

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

FRIDAY, 23 SEPTEMBER 1887

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. B. B. Moreton) replied—

The Registrar-General reports as follows:—"I have just completed report on the friendly societies, which is now going through the Press, and I am engaged on the report on vital statistics, which will take me at least a month to finish, and I will then commence that on the patents, which will take some time to prepare."

Mr. CHUBB asked the Minister for Works—

1. Are the loan votes of £150,000 (1882) and £100,000 (1884) for railways from Bowen to Houghton Gap and from Bowen to the Coalfields respectively (appropriated by the 50 Vic. No. 6 to a line from Bowen to Townsville, by way of Ayr) available?

2. Have any portions of these loans been expended?

3. If so, upon what works, and to what amount?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. C. B. Dutton) replied—

1. Yes.

2. Yes; £14,740 0s. 6d.

3. Upon the following works:—

	£	s.	d.
Surveys	4,155	2	5
Supervision	179	8	3
Boring for coal	2,760	2	11
Permanent-way material, etc., imported from England ...	7,645	6	11
	£14,740	0	6

Mr. NORTON asked the Colonial Treasurer—

1. Has the Engineer of Harbours and Rivers yet furnished the Treasurer with a design for dredge for use in the Narrows and similar places?

2. If so, at about what time may a dredge for this purpose be expected to be available for use?

The COLONIAL TREASURER (Hon. Sir S. W. Griffith) replied—

I have received a report from the Engineer of Harbours and Rivers on the subject, a copy of which I will lay on the table of the House.

The question raised by the report requires full consideration, and, in the meantime, I am unable to fix any time at which the dredge can be expected to be available.

IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

THIRD READING.

On the motion of the PREMIER, this Bill was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be transmitted to the Legislative Council for their concurrence, by message in the usual form.

VOTING AT THE ENOGGERA ELECTION.

Mr. MACFARLANE, in moving—

That there be laid on the table of the House, a Return showing—

1. The total number of votes recorded at the Enoggera election.

2. The number recorded more than once, showing how many voted twice, thrice, or oftener.

—said: I have to thank the hon. member for Enoggera, Mr. Dickson, for calling out "not formal" to this motion, and thus giving me an opportunity of explaining the object I have in asking for this return. I can assure the hon. gentleman I have no complaint to make in connection with this matter, personal to either himself or the candidate who opposed him at the recent Enoggera election. From having conversations with my constituents, and having seen notices in several papers to the effect that at that election several people had adopted the suggestion "to go early and go often to the poll," I thought it right to make some move in the matter. One constituent, who is a very earnest advocate for purity of election, asked me to call for the return which I now ask for. Having in view the near approach of the general election and the desirability of having that election conducted as purely as possible, I think it will be well to have a slight discussion on the matter in this House before the time comes, so that voters

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Friday, 23 September, 1887.

Questions.—Immigration Act Amendment Bill—third reading.—Voting at the Enoggera Election.—Auriferous Sulphide Ores.—Valuation Bill—consideration of Legislative Council's Amendment.—Supply.—Insane Immigrants.—Supply—Defence Force (land).—Adjournment.

The SPEAKER took the chair at half-past 3 o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

Mr. MELLOR (for Mr. S. W. Brooks) asked the Colonial Secretary—

When will the report required by the 99th section of the Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Act of 1884 be laid upon the table of the House?

in the habit of personating or double voting may take warning, and not repeat what they have been doing in the past. I have no other desire in this motion than simply to draw attention to the fact that double voting was supposed to have taken place at that election, and that notice being called to it in the House, it may deter persons from acting in the same way in future. I beg to move the motion standing in my name.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—I am afraid the hon. gentleman cannot have his curiosity satisfied on this occasion, as there are no means in the possession of the Government of ascertaining how many people voted more than once. The Elections Act of 1885 requires the returning officer at an election where there are several polling-places to compare the rolls of the different presiding officers, and ascertain whether any electors appear to have voted at more than one polling-place, and to make a list showing the names and numbers of the electors who appear to have so voted; and an official copy of that list is to be given to both candidates, the original list being sealed up with the sealed packet of votes delivered to the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly. I have ascertained, however, that the returning officer in this case did not perform that duty, and the only means we have now of ascertaining the facts is by opening the sealed packet in the possession of the Clerk of the Assembly. I think it is not worth while to do that, as it is not suggested that it would invalidate the result of the election, and so far as I know no petition has been presented or is likely to be presented against the return of the successful candidate. If that is desired to be done, it will be necessary to make a different motion to really raise the question. It will be necessary to move that the Clerk be directed to open the sealed packet transmitted to him by the returning officer for this election, and make this investigation. I do not think the House will be disposed to do that, nor do I think the mover of this motion will be disposed to move a motion in that form. In its present form the hon. member's motion can be of no avail, and the best thing he can do under the circumstances is to withdraw it.

Mr. DICKSON said: Mr. Speaker,—In making this motion "not formal" I trust hon. members will not entertain the idea that I was averse to the most searching investigation being made in connection with this matter, if it was thought desirable. That was certainly not my desire, and I shall support the motion if any investigation can be held. I must say that when the senior member for Ipswich proposed the motion I felt rather warmly at the time, because one of the papers published in this city on the day following the election issued a leading article of a most disingenuous and misleading character, which appeared to give a tone or colour to this insinuation. In the *Telegraph* of the 13th September, the day following the Enoggera election, these words appeared:—

"Mr. Dickson resigned his seat in the Assembly and went to his electorate for a new commission to ratify his action in resigning the Treasurership, because the Government would not sell land, and because they proposed to replenish the Treasury through a land tax, which he does not disapprove of in principle, but only in the form which they preferred, and for the present. His appeal was made to 3,359 persons. Out of that number 1,373, including double and treble voting, gave him a favourable reply."

I say that is a most disingenuous and discreditable paragraph for any respectable paper to give expression to, because it applies distinctly to the successful man; the gentleman who is unsuccessful in the election disappears from the field of observation and sinks below the horizon for the time being. It is the successful

man, therefore, who is challenged and to whom is imputed those corrupt practices. I am sure that my friends and the many hon. members in this House who gave me their full and ardent support would sooner have seen my name at the bottom of the poll than for one moment to lend themselves to such corrupt and discreditable practices. I therefore say that is a most disingenuous and discreditable statement to make, and I believe it is utterly without foundation, because from my own observation at the election I may say there was never a more honourably contested election on both sides. I do not believe, if the papers are investigated, that anything to justify this statement will be found to have taken place. Before this insinuation was made, holding up to discredit myself and those who supported me, the writer of the article should have been fully satisfied that these things did take place. I am of opinion that they did not take place, and I say now that if the Premier will inquire from the returning officer, and that gentleman informs him that to his belief or knowledge the slightest irregularity of this sort took place, or if even a majority of the scrutineers will say that in their belief double voting was practised, I shall most ardently desire a most thorough investigation to substantiate that statement or otherwise. As far as my friends who worked with me were concerned, they would not, I am sure, have lent themselves to anything of the sort. Not only I, Mr. Speaker, but others were very much annoyed at this leader which appeared in the *Telegraph* the day after the election. Indeed, I was asked to bring the matter before the House; but I do not like to trouble the House with matters of a personal character, and until my hon. friend gave notice of his motion, I did not intend to trouble the House with it. But when the hon. member for Ipswich gave notice of this motion, I saw at once how a baseless insinuation of this sort can gather currency, and I decided to take action in this House. I felt that I was bound to bring the matter prominently forward. To make matters worse, some days afterwards the *Telegraph* proprietors or editors were communicated with on the subject, and they inserted this ambiguous apology in a paragraph headed "Yesterday's Election":—

"In our first leading article headed as above, on Tuesday last, there is a sentence which is open to misconstruction. It relates to double voting, and is so placed as to leave it open to be inferred that if there was double voting it was in favour of Mr. Dickson. It was intended to convey the idea that there was double voting, and that a percentage for it should be allowed from the numbers polled; but it was not intended that such voting was exclusively for either candidate, and by no means to convey the idea that either candidate or candidates' recognised friends had anything to do with it."

I take that apology for what it is worth. A charge of this sort, as I said before, does not affect the defeated candidate; it only affects the credit of the successful candidate and his friends. But this apology goes even further than the original article. It assigns these corrupt practices to the electors of Enoggera. On behalf of the electors of that constituency, whether they voted for me or against me, I repudiate the charge. I cannot see why the electors of Enoggera should be held up to the eyes of the whole colony as having been guilty of those corrupt practices. However, as I have said, if the Premier is informed by the returning officer, or by a majority of the scrutineers, that in their opinion the voting was improperly taken, I shall be happy to see the present motion so altered that the papers can be gone through by the Clerk of the House, and the electors be relieved from the undeserved stigma that has been cast upon them.

Mr. CHUBB said : Mr. Speaker,—I am sure every member will be willing to assist in authorising an investigation, if necessary ; but I doubt whether, after the statement of the Chief Secretary, the opening of the papers would give us the information. The hon. gentleman has told us that the returning officer did not make out these lists.

Mr. W. BROOKES said : Mr. Speaker,—I may perhaps be permitted to say a few words, seeing that I was very active on the side of the candidate who was defeated.

Mr. MOREHEAD : Perhaps that is why he was defeated.

Mr. W. BROOKES : I admit that I did my very best on behalf of the defeated candidate. But on behalf of that gentleman, on behalf of everybody concerned in the election, and certainly on behalf of myself, I must say that I quite agree with what has fallen from the successful candidate, the present hon. member for Enoggera. I do not believe there is anybody in town who really believes that that election was improperly conducted, and I am very glad to have the opportunity of saying, on behalf of both candidates, that I do not believe two more honourable candidates ever contested an election in this colony.

Mr. McMASTER said : Mr. Speaker,—I hope the senior member for Ipswich will so alter his motion, or give notice of a fresh one, as to enable the House to lay before the country the information he desires. As the hon. member for Enoggera, Mr. Dickson, has said, we, his supporters, would rather have seen him at the bottom of the poll than have adopted the corrupt practice alluded to in the newspaper. I myself, as one of those who signed his nomination paper, would very much rather have seen him defeated than adopt any such malpractices ; and I feel sure I can say that of all the rest of the hon. member's friends and supporters. We have heard a great deal about corrupt practices at other places, whether true or not, and it would be interesting to have it proved whether such practices have or have not been carried on so close to our own doors. I hope the hon. member for Ipswich will so alter his motion that we shall be able to get at the truth about these charges.

