

this creation of art and beauty and industry will perish from sight, but their influence will remain to "make it live beyond its too short living with praises and thanksgiving." Who can tell the new thoughts that have been awakened, the ambitions fired and the high achievements that will be wrought through this Exposition?

Gentlemen: Let us ever remember that our interest is in concord, not conflict; and that our real eminence rests in the victories of peace, not those of war. We hope that all who are represented here may be moved to higher and nobler effort for their own and the world's good, and that out of this city may come not only greater commerce and trade for us all, but, more essential than these, relations of mutual respect, confidence and friendship which will deepen and endure. Our earnest prayer is that God will graciously vouchsafe prosperity, happiness and peace to all our neighbors, and like blessings to all the peoples and powers of earth.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE



SIR CHARLES WENTWORTH DILKE, P. C., M. P., an eminent English author and politician, was born at Chelsea, near London, Sept. 4, 1843, and was educated at Trinity Hall, Cambridge University. After being called to the Bar in 1866 at the Middle Temple, London, he devoted the next two years to extended travel in the United States and the English colonies, the results of which appeared in 1868 in his book, "Greater Britain: a Record of Travel in English-speaking Countries." The work achieved a great success. In 1868, he entered Parliament as member for Chelsea, and in his early parliamentary career addressed the House mainly on foreign, Indian, and colonial topics. In 1869, he succeeded his father in a baronetcy created in 1862. His public expression of a preference for a republic instead of a constitutional monarchy was the cause of much opposition to his reelection in 1874; his opponent was nevertheless defeated. Prior to 1880, Dilke was instrumental in securing the municipal suffrage for women, the abolition of the barbarous penalty of drawing and quartering, and the extension of polling hours at metropolitan elections, by what was known as Dilke's Act. In 1880, he was appointed in Mr. Gladstone's cabinet under-secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and while in office was chairman of the Royal Commission which arranged a commercial treaty with France in 1882. In the same year he became president of the Local Government Board, and in 1884 chairman of the Commission on Housing the Working Classes. He failed of reelection to Parliament in 1886, but in 1892 reentered the House of Commons as member for the Forest of Dean, in Gloucestershire. He is the owner of the well-known London literary weekly, "The Athenæum," and is also proprietor of "Notes and Queries." Besides the work on "Greater Britain," and many contributions to reviews and other periodicals, he has published "The Fall of Prince Florestan of Monaco," a clever political satire (1874); "The Eastern Question" (1878); "Parliamentary Reform" (1879); "The Present Position of European Politics" (1887); "The British Army" (1888); "Problems of Greater Britain" (1890); "Imperial Defence" (1891); "Army Reform"; and "The British Empire" (1899).

COST OF THE CROWN

ADDRESS DELIVERED AT NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE, NOVEMBER 6, 1871

I AM announced, I see, to speak to-night on "Representation and Royalty," and if I say more of Royalty than I do of Representation it will be for two good reasons. The one is that I believe that many of you have seen a report

of a speech I delivered the other day at Manchester upon Representation, and that you know something of my views upon that subject. The other is that I hear that you are exercised in your minds about Royalty and want to compare notes with me upon that serious subject.

As to representation I intend next session to ask the House of Commons to declare that an attempt ought to be made, and made soon, to give equal weight to the votes of electors in whatever part of the country they reside, and that the scandal of 13,000 electors in Newcastle (and 40,000 in Hackney) having only two members, while 136 in Portarlington have a member to themselves, should cease.

I showed that divisions often took place when the minority represented more voters than the majority. I showed that in the division upon the election expenses, we who voted with the government and were beaten by 96 represented nevertheless more voters than the majority, who voted for excluding poor men from Parliament.

I showed, too, that certain tiny minorities, when examined from this point of view, often revealed the fact that, although very few in number, the members who voted in them represented all the populous and intelligent towns. The vote against the annuity to Prince Arthur is one of those which show a far greater real support when examined in this way than when counted roughly by the number of members; and this is indeed so markedly the case that I may be perhaps excused if I wander somewhat into a defence of those who took that course. The 53 who voted with Mr. Dixon for reduction represented 766,000 voters, and the 11 who voted root and branch against having these grants at all were mostly members for large towns.

It has been attempted to show that the question was one

not worth raising, and as it has even been put by some, one which it was shabby to raise. The first statement rests upon the belief that the whole cost of the Royal Family is £385,000 a year, and the second upon an idea that there was an arrangement at the beginning of the reign by which such annuities and dowries as have been lately applied for should fall upon the Consolidated Fund.

Now, as I believe both these statements to be erroneous, but as both ideas are at the same time widely spread, it would not be altogether out of place if I were to show that those who in the large constituencies objected to this grant seem to have had strong arguments on their side.

