows him will be convinced of the accuracy of every statement he makes. His word is as good as his oath. An English lady went out also. She was permitted to go as far as Bloemfontein; but Mr. Rowntree was not permitted to go beyond Cape Town, though a great deal of persuasion was brought to bear on Sir Alfred Milner, as he then was. No doubt what has happened since in these camps and elsewhere has entitled him to his peerage. What has he done? He has allowed one lady to proceed as far as Bloemfontein, but no farther. We now know the reason why no one is permitted to proceed beyond Bloemfontein. The facts revealed by the right hon. Gentleman, which have come straight from Lord Kitchener, show that there was a state of things at Johannesburg which the Government were afraid to exhibit. This lady has made some reports as to what was taking place in the best of these camps—the best equipped and the longest established—and they are sufficiently deplorable. These were camps, not of fighting men, every one of whom would pass a physical test, but of women, many of whom were in a weak condition, and of children. Food, insufficient; such as was supplied, bad; the women herded together, sometimes twelve in a tent; tents leaking; clothes saturated; not much clothing allowed; little children half starved; the food they had, bad; their clothes soaked through with rain and dew. What marvel is it that the right hon. Gentleman has to tell us this tale of hundreds of children dying? [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: Another Weyler.] The quantity of the food is less—I carefully compared it—than the amount allowed in this country to criminals under hard labour. Here is the official Report of the medical officer in this very camp about which we are inquiring to-day—“Examined samples of the mealies, and of the sugar used. Sample one: mouldy and contains mite; unfit for human consumption.” This is given to little children. “Sample 2: contains

mite, but I could not discover any living mite; it is very dangerous as human food. Sample 3: a moist sample of brown sugar; smells somewhat sour, but with microscope could not find ferment or other foreign matter, except water; the sugar is unfit for the use of young children.” Until recently there were two scales in these camps. The full scale for children was—flour and meal, half a pound; meat, half a pound; milk, quarter of a tin; and so on. But this is for children under six years of age. If relatives on commando, no flour; and only one-third of the quantity of meat given to other children. Little children under six years of age to have no flour, one-third the quantity of milk, and no meat at all on five days a week, because their relatives are on commando! [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: Generous England!] When this statement was first made the right hon. Gentleman denied it very violently, and it is to his credit that he did so, for he did not believe it possible that such inhumanity could be committed by anybody in authority. The warmth of his indignation is creditable to the right hon. Gentleman, and it is still more creditable that when he discovered that it was a fact he stopped at any rate that part of the transaction. That the state of things with regard to the clothing is very bad is proved by the appeal which has been made to America by the wife of the Military Governor at Pretoria to raise funds— “for the purpose of providing warm clothing for the Boer women and children in the refugee camps in South Africa, many of whom are totally destitute, and unable to provide against the cold weather which is now setting in.” Then she goes on to say— “It is in the name of little children who are living in open tents, without fires, and possessing only the scantiest clothing, that I ask for help.” An appeal has to be sent by the wife of the Military Governor of Johannesburg; to America to provide for the women and children we have taken under our protection.

This, Sir, is the idea of bringing a great war to a successful issue. We are told that war is war, and that, after all, these are the necessary consequences of a state of war. I do not think that is so. We know perfectly well that this is the result of a deliberate policy. I cannot challenge that policy at the present moment, and I do not propose to do so. I say that this is the result of a deliberate and settled policy. It is not a thing which has been done in twenty-four hours, for it has taken months and months to do it. The military authorities knew perfectly well it was to be done, and they had ample time to provide for it. They started clearing the country about six months ago, and it is disgraceful that five or six months after that children should be dying at the rate of hundreds per month in the different camps. But let me point this out to the House. The rate of mortality among children—and I think this is the most disgraceful fact in the whole situation—is higher than that amongst the soldiers who have braved all the risks of the field. The mortality amongst our own troops is something like thirty-six per thousand. When the epidemic was at its height in Bloemfontein the death rate was fifty-two per thousand. Even taking the argument that war is war, and that Women and children should not be altogether exempt from its dangers, it is unfair to class the mortality of soldiers in the field with that of women and children. But while the rate of mortality amongst the soldiers in the field is fifty-two per thousand, the mortality amongst the women and children in these camps is 450 per thousand, and we have no right to put the women and children in this position. What is the assumption of the right hon. Gentleman? He says that it is by voluntary submission on the part of these women and children that they are refugees, and that they sought our protection. If they are seeking our protection, then we are ill requiting their confidence. They are British subjects, and they are voluntarily British subjects. They came voluntarily to seek the protection of the British flag, and how do we treat them? Why, we half starve them. We give them bad food, no shelter, we clothe them badly, their houses are burned, and their stock taken away. This is how you treat those who have voluntarily submitted to us. This is the first object lesson for them under British rule.

MR. NOLAN (Louth, S.) We know all about that in Ireland. [Ministerial laughter.]

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.) Yes, it is common in Ireland; laugh at it if you like.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE The right hon. Gentleman says they sought our protection. Protection against whom? Is it against their own kith and kin? Is it against the natives? Is there a single case recorded where the natives have attacked these poor women and children out on the veldt? No, but they have been driven and compelled to come in. I have got case after case which I might quote to the House where they were compelled to come in—cases where the husband

never fought against us, and cases where the husbands are now on commando. There were no charges against the women, and there could be none against the poor little children, but they were compelled to come into these camps. The right hon. Gentleman says he is perfectly willing that they shall go elsewhere if they have anyone to protect them. They have sent petitions in to the military authorities begging to be allowed to leave these camps. [The hon. Member read one of the petitions referred to, and continued:] We are told that these people are voluntary refugees who ask for our protection, but if this is so will the right hon. Gentleman explain why the terms of this petition at Kimberley were refused, and why there was a barbed wire fence surrounding the whole camp? If such a camp is not a prison, it is very like one. All round the camp there are sentries outside. These refugees have asked permission to be allowed to go away, and it has been refused. There are cases in which relatives in Cape Colony have offered to take these women and children under their protection and to pay the expense of conveying them and of keeping them, and even this offer has been refused.

The right hon. Gentleman cannot possibly state, in face of all these facts, that these are voluntary refugees. I say that it is the very worst policy in the world to keep these women and children there in these camps against their will, and under such conditions. It is perfectly impossible, owing to the circumstances, that these children should not suffer. You cannot have children of eighteen months and three or four years old under these tents, in all sorts of weather, without injury to their health. You cannot give them the class of food which you can give to a man in full health and strength, and there certainly ought to be some means of protecting them rather than herding them together in these refugee camps, and I appeal to the right hon. Gentleman to do something in this respect. He must know that it is quite impossible under the conditions existing in the Orange River Colony and the Transvaal to do anything to adequately provide for women and children in those parts. There are two camps which are fairly good, I am told, at Port Elizabeth and Norval's Pont, in Cape Colony. There the refugees are within reach of a sympathetic population, and I put it to the Government that it is better to send these people to places where they will have the sympathy of their kinsmen, for it is too much to expect of flesh and blood that they will not sympathise with these refugees. Is it not better that they should occupy themselves and exhaust, as it were, their sympathy upon providing for the women and children of the men in the field, and thus relieve us of the anxiety and the burden, and at the same time occupy themselves with work of this character? Would this not be infinitely better than herding these women and children together in camps in the Orange Free State, from which place all kinds of reports are coming with regard to their condition and treatment, which have given rise to a state of things approximating to rebellion? I put it to the right hon. Gentleman as a matter of policy that this would be infinitely better. I could give cases, if time permitted, showing what has been done in these camps. Some of these women are the wives of well-to-do farmers whose husbands are on commando. Some of their husbands are in prison, and some of them are curious comments on the reports we get of great captures. In one case the husband is in prison, and he is an old man of something between seventy or eighty years of age, and subject to epileptic fits. This old man never fought at all, and he was never on commando, but he was arrested and sent to prison, and reported as one of our great captures. What an absurd thing it is to do things of that sort. I have case after case of women in these camps whose husbands have been sent to Ceylon, Green Point, or St. Helena as prisoners of war, and who never fought at all against us. They include old men between seventy and eighty years of age, and the women are thrown on our hands while these men are kept as prisoners of war. The whole country is disturbed and denuded in this way, and that is the state of things with which we are confronted. I hear it stated very often that to feed these women and children at all as long as their husbands are fighting against us is an illustration of our generosity. Really, let us look at the circumstances. We set to work clearing the country. I have one case here where the first thing we did was to take over the whole of the cattle in stock from the farm. Then we destroyed every bag of mealies, and afterwards fired the house, burning the furniture and everything else in it. Thus we deprive these poor women and children of everything, and then we take them to the camps. Is it really suggested, under these conditions, when you deprive these women and children of the last crust, that it is an instance of great generosity on our part that we herd them together into camps, giving them food of this character, and keeping them in such a state that hundreds of children die off every month? To put that forward as an illustration of our magnanimity is to show that we have not grasped the situation at all. After what we have done we are bound to keep these women and children.

I say that this policy which has been adopted is a perfectly novel method of warfare. It is all very well to say that we are simply doing what other countries have done before us. The only precedent for what we have done that I know of is that of Spain and Cuba before the American occupation. We are following that precedent, and President M'Kinley in his appeal to the American people described the system pursued in Cuba in terms which are identical with the system we are pursuing in South Africa, and he gave an accurate description of what the condition of things would necessarily be. This is what is going on. We cleared the country and denuded it, and we left nothing for these poor women and children to live upon. We herded them together in camps, and, after doing all this, I say that it is our bounden duty to keep them. I should be very sorry to make this a mere party question. [Cries of "Oh."] Well, why should it be a party question? Surely the protection and feeding of children who are brought under our protection, and who are our fellow-subjects according to our own theory, ought not to be a party question. It has nothing to do with the origin of the war or the policy of the war. Assuming the policy of the war to be perfectly right, assuming it to be a perfectly just and necessary war, surely it does not follow that we ought to pursue a policy of extermination against children in South Africa. The worst of this method of proceeding is that the burden of it is falling not upon the men on the field, but upon the weak and innocent who are outside. Why should the children be punished? Assume that President Kruger and his counsellors, assume that the Volksraad and the leaders of the people there, and all the men in the commandoes, are responsible for all this business in Africa, does it follow that these children should be punished for the sins of their fathers? I really would appeal to the humanity of the House, and I would appeal to policy in this matter.

I cannot discuss the policy of the reconcentrado camps, but let us take it for granted that it is a wise step to form these camps; would it not have been better to give more time to provide more shelter and to see that there was better food, more of it, more suitable food, and plenty of clothing? What will happen as the result of all this mortality among the children? The right hon. Gentleman seemed to think that the one thing to do was to finish the war. It is not so. If once we have annexed this country we want to make loyal British subjects of the people. Is this the way to do it? Brave men will forget injuries to themselves much more readily than they will insults, indignities, and wrongs to their women and children. I have looked through a mass of evidence given by those poor women in the camps, and one and all have indicated that there was great readiness amongst the well-to do people, especially in the Orange Free State, to submit to British rule. There were a good many of them who felt that they had made their protest, and they would have accepted it. There is one case given of a man of English blood. A cousin of his fought at Magersfontein on the other side. I believe he is in the Black Watch. That man had been a burgher in the Orange River Colony. A good many of the burghers there and in the Transvaal are of British blood. He was prepared to submit. On coming home to Jacobsdaal, what did he find there? He found his home had been burned by the British. There was a fight going on at Jacobsdaal. The wife did not take part in it. Her husband was with the commando. They burned her out of her home and left her with her little children there. After a fortnight she was taken to some camp. The husband found his home a blackened ruin, and his children beggared. He said, "I came home to submit; but now, never." Hon. Members can understand this better when they are thinking of Englishmen. Is not that what you would expect from an Englishman? He comes home and finds this condition of things for no harm that he has done. He was bound as a loyal subject of the State to fight. He did his best as a brave man, and having done his best he was prepared to surrender.