Mr. HAMILTON said : Mr. Speaker,—It is quite cheering to find that I am not the only member against whom charges of this kind have been made. I thought I was the only member who had been accused of having done anything in the way of personation. It was said that I had actually raised a whole graveyard to my assistance. The hon. member, Mr. Dickson, has not got so far as that yet ; he is only charged with being a party to double and treble voting. But I have ceased to be surprised at charges of this kind being brought by the Government against their opponents. With regard to this particular election even the Premier himself has seen double. He has told us that he saw his private secretary in his office every day, when I knew from undisputed authority that at the very same time that gentleman was miles away actively canvassing the electorate against the Premier's former friend and colleague. The junior member for North Brisbane tells us—what I am sure we all believe—that there are no grounds for this motion. But I am not at all surprised that insinuations of this nature have been whispered against the ex-Treasurer, for we notice that those who are opposed, or who are believed to be opposed, to the party in power generally get their characters attacked. On the day of election I saw leading citizens—not members of the House—in front of the polling-booths attacking him privately, and I, although on the opposite side to him in politics, should have felt myself very little-minded if, seeing this, I had not taken his part.

1887—2 x

Mr. BLACK said : Mr. Speaker,—There is one important matter which seems to have escaped the attention of hon. members. In the Elections Act of 1885, which we took considerable trouble in passing, the duties of a returning officer are distinctly laid down. The 81st section, to which the Chief Secretary has referred, distinctly states that the returning officer "shall examine the rolls which have been used and marked by himself, and the presiding officers at the several polling-places, and ascertain whether any electors appear to have voted at more than one polling-place"; that he "shall make a list showing the names and numbers of all electors who appear to have so voted at more than one polling-place," and so on. It does not mean that those are to be laid on the table of the House. He is instructed to do so in order that a candidate—the defeated candidate probably—may know really whether double or treble voting or personation of any sort has actually taken place. That section lays down very plainly the duty of a returning officer, and I think that in view of the general election, which is probably not far distant, the Chief Secretary should instruct returning officers to see that in future that section of the Act is carried out. I cannot help thinking that the returning officer in this case, having entirely neglected the performance of this portion of his duty, is decidedly deserving of some censure. I do not think this motion is one which should be lightly passed over without this House having an opportunity of saying whether this clause of the Act is to be carried out or not. I maintain that it should be carried out. The returning officer, with the rolls used by the presiding officers, has an opportunity of detecting at once whether fraud has been perpetrated ; and he should send a memo. to the candidates of the result of his analysis. It would then rest with the candidates whether they took further action or not. It does not in any way divulge the secrets of the ballot-box, but it enables the candidates to know whether the election has been a fair one. Had that been done, I cannot imagine how any newspaper, if it got its information from the defeated candidate, could put in such a paragraph as that to which exception has been taken by the hon. member for Enoggera. I hope the Chief Secretary will see that the returning officers are instructed to strictly carry out in future that section of the Act.

Mr. MACFARLANE said : Mr. Speaker,—I am glad that the hon. member for Mackay has drawn attention to that section of the Act. The person who asked me to table this motion was not either of the candidates ; he was a person who, like myself, is a friend of the hon. member for Enoggera, who, I am very glad indeed, was returned to the House. The gentleman I speak of is an ardent politician, and knows as much about politics as most members of this House ; and he had worked hard for Mr. Dickson on the polling-day when it was reported in the local paper and two of the other papers that personation and double voting had taken place. This gentleman felt so disgusted that he came to me in a great flurry and said he would cease to work if such a thing took place ; and that is how this motion came to be put on the paper. Had the returning officer done his duty, there would have been no difficulty at all as far as I can see. There are, I believe, fourteen polling-places in that electorate, and I can see no difficulty whatever in running over the fourteen rolls and seeing how many names have been marked more than once. Attention having thus been called to the matter, I do not think it is necessary for me to amend my motion, unless anyone else with more interest in the matter wishes to push it further. As the thing has been discussed in the House and brought before the country, I shall, with the permission of the House, beg leave to withdraw the motion.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said: Mr. Speaker,—Before the motion is withdrawn I wish to say a few words. I hope the hon. member for Ipswich will not think I am at all discourteous in speaking after him; I waited to see if any other member of the House would take up this question. We all know that the *Telegraph* newspaper is owned by certain members on the Government side of the House, amongst them the hon. the Premier himself. Now, I take it that the chief opponents of the late Colonial Treasurer were the Ministry, and certain very ardent supporters of the Government sitting immediately behind the Ministry, amongst whom is the hon. and respectable junior member for North Brisbane, Mr. Brookes. I think that he, next to the Premier himself, was the most ardent antagonist Mr. Dickson had at the late election, and he has told us that he does not believe there was any double voting, and that there was no necessity for the motion proposed by the hon. member for Ipswich. Now, sir, I take it that the character of an extremely respectable paper—a paper that is noted all over Brisbane and probably all over the colony for telling the truth—has been traduced by the hon. member for North Brisbane, Mr. Brookes. He says there was no double or treble voting, and the *Telegraph* newspaper says there was double and treble voting. Now, sir, I think that in the interests of that extremely immaculate newspaper, partly owned by the hon. leader of the Government, an examination of these papers should take place, so as to show whether the hon. member for North Brisbane, Mr. Brookes, is correct, or whether the newspaper is correct. I hope that the hon. member for Ipswich will carry out his motion much further, and that he will be assisted by the gentleman who leads the Government in obtaining a full investigation. We know very well that newspapers and individuals are always in the habit of assailing the successful candidate as having been returned by double and treble voting, and the best way to set the question at rest is to show whether this newspaper has told the truth or not. If it is once shown that it has not told the truth, it will be more careful perhaps in telling the truth in future.

The PREMIER: This motion will not be of any use.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: No; but the truth can be ascertained.

The PREMIER: By another motion altogether.

Mr. DONALDSON said: Mr. Speaker,—I think it is a matter for regret that the returning officer has not fulfilled his duty. Under the Electoral Act of 1885 there have been two contested elections, one for Warwick and the other for Enoggera, and I am informed that on neither occasion did the returning officer send a list to the candidates, as required by the Act. This discussion may draw the returning officers' attention to this matter, and I trust that in future they will not neglect to do this. I find there have been three elections—there was also the election for Mulgrave—and the candidates on that occasion did not get a list. The returning officers have kept to the old Act, and have not paid any attention to the new one. It is a great pity that in the case of the Enoggera election the returning officer did not do his duty, because it would have enabled the successful candidate or the unsuccessful candidate, as the case may be, to either confirm or refute the cowardly attack which, I believe, was made in that leading article in the *Telegraph*. Now, it is nothing new for the *Telegraph* to make such a charge as that. On the occasion of the general election they made the statement that from one end of the colony to the other there had been personation and double voting. They have been so used to

making charges against their political opponents that on this occasion they certainly forgot themselves, when they made such a statement in regard to an election which, I believe, was thoroughly honourably conducted. I only hope that on future occasions the returning officers will not neglect to perform their duties properly. This discussion may have a good effect in calling attention to the matter. The duty is very simple, but they seem to have followed the instructions under the old Act. I have just been reminded that it rests with the Government to issue proper instructions, and I trust that will be done in future elections.

Mr. ALAND said: Mr. Speaker,—I may not understand the Act correctly, but it appears to me that the returning officer is not required to submit the list to the candidates unless he has found out that there has been double and treble voting, and possibly in the cases to which the hon. member for Warrego refers—the elections for Mulgrave and Warwick—there was no double and treble voting. We may also presume, Mr. Speaker, that in the case of the Enoggera election there had been no double or treble voting. The clause of the Act reads:—

"The returning officer shall also examine the rolls which have been used and marked by himself and the presiding officers at the several polling-places, and ascertain whether any electors appear to have voted at more than one polling-place; and shall make out a list showing the names and numbers of all electors who appear to have so voted at more than one polling-place, and shall forward a copy thereof to each of the candidates, and shall enclose the original list in the sealed packet to be made up by him as hereinafter provided."

Therefore, I take it that in the Enoggera election and the other elections which have taken place there have been no double votes recorded at the several polling-places, and hence the returning officer has not sent in the list.

Mr. MORGAN said: Mr. Speaker,—With regard to the Warwick election, I may point out that there was only one polling-place there, and consequently double or treble voting was practically impossible; and after hearing the clause read by the hon. member for Toowoomba, I think a charge of neglect cannot fairly be made against the returning officer at Warwick.

Mr. KELLETT said: Mr. Speaker,—I understood the Chief Secretary to state that the rolls had not been checked and lists made out by the returning officer, and under the Act that ought to be done. I think the hon. member for Toowoomba could not have heard what the Chief Secretary said. That is what I understood—that the lists had not been sent out in accordance with the Act. I am very glad this matter has been called attention to in view of the general election that is coming on, because no doubt there will be double voting if possible. I think if people know that this return will be sent to the candidates, and consequently if there has been double voting they will appeal—they, knowing that they will have to stand an appeal, will be very careful about double and treble voting. I think it is a very good thing that this discussion has taken place to-day, because I find that there are a few people who did not know that this return must be sent in by the returning officer. They thought it was only in the case of a petition to the House that the papers would be opened.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—I should like to add a few words. The returning officer has informed me that the candidates and scrutineers said they did not desire that he should go to the trouble of making out the lists. They said they were both quite satisfied, and that they did not see any good that could be done by it. Therefore it was not done.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

AURIFEROUS SULPHIDE ORES.

Upon the Order of the Day being read—

“Resumption of debate on Mr. Adams’s motion, ‘That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of an address to the Governor, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be placed on the Supplementary Estimates the sum of fifty thousand pounds (£50,000) for the purpose of erecting works within the colony for the effectually treating auriferous sulphide ores.’—which stood adjourned (under Sessional Order of 20th July last) at 7 p.m. of Thursday, the 22nd instant”—