In the first place, let us consider what in this country Royalty may be supposed to cost; and, when we have done that, then let us turn to the arrangement which it is believed was made and by which we are said to be morally bound. We have first to deal with the sum of £372,000 a year expended upon the Privy Purse and upon the Household, to which I add the Royal Bounty and Royal Alms, which amount to £13,000, making up the sum to £385,000. We next have £131,000 of annuities of a similar kind to that which we lately had to consider; the income of the Duchy of Lancaster, £32,000; that of Cornwall, £63,000; the interest on lump sums which have been paid to the various members of the Family still living, of about £10,000,—making up £621,000.

Steam packets, insignia, presents (such as those given by Prince Alfred in India and Australia), pensions to royal servants, rangerships of parks not borne upon the Civil List, make £7,000 more; and military and naval pay to various members of the Family about another £20,000. The palaces, omitting Hampton Court, which is a public show-place, are £47,000 more.

I speak now only of the yearly charge on us, but sometimes sums which should by rights have come to the nation have been swallowed up in the palaces,—for instance, in 1849, £53,000 obtained by the sale of the Pavilion at Brighton was sunk in Buckingham Palace, as vast sums had previously been sunk by George IV. On Windsor Park there is a deficit in the Woods and Forests' account, and that deficit, of £12,000, about represents the cost of the keepers, game, and other royal as contrasted with public expenses in reference to the park. This makes £707,000, which is the end of the figures that are of a certain and very tangible character.

Beyond this we have two large sums, as to one of which we can be fairly accurate; as to the other of which we can give nothing but a guess. The first of them is the cost of the Guards. It would be totally unfair to set down anything like the whole cost of these regiments to the account of Royalty; because the infantry are good troops and are available as part of the regular army.

I regret that it is not in my power to say as much for the cavalry of the Guards—the Life Guards and Horse Guards, as they are called. I do not speak of the stampede of their horses when the geese sounded the alarm at Chobham, but their cumbersomeness and unsuitability to modern war were amply demonstrated in my presence on several occasions during the Hampshire campaign, and especially in the first battle, at Seale.

I calculate that the cost of the Guards, over and above the cost of an equal number of the Line, including an increased expenditure caused by the expensive nature of their barracks in the immediate neighborhood of royal palaces, would be about £100,000. I believe that it is not easy to overrate

the evil effect upon any army of the existence of privileged corps.

The first act of the French Republic, after the demoralized Empire was upset—no, not the first—the first was the abolition of the Senate, the French House of Lords—but the second, was the abolition of the privileges of the Imperial Guard and its fusion with the regular army.

At Sedan they had painful experience of the value of *corps d'élite*, and things had come to such a pass that the troops used to hiss when the *Cent Garde* went by. Even the royal warrant on promotion in the army, issued last week, contains traces of the evil of which I speak.

The Guards are excepted from the warrant, and the pages of honor to the Queen are carefully allowed, by special favor, to enter the army without that examination to which less-favored mortals have to submit.

You have been told that the army has been “bought back from the officers” at a cost of eight or ten millions: that purchase has been abolished: that it is of vital importance that entrance to the army should be by open competition, and then you have at once an exception made in favor of these young gentlemen which destroys the whole moral value of your rule.

The other of the sums is, as I believe, the largest of all the separate items of expenditure connected with the Royal Family, and that is the cost of the royal yachts. We all of us have heard the stories of the harm done to the naval service at the time of the Crimean war—both actual and incidental harm of a moral nature—by the diverting of the service of men who ought to have been employed upon our warships to the finishing for the Queen of one of the royal yachts,—the “Victoria and Albert,” I believe.

But few of us are aware of the vast expenditure which

still and at all times goes on upon royal yachts—expenditure for building, for repairs, for coals, for seamen's wages, for pensions to the late officers and seamen of the yachts—an expenditure which at the least cannot be less than another £100,000 a year, and which, having taken great pains to ascertain the facts, I believe very largely to exceed that sum.

Several able-bodied men I found employed all the year round at painting the ornamented fire-buckets for these yachts. This makes the total figure £906,000, and I think that, speaking roughly, you may say that the positive and direct cost of Royalty is about £1,000,000 a year.

The indirect cost,—in the harm, for instance, done to the army by the privileges of the Guards—I of course cannot assess. In addition to the increase that I have mentioned, it is worth remembering that the Royal Family are the only persons in the kingdom who pay no taxes; and even those annuities which we have lately granted are expressly freed from all taxes, assessments, and charges.

It is strange, with regard to the Queen's income, that this should be the case, seeing that Sir Robert Peel stated to the House of Commons, when about to introduce the Income Tax Bill in 1842, that her Majesty, "prompted by those feelings of deep and affectionate interest in the welfare of her people which she had ever manifested, stated to him that if . . . Parliament should . . . subject all incomes to a certain charge, it was her determination that her own income should be subjected to a similar burden."