*\*MR. SPEAKER* This is a matter that cannot be discussed on the motion now before the House. The hon. Member obtained leave to discuss the condition of the camps of detention in South Africa and the alarming rate of mortality among women and children contained therein. I think references to how their presence in camps came about cannot be made. The hon. Member cannot discuss cases of farm burning or the way in which the war is being carried on.

*MR. LLOYD-GEORGE* This is one of the cases in a refugee camp.

*\*MR. SPEAKER* That reason would involve the discussion probably of a great deal of the war.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE Very well, Mr. Speaker, I bow at once to your ruling. I give that as an illustration, and what I want to point out is that this is the very worst policy we can possibly pursue. It is our interest to treat women and children well. The men are our enemies. We are fighting them, but we are bound to fight them according to the rules of civilised nations, and by every rule of every civilised nation it is recognised that women and children are non-combatants. We are bound to treat them as neutrals, whatever their feelings and whatever their sympathies, and, of course, their sympathies must be with their own people. We are bound to treat them in the best possible way. I want to point out to the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War, when I quote this case, that he is going about the settlement of this question in the very worst way. When I say "him," I take him as the Minister responsible for this state of things. I would not imagine for a moment that he is directly and personally responsible for the condition of affairs in South Africa. When children are being treated in this way and dying, we are simply ranging the deepest passions of the human heart against British rule in Africa. The love of men for their children, for their home, for their country, and for humanity—we are ranging all these passions against settled government under the British flag in Africa. It will always be remembered that this is the way British rule started there, and that this is the method by which it was brought about. I will not talk about the probabilities of risings in the future, but if you want to provide material for them it is to be found in the condition of these camps. I am making no attack upon the troops or the officers in the field, or Lord Kitchener, whose hands are full. This is a question of policy. It is a question the right hon. Gentleman ought to take upon himself. This policy has desolated the country. It has left these poor people beggared. They have come and sought the protection of the British flag, and I say it ought not to be dishonoured by allowing women and children to starve in such places.

\*MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) I rise to second the motion which has been made, and in doing so I would say that a motion for the adjournment of the House is not a very convenient way of discussing this or any other question. But as matters stand it is the only method open to us. It has been my lot during this session to ask a large number of questions with respect to these camps, and I can assure anyone who does me the honour to listen to me that my sole and single object in asking these questions has been to get at the truth. I do not think that the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War, who has shown anxiety to answer to the full those questions according to the information in his possession, will find any fault with questions on this matter. Indeed, I shall be very much surprised if he finds any fault with this motion for adjournment, because if he has a case we are giving him an opportunity of placing it before the House. The only fault I have to find with the right hon. Gentleman is that he has not insisted upon those responsible in South Africa giving him, a little earlier, full and accurate information. The House is, indeed, discussing a very grave and serious matter. The figures read to us this afternoon prove that. If I mistake not, there are not far short of 60,000 of those whom the Government call our fellow subjects interned in these camps, for the most part surrounded by barbed wire fences, with British sentries walking round, and, for the most part, unable to get out, a large majority of them being women and children. There is no greater delusion in the mind of any man than to apply the term "refugee" to these camps. They are not refugee camps. They are camps of concentration, formed by the military as the result of military operations in the field. The right hon. Gentleman ventured to say earlier in the session that the people in these camps were not prisoners of war, and that those who came might go. These are his words. He never gave the House more inaccurate information than that. When a camp was formed in Cape Colony Mr. Sauer, who has been one of the Ministers of the Crown a good many times in Cape Colony, and probably will be again, did his best to get from the camp those who had plenty of persons outside the camp in good position who were willing to take them and treat them as their guests. I have his permission to read this letter. He says— "Permission to leave the camp is absolutely refused. Shortly after the women taken to Port Elizabeth were placed in camp guarded by armed soldiers, I applied for the release of a number of these women whom friends and relations in Cape Colony had offered to take care of and provide for. I asked the Attorney General (Innes) to lay the request before the military. He did so, but the request was not granted." My information regarding these camps is derived from personal interviews with people who have come home, more especially my relative Mr. Rowntree, formerly Member of this House for Scarborough, who went out at my request in December last and returned home in April. The idea that these people are inside these camps at their own request is an absolute and entire fallacy. It arises from

the military devastation of the country. Even Sir Alfred Milner—now Lord Milner—I was glad to see, in a despatch which was more of a leading article than a despatch as it contained more argument than information, said—“I am glad to think that this measure ”—that is, the devastation of the country—“is very seldom, if ever, resorted to.” But Lord Kitchener told the people whom he called together in the market square at Pretoria that—“it is essential that the country should be cleared; our forces are compelled to denude the country of everything movable.” I am not going to discuss the policy at the moment, but merely to state the facts. How do these people reach the camps? The pictures drawn by those who have shared in the journeys to and the life in these camps are terrible. Hundreds and thousands of women and children sat in open trucks for twenty-four, forty-eight, and even seventy-two hours—pent up like the passengers in the old third-class carriages in this country which men of my age can remember forty-five years ago. They were not allowed to leave these trucks. At more than one station what happened when these trains came in? The children were wailing—not crying; they had lost the power to cry; they were wailing with hunger. Their mothers were trying to leave the train to get provisions for them, but they were forced back into the trucks at the point of British bayonets. The very soldiers were so heart-broken and grieved by what they saw that they distributed their own rations among the women and children—a tribute to the humanity of the British soldier, a humanity which I acknowledge is exhibited on those benches opposite as fully as on these in many instances. Do not think I am making this, a political matter. It is too high and sacred to be dragged into politics. These trains arrived after these long journeys at the camps. I will not trouble the House with many quotations, but I must give one from Mr. Rowntree, What he says is this—“In one tent news was brought us that more prisoners were coming.” They do not talk there about refugees. “Their quick eyes caught them detraining when I could distinguish nothing at all.” I am told that the eyesight of these Boers is of two miles greater radius than that of the British soldiers. “A few soldiers first, who looked good-natured and as if they did not greatly relish their work; then a long procession, broken often into clumps. They were chiefly mothers and children, many babies in arms, many clutching at gown or hand. Most of them were weary, sad, and grave, a look of destitution imprinted on faces and clothing alike. All, down to the infants, had some little thing—presumably the most precious and necessary possession—clasped in one hand. A water-bottle, a kettle, a bundle (Small) of clothing, a bag with a few provisions (rare). One lone woman was cherishing a cat. One old woman came along in a ricksha, the rest were all on foot. One little lad of seven or eight was so tired that he laid down twice in the grass and was made to go on. They had no umbrellas against the sun. Their head-dresses were mostly dark voluminous hoods. The general effect was very sombre, and infinitely sad; two or three I saw in tears, and I had to move away by myself for a time.” That picture might be multiplied by the dozen.

The right hon. Gentleman told us expressly the other day that these people were not prisoners of war. They are British subjects in the eyes of the Government. Surely the responsibility on us is great and terrible to see that the conditions of their environment are healthy and decent under the circumstances. What are the actual conditions? You have these vast batches of humanity swept into these camps; and let the House remember that you have among them all sorts and conditions of people. You have what you might have if you swept an area of a few acres of Chelsea or other portions of London—persons who have been accustomed to live—I speak from knowledge—in great luxury, delicate children who have been accustomed to have all their wants supplied, along with persons of considerable poverty, accustomed to endure hardships. I am told, and I believe, that in the majority of the camps the shelter is very deficient indeed. It is deficient both against the South African heat and specially against the South African winter. The overcrowding in some of the tents has been something terrible. If we were not discussing this matter we should be probably discussing the Factory and Workshops Acts Amendment Bill. Now, we have taken the very greatest possible security within the last thirty or forty years that factories and schools should be provided with an adequate number of cubic feet of air. But I have been told by those who have been in these tents that the only description which can be applied to them is that they are like the Black Hole of Calcutta. As to the food, I have gone through the rations, which from the point of view of women and children are not at all satisfactory. As to the differentiation of rations between those whose husbands and fathers have surrendered and those whose relatives are still on commando, I will say that a more diabolical arrangement was never entered into by any civilised nation. I acquit the right hon. Gentleman of being responsible for this. I go further. I acquit the Government. Curiously enough, I do not see the Colonial Secretary

present. When we are discussing one of the many fruits of the policy of the Secretary for the Colonies he always absents himself from the House. I acquit the Government of responsibility for what I call this diabolical arrangement, and I was delighted when I heard the right hon. Gentleman get up and say that this thing was at an end. But still the food is insufficient and bad, and the matter requires looking into at once. Then there is the water supply; it has, in many cases, been extremely bad, extremely impure, and extremely insufficient. There have been camps in which for weeks there has not been—I almost half smile when I mention it—a particle of soap, although there are thousands of women and children in these camps. We know what an apparently small matter like that really means. Then in regard to cooking—the means of firing and cooking have been entirely insufficient. The furniture in those tents, the household utensils and implements, have also been deficient. Some of my informants tell me that there were scores and hundreds of women unable to get a needle and thread. Think what that means! I turn to a more serious grievance. Births are taking place in these camps, and there has been insufficient medical attendance in the hour of woman's greatest need. There have been deaths, but I will not dwell upon or emphasise the Returns—the awful Returns of mortality. I daresay the right hon. Gentleman will get up and endeavour to show that matters are improving. It may well be so, but let us have the full facts as to mortality month, by month. I ask him to lay on the Table of the House a schedule of the actual deaths in each of these camps. He told me a good many weeks ago that he had inquired for Returns to be presented, to the House. Let us have the actual figures. It would be very easy to place them in the shape of a Return, which I hope he will consent to have laid on the Table of the House. Again, the nursing and the hospital accommodation leave a great deal to be desired. I turn now to what I call the social aspect of the matter. Here are these 60,000 people, more or less, going to rest, but many of them not to bed, every night knowing that they are practically in a prison, and waiting every morning to meet another long, weary day. What provision is there for their occupation? They come into these camps naturally brooding over their wrongs—wronges with which we can sympathise—wronges against which we ourselves would fight to the death. What provision is being made for the education of the children? I am aware that something is being done, but not very much. Again, what provision is made for religious services? We open our proceedings every afternoon with a recognition of our common Christianity. What access has been, allowed to the camps to ministers of religion? What is done on the Sundays for religious services?

I hope, Sir, that the right hon. Gentleman will give us some information on these points. This is not a passing matter. These people are there day by day, week after week, month after month, and Heaven alone knows how soon these things will come to an end. I am quite sure there is not a man on the Treasury Bench who will make a prophecy on that. We are responsible in the sight of God and man for these people, who are British subjects. It is pitiful to read the letter of the wife of the British general at Pretoria appealing to the people of the American Republic for help for these women and children. We ought not to have allowed such a letter to be written. All honour to that good woman, but we ought not to have allowed that letter to have gone across the Atlantic when we are voting hundreds of millions sterling for prosecuting this war. But that good woman's heart was wrung at the scenes of misery in the camps. It is a slur upon us, upon the British House of Commons, upon the British Government, that that letter should be necessary. Our honour is concerned. I have endeavoured, and I hope I have succeeded, in avoiding any political asperity in my remarks. I would not have risen to second this motion unless I had, what I venture to term, the humanitarian aspect of the question mainly in my mind. It is on that ground that I appeal to the right hon. Gentleman. I ask him to give us full information and let us have all the facts and figures; but, above all, I ask him that duly accredited persons from this country, ladies of the type of Miss Florence Nightingale, shall have free access to these camps, and that the British public will be able to send whatever they may desire under proper safeguards. I received this afternoon, and I was very thankful to get it, a letter from a lady now in South Africa who spoke in the highest terms of the facilities which Sir Hely Hutchinson had given her to visit some of these camps. I hope that is the beginning of a new departure, and that in future accredited ladies will not be refused access to these camps. I acknowledge at once the manner in which Sir Hely Hutchinson has acted. The lady in question, by the way, is not of my own political way of thinking. She went out to South Africa not to criticise the Government, but to do what she could to alleviate distress. War is a terrible thing. The people of this country are now finding it out. It may be that among those who do me the honour to listen to me there are some who have suffered family bereavements in this terrible war. Towards all such our sympathies go

out. But I would ask, in the name of our common Christianity, that the Government should at once take such steps as will alleviate the sufferings and improve the condition of the women and children in the camps in South Africa.

*Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(Mr. Lloyd-George.)*

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guild-ford) I do not suppose that any Member who has listened to the hon. Member who has just sat down doubts for a moment his real and earnest belief in the case which he has put before the House. But the hon. Member for Carnarvon in introducing this question asked very pertinently why this should be a party question. I confess I thought his own action in the matter and the manner in which this subject has been introduced into the House to-night gave some answer to the question which he himself asked. This question is brought before the House as a definite matter of urgent public importance—so urgent that no notice can be given to the Government that such a question is going to be raised—[An HON. MEMBER: Blocking motion]—this, curiously enough, being the third Parliamentary Government night on which a definite matter of urgent public importance has been found to be brought forward to delay the progress of public business. I submit that under those circumstances there does seem to have been a lack of precaution in avoiding the element of party which the hon. Member himself might on reconsideration discover in his own motion. When I speak of notice I say again, as I have said before in this House, that I am ready at all times to answer for any subject connected with the war for which Lord Kitchener or the authorities can be called in question; but if the House of Commons desires to have anything except a partial and a hurried consideration, on the spur of the moment, of the matters brought before us—brought before us by elaborate speeches with long notes by hon. Members opposite—if the object is not to snatch an argument unawares or to snatch a division unawares, then there can be no objection, upon a matter of great public importance, to giving some notice to the Government of intention to bring it forward. And there is another point upon which I must dwell for one moment. If these questions are to be brought forward from a purely humanitarian and patriotic standpoint, I think they ought not to be accompanied by these attacks which were made by the hon. Member for Carnarvon upon the general humanity with which the war has been carried on. I resent these attacks. I resent them because the mistakes of the war in that respect have been an excess of confidence in the advantage which humanity would give us in dealing with the Boers throughout the campaign. Lord Roberts began by making what has since been found to be a great blunder—that was, by allowing Boers on parole in the Orange Free State to go back to their farms. That piece of humanity has, no doubt, cost us a considerable prolongation of the war. These men went back to their farms, and they did not keep their parole. Every farmhouse became a fresh recruiting agency for the enemy, and after the men had gone back on commando the farmhouses occupied by the women became depots from which they got supplies and stores and from which they obtained information of the movements of our troops. It was absolutely necessary to put a stop to those proceedings. It was a necessity which every general would have felt, and which if he had not recognised he would have been greatly wanting in his duty. Then what occurred? Lord Roberts in several instances endeavoured to get the Boer generals to look after their own women and children. If they had been willing, as they were able, when they retired before us—they had the line of railway—to provide for their women and children, many of those difficulties which are now complained of would never have occurred; but they persistently threw on us the charge of looking after their women and children; they traded on our humanity in the matter.

\*MR. SPEAKER I am afraid I must stop the right hon. Gentleman when he goes into the military policy which led to these women and children being in the camps. The question for discussion is the condition of the camps and the treatment of the women and children there.

MR. BRODRICK Certainly, Sir, I desire to speak entirely within the limits of your ruling; but my desire is to show that a large number of those individuals who are now in the camps would not be there if we could have induced the enemy to recognise their own responsibilities in the matter. I would say that a large number of these refugees are now in camp, not owing to any wish of the Government, but owing to the action of their own friends. Then we have gone a step further, and we have in camp a certain number who have come voluntarily, because they wanted food and shelter, and we have a certain number who are there because the country had to be cleared. All those put upon us a burden



which it was hoped by the enemy we should not be able to bear, but which we are endeavouring to bear. If hon. Members could realise what it is in a country like this, with every convenience, to keep 63,000 persons properly sheltered and fed, even with every opportunity and every source of supply, they would have some conception of what the difficulty is in a country fed by single lines of railway, along which most of the food has to be brought from the base, and where there are 250,000 soldiers whom it is our first duty to supply. When I am told that the case of these individuals is not what we should wish it to be, I entirely agree. It cannot be so, and it will not be so. When you have a country in a state of war you will have to hear of sufferings you do not like to hear of. So you would if you went into our own camps to-night and saw what men who are on trek are enduring at this moment, in spite of every provision we have there and every arrangement we can make for them. The only question between the House and the Government can be if you challenge our policy in keeping these women in camp. Then we are willing to answer for it, for we know well that from the moment we begin to scatter these people broadcast throughout the country one of two things will happen—either a considerable number of persons will starve, and there will be material for diatribes even more violent than those we have heard in this House, or you will have again those difficulties to encounter of your own troops finding themselves at every moment coming across depots made for the enemy, leading without doubt to the prolongation of the war. We are not willing to face either of these contingencies. It is urged that we have not done sufficient to make these camps sanitary, and to preserve human life. I deny it altogether. It is said that they are going from bad to worse. Those who have been out there, and who have come to see me since they came back, having gone out there to distribute goods and luxuries beyond actual necessities among the women and children in the camps, have, I think, in every single case, assured me that things, so far from going from bad to worse, have been steadily ameliorating.

The camps were begun at a peculiarly unfortunate time. In the month of January, shortly after they were established, owing to the incursion of De Wet into Cape Colony, which resulted in the lines being cut in the rear, there was the greatest difficulty both in supplying the troops and supplying the camps; but since they have been established every attempt has been made to get up shelter, to supply sanitary conveniences, to see that proper medical appliances are within their reach. As I told the hon. Member this afternoon, in the camp of Johannesburg there has been undoubtedly a severe epidemic. I will go further. I say that a great deal of that epidemic is, so far as my information goes, due to the conduct, unluckily, of the Boer women themselves who are there. They find it very difficult to make up their minds to accept the ordinary medical arrangements for separation and the ordinary precautions which are taken against an epidemic of that character. They will not accept the rule as to dieting patients. An instance has come to my knowledge to-day in a private letter. A woman who had a child suffering from dysentery in the camp gave that child—although proper food was there and was ordered by the doctor—a raw carrot, and the child died in four hours. That is only one of many instances in which it has been found impossible to get women who have not been accustomed to life in camp to recognise that the first law for the preservation of life and health, when an epidemic is raging, is to obey the precautions the doctor enjoins. With regard to the other camps, I have to complain a little that this motion is put forward so hurriedly. It was only on Friday that I received notice that a question on the subject was to be asked, and I have not yet received from Lord Kitchener the most recent statistics as to the mortality during the month of May. These I hope to receive within the next two or three days. But, generally speaking, our principle has been to have the food which is given examined. There may, and there must, be instances over so large an area when the food cannot always be given in the best condition, but, generally speaking, it is good and sound. I have heard it said this evening that the food is the food of criminals. It is the food that is given to the British soldier. You cannot give luxurious food under circumstances such as prevail at this moment in the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony. The hon. Member asked me a question as to religious ministrations in these camps, and I specially inquired into that matter. There has been an attempt in each camp to provide schools of instruction, and I understand from Lord Kitchener that arrangements have been made for religious ministrations. Attempts have been made to set up various forms of labour in order to occupy the inmates of the camps, and many attempts have been made to provide amusements, so as to prevent the inmates from suffering from dejection and despondency. But when the hon. Member asks that there should be free access to the camps, we enter on a different category. The opinion of Lord Kitchener, which is shared by Lord

Milner and by His Majesty's Government, is that it is highly desirable that in each locality there should be a local committee formed, on which there might be Dutch representatives and ministers of religion, and which, in conjunction with the commandant, will have the opportunity of organising to some extent amusements or other means of occupation in the camps. The committee will also be able to distribute such things as may be sent out from this country or given by charitable people for the relief of inmates. Local effort of that kind has the entire concurrence of the Government. But if by free access from here is meant the sending out of individuals who, however little they may desire it, are to become centres of agitation and trouble, then we are opposed to that form of intervention. We do not want the men who have been spreading in Cape Colony blood-curdling pamphlets, highly-coloured statements, and untrue narratives, which have accentuated the bitterness of the war, to intervene in order to make still more difficult a difficult situation. Through these local committees philanthropy will have full scope; and upon this point the hon. Gentleman has made a personal appeal to me and to the Government not to be backward in taking up a fresh position. Our position throughout the matter has been this.

*\*MR. JOHN ELLIS* I do not quite understand the right hon. Gentleman. I did not ask the Government to take up a fresh position; that would be a political matter, and I did not deal with the policy of the Government in this matter.

*MR. BRODRICK* I understood the hon. Gentleman to suggest that it was a matter of policy; that we ought to intervene.

*\*MR. JOHN ELLIS* I did not say a word about the policy.

*MR. BRODRICK* I only spoke from recollection, but—

*\*MR. JOHN ELLIS* I have my own opinion as to the policy of the Government in the matter, but I did not state it.

*MR. BRODRICK* We cannot scatter these individuals over the colony again. We are in communication with Lord Kitchener as to those who can find homes for themselves where they can be maintained. To that extent we shall be only too glad to rid ourselves of the responsibility of looking after them. We cannot undertake that life in the camps shall be otherwise than simply healthful, as far as we can secure that, and we shall also, as far as we can, surround them with proper medical and other attentions. But the one thing which can help these camps is the cessation of the war.

*MR. BRYN ROBERTS* (Carnarvonshire, Eifion) It rests with you.

*MR. BRODRICK* The cessation of the war will not be accelerated by speeches such as were made by the hon. Member who has just interrupted me, who has given every encouragement—

*MR. BRYN ROBERTS* Pooh!

*MR. BRODRICK* The hon. Member may not have the manners I should desire, and he is not chary of what he says himself either about his opponents—or about British soldiers in the field.

*MR. BRYN ROBERTS* I challenge the right hon. Gentleman to prove any inaccuracy except—[Laughter.] Everything I said was true, and was admitted by the right hon. Gentleman, except that it was of the Kaffrarians and Brabant's Horse, and not of the Australian Horse.

*MR. BRODRICK* I do not wish to pursue the subject, but before I leave it I desire to say that the hon. Member charged a body of men with mutiny who had never mutinied.

*MR. BRYN ROBERTS* I claim the right to reply to that statement, and to point out that that was an error, which I corrected before the right hon. Gentleman. I apologised to the Australians, and named the persons who were responsible.

*\*THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. J. W. LOWTHER, Cumberland, Penrith, who had taken the Chair during the temporary absence of the Speaker).* I fear that the discussion is rather disorderly.

*MR. BRYN ROBERTS* Then he ought not to have begun it.

*\*THE DEPUTY SPEAKER* It was the hon. Member himself who first interrupted the right hon. Gentleman.

*MR. BRODRICK* My past experience of the hon. Member teaches me that he is very little careful of what he says about others. The hon. Member interrupts me, and I think I am entitled to reply to what he says. I wish hon. Members would be a little more careful in the language which they use, for expressions used in this House come back to me from South Africa by every mail. Our one desire is that there may be restored that condition of peace in the Transvaal which will enable these women to go back to their homes. [An HON. MEMBER: Never, never!] We will do what we can to preserve them from unnecessary suffering, whether they come to us of their own accord, or through our exercise of force, or through the neglect of their own people. More than that we cannot say. I believe there is a universal feeling among those who have gone out that the desire of the commandants of the camps is to exercise all the humanity they can. But humanity has its limits in this one respect. We are not going, either by releasing these people in large numbers or by any sign of faltering in our policy, which is to pursue this war to its conclusion, to hang a burden on the backs of the military authorities in South Africa, or to take any other step which would lead to the prolongation of the war.

*SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs)* The right hon. Gentleman made a complaint, at the beginning of his speech, of the way in which this matter has been brought before the House, and he complained especially that there had been no opportunity for him to prepare the facts for the argument he would have to use. There was an interjection at that point which I think showed that there was perfect justification for the action of my hon. friend in not giving any public, or even semi-public, notice of his intention. The justification is simply this; that if any such notice had been given, there would have been immediately put down a "blocking" notice, which would have prevented this motion from being brought forward.

*MR. BRODRICK* Notice might have been given me this morning.

*SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN* The right hon. Gentleman has only to look at the Notice Paper and he will see there are three subjects—one of them of very small importance, but the other two of very large importance—which the House of Commons is absolutely debarred from discussing by notices of motion so transparent in their purpose, and so shadowy and useless in themselves, that they ought not to be allowed to remain for that purpose on the Notice Paper any longer. There is the question of farm burning. No one can say a word upon it, because the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wigtonshire wishes to call the attention of the House to the Return on farm-burning in South Africa, and to move a resolution. There is the question of press censorship, and the nature of the information which is vouchsafed to the people of this country with regard to all that is being done in their name; but the hon. Member for North Ayrshire is anxious to call the attention of the House, at some unknown distant date, to the communication of news from South Africa and to the exercise of the censorship, and to move a resolution. The other day a comparatively trifling incident occurred. Two Boer prisoners attempted to escape, were caught, tried, and punished. That may have been right or wrong—I am not speaking as to that now—but immediately the conscience or the interest of the hon. Member for a division of Sussex is so exercised that he also wishes to call the attention of the House to this incident, and to move a resolution. Why, Sir, the farce is transparent. I wonder how long the House of Commons is going to endure this. It may, perhaps, excite some strange feeling amongst us to know that these camps of Boer women and children are surrounded by fences of barbed wire, but there is a barbed wire fence around the House of Commons, which prevents us exercising the ordinary rights of speech which belong to this Assembly.

So much, Sir, for the motion which has been made. The whole question is two-fold, and I confess, a once, that the part to which my hon. friend confines the attention of the House, although eminently urgent and deserving of attention,

cannot, I think, be discussed without reference to the other portion, and that other portion we are precluded from discussing. What I object to is the whole policy of concentration, the whole policy of destroying the homes of women and children, driving them in circumstances of considerable cruelty, certainly of unintentional cruelty, into these camps. Under the very natural and proper ruling of the Speaker we cannot discuss the whole of that side of the question, and what we have, therefore, to speak on is merely the condition of those camps. Now, Sir, I have not seen the report of Mr. Rowtree, long a respected Member of this House, but I am acquainted with the reports of the gallant and plucky lady who went out to South Africa in order to do what benefit she could to these unfortunate people; and I wish to say this. I am confirmed in my belief in the accuracy of her reports because of their most remarkable fairness. She brings no accusation, and I am sure that none of us would do so—at least, speaking for myself, I have never said a word that would imply cruelty or even indifference on the part of officers or men in the British Army. It is the whole system which they have to carry out that I consider, to use a word which I have already applied to it, barbarous. There are no people in the world who feel that barbarity more than the unfortunate men whose duty it is to enforce that system. But there can be no question that much of what the right hon. Gentleman said is well founded when he assured the House that every effort has been made by the commandants of these camps in most cases to alleviate the sufferings of the unfortunate people entrusted to their care under difficulties of a perfectly overwhelming character. The numbers coming in were so great as to swamp all the preparations that had been made. This lady went to a camp, and after spending a little time there was satisfied that things were a little better. She goes back after a few weeks, and finds that perhaps 2,000 more of these so-called refugees have been brought into the camp and therefore the whole thing is upset, and the difficulties are worse than ever. That is the sort of hopeless task that these unfortunate British officers have put upon them—to undertake to provide the necessaries of life for those unfortunate people. One word I wish to say which I omitted to say, and which is recalled to me by the use of the word "refugee." I believe that two pleas used have very little foundation. The first is that these are refugees who have fled from starvation, and perhaps fear of worse evils, to go into the camps; and the other plea is that they have had to go there or to be taken there in order to escape from the vindictiveness of the native population. I have not seen a single authenticated case of women and children in any farm, however outlying or remote and undefended, suffering anything from the natives. On the contrary—and I do not know whether it has struck hon. Members as it has struck me—all through these many months the natives have stood loyal and closely by the Boers, who have been their nearest neighbours. Nor is that all; at any rate, I have not heard of any case where the women have received anything but the most humane assistance from the natives. There is no doubt at all that the state of things in the camps is perfectly horrible, and I trust that these reports will be published, so that the British people may know the state of things.

After all, what we have to do is to consider what is to be done with these people now that they are there. The right hon. Gentleman says that we cannot break them up and disperse them and have the women starving all over the country. No one proposes that. There are two classes of women. There are those who have relatives and friends to whose houses they could go in Cape Colony, who would receive them and treat them well. When they have asked for that permission it has been refused. There is another class of women who say, "Let me and my children go back to my farm, and, even if there be only scorched walls, I would be able to scrape, with the help of those in the neighbourhood I know, a few vegetables or something to keep us alive. Only take us out of this place in which we are." Surely that, at least, could be done. And with regard to those who must remain, who have been brought there in a ruined and starving condition—with regard to them I am not at all satisfied or disposed to be content with this idea of a local committee which is to look after them. Where are the materials in the greater part of these localities for these local committees? What I would urge upon the Government is to send out a staff of nurses and competent civilian medical men. In some of these camps there is hardly any medical assistance at all, and in others there are only one or two Army doctors. I do not wish to speak disrespectfully of Army doctors, but the diseases of women and children are not quite the branch of the profession with which they are most accustomed to deal, and I know that in many cases there has been really no competent medical advice to be obtained on the spot. As to nursing, this gallant lady, of whose report we have been speaking, herself in two or three camps organised a sort of scratch team of nurses of the younger Boer women, and accomplished a great amount of good. What is the objection to sending a certain number of skilled doctors and, above

all, of nurses in order to do what is necessary both for the sanitation and the healing of the inhabitants of these camps? The right hon. Gentleman says that we do not want people to go in there to stir up agitation. [Cheers.] Certainly not. The hon. Gentlemen who cheer, therefore, think you cannot find in the United Kingdom a dozen or twenty doctors and perhaps a score or a hundred of nurses who can be trusted to go into these camps without spreading unnecessary political agitation. I think better of both doctors and nurses. I am quite certain that this is the course which humanity dictates, and it is the only course which will convince these unhappy women and children, so far as they can realise the circumstances, that the British people really care for them and desire to save them from unnecessary pain and suffering. The right hon. Gentleman talks of closing the war, of "bringing it to a conclusion." That is the desire of everyone, but the last way to bring it to a conclusion is by doing what has been done for the last two or three months. Will not the view naturally adopted be—of course, I do not suppose for a moment that it was the intention of His Majesty's Government—but are we not open to having it said that because we cannot effectively deal with the men we are trying to get hold of the women? Yes, and that is the view taken by the women of it. They say, "You bring us here, and you think that by inflicting hardships upon us and our children you will induce us to bring pressure to bear upon our husbands." But they answer in the well-known words of Lord Chatham, which have already been quoted to-night, "Never, never, never." Is this the way to train up these people to be kindly, contented, and friendly fellow citizens, imposing upon them sufferings which by a little foresight might have been avoided? The best way of avoiding it would have been to have left them in their own homes, but if they must be deported, surely ample provision should be made beforehand; and as that was not done, let us make up for past remissness. Let the Government send out not only sufficient stores, if they are wanting, but, above all, a number of capable men and women who will teach these people the laws of health, which the right hon. Gentleman says they are inclined to transgress, and thus induce a better state of things than that which has been brought before us.

*\*MR. C. P. SCOTT (Lancashire, Leigh).* We are told that all these things of which we have heard are part of the terrible realities of war and cannot be avoided; that nothing is being done which cannot be defended or which is contrary to humanity. We are also told that these things may be very dreadful, but if the war is to be brought to an end they are necessary. I think it will be admitted, however, that there are some things which we have not a right to do even in order to shorten somewhat the duration of the war. I do not think we can for a moment admit that women and children ought to be swept up in this way and taken from their homes unless we have some means of providing for them. It cannot be contended that we are justified for any purpose whatever in bringing these women and children into a condition in which they are bound to die or to undergo terrible sufferings. But, even granted that these measures are necessary—which I do not for a moment admit, for I think that even from a military point of view the whole proceedings are a mistake—we have to consider whether the Government are doing their best for these women. I think it is perfectly obvious that in an immense number of cases they are not. We have heard a great deal to-night about the sufferings of these people, but I do not believe that either on this or the other side of the House hon. Members in the least degree realise the extent of the sufferings. I do not believe that any hon. Members can realise what it means for women and children to be living, a dozen of them together, lying on the bare ground, in a little bell tent with the thermometer at 100° or 110°, with torrential rains and morning dews coming through and wetting everything inside. But even supposing we are bound to do this, then the question arises, Are we obliged, having brought the people there, to keep them there? That is a question which I think the Secretary of State for War has not sufficiently considered, and to which he certainly has given no satisfactory answer. We want to know why it is that these people are kept as prisoners in these camps. There have been practically none released. Some months ago there were two or three cases in which certain of the women were allowed to go to their friends. That, however, was stopped, and now we have the state of things that there are some 60,000 women and children, many of whom have friends elsewhere willing to receive them and to pay for their journey to them, kept in our hands as prisoners. I say that this is a disgrace, and if children die and women fall ill it is upon us that the responsibility lies, and upon the fair fame of this country lies the discredit. I hope we may hear more from the Secretary for War on this subject. He has given us a little hope to-night, and we were glad, at any rate, that we have obtained a little good from the debate, and that the right hon. Gentleman has promised to look into this matter for himself. I hope the right hon. Gentleman will

go a good deal further. We were told at first that the women went into the camps voluntarily as refugees, but it is now admitted that they are prisoners. Some of them tried to run away, but soldiers were sent to bring them back. We are entitled to ask that the women and children who are in the camps against their will, and who have relatives in Cape Colony willing to take them, should be allowed to leave. I am told if the women and children were allowed to do this a great majority of them would be provided for in Cape Colony. Further, we ask that the Secretary of State for War shall not on any consideration whatever add to the already enormous number of these refugees unless he can provide for them in a decent and humane manner, and also that he will, to the utmost of his power, endeavour to find homes for these people, or permit them to find homes for themselves in Cape Colony, where they can be kindly treated and taken care of. Unless these things are done, the responsibility for the terrible mortality that occurs will rest upon the right hon. Gentleman and the Government. It is all very well to say that it is only measles, but the constitutions of the children are utterly undermined and enfeebled to such an extent that they are unable to resist any illness which may attack them. This is a terrible state of things, and one which the House and the country cannot be satisfied with, and we have a right to appeal to the humanity of the Government to see that a remedy is found.

*MR. HALDANE (Haddingtonshire)*. My hon. friend who has just sat down is, I think, justified at all events to this extent—that the facts to which he has alluded are facts to which the House of Commons ought to attend. The statistics as to the death-rate alone constitute a subject on which we might well spend some time in debate. While, however, I entirely sympathise with my right hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition in his objection to "blocking notices," my sympathy goes out also to the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War, who finds himself plunged into a debate of this kind without any notice. I think it would have been in the interests of the question itself if some intimation, however informal, had been conveyed to the right hon. Gentleman this morning that the topic was going to be discussed, in order that we might have had before us a full statement on what, to my mind, is a very grave subject—namely, the amount of mortality which has taken place in these camps. It is one of the infortunate circumstances connected with the discussion of all topics cognate to the war that they cannot be handled without the importation of a great amount of bias and feeling. With many of the statements made by the hon. Member for Carnarvon Boroughs and the hon. Member for the Rushcliffe Division probably we all agree. They hate the war; we hate the war. They hate these evils; we hate these evils. They would fain have an end put to the miseries which these unhappy women and children are undergoing; we all desire to see that done as quickly as possible. But I cannot help thinking that no useful purpose is served by bringing such phrases as "even Sir A. Milner" or the word "barbarous" in connection with military operations. These things do not tend to bring the war to an end. What is likely to have that result? Surely the inspiring not only of the Boers in South Africa, but also of the nations on the Continent, with a sense of our desire to be fair, at all events, in these matters. I do not blame people who differ strongly from me with regard to the war, but I cannot think that in discussions on specific matters of this kind it is well to travel over the line even a little and to introduce these controversial questions. It must have the effect of strengthening the attitude of resistance of those opposed to us—if, indeed, that be possible.