Mr. NORTON said : Mr. Speaker,—The subject introduced by this motion is one with which the House has already been made familiar. If my recollection serves me there was a somewhat similar motion tabled during last session. But so far as I am personally concerned, the subject-matter of the motion is one that I have been familiar with for some considerable time ; and I have given it a good deal of attention, partly because it was brought before me by the gentleman who was, I believe, partly instrumental in this motion being tabled now. For my part, sir, I should like to be able to support the motion if I thought it was a fair thing to do under the present circumstances of the colony, because, although our mining industry is advancing very considerably just now, it is important that no opportunity should be lost of still further promoting this industry, both for the benefit of miners and for the benefit of the colony at large. But, sir, I cannot see my way to support a motion of this character, and for this reason : In the first place if we are going to ask the Government to undertake these works we must do it not only in the case of one industry but of every one. If there is any new system for the treatment of natural productions of any kind, then the Government may be asked to assist in the matter by putting up works for the purpose of carrying it into effect, and for my part I confess that I do not see my way to support such a scheme. And in this instance there are special reasons why it is not desirable that the Government should undertake this work. In the first place, if the sum of £50,000 were voted, it does not at all follow that that would be sufficient for the object which the hon. member has in view. Of course works could be erected for £50,000, but whether those works would be sufficient for the whole colony is a question of very great doubt. And in reference to what was said when the matter was under discussion before about the works in Germany, I think if hon. members had the slightest conception of what those works cost they would never think of comparing anything that is likely to be done here with them. At the same time, as was pointed out by one hon. member, in Germany they have chemists of the very highest skill, the most scientific men perhaps in the world ; so that they have many advantages that we have not here. Now, sir, if these works were established I would ask hon. members to consider whether they would be of that benefit to the colony which some hon. gentlemen seem to suppose. No doubt if they were established in any particular port where the ores could be brought down by rail or otherwise at reasonable cost to be treated there would not be so much difficulty ; but the great difficulty is in conveying them by water. I believe I am right in stating that, in the case of the large quantity of Ravenswood ores that were sent to Germany before the works were started at Ravenswood, the cost per ton of conveying them to the works in Germany was less than the cost of conveying them from the mines to the works in Melbourne, and that is simply because the freights here are so high that it would prohibit a freight of that kind from being carried. It is quite possible

if large works were carried on that vessels would be put on specially to carry ore at a low rate, but as we are circumstanced at present I believe the rates are absolutely prohibitive, and there would be no prospect of any large quantity of ore being conveyed from places far distant from the works. The Chief Secretary, in referring to the matter, seemed to be in doubt whether such works could be put up—whether we had sufficient knowledge in the colony to keep up the works effectively. I do know we have, and I know that the ore at Mount Morgan has to be treated by a process which would be equally successful in treating ordinary pyrites. Of course Mount Morgan has a great amount of gold to work upon, and from the returns of the mine it is possible that enough money would be produced to put up large works without materially interfering with the dividends paid to the shareholders. Besides, the ores are not very refractory. I believe the process there is a mechanical one more than anything else, but there is one other place where such works have been erected. I am now referring to Ravenswood, because I believe the works there were a failure on account of the gentlemen who had charge not understanding how to work the system properly. I have been told that the furnaces were not treated properly, and a great deal of the gold went up the chimney. But there are works in my own district erected by Messrs. Richardson and Conran. The field is not a very large one, and there are very refractory ores to deal with, which others have attempted to treat by the ordinary process ; and although a fair quantity of gold was obtained, the cost of treating the ore by that process was so large that other works had to be erected. One of the partners—Mr. Conran—heard of a reef, the reports of which were such that he went and inspected it. He knew how to make an analysis of the specimens, and after seeing the place he formed an opinion of what could be done. He examined the place carefully and took away some specimens. He then went to Melbourne, and I believe spent some months with Mr. Cosmo Newberry studying a process that had been patented by Newberry and Vautin. After he had obtained a thorough knowledge of the process he returned to the Port Curtis district, and put up experimental works in order to test on a small scale and ascertain the value of the ores. He told me himself that before putting the ores through these works he calculated the amount which he would receive in gold and the value he would receive for that gold. Before putting the stone through he reported to his partners what the process would produce. He calculated the first lot at a sum not far less than £1,000, and he returned gold the value of which was within £5 of that sum. Having succeeded so far he made arrangements for working on a larger scale, and the works were opened a few months ago. The roasting process was commenced, by which all the ore has to be first treated. Since that time he has been going on on a larger scale, and last week I hear that he produced from 600 to 700 oz. of gold as the result of his first crushing. Now, I know for a fact that Mr. Conran, who is managing these works, perfectly understands the process, and that he is able with the knowledge he has not only to carry on the process successfully, but to ascertain to a trifle what result he will get from a certain amount of ore. In order to do that he has to test the stone by analysis. When we find a success of that kind has been achieved with no very large outlay of capital we ought to be encouraged. The object the hon. member has in view in bringing this motion forward has, I take it, been attained. The great object, I

presume, in bringing it forward is not merely to get the Government to supply money for carrying on works of this kind, but to prove whether some new process cannot be carried out here. Well, if private enterprise can carry out such works, it should be left to private enterprise. I think the country is indebted to Mr. Conran for establishing such works at Port Curtis, and that a feeling of gratification will be expressed at the great success which he has achieved, and that men throughout the colony who are interested in mining will be glad to give expression to the satisfaction they feel that Mr. Conran has been able, through his own exertions and determination, to carry out works of this kind which solve a great mystery, or rather which prove that a process has already been invented for treating ores which have hitherto proved of a most refractory nature. It is evidence that the work can be done, and when it can be done by private enterprise I think we might well leave it to private enterprise to carry on such works in other places besides Port Curtis. For that reason I do not see my way to support the motion.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said: Mr. Speaker,—The hon. gentleman who has just sat down has alluded to gentlemen who have established, by private enterprise, works of the nature which the hon. member for Mulgrave wishes to establish. Now, I think that the varieties of ores are so great that a single process would not suffice to deal with all the combinations that we have in different parts of the colony, and if that is so, then the motion involves the necessity of establishing extremely expensive works, on a similar scale to those in Germany. In Germany they do not profess to treat any one particular ore, but in such establishments all ores are treated, involving, of course, costly appliances. I believe no one will dispute the advantage that would result from the establishment of works of that kind here, where we have so many different ores to deal with, and it is a question whether such works should be carried out by Government or by private enterprise. I do not think private enterprise is likely to carry them out on an extensive scale, or, if so, the process would only be applied to particular mines in which particular people are interested. However, I think it is a legitimate field for private enterprise, and there is very great danger in the Government coming in to assist any industry in this way, because assistance may be extended without limit, and the only thing which would justify the Government in coming in and assisting such an industry would be the possibility of its verging into a monopoly; and monopolies, I maintain, in works of that kind, should always be in the hands of the State. That would be the only justification for the Government taking the matter in hand. Looking at it from a more practical point of view, the question is—Is it desirable that the Government should, under the present condition of things, attempt to meet a want of this kind, however urgent? That such works would be very desirable in the Maryborough district is undoubted, but then the Central and Northern districts would have an equal claim upon the assistance of the Government in the same direction. The facilities for carriage are not so great that one central establishment would be able to treat the ores sent from all parts of the colony. That would be entirely out of the question. In order to produce practical results, they would have to be established, at all events, in three localities in the colony; so that even if the Government were prepared to take the matter in hand at any future time, they would not be justified in starting an establishment in one place only when there are three parts of the colony with equal claims—if any part has a claim—in

that direction; so that I think the hon. gentleman will have to satisfy himself with having ventilated his ideas—ideas held in common, I believe, by most people who look forward to the mining industry as the great source of our wealth—and with the hope that one day what he wishes to see accomplished may be brought about by the energy of private enterprise.

Mr. NORTON said: Mr. Speaker,—By way of explanation, I may be allowed to say that though Mr. Conran's works were established for the treatment of auriferous ores, they are also able to treat other ores. After extracting the gold by one process, silver and copper are extracted from the refuse by the same process.

Mr. DICKSON said: Mr. Speaker,—The tendency of the debate has been to show the inability of the Government to undertake to provide works for treating auriferous sulphide ores; in other words, the undesirability of extending the system of State-feeding generally desired all over the colony. I must say that, while I desire to show every consideration for the mining industry, which has done so much for the country—and there is no one who has observed the progress of Australia for the last thirty years but must admit that the wonderful progress made in the different colonies is largely due to the auriferous discoveries made at certain periods—still I contend that we have no right to call upon the State to nurse or found industries, and thereby possibly preclude the establishment of those industries by private enterprise. I think the Minister for Works has pointed out very forcibly the objections to this motion, inasmuch as no central establishment that could be erected would be equally convenient for all the fields whence these ores are obtained; and I think the cost of carriage from the distant fields to a central point would be almost as great as exporting the ores to Europe for treatment there. I do not go with other speakers who regret that there is no money in the Treasury at the present time to provide for the establishment of the industry; I rather consider it a not unalloyed misfortune that the Treasury is not in a position to supply the money at present, because I think the State should be chary of stretching out its arms in such a direction as will tend to prevent legitimate creation and development by private enterprise; and I do not see that even Freiburg, in Saxony, should be set up as a model for our edification. The establishment founded there 100 years ago has attained great dimensions; it is the mining centre of Saxony, and exercises control over the mineralogical pursuits of the country generally; but the social conditions were different when that school was established from the conditions which exist in a British community such as Queensland. In fact, I know that there are some Queensland gentlemen studying at those Freiburg schools with a view to pursuing their profession in Queensland, and therefore the colony will have the advantage of their special training in connection with metallurgy and ores generally when they have completed their studies, and come back to the colony. It has been pointed out that the Government have accepted the principle of establishing these industries by loans to central sugar-mills, and as I was a member of the Government when that grant was made, I desire to say something about the matter. I freely admit that, according to my opinion, the granting of loans by the Government for the establishment of central sugar-mills, or of works for the treatment of auriferous ores, is wrong in principle. But there was something deeper underlying the granting of loans for the establishment of central sugar-mills; it was done, as hon. members will bear in mind, to solve the very vexed question

as to whether sugar cultivation can be successfully prosecuted in the North by European labour only; and it is to be trusted that the assistance which has been given by the Government in that direction will have a successful issue, and be a satisfactory solution of the problem. At any rate the experiment is now on its trial, and I am of opinion that, whether successful or not, the Government should not go much farther than they have in that direction, because, if they do, they will interfere with private enterprise. However, I do not think that may be fairly quoted as a case in point to support the motion of the hon. member for Mulgrave. I think sufficient has been said by previous speakers to show the inability of the Government at present to enter into the matter; but I rose to enter my protest against any Government contemplating, even if blessed with a large amount of public funds, as I hope they may be shortly, the establishment of industries of this sort, which may very fairly be left to private enterprise; and I believe I have expressed the opinion of a considerable number of thinking men in this colony in saying what I have said on the subject.

Mr. MELLOR said: Mr. Speaker,—The hon. gentleman who has just sat down does not know much about mining. I am very sorry to hear him express himself in the way he has done. I think it will be admitted that mining in the colony of Queensland is likely soon to be the foremost industry—it is nearly the first at the present time. We find gold under so many different conditions here that it is impossible to say where it may next be found and under what conditions; and we are aware that the precious metal has been discovered in many different places—in fact, almost all over the colony. Under those circumstances, I think the Government would be justified in doing anything almost to encourage this important industry. We know that mining has done a great deal for the colony, and we also know that mining has not received very much attention either from this or any other Government. Turning to Victoria, we find the Government have spent large sums of money to assist mining in all its branches; and I am of opinion that, if the Government of this colony were to assist in the direction indicated by the resolution, it would be of immense benefit to the colony generally. The time may come shortly when the Government may consider it advisable to establish a mint in this colony. I think this will go hand-in-hand with the erection of what is asked for in the resolution, and it would be a very great advantage if we could have something of the kind established in the colony. I believe Queensland is becoming the first gold-producing colony in Australia; and the subject referred to is of such importance that a future Government, no matter who they may be, will have shortly to take it into their consideration. In reference to the treatment of ores, we have to go to great expense in sending ores to Germany or England to be treated. In our district one company has to send the whole of the ore to Germany to be treated. They have to cart it some fifteen or twenty miles to the railway and then ship it, and I believe if there were works in the colony where they could be dealt with a considerable saving could be effected to individuals who open mines of that description. In connection with mining, the Government very rightly, at the suggestion of the hon. member for Port Curtis, appointed mineralogical lecturers throughout the colony; and I believe that wherever those gentlemen have been giving lessons they have done very good and substantial work. I think that the knowledge they have imparted will enable their pupils to discover in

Queensland much more than has been discovered up to the present time. It is no use discussing the question very far. The hon. member who has brought it forward knows very well that it will not be carried. We have not the money to carry out the scheme at the present time; but I trust that now the matter has been mooted it will receive every consideration at the hands of the Government in the forthcoming Parliament.