I need hardly say that all these enormous sums of money are not well spent, and it is almost worth a few minutes' time to see in what kind of manner they do contrive to disappear. The salaries in the Royal Household, which amount to £131,

000 a year, include a vast number of totally useless officials,—Chamberlains, Comptrollers, Masters of Ceremonies, Marshals of the Household, Grooms of the Robes, Lords-in-Waiting, Grooms-in-Waiting, Gentlemen Ushers, and a few persons who appear to perform services, but who ought to be paid for those services as they perform them, and not be made permanent officials with great titles of honor, such, for instance, as the Historical Painter to the Queen, Portrait-Painter to the Queen, and the Lithographer in Ordinary.

Under the Lord Steward's department, and the department of the Master of the Horse, we have such officers as the Coroner of the Household, and the Chief Equerry and Clerk Marshal, whose duties are not of a very burdensome description. Nothing is more singular than the constitution of the medical department. You would hardly credit the number of medical gentlemen who are required for the service of the household, but I am aware that some of them are unpaid. There are three Physicians in Ordinary, three Physicians Extraordinary, one Sergeant-Surgeon Extraordinary, two Sergeant-Surgeons, three Surgeons Extraordinary, one Physician of the Household, one Surgeon-Apothecary, two Chemists of the Establishment in Ordinary, one Surgeon-Oculist, one Surgeon-Dentist, one Dentist in Ordinary, and one other Physician—or twenty-one in all; while the Prince of Wales has for his special benefit three Honorary Physicians, two Physicians in Ordinary, two Surgeons in Ordinary, one Surgeon Extraordinary, one Chemist in Ordinary—or eleven more, making thirty-two doctors in the Family.

I should be almost afraid of tiring anybody who listened to me when I went over the list of strange officers of which the household is made up,—Lord High Almoner, whose duties consist, I believe, in giving away, on certain mysterious days,

silver twopenny pieces, made on purpose for him at the Mint; Sub-Almoner, Hereditary Grand Almoner, Master of the Buckhounds, Clerk of the Check, Clerk of the Closet, Exons in Waiting, and last, but not least, the Hereditary Grand Falconer,—the Duke of St. Albans,—who might perhaps with advantage, if he is to retain his salary of £1,200 a year, be created Hereditary Grand Pigeon-Shooter in Ordinary.

If we turn to the Lord Steward's department we come at once upon a mysterious Board of Green Cloth, as it is called, at the head of which are the Lord Steward, the Treasurer, the Comptroller of the Household, and the Master of the Household, with a perfect army of secretaries and clerks, and with special secretaries, with special offices, and with special salaries, in each of these sections of the department.

In the Kitchen department, we have a Chief Cook and four Master Cooks, receiving salaries of between £2,000 and £3,000 a year between the five; and a host of confederates, some of whom have duties that I cannot even guess at—such, for instances, as the two "Green Office" men. There are whole departments the duties of which cannot be very considerable, one would think, or, at all events, not considerable enough to warrant their being made into departments of the Household—for instance, the Confectionery Department and the Ewer Department, while the duty of table-decking employs no less than five persons, who have salaries of between £500 and £600 a year in all.

Now, I have said already that a great deal of this expenditure brings no benefit in any shape to members of the Royal Family, and that it is largely an expenditure upon mere sinecures, but at the same time the expenditure could be curtailed. No one can doubt but that the Queen might

abolish these offices if she chose, and that if, as I believe, she has no right to abolish them and take over the consequent savings to her own use, Parliamentary powers for the abolition of offices—taking the saving to the public—would gladly be given to the Treasury and the Crown.

Indeed there can be no doubt, as it seems to me, but that it is the duty of those who are the responsible Ministers of the Crown to advise the Queen to abolish them; because many of the chief offices in the Household are notoriously made use of for political purposes, and those members of the Household who have seats in the House of Commons are expected to vote against independent members just as steadily as though they were political members of the Government.

The bad tone, moreover, that is set by the retention of these ridiculous sinecures extends far beyond the limits of the Household, and does much toward continuing the political demoralization in high places which all of us deplore.

To come back, however, to where we were. We have shown an expenditure of nearly £1,000,000 a year upon the Royal Family, and the question with which we started still remains—whether, in the face of so large an expenditure by the nation, it is necessary or even just to ask for more? In considering this question we cannot, I think, put out of sight the fact that, besides the great sums which the Crown draws from Parliament, the present occupant of the throne and her eldest son are both known to be possessed of considerable property.

The Prince of Wales, when he came of age, received, it is said, £750,000, the accumulations of his income during his minority; and the Queen received on one occasion a legacy of two thirds that amount—sums which together ought of