The material question at issue is whether a case of neglect has been made out against the Government. If I thought that such a case had been made out, I should, without hesitation, vote for the motion, because a matter which concerns the weak, helpless, and defenceless is one which, above everything else, ought to enlist sympathy in this House. But the conclusion at which I have arrived, as regards not only this matter but many others connected with the war, is that a case has not been made out. There have been many blunders—some on the other side, such, for instance, as the permitting of large numbers of burghers to go on parole to their farms, a course of action which had no good result from any point of view. There have been policies in connection with farm-burning and other matters which enlightened opinion has probably agreed were mistaken. Blunders of that kind have been made, and they always will be made in a great military campaign, because of the want of organisation which it produces. Still, I see nothing to lead me to question the desire of everybody, from the generals in the field to His Majesty's Ministers, to conduct the warlike operations in South Africa with as much humanity and as little cruelty as possible. War is always a horrible and terrible thing—you will never make it otherwise than miserable; but, notwithstanding the many hardships which

have resulted, I cannot see that His Majesty's Government have had brought home to them any neglect or oversight in this matter. The right hon. Gentleman told us of certain steps which, I understand, have been taken. He has to deal with a very large number of women and children. We are not in a position to discuss the question of concentration. Concentration is a most disagreeable necessity of war, if a necessity of war it be. But one has to consider whether it is a better or a worse alternative to something else. I cannot discuss the matter now, but before I pronounced against concentration I should like to know what other methods are open. I have listened in vain to the speeches on this side of the House for an alternative suggestion.

*MR. BRYN ROBERTS* Stop the war.

*MR. HALDANE* My hon. friend behind me, whose devotion to this cause no one will question, says "Stop the war." A great number of people on this side who wish to see the war stopped think that to stop it in the way that my hon. friend suggests would be the most disastrous thing that could happen. I have never shared the views of my hon. friend upon this matter. I have never had a doubt that the cause of this war was the policy adopted by President Kruger, and I have never had a doubt that the bringing of this war to a satisfactory conclusion can only be accomplished by the present policy of the Government. I think that in saying this I am expressing the views of a large number of hon. Members on this side of the House. [Opposition cries of "Order, order," and Ministerial cheers.] I know that we shall not be allowed to enter into these matters now, but I must emphasise them, because time after time—

*MR. LABOUCHERE* (Northampton) Has my hon. friend any right to discuss the opinions entertained on this side of the House in regard to the policy of this war?

*\*MR. SPEAKER* The hon. Member has not a right to discuss upon the present motion the opinions on the war held by hon. Members of this House. I understand that the hon. Member only spoke about it for a very few moments, in consequence of an interruption.

*MR. PIRIE* (Aberdeen, N.) It is distinctly out of order.

*MR. WILLIAM REDMOND* (Clare, E.) I rise to a point of order; otherwise I should not have risen at all. I desire to ask you, Mr. Speaker, for my own information, whether in the course of this debate the hon. Gentleman is in order upon this motion in discussing the policy of Mr. Kruger and what led to the war, because, if he is, I shall be inclined to take part in the discussion.

*\*MR. SPEAKER* I did not understand that the hon. Member was doing anything of the kind. I hope he will not follow any line of argument of that character.

*MR. HALDANE* I know that I should have been wholly out of order if I did that, and I had not the smallest intention of doing more than merely saying what I have already stated. I say that this matter has been discussed and colour has been brought into it, and my desire was to make it clear that I do not partake in that colouring.

*MR. WILLIAM REDMOND* Then why did you bring Kruger in?

*MR. HALDANE* I did it to make it perfectly clear that there is a difference between myself and some hon. friends of mine who sit on this side of the House.

*MR. PIRIE* The strongest difference.

*MR. HALDANE* The question which has been raised, I am aware, relates simply to what has been done in these camps, and not the policy of keeping the refugees there; and if that fact had been observed in the discussion we should have been spared a considerable amount of these interruptions. The right hon. Gentleman has informed us that instructions have been given to the military authorities to discontinue some of the practices complained of in these camps. In the

first place, I am very glad that the differentiation between the kinds of food, which was a blunder, has been abolished, and I understand that there is now no difference between the food given to the children there, whether they belong to the Boers in the field or to the people who are not in actual warfare. In the second place, I gather that provision is being made for the instruction of the children. I trust that this policy of keeping the women and children in camps is not one which it is necessary to carry on for a long period. It is right that the provision for the instruction of these children is one which should be maintained. In the third place, as regards the question referred to by the hon. Member for Rushcliffe, I am not quite sure whether that is satisfactory, but I gather that the right hon. Gentleman is in sympathy with what the hon. Member for Rushcliffe desires in regard to the religious question, and that steps are being taken in that direction. As regards occupation, provision is being made for the refugees, and local committees have already been formed. Then there is the question of visiting. I cannot help thinking that too much stress is apt to be laid upon the danger of allowing relatives and friends, who may happen to come from other places, access to those whom they know in these camps. I think that, as far as is consistent with our policy—and it is almost impossible for us to judge of the details 6,000 miles away—I should like to see every relaxation made in that direction. As regards sending these unfortunate people back to their homes, I understand the right hon. Gentleman is considering that as a practical matter. It is all very well to say that permission to leave has been refused. I notice that my hon. friend the Member for Carnarvon said that Mr. Rowntree—with whom I am personally acquainted, and who is a gentleman as honourable as any to be found in the length and breadth of England—had not been permitted to go to Bloemfontein.

*MR. JOHN ELLIS* He never tried to get permission to go to Bloemfontein.

*MR. HALDANE* He must have proceeded on mere hearsay in some of these matters.

*MR. JOHN ELLIS* It was not so.

*MR. HALDANE* It is difficult for such people as Mr. Rowntree to be certain at first hand, and I cannot help thinking that things have not been quite so bad in some particulars. I trust the right hon. Gentleman will develop this policy of endeavouring to make the lives of these people brighter and happier, and of allowing them to return to the homes which may be provided for them as soon as possible.

*MR. JOHN ELLIS* These complaints were made by Sir Sauer in specific terms.

*MR. HALDANE* But Mr. Sauer could not write letters on behalf of the women and children, and what has been alluded to must have been some general proposal. At any rate, now we know that this policy of allowing these people to return to their homes is being considered. Again I say that I am glad this matter has been raised and discussed upon this occasion. The subject is a very grave one. These death-rate statistics are very serious, and I wish it had been possible to have had some more specific details than we have had to-night. I hope the right hon. Gentleman will be able to reassure the House on these matters, and in sitting down I wish to repeat my emphatic conviction that everything will be done that can be done by the right hon. Gentleman, and by the distinguished soldiers in command of the military operations to alleviate the condition of these people. It is our duty in the House of Commons to be vigilant in these matters, and we have done right in being vigilant. I have yet to be convinced that there has been brought home to them any blameworthiness for a state of things which, if it is blameworthy, is blameworthy because of causes far deeper and reasons more far-reaching than any mere incidents that can happen in the course of a great military campaign.

*MR. WILLIAM REDMOND* The hon. Gentleman who has just resumed his seat has, like other hon. Members of this House, no doubt the greatest sympathy with these unfortunate women and children whose case is now being considered. At the same time, I think there are a number of hon. Members who will agree with me that the tone and the trend of the speech of the hon. Member for Haddingtonshire is not calculated to urge the Government to relieve in any way the things which we complain of in regard to their conduct in South Africa. When a specific charge is made in this House that certain things are being done in South Africa which are a dishonour to the name of this country and to the very name of civilisation, the proper way to have these things altered is not to get up and express your utmost



confidence that the case in regard to them has been exaggerated, and to say that everything possible will be done, and no doubt has been done. I think if a remedy is looked for it will have to be sought rather in the tone adopted by the hon. Member for Carnarvon and the hon. Member for the Rushcliffe Division, who, in my opinion as an Irishman, are redeeming the very name and credit and honour of England by the action they are taking. The hon. Member for Haddingtonshire said he regretted that this matter could not be discussed without having a heated tone imported into the debate. Nobody wants, in a serious case of this kind, where serious allegations are made, to have a heated discussion or to introduce anything at all in the shape of party recriminations; but I venture to say that whatever has been introduced into this debate of that character has largely been introduced by the hon. Member for Haddingtonshire himself, because instead of confining himself to the particular matters which were raised by the motion of the hon. Member for Carnarvon, to a large extent he went into the history of the commencement of this war. If the hon. Member did not want to introduce heat, why did he make the charge that President Kruger was responsible for this war knowing as he did the ruling which had been given, and the limits within which this debate had to be confined, there was no justification whatever for the hon. Member venturing the opinion that Mr. Kruger was to blame for this war, when he knew very well that you, Mr. Speaker, would not allow any subsequent speaker to go into the Causes which originated this war or into the conduct of Mr. Kruger. The hon. Member for Haddingtonshire was most anxious to say that he does not believe any cruelty is knowingly or willingly indulged in by those in authority in South Africa, and he is quite sure that there is not a single Member in this House who is not inclined to condemn cruelty and inconsiderate treatment to women and children in South Africa. I re-echo that opinion. As I understand the hon. Member for Carnarvonshire and the hon. Member for the Rushcliffe Division, they do not make specific charges against persons or individuals in South Africa. They do not charge hon. Gentlemen opposite who support this policy with being themselves individually in favour of what is complained of in their conduct toward these women and children. On the contrary, as far as my information goes, so far from charging those in immediate authority in South Africa, and certainly so far from charging the rank and file of the Army of the British Empire, it is quite the contrary. But while we make these complaints as to the treatment accorded to the women and children in these camps we say, at the same time, without the slightest fear of contradiction, that the rank and file of the British Army, if canvassed, would be found to be absolutely and utterly disgusted at the work they are called upon to do, and the deeds they have been called upon to perform, which is not the work they enlisted in the Army to carry out, and which is not the work of a soldier. I venture to say that to have armed sentries surrounding, the camps of defenceless and helpless, women and children in different parts of South Africa is not the work of soldiering in the Army, and it is repugnant to their feelings and disgraceful and discreditable to those who place such work upon them.