Mr. BROWN said: Mr. Speaker,—The hon. member who has brought forward this motion must have realised after what has been stated that he has not the slightest chance of carrying it at present; but I think he has done very good service in bringing the matter forward. It is one which should engage public attention to some extent, but there is not the slightest chance of the money being voted now. However, there are one or two features in connection with the subject to which I must draw the attention of the House. I know something about the business of exporting ore, and I have had something to do with exporting it to Freiberg in Germany. I would remind hon. members that if works were established, say, in the hon. member's own district it would cost nearly as much to take the ores there from other parts of the colony as it would to send them to Freiberg. I have had a good deal to do with shipping ores, and therefore know what the expense is. The freight from Townsville, which exports large quantities of ore, to Freiberg does not exceed about 25s. per ton, while the cost from Charters Towers or Ravenswood to Townsville is under 10s. per ton, so that the total cost is not over £2 per ton. And we must realise this fact: that the works at Freiberg can conduct the manipulation of these ores at a very much less cost than we can. The works at Freiberg are a Government establishment, and are in a position to buy ore of almost any description, and great economy can be exercised in treating different ores at the same time; they have carbonates of all descriptions, as well as sulphurets, which they work in together. However, as the hon. member has pointed out, there is this good in the motion: that the large sum we pay now to the Government works in Freiberg would be paid to our own people; and that is well worth taking into consideration. I think that the best way to deal with the matter is for the Government to offer a bonus to some substantial company, or firm, or private individual, who will start such works. I do not think it will answer for the Government to take the works into their own hands. Then we must recollect, Mr. Speaker, that these works in Germany, although very successful so far as treating ores is concerned, are not conducted at a profit; at least I believe not. We have no information upon that point, but I do not think they are conducted at a profit. I believe the object of the Government there is merely to develop the mines and keep the people in the country, and they will be carried on as long as they pay current expenses. If we consider the enormous amount of money spent on those works, and estimate the annual interest, we must realise that they are not conducted at a profit so far as the Government are concerned. I give the hon. member credit for bringing the matter forward, and quite appreciate what he said as to the difficulty of treating these ores. I have watched the subject for many years, and although I sympathise with the hon. member, I do not quite agree with him in his assumption that such an establishment could be conducted by the Government at a profit. I do not think it could, and if the Government are going to give any assistance in the direction intimated by the hon. member their proper course is to offer a bonus to a company, or an individual, or a metallurgist who understands the business as an inducement to establish such works.

Mr. HAMILTON said : Mr. Speaker,—I think the hon. member for Mulgrave deserves great credit for having brought forward this motion, and I am very glad indeed to see at least one member on the Government side supporting him. We cannot expect to start these establishments on the large scale on which they have been started in Germany. At the same time they have been a success in Germany, and I have no doubt they would prove a success here also. One objection has been urged by the hon. Minister for Works, and that is that it would be necessary to establish three plants in different parts of the colony. The amount that has been asked for, it has been said, would be sufficient to establish one, and if that had been established and found a success it would be time to consider the establishment of similar ones elsewhere. The hon. member for Port Curtis stated just now that if we spend money in such an experiment we should have to spend it in others of a similar nature. But we have spent it in others; we have spent £50,000 in one experiment—that of erecting machinery of different descriptions for central sugar-mills. This, I think, would be a far less costly experiment, and I think there is more justification for spending the money in the direction asked. Australia is rich in mineral resources, and this portion of Australia—Queensland—is far richer in that direction than any of the other colonies. We have more to expect from the development of our mineral resources than from the development of any other of our resources. We receive as much from them as from any other, even at present, and it should be our object to do all we can to further develop them. One objection urged is that if we did establish these works we have no scientists in Queensland, as they have in Germany, to superintend them. But we could easily obtain one from Germany; and if the statement made by the hon. member for Enoggera, Mr. Dickson, is correct, that there are now Queenslanders studying in Freiburg, we should have them here to conduct the works. The hon. member for Townsville, Mr. Brown, has stated that he believes that this industry is conducted at Freiburg at a loss, for the purpose of developing the mining industries of Germany. But that is only an opinion of the hon. gentleman; and even if it were the case that the establishment is conducted at a loss, would it not pay this colony also to conduct a similar establishment at a loss for the same purpose—namely, the development of the mining industries of the country? I am perfectly sure, however, that the authorities at Freiburg will not assist to develop the industries of another country by working their establishment at a loss. I have been informed that during the last three years large quantities of ore have been shipped from the port of Townsville alone, and that as much as 300 tons in one ship has been sent from that port to Freiburg. Of course we know very well that the Freiburg establishment does this at a profit, and the fact that so much ore is sent there from this colony is evidence that there would be sufficient work for an establishment here of the same kind from those very mines which are now shipping their ores to Germany. It would certainly be cheaper to ship the ore from one port to another in this colony than to send it all the way to Germany. The advantages that would be derived from the establishment in the colony of such works would, in my opinion, be immense. We have ores rich in minerals all over the colony. We can assay those ores certainly, but assaying is no criterion as to their value. I am continually getting ores from friends in different parts of the colony and having them assayed, but that gives no indication of their

value; we must also ascertain what it will cost to extract those minerals in quantity from the ores, and that we cannot do by assay. The only way to do it is by sending the ore to works of the description which it is proposed should be established in the colony. Objection has been made to the resolution that it is only an experiment. But I think that the passing of the railway plans that have been laid on the table this afternoon, for a line from Warwick to Thane's Creek, the other end of the *via recta*, will be a far bigger experiment than the adoption of this motion for the expenditure of £50,000 in erecting works for treating auriferous sulphide ores. However, the Government have expressed their sympathy with the proposal, though they have also stated that they cannot afford to carry it out. I am afraid that their sympathy will not be warm enough to melt sulphide ores.

Mr. ISAMBERT said : Mr. Speaker,—The motion of the hon. member for Mulgrave comes from a very queer quarter—from those who have no sympathy with the Government. They say, "There is a deficit in the Treasury, and not one penny shall you have to make up that deficit," and then coolly make a proposition involving an expenditure of £50,000. All that has been promised by the Government is sympathy, and under the circumstances I do not think the hon. member deserves even sympathy, nor do I think that sympathy is a thing with which refractory ores can be treated; they require something stronger. On the whole, however, some good may come out of the discussion on this motion. The Government have, I think, no reason to be so low-mouthed with regard to this expenditure. In my opinion an expenditure of £50,000 is not required in order to attain the object contemplated by the mover of the resolution. We may make a start at once in that direction without spending £50,000. In a certain way this has been done already by the appointment of mineralogical lecturers. We ought to take a lesson in this matter from a race of people who are now very much despised and hated. Enlightened as we are we might with advantage copy the example of the Chinese and Japanese, who send some of their intellectual young men, who have passed very high examinations in their schools, to Europe at the expense of the Government, in order that they may acquire further knowledge, and then come back and work in their own country. I think the Government would do well if they offered a prize for pupils who have passed high examinations in chemistry and other subjects, and then send such of them as passed with credit to such schools as Freiburg. By adopting a course of this kind the colony would, in the course of time, be enriched with its own wisdom. That, I think, the colony could well afford, and it would tend very much to reduce the deficit, and it would lead to our procuring the best skill we could possibly obtain from Freiburg, and England, and America. Schools of mines might be established at very little expense, and smelting works might also be established where those who take an interest in mineralogy and mining could learn how different ores are treated. Different ores would be treated and tested there, and it would be ascertained whether such establishments could be profitably conducted on a large scale. Our mines are very rich, and if once the owners of mines know how to treat the various ores so as to secure a profit on their outlay, they would not be slow to adopt the process and carry out the different works that may be necessary without requiring the Government to do everything for them. Some hon. member has stated that the Freiburg school of mines is not profitable. I believe there are few universities or schools that are profitably conducted, and yet they are profitable

for the nation as a whole. And, reasoning on this line, I think the Government, notwithstanding the deficit, ought to make a beginning at once, and get the highest skill that love or money can procure from abroad; and I firmly believe that before two years are over we should have those works established, not in one part of the colony only, but in several parts. I shall vote against the motion. If the Government did intend to set aside £50,000 for the purpose mentioned in the motion, the people of one place would try to get the amount spent in their district, and others would probably resort to log-rolling to get it spent in their district, and the Government would have a pretty time of it. I think it would be far better to adopt the plan I have suggested. Even if it was a loss, that objection could easily be remedied by imposing a tax on all dividend-paying shares, which would cover the expense, and the country would be none the worse for it. If the hon. member for Mulgrave will alter his motion and propose it in the form I have indicated I will heartily support it, but I cannot vote for it in its present shape.

Mr. ADAMS, in reply, said: Mr. Speaker,—It struck me when the hon. member for Rosewood rose he was going to tell us that the opposite side would be very good to their friends, as he started by saying that the proposition came from a very queer quarter—as much as to say because it comes from this side of the House, and hon. members on this side have no sympathy with the Government. Whether that is so or not I am happy to say the hon. gentleman who leads the Government sympathises with my project. I tried to point out as forcibly as I could the benefit of the establishment of works of this kind to the colony generally, and the way in which we would be able to utilise the labour now walking about the colony. I do not believe people would try to pull each other's heads off to say where such works should be established, but they could be established where it was proved the ores are from which the gold might be extracted. My object is to assist the colony ahead, and to assist also in absorbing the large amount of labour we are bringing into the colony. The Premier expressed his sympathy with the object of the motion, and I was rather surprised to hear that other members of the Ministry were not in sympathy with it. I was sorry to hear the remarks made by the hon. member for Enoggera, Mr. Dickson. It has been said that this will interfere largely with private enterprise. We know very well that capitalists in the first instance do not care very much about experimenting. But there has been experimenting in this direction going on in the colony for many years, and I believe we have now got beyond that stage, and that what we want to do now is to show the outside public and capitalists that we have got beyond that stage, and that we are positive now that we can treat the refractory ores satisfactorily. That has been proved, as was mentioned by the hon. member for Port Curtis, by the works in his district. It has also been stated that it will not cost anything like this sum to establish works similar to these, and, therefore, if the £50,000 is found to be too much, works of this kind can be established in more than one part of the colony; and I do not think, as I have said, that there would be any quarrel as to where they should be erected. I mentioned my own district because the ores are there, and we have also everything necessary for working them. We have the coal there, the freelay for making fire-bricks, and all the materials are at hand; so that it would be economical to erect the works there, on the seaboard, and with an excellent river for the conveyance of the ores. The hon. member for

Townsville, Mr. Macrossan, distinctly said we had experimented enough, and that it would not be wise to experiment upon mines of this character; but, as I have said, we have got beyond the experimental stage, and it has been proved as a positive fact that these ores can be manipulated profitably in the colony. Captain Bennett, of Reid's Creek, who was lately at home and visited the works at Freiberg and in England, assured me, when passing through Brisbane, that £50,000 would be ample, not only for the erection of suitable works to treat the whole of the ores in the colony, but also to engage a scientist to come out and work them. He also told me that at Freiberg, where they treated ores from this colony, he was assured that these ores could be treated far more economically in the colony than at home, and that with proper works their treatment would not require such a large amount of scientific knowledge as was anticipated, and that was the case not only with ores sent from Reid's Creek but from other parts of the colony. It is all very well to talk about sending ores home and say they will only cost from 25s. to 30s. a ton for freight. The hon. member for Townsville, Mr. Brown, was no doubt sincere in saying so, but he spoke from a shipper's point of view. He is a shipper himself, and has shipped many tons of ores to Freiberg, and he ought to know something of the freight, but it is not the shipping freight alone that has to be considered, but also the railway freight. We have to consider all the charges involved, and I was speaking under the mark when I said yesterday the expenses would be over £5 a ton. I say it is wiser for us to keep this £5 a ton in the colony by the establishment of these works than to pay it away either to a foreign nation, like Germany, or to England. We should look to our own people; and every man, woman, or child, no matter from what part of Europe they come to this colony, should be first of all Queenslanders. I know very well the state of our finances at the present time, but I think that by the erection of works of this kind we should be leading the way to improving the financial position of the colony. It is said we cannot afford to spend £50,000 for this purpose, even as I pointed out, with a positive certainty of success that will ensure a fair percentage upon the money expended; yet we see plans laid on the table of this House day after day for railways that it has been stated in the House will never pay for grease for the wheels. If there is money for the one class of works there should be money available for the other. The hon. member for Enoggera, Mr. Dickson, protested against the Government entering into competition with private enterprise in the erection of such works, and I do not know how it was he never protested against the Government entering into competition with sugar-planters and sugar-mill proprietors, by the expenditure of £50,000 for central sugar-mills. He did not protest against that, but he now protests against a proposition that would further the interests of the colony and the working population throughout the colony. I consider this matter has been fairly debated, and I am almost certain I am not going to carry my motion, and in fact in the present state of the Treasury I hardly expected to do so. I am thankful to hon. members who have assisted me in debating it; and at all events it will have this beneficial effect: that it will show the outside world that we have the minerals here, and all we require is persons with capital to come in and assist us in developing these resources. I may say I am not asking more than any of the other colonies would grant, for I find that in Victoria the Government are doing everything they can to assist the mining industry. I notice

in the papers that the Victorian Government are assisting the mining industry in that colony to a very large extent. On this year's estimates there are £8,000 for prospecting, £120,309 for general operations, £3,000 for searching for coal, in addition to £1,400 last year, and £5,000 for diamond drill boring. If such is the case in the other colonies, we ought also to do all we can to develop our mineral industries, more especially as our mineral resources are greater than those of any other part of Australasia. As I said before, although I cannot expect to carry my motion to-day, yet I feel sure that the fact of bringing it forward and having it discussed will have a beneficial effect.

Question put and negatived.

VALUATION BILL.

CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL'S AMENDMENT.

On the motion of the PREMIER, the House went into Committee of the Whole to consider the Legislative Council's amendment in this Bill.

On Legislative Council's amendment—to omit the second schedule of the Bill, with the view of inserting the following new schedule :—

FORM OF VALUATION AND RETURN. Municipality [or Division] of , a valuer for the Municipality [or Division] of the undermentioned rateable land therein situated.																			
Valuation by me		OCCUPIER.		OWNER.		DESCRIPTION AND SITUATION OF LAND.				ANNUAL VALUE.									
No.	Number.	Surname.	Christian Name.	Occupation.	Surname.	Christian Name.	Residence.	County and Parish of Town.	Portion.	Section.	Allotment.	Subdivision.	Acres.	Roads.	Perches.	Area.	In case of town and suburban land, if let, for what term and in what manner.	At two-thirds of letting value (a)	At per cent on capital value & [or rent paid to the Crown.]

The PREMIER said the only amendment made in the Bill by the Council was the substitution of a new schedule for form of valuation and return. In some particulars it was certainly an improvement, and he should have been prepared to move that it be agreed to altogether, but that there was an important omission. In the schedule as it left the Assembly there was a column headed, "Description of land (town or suburban or country land, or pastoral lease or license), and in the case of town and suburban land, whether occupied or improved or not." That was a most important provision, and he proposed, therefore, that a new column containing those words be inserted in the proposed new schedule.

Question put and passed.

The PREMIER proposed, as a verbal amendment, that the heading "Description and situation of land" be altered to "Situation and area of land."

Question put and passed.

Question—That the Legislative Council's amendment, as amended, be agreed to—put and passed.

The House resumed; and the CHAIRMAN reported the resolution to the House.

The report was adopted, and the Bill was ordered to be returned to the Legislative Council, with a message informing them that their amendment had been agreed to with amendments.

SUPPLY.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—I move that you do now leave the chair, and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

INSANE IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. CHUBB said: Mr. Speaker,—Before we go into Committee of Supply, I wish to refer briefly to a matter in connection with the Immigration Bill which passed its third reading just now. If I had had in my hand last night the report on the asylums at Goodna and Ipswich, which I only got this morning, I should have referred to it then. It does seem rather late to get a report for last year, dated 25th August; surely it might have been circulated a month or two earlier, so that we could have an opportunity of referring to it when this and kindred subjects are before the House. On the second page of the report, reference is made by Dr. Scholes to the number of insane patients brought out last year by the immigration service :—

"Last year thirty patients, or 13·5 per cent. of all admissions, were recent arrivals, and this year twenty-nine persons, or 14 per cent. of all admissions, many of whom have been previously insane, were imported. The following table gives particulars of these cases."

He gives particulars of twenty-nine cases, some of whom have been in hospitals at home more than once. There is one case of a man twenty-eight years of age, who had been in eight English and Irish asylums before he came to the colony, and others had been in more than once. I note this remarkable fact: that out of the twenty-nine cases no less than eighteen came from Ireland, which seems to point to a greater laxity of supervision over the immigration from that part than exists in England or Scotland. There is another case of a person—

"Insane and in a asylum in Ireland, sent direct from immigration depot."

Another—

"Was six months in Lock Hospital and five months in Industrial Home since landing."

Another—

"Was in Richmond Asylum, Dublin."

The next—

"His second attack since arrival."

Another—

"Far advanced in consumption."

The next—

"Was in Belfast Asylum in 1878."

The next—

"Landed in Sydney, was in asylum there, also in Sweden."

Another—

"Was in Ballinasloe Asylum, Ireland."

The next—

"Landed in Melbourne, was insane in Scotland; brother insane in Scotland."

The next—

"Insane on voyage, sent from depôt."

The next—

"A cripple from birth."

She was brought out under the immigration system.

The PREMIER: Impossible!

Mr. CHUBB: It gives the case. In the next case there was a sister insane; then comes the case I referred to:—

"Landed in Melbourne; was in eight English and Irish asylums."

Now, some provision ought to be made for dealing with cases of this kind, and I think in the Bill which has just passed the Government might insert a clause in the other Chamber that would to a certain extent act as a protection. The report goes on:—

"Since compiling this table, a person has been sent to asylum who was violent and troublesome in the depôt at Plymouth, but who was shipped out and admitted insane immediately on the arrival of the vessel in Queensland. Other colonies are taking steps to prevent incapable immigrants becoming a burden on the country, and I append a newspaper cutting bearing on the matter:—

"**INCAPABLE EMIGRANTS.**—The Tasmanian Legislative Assembly has passed a Bill providing that the owner, charterer, or master of any vessel bringing to the colony any person deaf or dumb or blind, or unable to support himself in the colony, shall give a bond with two sureties for £100, and if such person becomes chargeable within five years to any charitable institution, the expenses of his maintenance shall be paid by the persons giving the bond."

I see considerable difficulties in the way of adopting that plan, but I mention the matter so as to give the Government an opportunity before the amending Immigration Bill becomes law, to add a clause, if they think advisable, meeting this very objectionable business.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—This matter had not escaped the attention of the Government. I read that report, and had had my attention directed to the subject before then on more than one occasion. I think I have more than once referred to it in this House. As a matter of fact abuses of that sort are inherent in any large system of immigration. There are always people in Great Britain who will endeavour to get rid of their poor friends, their insane friends, and people of damaged reputations, by sending them out to the colonies, and it has always been so wherever there has been any system of immigration. We take the greatest precautions to prevent ourselves from being imposed upon, and I doubt whether all the cases reported here were immigrants—that is, persons whose passages were paid by the Government. In nearly every case where that happened I have caused an investigation to be made, and have found out exactly how we were imposed upon, however poor a satisfaction it may be to find it out. I remember one case where the individual concerned came from Ireland, and very soon after got into an asylum. When the matter was reported to me I made inquiries and

ascertained that this particular person had been twice in an asylum in Ireland before she came out. On making further inquiries from the Agent-General it was found that this person, who had been twice in an asylum, was certified to by the medical officer of the parish as being perfectly sound, and as having never been in an asylum; and that was also certified to by the parish priest, although both of them must have been perfectly well aware that the person was a lunatic. What can we do in a case of that sort? We must rely upon persons in a position like that. Those cases, on the whole, do not very often happen. Out of the 6,000 immigrants we have been introducing a year, or a good deal more than that—out of 10,000 immigrants—we are imposed upon in not more than one case in 1,000. I do not see how the matter can be remedied by any legislation. The imposition is practised in England, and can only be met by administration, and in that the greatest care is exercised. Of course, the doctor may be deceived sometimes, but the greatest care is exercised, I know. Almost every voyage the report contains a list of persons who have been rejected.

Question put and passed, and the House went into Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY.

DEFENCE FORCE (LAND).