Sir, we have had extraordinary instances of the want of consideration on the part of those in authority many times since this war commenced, but nevertheless I do not charge individuals or persons—they are obliged to carry out the system, but I shall deliberately and absolutely, without the slightest fear of contradiction, and with the full responsibility which attaches to my words, so long as I am a Member of this House, denounce as barbarous, outrageous, scandalous, and disgraceful, the way in which these wretched, unfortunate and poor women and children have been treated in South Africa. [Ministerial cries of "Divide, divide."] You may cry "Divide," but you cannot alter the words I utter, and you cannot prevent me as a Member of this House saying to you, and to the world outside through the press, that your conduct in South Africa in connection with these women and children is conduct which would bring shame to the cheeks of the most savage and most barbarous people in existence. We sometimes hear wonder expressed why the war is still dragging on. We sometimes wonder, when the news of another engagement comes, why the Boers are still holding to their arms. I do not know what reasons may animate them in continuing this war, but I do say that in all probability the worst part of this war would have been now over, and hundreds of lives would have been saved, but for the treatment you have meted out to the wives and the daughters of these men who are now in the field against us. Therefore I am not surprised at the action of the Boers in continuing this struggle, and I say here that if I belonged to the race of Boers—and if I did I should be very proud of it—and if the faintest echo of the news of the treatment which has been accorded to poor Boer women and children in the refugee camps had reached my ears, it would steel my heart and make me determined, if nothing else affected me, to fight to the last

against the flag and the country, and the people and the Government, which could sink so low as to attempt to make war upon helpless women and children in this way. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Haddingtonshire speaks softly of these matters. I say that the time has come for everyone in this House, whether he be from Scotland, England, Wales, or Ireland, who believes in humanity, honour, and civilisation, to raise his voice against this state of things. The speech delivered by the Leader of the Opposition was a calm and moderate one, but it illustrates in this House what is going on outside, and it is that the masses of the people of England and Scotland are tired and sick at heart of these brutalities, and the Leader of the Opposition has echoed that feeling in his speech to-night. We are told that the Government will do their best to remedy this state of things, and we are told that we ought not to spring debates like this upon the House. That is all very well, but unless we do this how are we to get grievances removed? Are grievances removed by consulting the convenience of the Government, or by refraining from moving the adjournment, and sitting silent on these benches? No. I say that what has been done in South Africa—and I admit that something has been done—to mitigate the suffering of these unhappy women and children, is the direct result of action taken in this House. We know that there have been two scales of food—a full dinner and a full meal for the poor child whose father has pulled his flag down, and handed in his arms and surrendered to the British, and half a meal for the wretched little child in camp whose father still holds on to his rifle. Is that making war in a British way? Is that making war in a way calculated to bring credit upon this nation? Is that carrying on war in the spirit in which it would have been carried on by the men who fought for England in days gone by? No. Such conduct as the starvation of poor women and children in order to make their able-bodied relatives surrender is a course of action the most discreditable, the most contemptible, and the most dastardly which I have ever heard of. No man can deny the truth of what I have said. [Ministerial cries of "Oh, oh!"] Do hon. Members deny that at the commencement of these encampments there were two scales of food; that one scale was supplied to the women and children of the men who were not in arms against us, and that the lesser scale was supplied to the women and children of the men who were still on commando? [AN HON. MEMBER: I deny the whole tenour of the hon. Gentleman's speech. There was only a certain amount of food to go round, and that is the answer to his argument.] I do not ask the hon. Gentleman opposite to approve of the whole tenour of my speech. If I thought for a moment that I should have the approval of the whole tenour of my speech from him and hon. Gentlemen sitting around him I should be ashamed. I do, however, ask him, can he deny the specific statement made that more food was given to the wives and children of those who had surrendered and less to the wives and children of those who were still in arms against us? His answer to this is one which has never been heard of from any other quarter of the House up till now. He states that there was not food enough to go round, but I have not heard that argument advanced by the Secretary of State for War, or from anybody in authority. But, granted that it is true, what a curious coincidence it is that, when there is not enough to go round, the larger share shall be given to the women and children of those who have surrendered, and the smaller portion to the women and children of the men who are still on commando. That system did exist, and it cannot be denied. I am heartily glad, and so is every other man here, whether he be an Englishman, Scotchman, or Irishman, to know that that system has been abandoned; and now I understand that the same food is given in equal quantities to all these wretched women and helpless children, whether their husbands and fathers are still fighting or whether they have been taken prisoners. I am glad to know that this system has been abandoned, but when was it abandoned? I ask the hon. Member for Haddingtonshire why was it abandoned? It was not abandoned until the hon. Member for Carnarvon and men like him exposed this system in the House, and brought home to the attention of the British public this kind of treatment. After the Government had been put to some inconvenience, then this policy was changed and something was done in the matter. I know many hon. Members of this House deprecated interference at the time, but the result of that interference was that this diabolical system was destroyed.

We are told the question of allowing these women and children to go to whatever homes any of them have still left standing is being considered. We know many of them have lost not only their breadwinners, but their very homes have been razed to the ground. Many of them have no homes to go to, and still we are told that the question of allowing their friends to take care of them is being seriously considered. I am making no personal attack upon the Secretary of State for War in this matter, because I can hardly conceive that any man who really has information of what is going

on could approve of the things which are being done. The right hon. Gentleman has said that the question of allowing these people to return to their homes is being considered, and why is it being considered now? Exactly for the same reason that the two different scales of provisions for the women and children was considered. It is now being considered, because a few good and true men in this House, like the hon. Member for Carnarvon and the hon. Member for the Rushcliffe Division, have raised their voices here. I do sincerely hope and trust that the day is very near when all these things which are complained of most justly will have disappeared, and when better treatment will be meted out to these wretched women and children. When this has been achieved great credit will be undoubtedly due to those hon. Members who, though they have been denounced by the majority, have, to the honour of England, protested against such treatment.

There is only one point to which I wish to refer, and it explains why I, as an Irish Member, interfere in this debate at all. Are these women, some of whom are old and others young, prisoners or are they not? I want a straight answer to that question. I say that a straight answer has not yet been vouchsafed to the country by the Government. We are told that they are pauper refugees. We are told that they are destitute, and might perhaps be outraged and murdered by the natives. We are told that all of their own free will came into the camps and stay there now. Is that true? I say it is not true. I say that, just as Boer men are prisoners surrounded by British sentries with rifles and bayonets in St. Helena, Ceylon, and other places, the Boer women and children are prisoners surrounded by sentries in South Africa at the present time. I have got strange confirmation of my suspicion in this matter from the Secretary of State for War at question time. He let fall the word "release." What does he mean by the release of these people? You do not speak of the release of voluntary refugees. You speak of the release of people who are prisoners. Prisoners these people are, and I say it is a dishonour and a discredit to this country, to the very name of civilisation, that this should go on, and, moreover, I say this—and I have some slight knowledge of the Dutch in South Africa, having spent some time years ago in Cape Colony—every day you continue this treatment, every day you allow women and young children to die in these wretched camps, you make more difficult and more impossible British rule in South Africa, and you instil into the hearts of the Dutch people a deadlier hatred, if possible, than exists at the present time for your rule. If not for the sake of humanity, if not for the sake of the sufferings of the women and children—and there is no gentleman in the House of Commons but must have sympathy with these wretched women and children who are huddled together—I ask that a new arrangement should be made for the sake of the common interest of this country. I ask you, out of common prudence and out of common regard to what you propose to do for South Africa in the future, having regard for the peace and contentment of the country, to put an end to these camps of hell which are at the present time simply maddening every man of the Dutch race throughout the length and breadth of Africa and Europe as well.

There are some hon. Members opposite who take this matter lightly. I confess that I myself belong to the Irish race, and I say, whatever the light-heartedness of the Irish race may be, that there is not one of us who has not been stricken with sorrow and sadness as the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War read out the figures with regard to these camps. Hundreds of poor, wretched, helpless little children dying every month! Hundreds of women dying! An abnormal death-rate which, even according to what the Secretary of State for War has himself stated, is sufficient to appal every man who realises what it really means. I can only say from my heart and soul that I pity the man who can find cause to smile in the story related by the Secretary of State for War. If you had nothing else, the rate of mortality of women and children is reason enough itself for moving the adjournment of the House in this matter; and, as an Irishman, having very little reason to have consideration, and much less admiration, for English Members of this House or the conduct of the English Government, I say, and I believe it is the feeling of my countrymen around me, that we do honour and admire the gentlemen who have brought this discussion forward, and if there is a gleam of hope or generosity or honour in the present situation it has undoubtedly been afforded by the action of the Welsh and English Members, who differ from us on many questions, but who have shown us in this matter that they have hearts to feel and minds sufficiently statesmanlike to perceive that danger—[A laugh.] Yes, he is not an Englishman who is laughing now. He is an Irishman who is sitting away from his own countrymen, and who has joined the foreign commando. I say that whatever gleam of hope and honour there is has been afforded by those independent

Englishmen, Welshmen and Scotchmen who are not debarred by the sneers and jibes of the great party that have secured a big majority from coming to the House of Commons and raising their voices on behalf of the wretched people who have no others to speak for them at the present time. I say that their action does honour and credit to the countries to which they belong, and as far as gentlemen from Ireland are concerned, I say that we join with them heartily and, to some extent, hopefully in this effort, and we trust that as the result of the exposure something will be done to alleviate the lot of these people in South Africa. Do not tell me that this must be kept up till the war is over. Send them to their husbands in various parts of the world. Although I have denounced the First Lord of the Treasury for eighteen years in this House, and although at one time he was my jailor, I still say here from my observation of him for many years that I do not believe he has a heart which would approve or sanction in the slightest degree things which were really cruel and unnecessary. I ask him as head of the Government to inquire if the charges which have been made are true. How can that be done? It can only be done by sending a fair and impartial Commission to South Africa. Let it be composed of men who have the confidence of Liberals and Tories and the Irish Members. Let them inquire into the conditions of these camps, and if that Commission reports against the system, in the name of God and for the sake of Christianity I ask you to abolish that system and to restore these people to the comforts and the decencies of ordinary civilised life.

*\*MR. HERBERT LEWIS* (Flint Boroughs) It has been stated that Mr. Rowntree was only able to visit one or two of the camps in Cape Town and Natal. I would like to ask whose fault was that? Was it the fault of Mr. Rowntree or the Government, or those who represent the Government in South Africa, who did not allow Mr. Rowntree to proceed further than the limits I have stated? But fortunately we have evidence at first hand, taken from a considerable number of the camps by a lady whose word will command implicit confidence from everyone who knows her. The right hon. Gentleman in the course of his speech referred to a case in which Boers refused to be separated from their children, and would not allow them to go into the hospital. Now, may I give the House one or two reasons for this? [Interruption and cries of "Divide."] This question affects 60,000 people, of whom 40,000 are children, and I venture to think that under the circumstances, although hon. Gentlemen may be anxious to go to dinner, they could listen for a few moments to a few of the details which have been asked for. Why have the Boer families refused to be separated? I will give the right hon. Gentleman one case which may show the reason for that. The lady who visited the camps says— "In our tent a girl of twenty-one lay dying on a stretcher. The father, a big, gentle Boer, kneeling beside her; while in the next tent his wife was watching a child of six, also dying, and one of about five drooping. Already this couple had lost three children in the hospital, and so would not let these go, though I begged hard to take them out of the hot tent. 'We must watch these ourselves,' he said." That may give the right hon. Gentleman some inkling as to the reason why in certain cases Boer families refuse to be separated from one another. The right hon. Gentleman has given us to-night the usual official optimism with perfect honesty, as he always does, but may I recall to his recollection the questions asked in this House on 1st and 8th March. On the 1st March the right hon. Gentleman said— "Lord Kitchener has informed me that a sufficient allowance is being given to all families in camp, and that they are satisfied and comfortable." On the 8th March he said:— "Lord Kitchener telegraphed to me that he himself has gone into the question, and finds that the people in the laagers are all contented and comfortable." Well, I have something to say upon that point. [Cries of "Divide!"] You have asked for details, and I propose to give the House some. Here are the circumstances under which the Boer prisoners were "contented and comfortable" on 13th March. This is Miss Hobhouse's description of the camp at Kimberley five days after the right hon. Gentleman made his statement in the House of Commons:— "It is the smallest in area that I have seen. The tents too close together, and the whole enclosed in an 8ft. high barbed wire fencing, which is supposed to be impregnable, and cost £500. Sentries at the gate and walking inside; no nurse; an empty unfurnished marquee, which might be a hospital; overcrowded tents; measles and whooping cough rife; camp dirty and smelling; an army doctor, who naturally knows little of children's ailments; fuel almost none." Then again—[Cries of "Divide!"]—I think the House has asked for facts. I am attempting to give the House some facts, and may I appeal to hon. Gentlemen opposite to listen? The war has now been proceeding for eighteen months, and this is only the second occasion on which I have said a single word. I am going to make one appeal to the right hon. Gentleman with regard to the children. There are certain mothers who have been separated

from their children. They are mad to get to those children, and I would ask him to consider whether he will allow the mothers to go and search for their children. They have been compulsorily separated, and I trust the Government will, at all events, as an act of grace allow the mothers to rejoin their children. We have already heard something of the condition of the children in the camps. What has been said so far has been by way of general statement, and I should like to give—[Cries of "Divide!"] The effect of the camp system, as described by eye-witnesses, presses hardest on the children. Thousands of them are physically unfit to undergo the conditions of life there. They have not the strength to endure it, and we are told that to keep these camps going is murder to the children. The Government has taken upon itself a grave responsibility in sanctioning what is going on at the present time. Who would have thought when General Weyler had his concentration camps in Cuba that similar measures would be adopted within the bounds of the British Empire? The right hon. Gentleman has defended all that has taken place in connection with these camps on the ground of expediency. I would venture to say, looking at these 40,000 children in the camps, that we are only sowing the seeds of discontent, and that we may reap a terrible harvest some day—not perhaps this year or next year, but in time coming a nation will grow up which will remember all these iniquities.