The PREMIER, in moving that £37,746 be granted for the Land Defence Force, said some changes had taken place in the vote to which he desired to call attention. Under the head of "Permanent Staff" there was no change, except that three additional sergeant instructors had been appointed, their services being rendered necessary by the additional number of corps to be instructed. In fact, the number of instructors was too small for the work that had to be done. The amount asked for the permanent force was precisely the same as before; so was the amount for the headquarters band and the Wide Bay and Kennedy regimental bands, less £50 voted last year for instruments; and £100 was asked for two volunteer bands. Passing on to the men of the force, the numbers, in some cases, had been increased, but the pay asked for was less per man than on the previous occasion, because it was only asked for twelve days instead of sixteen, which had been the usual practice. The reason of that was that there had been considerable additions to the number of corps, and to the number of men in them. Several corps had been converted from being purely volunteer corps into part of the Defence Force, in which they got regular pay, and, of course, the result had been that the amount of pay required was larger. He said last year that he considered the estimate sufficient for the maintenance of the Defence Force, and that they ought not to spend a larger sum of money for pay. But the numbers of the corps had in the meantime been increased, and the only way in which they could keep their word was by reducing the amount of pay to each man—that was, calling them out fewer days in the year. In the case of the field artillery there was no change, except that the pay was reduced from sixteen days to twelve. The garrison artillery was also the same, and so was the engineers' vote. In the infantry battalions there were two additional companies in the 1st Queensland regiment, a Southport company and another company near Ipswich. The 2nd Queensland (Wide Bay and Burnett) regiment was on the same footing as before. The 3rd Queensland (or Kennedy) regiment was a new regiment, consisting of six companies. Most of these were in a flourishing state, and the rest were doing very well. Application had been

made in that district offering the services of more men; but unless Parliament voted more money their services could not be accepted. Then there were companies at Warwick, Toowoomba, Rockhampton, and Mount Morgan, which were the same as before. In the mounted infantry branch, there were the Moreton company and four companies at Gympie, Bundaberg, Mackay, and Charters Towers. Three of those were practically new. Although money was voted for three last year, only one was then in operation, and there were now four. The amount for horses was considerably less than before. The total amount for pay was increased from £22,420 to £23,188. That was the amount which would be required if all the men served the whole twelve days, which, however, they would not. Some men were sure not to do so, but that was the full amount required. Against that, however, there was deferred pay which would probably amount to more than the £1,000 asked. The whole amount for pay to be distributed over the men was, as far as could be ascertained, £23,188. That would be sufficient, or perhaps a little more than sufficient, to cover the pay—perhaps a few hundreds over. Then there were contingencies, £14,558 as against £15,458 last year, which had been spent. The result of the year's transactions was that the amount asked for was just sufficient to cover the expenses. The amount actually spent, according to the latest data he could get, was a little less than that, but there were a few outstanding accounts which might make it exceed the vote by a few pounds. They were in the habit of hearing a great deal of criticism on the Defence Force, and various opinions had been expressed on the subject. Some members did not think a defence force necessary at all. He was not one of those. He should be very sorry to live in a country where, if it were invaded, they should have no alternative but to lie down and let the enemy walk over them, or take their possessions and their wives and children into the interior. Every country worthy of existence ought to be able to defend itself; at the same time they ought not to expend more money than was absolutely necessary. To a certain extent it was non-productive expenditure, and from that point of view was comparatively useless. But it was an expense in the nature of insurance against possible loss. They had tried various forms of a defence force, and they had found here, as in every other place where it had been tried, that the volunteer system, properly so called, had been a failure—an absolute failure. They had now a system which enabled them to get trained men; they were under discipline, served for three years—the force had, however, scarcely been in existence three years—and then passed into the reserves. So that they would have a continual succession of men who had undergone three years' drill, and who would be fairly competent soldiers if at any time their services were called into active service, and who would be still attached to the force without pay. When that system had been in force for a few years they would find, as was found in some other countries, that most of the men in the colony—a large proportion of them, at any rate, were capable of bearing arms when the necessity arose. Their present system, established in 1884, was recognised by competent judges as the best in any of the Australian colonies, and one of the best in any of the British dominions. They had attached to that, under a liberal interpretation of the Act, what were called volunteer corps. They were not under the same discipline as the Defence Force, and the Commandant could never count upon what they were going to do. They did not attend drill regularly, and if they did not like it they could stop away.

If they were summoned to go into camp, so that they might get practical knowledge of their work, they could, as one corps had done, ostentatiously choose that day for a picnic somewhere else, and so on. Of course they were not the sort of men to rely upon when the necessity arose, in which the actual use of the force would be shown. Therefore he did not place so much value upon the volunteer branch of the force as some people did. On the other hand, it would be unwise to discourage the volunteers. If they could only be got to do their work, and attend to their duty, they might be made very useful; but whenever there had been a volunteer force, sometimes they worked and sometimes they did not. He did not think he could say much more with respect to the constitution of the present system. Some members seemed to think, as had been said frequently during the session, that that was an amount where they might exercise economy, and he wished the Committee to thoroughly understand the matter. Of course, there could be economy, but it could only be done in one way, and that was by disbanding the force altogether. They could not do it in any other way if they were to have the system of paying the men for their actual service, which they did at the rate of 6s. a day, and a little more for commissioned and non-commissioned officers. They might reduce the pay, but it would be very unwise to go chopping and changing about year after year. It would not make much difference if the rate was reduced by 1s. per day, as it would amount to perhaps £200 only, and that was not worth considering. The numbers, of course, could be reduced. If hon. members thought the army was too large, of course the numbers could always be reduced. It was just as well to know what the numbers were. They were given in the Commandant's report, where it was explained in detail where the men were located. There was "A" Battery of the Permanent Force. If hon. members would look at Major Grieve's report they would see that, although some people objected to that branch as an ornamental force, the men were very hard-worked. He did not think there were any men in the country who worked so hard for so little pay. They had very hard work to do and were always employed. The complaint that Major Grieve made was that he had not enough men to do the work, and that was the reason why there was a difficulty in keeping them in the battery. They had to look after all material, plant, and stores, and there was quite enough for them to do. Then there were the two batteries of field artillery; five garrison batteries: one in Brisbane, one in Ipswich, one in Cooktown, one in Cairns, and one in Bowen. Four of those were in the northern part of the colony. Two of them were formerly volunteer companies, but had been converted into companies of the Defence Force during the last financial year. Then there were companies of mounted rifles: one at Brisbane, one at Gympie, one at Bundaberg, and one at Mackay; Engineers: one company in Brisbane with a submarine company attached. Then there was the Moreton Regiment, consisting of five companies in Brisbane, one in Ipswich, one at Southport, and one at Blackstone, Bundamba. The latter had been established during the last few months, but the one at Southport was converted from a volunteer company in last November. In the Wide Bay district there were five companies: two at Maryborough, one at Gympie, one at Howard, and one at Bundaberg. Of the Kennedy regiment there were two companies at Charters Towers, two at Townsville, one at Ravenswood, and one at Mackay. Then there were other companies in the southern part of the colony: one at Toowoomba,

one at Dalby, one at Warwick, and one at Rockhampton. Those, with the ambulance corps, made up the number. Now, if it was desired to reduce expenditure the men must be reduced, and it must be said which corps it was desirable to disband, because they were scattered all over the colony. They could not reduce a company down to twenty-four men, or an insufficient number to drill together. The companies must be large enough to work, so that it was a serious question to be considered—which of the companies should they disband. Then he turned to the Volunteer Force. The establishment he had given was the establishment on the 30th June last, and he should have added that the nominal establishment had increased during the last twelve months from 1,817 on the 30th June, 1886, to 2,272 on the 30th June, 1887, and the actual strength had increased from 1,780 on the 30th June of last year to 2,013 on the 30th June of this year. Now, those men cost 6s. a day for every day they were out, and the officers and non-commissioned officers a little more. When they were out sixteen days in the year they cost £4 16s. per man per annum, besides their clothing, which did not amount to very much in the year, say £1. Then for the present year it was proposed to spend 72s. per man. The volunteer establishment consisted of several companies, and there had been a good many changes in it. At the beginning of last year there was a company of garrison battery at Cairns and at Bowen, mounted infantry at Gympie, Bundaberg, and Mackay. They were under the volunteer system, but came in as corps of the Defence Force during the year. In Brisbane there were four volunteer rifle corps; A Company, Brisbane Rifles; and another company of that was established in last December. There were also three companies of the Queensland Scottish Volunteer Corps, two at Brisbane and one at Rockhampton; and three others were established during the year—one at Brisbane, one at Ipswich, and one at Toowoomba. Then three companies had also been established during the year of the Queensland Irish Volunteer Rifles. They were established, one in February and two in March. At Hughenden there was a company which was disbanded; at Dalby and Gladstone there were still companies; at Southport there was one which was converted into a corps of the Defence Force, and at Maryborough one which was disbanded. The Brisbane Ambulance Corps had also been converted into a corps of the Defence Force. During the year there had been established seven new companies of volunteers, making 700 in all. In addition to that there were rifle clubs, which at present included a total of 879 members, and they were scattered over various parts of the colony, from Thargomindah in the south-west to Watsonville in the north; with one at Cooktown and one at Maytown. One of them had seventy members, and another had sixty, and so on. He had now given the number of men enrolled under the present system, and if the cost of it was compared with the defence forces of the neighbouring colonies it would be found to be extremely economical. For instance, in New South Wales they gave £12 per head instead of the very moderate amount paid here, and they spent £133,000 a year for a body of men, not more than about 50 per cent. larger than the Queensland force, costing £37,000. In Victoria they had a force of over 4,000, and spent £110,000 a year. So that it could not be said that the Queensland force was extravagant in comparison with the other colonies. On the contrary, he thought it was as economical as it could be. In fact, the force was starved at the present time, and anyone who read the reports of Major Lyster and Major Grieve, attached to the report of the Commandant, would see that the force was really starved. They had not a

sufficient number of drill-sheds or proper places to store their arms, and he was continually applied to for money to defray bare necessary expenses; but he had given his word to the House that the cost should not be increased, and he was obliged to refuse all requests. He wished hon. members to thoroughly understand the position. One course would be to have no Defence Force; though he, being responsible for the defence of the country, would be very sorry to see such a course adopted. Another course would be to disband a certain number of men; but if hon. members thought the present number not too large, it was certain that the expenditure could not be reduced in that way. The only other course would be to abolish the present system and have some other system. But the present system had worked remarkably well so far, though there had no doubt been faults in administration, as there would be even in the most perfect system. If they had a defence force they must have an efficient one, and they could not have an efficient force and at the same time not pay for it. He would be glad to give any further explanation as to the condition of the corps, the expenditure during the year, or any matters of administration with respect to which hon. members desired information.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he had carefully listened to the Chief Secretary, who had omitted only one matter—a matter which he generally omitted to mention when dealing with questions involving the expenditure of money the Committee was called upon to sanction—that was, the element of cost, and whether the country could afford to spend the money. He thought the vote could be very easily reduced by a considerable sum; and if the necessity arose for reducing the Permanent Force, which seemed to be the only plan suggested by the Premier, even that difficulty might be got over by increasing the number of volunteers. He maintained that the volunteers had been improperly treated by the Commandant and by the Government, and that full consideration had not been given to them for their services; and when hon. members saw the vote increasing year after year, it behoved them to consider whether they were justified in going to such an extent. What was the vote for 1884-5? The Premier ought to know, but if the hon. gentleman did not, he would tell him; it was £23,356.

The PREMIER: The Act came into operation in December.

Mr. MOREHEAD said that amount included an increase in the salary of Colonel French from £700 to £900 a year, but did not include the item of naval defence. Now, the Committee had to consider two things in dealing with the question, and the first was whether the financial position at the present time was better than in 1884-5. He thought the answer would be that it was not. Then they had to consider whether the colony was in greater danger of being attacked by a foreign power now than then, and he thought the answer to that also would be in the negative. And no reason was given by the Premier why the expenditure should continue to increase as it had done year by year, but he told the Committee that the force was already starved out. If that was the case some of them were starved out in a very comfortable way. He thought most hon. members would agree with him in that. The officers could ride their ponies up and down the streets, go in for polo, and live like fighting-cocks. They paid no duty on their liquor, and lived a great deal better than almost any of the taxpayers of the colony; yet the Committee were told that they were starved out. The hon. gentleman had spoken of what took place in New

South Wales, and compared the Queensland Defence Force with the force in that colony. He said it was a generally admitted fact—he went so far as to say that it could not be disputed—that the Queensland force and system were better than those of the other colonies; indeed, he was not sure that the hon. gentleman did not go farther. He (Mr. Morehead) doubted that very much; he thought the defence system in New South Wales was very much better than the system here, and not as costly, taking into consideration the number of efficient men. Last year the number paid by the State was well on to 6,000, and the cost was about £133,000, between three and four times as much as was paid here, and the men were very much more efficient.

The PREMIER: No.

Mr. MOREHEAD said that was the belief of any person—even a layman—who saw the different bodies on parades.

The PREMIER: I have seen them.

Mr. MOREHEAD said the hon. gentleman, in speaking of the cost of the system in New South Wales, did not mention the action taken by the New South Wales Government when they found themselves in financial straits, though not such severe straits as Queensland was in at the present time. They were short to the extent of £2,500,000, but they had not the element of uncertainty which hung like a cloud over the finances of Queensland, nor were they taxed up to their eyes like the people of Queensland. The Government of New South Wales had quite as difficult a problem to solve as the Chief Secretary had now, and they at once set to work and reduced their Defence estimates by a very considerable amount.

The PREMIER: Prove it!

Mr. MOREHEAD said there was a difference of about £12,000 or £14,000 between the two years.

The PREMIER: Was not the amount I gave the reduced amount?

Mr. MOREHEAD: Which amount?

The PREMIER: £133,000.

Mr. MOREHEAD: The amount for 1886 was £147,000, and that was reduced to about £134,000 in 1887.

The PREMIER: I gave the reduced amount.

Mr. MOREHEAD said the hon. gentleman gave the amount the Defence Force of that colony—the land force—cost in 1887. What he wanted to point out was that a reduction of £13,000 or £14,000 was made under the circumstances he had mentioned, owing, as he had said, to the financial position of the colony at the time. Now, if it was possible for the New South Wales Government, under such circumstances, to reduce the cost of their Defence Force, it surely was much easier for the Government of Queensland to do so. In the Queensland Permanent Force there were 78 men, as against 378 employed in New South Wales. They were told by the Chief Secretary that the men were overworked; but, if those seventy-eight men were overworked, what must be the state of the New South Wales force?

The PREMIER: They must be underworked.

Mr. MOREHEAD said they would be very much more overworked than the Permanent Force in Queensland. Anyone who knew anything about the fortifications in Sydney Harbour, and who knew the number of defenders, would admit that comparison between the two colonies, so far as the question of labour was

concerned, was very much in favour of New South Wales. What had they here in the way of forts for those seventy-eight men to look after? Why, according to the report of Major Grieve, they had a fort which was worse than useless, because under the pretence of defence it thereby invited attack; and, if attacked, he expected it would probably do much more damage to the defenders than to assailants.

The PREMIER: What are you referring to?

Mr. MOREHEAD said he was referring to page 12 in the report, dealing with the defences of Fort Lytton, which fortifications the gunners and drivers had to look after. They would find it stated in that report—

“During the past year a considerable portion of the interior slope of the rear face, or gorge, of Lytton Fort slipped down. The earth also under the 6-inch gun emplacement has shrunk away from the cement.”

The fort itself seemed to admit its own incompetence by trying to get away as quickly as possible. He hoped the Premier would not adopt the same tactics, although they might possibly be the best for himself. The report continued:—

“I would recommend that all the slopes be revetted, and that the magazines be protected from flooding.”

That last piece of advice was very good. Even Cromwell's faith in the Almighty was limited, as, while trusting to the Supreme Being, he told his men to “keep their powder dry.” He hoped steps would be taken to prevent the magazines being flooded. That went to prove to his mind that, if those men were overworked, they were neglecting their own work. If they looked at the large number of important fortifications constituting the first line of defence in Sydney Harbour, with only 378 men to look after them, every member of that Committee would see that they had not too few men when they had seventy-eight for that miserable apology for a fort at Lytton, which seemed inclined to disappear off the face of the earth as quickly as possible. He was told that there were two guns, which were likely to become historical, now lying on the top of the hill above Lytton; and possibly by the time they were mounted they would be obsolete, like the present guns in the fort. If what was said in regard to those guns was true, one might say somebody had blundered in the matter. He was told—he did not know how true it might be, but he took the story for what it was worth—by a gentleman who assumed to know, at any rate, that it would take about twelve months to put those guns in position. What with sinking pits, laying cement beds, and putting the guns in position, it would take something like twelve months; and yet they were told those seventy-eight men employed for the purpose of looking after that petty fort were overworked. They might be overworked. He had not seen them at work at Lytton; in fact the only work he had seen them doing was keeping the ground clear for the polo men. He believed they were very good at that, and there were plenty of other hon. members who had seen them too.

The PREMIER: What day of the week was that?

Mr. MOREHEAD said it was not on a Sunday; there was no breaking of the Sabbath. However, it was not a matter of very much consequence what they were doing; it was the work they were put to, and very active men they were. They evidently knew all their duties in regard to a polo-ground, as well as the mounted policemen, so that, perhaps, they were not without their uses. It struck him, however, as it struck others, that it would have been much better if they had been attending to the duties for which the State paid them than attending

to a polo match. Now, as regarded the question of defence as well as in other matters connected with the administration of the affairs of the colony, they had to cut their coat according to their cloth, whether red, or blue, or any other colour. He thought that now the era of retrenchment had set in, it was not an improper thing to ask the Committee to apply the knife of retrenchment to that branch of expenditure as to any other. They knew perfectly well that the hon. Minister for Works, when Minister for Lands, dispensed with the services of a considerable number of men who had been in the employment of the State for considerable periods of time, some longer and some shorter, on the ground of economy. On the ground that there was no necessity for their services they were turned adrift, he presumed, to do what they could in anything but a prosperous time in the colony. He had been told that day, and he was liable to correction by the Minister for Works if he were wrong, that that hon. gentleman had also applied the pruning-knife in his new department. He had been told that he had given notice of suspension of service to four gentlemen employed in the Railway Survey Department, three of whom were natives of the colonies, and two out of these three were natives of Queensland—young men brought up to the profession, and against whom there was no charge whatever. The other was a gentleman of more advanced age, and, he was told, a valuable man. Now, if that sort of thing was to be, surely they were doing a grave injustice in knocking off in one department men who naturally ought to receive consideration at the hands of the Government of the colony. They were doing that on the one hand, and on the other they were continuing an expense which was certainly of no benefit, and which was simply an expenditure to employ men, a lot of whom came from the other side of the world, and who were paid, to his mind, inordinate salaries for the work they did. Now, in regard to the Commandant himself. His position in comparison with the military officer in New South Wales, was one of very much more profit. The Commandant of the New South Wales force received a salary of £600 a year, and he had an allowance, he (Mr. Morehead) thought, of £175 for a house, and a forage allowance, and so forth. The Commandant in Queensland, with a very much smaller army to control and, he took it, very much less to do, was paid £900 a year, and had a house, and, he supposed, various other advantages, which, no doubt, the Premier would let the Committee know about later on. He took it that the agreement with Colonel French, the Commandant, was rapidly drawing to a close. He did not know how long it had to run, but he supposed it was drawing to a close, and he hoped that when a fresh agreement was made better terms would be made, or that his place would be given to someone else. In regard to Colonel French, and the volunteers, he did not think that the Commandant had shown any desire to utilise the Volunteer Force of the country in the way he might. In fact, in his report, which was in the hands of hon. members, he evidently showed, at any rate, a disinclination to have much to do with them. Now, he believed the same antipathy existed between military men and volunteers in England in the old days; but what had resulted was patent to every member of the Committee, and that was that the Volunteer Force in England at the present time was recognised as the inner line of defence, and had great weight in all considerations. No doubt Colonel French was doing all he could, and for obvious reasons, to foster an alteration or a change of positions in the Volunteer Force and the Defence Force by

pointing out, with an amount of self-praise which he supposed was in itself no recommendation, the good results of his system, and very much deprecating the volunteers. Colonel French said as follows:—

"In my report last year I drew attention to the very small attendance of volunteers in camp; this year shows no improvement in this respect. Attendance appears to depend on the whims of a few leading spirits. Thus the Roma Volunteer Corps attended in good force for five days, the Brisbane Volunteer Corps for two days, but the Brisbane and Ipswich companies of the Queensland Scottish were conspicuous by their absence—although I understand many of the men wished to attend. It appears that some of the corps preferred to get up a sort of entertainment on the Darling Downs rather than accept the Governor's invitation to attend the Lytton Encampment; and even when this fell through, a rifle-shooting competition was arranged instead. By the above action the worst feature of volunteering—the "go-as-you-please" system—has been emphasised in a very marked manner; but even from this evil much good may be deduced, if it has the effect of opening the eyes of those who, despite the total collapse of the purely volunteer system as a sole means of defence in this and every other Australian colony, still persist in saying that a volunteer force is *all we require*."