If, on other grounds, our remonstrances are disregarded, I would venture to appeal to the right hon. Gentleman on the lowest ground—that of expense. As an instance of the extravagant cost of these camps, I may mention that in one place twenty iron rooms were put up, and they cost on the average £125 each. There are a large number of women beseeching to be sent to their own relatives. The relatives offer to pay the expense. Why should they not be allowed to go to their relatives in Cape Colony? I do not wish to arouse any party feeling in this House, nor have I done so. The facts surely speak for themselves, and I have confidence that when the case is presented to the right hon. Gentleman he will take what steps are in his power. I am afraid he is not convinced of the sad state of things in these camps. I beg him to obtain early and full information on the point. Hon. Gentlemen opposite have made it extremely difficult for me to speak on this question. I only wish that someone would be allowed to set forth some of the actual details and circumstances of what has occurred. I have had the advantage of reading reports by independent eye-witnesses. I venture to think if hon. Gentlemen opposite would read these reports they would feel there was a case for prompt intervention. I appeal to the Government

*for the sake of the little children who are passing away like so many faded flowers in South Africa, for the sake of the parents who have to see them sick and dying before their eyes, to give their attention to this matter. The only effect of the present policy is to madden and exasperate the enemies of this country. They will be enemies to all eternity unless we reverse this policy.*

*THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.) rose in his place and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put." [Nationalist cries of "Oh" and "Gag."]*

*\*MR. SPEAKER* accepted the motion.

*MR. WILLIAM REDMOND* You want to stifle the truth.

*\*MR. SPEAKER* Order, order! I must ask the hon. Member to use more regular language.

*MR. WILLIAM REDMOND* In regard to this I repeat that you want to stifle the truth. You are ashamed of this work, and you are trying to shelve it. [Nationalist cheers and Ministerial cries of "Name him."] Name away. You are trying to cloak it all up.

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

*The House divided:—Ayes, 252; Noes, 149. (Division List No. 256.)*

Clare, Octavius Leigh  
Coddington, Sir William

Hobhouse, Henry (Somert, E.)  
Hogg, Lindsay

Pierpoint, Robert  
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard

Cohen, Benjamin Louis	Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)	Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse	Hozier, Hon. James Hy. Cecil	Plummer, Walter R.
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready	Hudson, George Bickersteth	Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole	Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)	Pretyman, Ernest George
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas		Price-Jones, Lt-Col. Edward
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)	Jackson, Rt. Hon. W. Lawies	Purvis, Robert
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)	Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse	Pym, C. Guy
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge	Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick	
Cranborne, Viscount	Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton	Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Cripps, Charles Alfred	Johnston, William (Belfast)	
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)	Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)	Randles, John S.
Crossley, Sir Savile		Rankin, Sir James
Cubitt, Hon. Henry	Kenyon, Hon. G. T. (Denbigh)	Rasch, Major Frederic C.
	Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)	Ratcliffe, R. F.
Dalkeith, Earl of	Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)	Reid, James (Greenock)
Dalrymple, Sir Charles	Keswick, William	Remnant, James Farquharson
Dewar, T. R. (TrH'mlets, S. Geo)	Kimber, Henry	Renshaw, Charles Bine
Dickinson, Robert Edmond	King, Sir Henry Seymour	Rentoul, James Alexander
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.		Renwick, George
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-	Laurie, Lieut.-General	Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield	Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)	Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. T.
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon	Lawson, John Grant	Ropner, Colonel Robert
Dorington, Sir John Edward	Lecky, Rt Hn. William Edw. H.	Round, James
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-	Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)	Russell, T. W.
Doxford, Sir William Theodore	Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage	Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Duke, Henry Edward	Leveson-Gower, Fredk. N. S.	
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin	Llewellyn, Evan Henry	Seton-Karr, Henry
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart	Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.	Sharpe, Wm. Edw. T.
	Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine	Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas	Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)	Skewes-Cox, Thomas
	Long, Rt. Hn Walter (Bristol, S.	Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Fardell, Sir T. George	Loyd, Archie Kirkman	Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward	Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)	Spear, John Ward
Fergusson, Rt Hn Sir J (Manc'r)	Lucas, R. J. (Portsmouth)	Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst	Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred	Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Finch, George H.		Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart
Finlay, Sir Robt. Bannatyne	Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. E.	Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Fisher, William Hayes	Macdona, John Cumming	Stock, James Henry
Fison, Frederick William	Maconochie, A. W.	Stroyan, John
Flannery, Sir Fortescue	M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)	Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Fletcher, Sir Henry	M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim. E.)	
Flower, Ernest	M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W	Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Foster, Sir Michael (Lond. Univ	Majendie, James A. H.	Thorburn, Sir Walter
	Malcolm, Ian	Thornton, Percy M.
Garfit, William	Manners, Lord Cecil	Tollemache, Henry James
Gibbs, Hn. A. G H (City of Lond.	Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E (Wigt'n	Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn	Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.	Tritton, Charles Ernest
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormby-(Salop	Melville, Beresford Valentine	Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon	Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.	
Goschen, Hon George Joachim	Middlemore, John Throgmort'n	Valentia, Viscount
Goulding, Edward Alfred	Mildmay, Francis Bingham	Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Graham, Henry Robert	Mitchell, William	Walker, Col. William Hall
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)	Molesworth, Sir Lewis	Warde, Col. C. E.
Green, Walford D. (Wednesby.	Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)	Warr, Augustus Frederick
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds	Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.	Wason, John C. (Orkney)

Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)	Morgan, David J. (Walthams'w	Webb, Col. William George
Guthrie, Walter Murray	Morgan, Hn. Fred (Monm'thsh.	Welby, Lt.-Col A. C. E. (Taun'n).
	Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.	Welby, Sir C. G. E. (Notts.)
Hain, Edward	Morrison, James Archibald	Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne).
Hall, Edward Marshall	Morton, Arthur H. A (Deptford	Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Halsey, Thomas Frederick	Mount, William Arthur	Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Middx	Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G (Bute)	Wills, Sir Frederick
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nerry	Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)	Wilson, A. Stanley (Yorks, E. R.
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.	Myers, William Henry	Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd		Wodehouse, Rt. Hon E R (Bath)
Harris, Frederick Leverton	Nicholson, William Graham	Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Haslett, Sir James Horner	Nicol, Donald Ninian	Wylie, Alexander
Hay, Hn. Claude George		Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Heath, James (Staffords. N. W.	O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens	Younger, William
Helder, Augustus	Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay	
Henderson, Alexander		TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Hermon-Hodge, Robt. Trotter	Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)	Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Higginbottom, S. W.	Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert W.	
Hoare, Edw Brodie Hampste'd	Percy, Earl	

*Question put accordingly.*

*The House divided:—Ayes, 134; Noes, 253. (Division List, No. 257.)*

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.	Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r.	Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte	Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds)	Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel	Balfour, Maj K R (Christch'rch)	Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Allhusen, Augustus Hy. Eden	Banbury, Frederick George	Bull, William James
Allsopp, Hon. George	Beach, Rt Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)	Butcher, John George
Anson, Sir William Reynell	Beach, Rt. Hn. W. W. B. (Hants.	Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Archdale, Edward Mervyn	Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.	Cautley, Henry Strother
Arkwright, John Stanhope	Bigwood, James	Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.	Bill, Charles	Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John	Blundell, Col. Henry	Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Austin, Sir John	Bond, Edward	Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy	Bousfield, William Robert	Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Bain, Colonel James Robert	Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)	Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
Baird, John George Alexander	Bowles, T Gibson (King's Lynn)	Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Balcarres, Lord	Brassey, Albert	Chapman, Edward
Clare, Octavius Leigh	Hobhouse, Henry (Somert, E.)	Pierpoint, Robert
Coddington, Sir William	Hogg, Lindsay	Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
Cohen, Benjamin Louis	Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)	Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse	Hozier, Hon. James Hy. Cecil	Plummer, Walter R.
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready	Hudson, George Bickersteth	Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole	Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)	Pretyman, Ernest George
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas		Price-Jones, Lt-Col. Edward
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)	Jackson, Rt. Hon. W. Lawies	Purvis, Robert
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)	Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse	Pym, C. Guy
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge	Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick	
Cranborne, Viscount	Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton	Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Cripps, Charles Alfred	Johnston, William (Belfast)	
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)	Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)	Randles, John S.
Crossley, Sir Savile		Rankin, Sir James
Cubitt, Hon. Henry	Kenyon, Hon. G. T. (Denbigh)	Rasch, Major Frederic C.
	Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)	Ratcliffe, R. F.

Dalkeith, Earl of	Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)	Reid, James (Greenock)
Dalrymple, Sir Charles	Keswick, William	Remnant, James Farquharson
Dewar, T. R. (TrH'mlets, S. Geo)	Kimber, Henry	Renshaw, Charles Bine
Dickinson, Robert Edmond	King, Sir Henry Seymour	Rentoul, James Alexander
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.		Renwick, George
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-	Laurie, Lieut.-General	Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield	Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)	Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. T.
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon	Lawson, John Grant	Ropner, Colonel Robert
Dorington, Sir John Edward	Lecky, Rt Hn. William Edw. H.	Round, James
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-	Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)	Russell, T. W.
Doxford, Sir William Theodore	Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage	Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Duke, Henry Edward	Leveson-Gower, Fredk. N. S.	
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin	Llewellyn, Evan Henry	Seton-Karr, Henry
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart	Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.	Sharpe, Wm. Edw. T.
	Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine	Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas	Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)	Skewes-Cox, Thomas
	Long, Rt. Hn Walter (Bristol, S.	Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Fardell, Sir T. George	Loyd, Archie Kirkman	Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward	Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)	Spear, John Ward
Fergusson, Rt Hn Sir J (Manc'r)	Lucas, R. J. (Portsmouth)	Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst	Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred	Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Finch, George H.		Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart
Finlay, Sir Robt. Bannatyne	Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. E.	Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Fisher, William Hayes	Macdona, John Cumming	Stock, James Henry
Fison, Frederick William	Maconochie, A. W.	Stroyan, John
Flannery, Sir Fortescue	M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)	Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Fletcher, Sir Henry	M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim. E.)	
Flower, Ernest	M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W	Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Foster, Sir Michael (Lond. Univ	Majendie, James A. H.	Thorburn, Sir Walter
	Malcolm, Ian	Thornton, Percy M.
Garfit, William	Manners, Lord Cecil	Tollemache, Henry James
Gibbs, Hn. A. G H (City of Lond.	Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E (Wigt'n	Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn	Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.	Tritton, Charles Ernest
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormby-(Salop	Melville, Beresford Valentine	Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon	Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.	
Goschen, Hon George Joachim	Middlemore, John Throgmort'n	Valentia, Viscount
Goulding, Edward Alfred	Mildmay, Francis Bingham	Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Graham, Henry Robert	Mitchell, William	Walker, Col. William Hall
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)	Molesworth, Sir Lewis	Warde, Col. C. E.
Green, Walford D. (Wednesby.	Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)	Warr, Augustus Frederick
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds	Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.	Wason, John C. (Orkney)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)	Morgan, David J. (Walthams'w	Webb, Col. William George
Guthrie, Walter Murray	Morgan, Hn. Fred (Monm'thsh.	Welby, Lt.-Col A. C. E. (Taun'n).
	Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.	Welby, Sir C. G. E. (Notts.)
Hain, Edward	Morrison, James Archibald	Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne).
Hall, Edward Marshall	Morton, Arthur H. A (Deptford	Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Halsey, Thomas Frederick	Mount, William Arthur	Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Middx	Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G (Bute)	Wills, Sir Frederick
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry	Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)	Wilson, A. Stanley (Yorks, E. R.
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.	Myers, William Henry	Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd		Wodehouse, Rt. Hon E R (Bath)
Harris, Frederick Leverton	Nicholson, William Graham	Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Haslett, Sir James Horner	Nicol, Donald Ninian	Wylie, Alexander
Hay, Hn. Claude George		Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Heath, James (Staffords. N. W.	O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens	Younger, William



Helder, Augustus	Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay	
Henderson, Alexander		TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Hermon-Hodge, Robt. Trotter	Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)	Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Higginbottom, S. W.	Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert W.	
Hoare, Edw Brodie Hampste'd NOES.	Percy, Earl	
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)	Grant, Corrie	O'Dowd, John
Allan, William (Gateshead)	Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton	O'Kelly, Conor, (Mayo, N.)
Allen, Charlea P. (Glouc. Stroud)	Hammond, John	O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N)
Ambrose, Robert	Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William	O'Malley, William
Ashton, Thomas Gair	Harwood, George	O'Mara, James
Atherley-Jones, L.	Hayden, John Patrick	O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)	Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-	O'Shee, James John
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)	Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.	Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.	Helme, Norval Watson	Pease, Sir Joseph W. (Durham)
Bell, Richard	Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.	Pirie, Duncan V.
Black, Alexander William	Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)	Power, Patrick Joseph
Blake, Edward	Horniman, Frederick John	Price, Robert John
Boland, John	Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)	Reckitt, Harold James
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson	Jacoby, James Alfred	Reddy, M.
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James	Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)	Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Burke, E. Haviland-	Jones, William (Carnarvons.)	Redmond, William (Clare)
Burns, John	Jordan, Jeremiah	Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Buxton, Sydney Charles	Kennedy, Patrick James	Rickett, J. Compton
Caine, William Sproston	Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth	Rigg, Richard
Caldwell, James	Labouchere, Henry	Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)	Lambert, George	Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.	Leamy, Edmund	Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Carew, James Laurence	Leese, Sir Joseph F (Accrington	Robson, Wm. Snowdon
Causton, Richard Knight	Leng, Sir John	Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Channing, Francis Allston	Lewis, John Herbert	Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Clancy, John Joseph	Lough, Thomas	Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Cogan, Denis J.	Lundon, W.	Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh.)
Condon, Thomas Joseph	MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.	Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R. (N'rth'nts
Craig, Robert Hunter	Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.	Sullivan, Donal
Crean, Eugene	M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)	Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Crombie, John William	M'Crae, George	Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Cullinan, J.	M'Dermott, Patrick	Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.
Dalziel, James Henry	M'Govern, T.	Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)	M'Kenna, Reginald	Thomas J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Delany, William	Mather, William	Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Donelan, Capt. A.	Mooney, John J.	Tomkinson, James
Doogan, P. C.	Morton, Edw. J.C. (Devonport)	Wallace, Robert
Duffy, William J.	Moulton, John Fletcher	Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan.
Duncan, J. Hastings	Murnaghan, George	White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Edwards, Frank	Murphy, John	White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Emmott, Alfred	Nannetti, Joseph P.	Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)	Nolan, Col. John. P (Galway, N.	Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert	Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)	Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Ffrench, Peter	Norton, Capt. Cecil William	Wilson, Charles H. (Hull, W.)
Field, William	O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)	Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond	O'Brien, Kendal (Tipp'rary Mid	Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
Flynn, James Christopher	O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)	Yoxall, James Henry
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)	O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)	
Gilhooly, James	O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.	TELLERS FOR THE NOES—

Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.) Mr. Lloyd-George and Mr. John Ellis.  
 Goddard, Daniel Ford O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)	Boland, John	Causton, Richard Knight
Allan, William (Gateshead)	Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson	Channing, Francis Allston
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud)	Bryce, Rt. Hon. James	Clancy, John Joseph
Ambrose, Robert	Burke, E. Haviland-	Cogan, Denis J.
Ashton, Thomas Gair	Burns, John	Condon, Thomas Joseph
Atherley-Jones, L.	Buxton, Sydney Charles	Craig, Robert Hunter
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)	Caine, William Sproston	Crean, Eugene
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)	Caldwell, James	Crombie, John William
Bell, Richard	Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)	Cullinan, J.
Black, Alexander William	Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.	Dalziel, James Henry
Blake, Edward	Carew, James Laurence	Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany William	Leng, Sir John	Price, Robert John
Donelan, Captain A.	Lewis, John Herbert	Reckitt, Harold James
Doogan, P. C.	Lough, Thomas	Reddy, M.
Duffy, William J.	Lundon, W.	Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Duncan, J. Hastings	MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.	Redmond, William (Clare)
Edwards, Frank	Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.	Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries)
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)	M'Crae, George	Rickett, J. Compton
Farquharson, Dr. Robert	M'Dermott, Patrick	Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Ffrench, Peter	M'Govern, T.	Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Field, William	M'Kenna, Reginald	Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond	Mather, William	Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Flynn, James Christopher	Mooney, John J.	Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)	Murnaghan, George	Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Gilhooly, James	Murphy, John	Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert J.	Nannetti, Joseph P.	Spencer, Rt Hn. C R. (Northants)
Goddard, Daniel Ford	Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.	Sullivan, Donal
Grant, Corrie	Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)	Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton	O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)	Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Hammond, John	O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid)	Thomas, A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. Herbert John	O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)	Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Hayden, John Patrick	O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)	Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, G'wer)
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-	O'Connor, James (Wicklow W.	Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.	O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)	Tomkinson, James
Helme, Norval Watson	O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)	Wallace, Robert
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.	O'Dowd, John	Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)	O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)	White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Horniman, Frederick John	O'Kelly, James (Roscom'm'n, N.	White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)	O'Malley, William	Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Jacoby, James Alfred	O'Mara, James	Wilson, Chas, Henry (Hull, W.)
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)	O'Shaughnessy, P. J.	Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Jordan, Jeremiah	O'Shee, James John	Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
Kennedy, Patrick James	Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)	
Kinloch, Sir John George S.	Pease, Sir Joseph W. (Durham	TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Labouchere, Henry	Pirie, Duncan V.	Mr. Loyd-George and Mr John Ellis.
Leamy, Edmund	Power, Patrick Joseph	

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.	Butcher, John George	Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte	Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.	Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel	Cautley, Henry Strother	Duke, Henry Edward
Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.	Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)	Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Allsopp, Hon George	Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire	Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart

Anson, Sir William Reynell	Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)	Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Archdale, Edward Mervyn	Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)	Fardell, Sir T. George
Arkwright, John Stanhope	Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm)	Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.	Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r	Fergusson, Rt Hn Sir J. (Manc'r)
Atkinson, Rt. Hn. John	Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry	Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Austin, Sir John	Chapman, Edward	Finch, George H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy	Clare, Octavius Leigh	Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Bain, Col. James Robert	Coddington, Sir William	Fisber, William Hayes
Baird, John George Alexander	Cohen, Benjamin Louis	Fison, Frederick William
Balcarres, Lord	Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse	Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)	Colomb, Sir John Charles R.	Fletcher, Sir Henry
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds	Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Atbole	Flower, Ernest
Balfour, Maj K R (Christchurch	Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas	Forster, Sir Michael (Lond Univ
Banbury, Frederick George	Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)	Garfit, William
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin	Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)	Gibbs, Hn. A.G. H (City of Lond
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H (Bristol)	Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge	Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Beach, Rt. Hn. W. W. B. (Hants.	Cranborne, Viscount	Gore, Hn G R C. Ormsby-(Salop)
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.	Cripps, Charles Alfred	Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Bigwood, James	Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)	Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Bill, Charles	Crossley, Sir Savile	Goulding, Edward Alfred
Blundell, Col. Henry	Cubitt, Hon. Henry	Graham, Henry Robert
Bond, Edward	Dalkeith, Earl of	Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Bousfield, William Robert	Dalrymple, Sir Charles	Green, Walford D (Wednesb'ry
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)	Dewar, T R (T'rH'mlets, S. Geo.	Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn	Dickinson, Robert Edmond	Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Brassey, Albert	Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.	Guthrie, Walter Murray
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John	Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-	Hain, Edward
Brookfield, Col. Montagu	Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield	Hall, Edward Marshall
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.	Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon	Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Bull, William James	Dorington, Sir John Edward	Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Ld G. (Midd'x
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nerry	M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W	Round, James
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.	Majendie, James A. H.	Russell, T. W.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd	Malcolm, Ian	Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Harris, Frederick Leverton	Manners, Lord Cecil	Seton-Karr, Henry
Haslett, Sir James Homer	Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.	Sharpe, William Edward T.
Hay, Hon. Claude George	Melville, Beresford Valentine	Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Heath, James (Staffords., N. W.	Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.	Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Helder, Augustus	Middlemore, John T.	Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks.)
Henderson, Alexander	Mildmay, Francis Bingham	Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Hermon-Hodge, Rbt. Trotter	Mitchell, William	Spear, John Ward
Higginbottom, S. W.	Molesworth, Sir Lewis	Stanley, Edward J. (Somersets)
Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampst'd)	Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)	Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.	Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.	Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Hogg, Lindsay	Morgan, David J. (Walthams'w	Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)	Morgan, Hn. Fred. (Monm'thsh	Stock, James Henry
Hozier, Hon. James Henry C.	Morris, Hn. Martin Henry F.	Stroyan, John
Hudson, George Bickersteth	Morrison, James Archibald	Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)	Morton, Arthur H. A (Deptford	Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Jackson, Rt. Hon. Wm. L.	Mount, William Arthur	Thorburn, Sir Walter
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse	Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute	Thornton, Percy M.
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick	Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath	Tollemache, Henry James
Jessel, Captain Herbert M.	Myers, William Henry	Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Johnston, William (Belfast)	Nicholson, William Graham	Tritton, Charles Ernest
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)	Nicol, Donald Ninian	Tufnell, Lt.-Col. Edward
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)	O'Neill, Hn. Robert Torrens	Valentia, Viscount

Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)	Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay	Vincent, Cl. Sir C. E. H. (Sh'ffi'ld)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.)	Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)	Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Keswick, William	Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley	Walker, Col. William Hall
Kimber, Henry	Percy, Earl	Warde, Col. C. E.
King, Sir Henry Seymour	Pierpoint, Robert	Warr, Augustus Frederick
Laurie, Lieut.-General	Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard	Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)	Platt-Higgins, Frederick	Webb, Col. William George
Lawson, John Grant	Plummer, Walter R.	Welby, Lt.-Cl. A. C. E (Taunton)
Lecky, Rt. Hon. Wm. Edw. H.	Powell, Sir Francis Sharp	Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts)
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareh'm)	Pretyman, Ernest George	Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u-Lyne)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage	Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward	Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.	Purvis, Robert	Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)
Llewellyn, Evan Henry	Pym, C. Guy	Wills, Sir Frederick
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.	Quilter, Sir Cuthbert	Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine	Randles, John S.	Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Long, Col Charles W (Evesham)	Rankin, Sir James	Wodehouse, Rt Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)	Rasch, Major Fredc. Carne	Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Loyd, Archie Kirkman	Ratcliffe, R. F.	Wylie, Alexander
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)	Reid, James (Greenock)	Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)	Remnant, James Farquharson	Younger, William
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred	Renshaw, Charles Bine	
Macartney, Rt. Hon. W. G. E.	Rentoul, James Alexander	TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Macdona, John Cumming	Renwick, George	Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Maconochie, A. W.	Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge)	
M'Arthur, Chas. (Liverpool)	Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Charles T.	
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)	Ropner, Col. Robert	

Bill read a second time, and committed to Select Committee of five Members, three to be nominated by the House, and two by the Committee of Selection.