Colonel French was evidently there fighting for his life. He (Mr. Morehead) did not think that the Commandant of the Defence Force in this colony was justified in speaking in that way of any force in the colony, especially of a force which they must look to in the future as likely to be the backbone of their defence system. Hon. members might say what they liked, but that was a fact; and yet the Commandant, in his official report, referred to volunteering as a "go-as-you-please" system. The system of the Colonel seemed to be a "pay-as-you-please" system, and, so long as his men were paid and he got the lion's share, he was satisfied. That gentleman would like to see the Volunteer Force, which might, if properly encouraged, prove as good a force for defence as his own, abandoned, and his own force established, so that they might rake in the dollars for themselves, and thus have more weight against the volunteers.

The PREMIER: I don't understand you.

Mr. MOREHEAD said the hon. gentleman might not understand him, but he had nevertheless made his meaning pretty clear. If the hon. gentleman did not agree with the arguments advanced by members on that side of the Committee, or with those of other members whose views did not square with his, he said he did not understand them.

The PREMIER: I want to understand you.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he had made his meaning plain enough. Colonel French, however, was not content with having ignored the volunteer movement as far as he could; he went far beyond that. He actually issued a brigade order, which was published, instructing any of his officers who had the power delegated to them to make short work of any obstructive officials. The officials meant were, he (Mr. Morehead) believed, the late Minister for Works and the late Postmaster-General. For the information of hon. members who had not read the order, and with the desire that it should receive the publicity that its phraseology deserved, he would read it to the Committee. It was as follows:—

"No. 485.

"It having been brought to the notice of the Commandant that some members of the force are deterred from attending camp owing to certain threats in a circular recently issued by a Government department, it is hereby notified for public information that regulation 162 provides as follows, namely:—'Heads of departments and all other Government officials are hereby instructed'—"

Mr. MOREHEAD: That is to say that Colonel French instructs.

The PREMIER: No; the Government make the regulations.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Well, the order continued—

“‘Heads of departments and all other Government officials are hereby instructed to afford every facility for attendance at drill and training to members of the Defence or Volunteer Forces under their orders.’ Section 81 of the Defence Act provides a penalty of £20 and imprisonment for six months in the case of persons who prevent members of the force from performing their duties. With such powers in their hands commanding officers ought to make short work of obstructive officials, and the Commandant hopes that they will not lose any opportunity for punishing them to the full extent of the law.”

That was certainly a Daniel come to judgment.

“Upon what meat doth this our Caesar feed,
That he is grown so great?”

That order was intended to make short work of those obstructive officials, and it was to be done by getting the officials fined or imprisoned. That was the only interpretation that could be put upon the document. But with regard to that particular brigade order, he (Mr. Morehead) believed that it went through a process of suppression, and that although it did appear in print it never got into the *Government Gazette*. That was one instance of the arrogance of Colonel French, of the arrogance of a man “dressed in a little brief authority.” That was one of his military instincts, he supposed, judging from the bloodthirsty threats of the gallant colonel towards the heads of departments. It was evidently intended to deal with two members of the Ministry, one of whom was now deceased, and the other, he was very sorry to say, had been despatched in a summary way. It might have been at the instigation of the Premier that the order was issued, but that could be explained afterwards. He was assuming at the present time that it was issued on the sole responsibility of Colonel French, and he was inclined to assume that from the fact that when the terrible notice became public, steps were taken, he supposed by those who were alarmed, to have it withdrawn. It must be in the memory of many hon. members what was the conduct of Colonel French at a public meeting of citizens held some time ago in Brisbane with reference to the removal of the rifle range from Victoria Park.

The PREMIER: We talked about that last year.

Mr. MOREHEAD said they would talk about it this year, and further, with regard to that same matter, he would refer to some things to show the persistency and insistence of Colonel French. They all knew about that public meeting, and how the colonel bearded the Chief Justice on the platform; but he believed that if the colonel were in a position opposite the Chief Justice, the Chief Justice would be much more likely to remove him. What followed after that? The gallant colonel, still sticking to his guns, he admitted, and still determined to do what he chose with regard to the rifle range in Victoria Park, notwithstanding that concession after concession had been granted to him by the trustees of the park,—that was, concessions in the way of extending the time for removing the rifle range, when it was objected to by almost everybody in the community—in the Brisbane community, at any rate,—and some of his military despots removed a fence belonging to the trustees of the park. At least the trustees were advised and believed that the fence belonged to them. Colonel French removed the fence away to erect another fence in a Government domain, in order to make a paddock for his horse. That was

objected to, and he repaired the fence in such a way that there was no fence at all, and cows and children, or anyone else, could pass across the range. That was reported to the trustees, who naturally objected to the proceeding; and Colonel French was notified accordingly, and told that he was not to remove any more fencing. His reply to the trustees' lawyers was a very characteristic one, showing the arrogance of the man and his ignorance of his position. He did not think the Premier had ever seen those letters, and he (Mr. Morehead) would be glad to show them to the hon. gentleman.

The PREMIER said he had never heard of them before.

Mr. MOREHEAD said they would be all the more interesting; that was breaking up new ground. Colonel French replied to the trustees' solicitors, Messrs. Hart and Flower, to the effect that in taking up the fence he was only using Government property, and that the trustees of the Victoria Park ought to be perfectly well satisfied that they had already been presented with £250,000 worth of public property, without attempting to take possession of Government property. He (Mr. Morehead) was one of the Victoria Park trustees; there were six of them, among whom, he believed, was the late Minister for Lands, and he was very glad to hear that they had been presented with that property; but, on inquiry, he found that they were only there as trustees, and that the property which Colonel French assured them was presented to them by the State was not their property at all. He thought himself that a severe censure should have been administered to Colonel French on more than one occasion.

The PREMIER: When did that happen?

Mr. MOREHEAD said it happened three or four months ago. He would show the hon. gentleman the letters; they were very interesting. He had a copy of them in his office, and he would be glad to forward them to the Premier. The late Treasurer, the member for Enoggera, knew how the trustees of Victoria Park, which was held simply for the benefit of the citizens, were harassed in their action in attempting to prevent the land that had been set apart for public purposes from being given up to the military. But the colonel had hold of it, and he (Mr. Morehead) admitted he did pretty game so far as the Victoria Park was concerned. Going back to the report of the Commandant, they found something which must have struck hon. members who read it, that although there might appear to be finality in the estimate of over £37,000, yet their needy Defence Force was crying out for more money. Let anyone look at Major Grieve's report. Under the heading of “Barracks” he said:—

“A sergeant's mess sufficiently large to accommodate sergeants of the Defence Force, attached for instruction, is urgently required; also, as before reported, hospital accommodation.”

That meant more money, if it was to be given. He said further:—

“The fencing all round the barracks is in urgent need of renewal. That round the guard-room is very insecure.”

That also meant further expense. Then they came to a very interesting paragraph under the head of “Officers”:—

“Uncertainty as to the tenure of their appointment and future promotion exerts a very depressing effect upon the subaltern.”

He wondered what effect that estimate had upon the taxpayers of the colony? He should say it was a very depressing effect indeed. The report went on:—

“Their pay is small in proportion to their expenses, and considerably less than that of other colonies.”

Well, let them curtail their expenses and live on less. He believed they were remarkably well paid, and a great deal better paid than the majority of people who had to hold the same position in the colony, and, as he said, they had, in addition, various advantages which did not appear on the Estimates. That was what he was told; and he believed it was true that they took advantage of the exemption given to officers of Her Majesty's service, and got goods duty-free—wines and spirits. The report further said:—

"No hope of further advancement is held out to them."

That, of course, had a very depressing effect, but he would suggest that they confine themselves to resignation. The gunners were said to have a considerable amount of irregular work at various periods of the year, but were otherwise well off. He supposed the "irregular work" was polo-playing, but from what he could see that appeared to be their "regular" work. The statement that they were otherwise well off would appear to show that they were not too hard-worked. Then there were certain recommendations in the report—

"1. That the establishment of the battery be increased as recommended in my last report."

That would entail more expense.

The PREMIER: Double.

Mr. MOREHEAD: What did it matter? It was other people's money those men paid with, and so it did not matter whether it was double or treble; let them increase the battery. The second recommendation was as follows:—

"That the drivers receive 2s. 6d. a day pay instead of 2s. 3d., and that their standard of height be raised from 5 feet 5 inches to 5 feet 8 inches."

If payment was to be given on the scale of height then the Premier and himself and one or two other members should get more pay than smaller members of the Committee. He was sure the Chairman would agree with him in that, though he did not see how the question of pay and height should come together.

The PREMIER: It is not proposed to make payment according to height.

Mr. MOREHEAD said they were put in the same paragraph. The report further recommended that—

"Where four-horse teams are used instead of six, the horses should be stronger and require taller and stronger drivers, being able, at the same time, themselves to carry extra weight. Heavy men would not be selected as drivers; a much better class of driver would be obtained."

He supposed they wished to have long thin men like himself as drivers, and, if so, it was quite possible a better class of driver would be obtained. The report further recommended the establishment of a sergeants' mess, a hospital or sick ward, stabling for Government horses, stores for artillery material at Brisbane, Lytton, and Townsville, and a *manège* for instruction in riding-drill. If all those requirements were to be supplied what would it cost? And all for the use of seventy-eight men. Hon. members would see that, not only were they asked to vote over £37,000, but, if all those requirements were to be attended to, there would be an enormously increased expenditure also to be met. He was with the Premier in this respect, that he had no desire that this colony should be attacked or trampled over by any foreign nation. Far be it that it should be so, but he maintained that at the present time they were maintaining a Defence Force at a great deal too much cost. They could not afford it, and they might just as well face that position. They must reduce the expenditure so as to come within the limits, if possible, of their means. He did not think it was for members on the Opposition side or on any side of the Committee

to suggest to the hon. member at the head of the Government how that was to be done, but it was for them to say how much they could afford to spend in that direction, and they certainly could not afford in their present financial position to support the heavy burden of their present Defence Force. He was never a believer in the Defence Force, but he was quite willing, as he always had been, to submit to what, in the opinion of that House, was the voice of the majority of the people of the colony. At the same time he must say that when the Bill for the establishment of that force became law, it was never intended, and it was never contemplated by anyone for a moment, that it would increase after a few years to the proportion it had reached now. It must be remembered that that increase was a continuous one year after year, without any adequate return for the expenditure involved. He submitted that no case had been made out by the Premier for the continuance of the Defence Force on its present lines, and if he could not continue to run the force on those lines and for that money, he must run it on other lines for less money.

The PREMIER: You had better run it on other lines.

Mr. MOREHEAD said that was no reply to what he said at all. What he said was that the country could not afford to spend the enormous sum of money the Premier asked for on that particular object, and he maintained that if the volunteer system had received that recognition at the hands of the Government, and at the hands of the Commandant and the permanent staff, to which it was entitled, they could easily get a force quite as efficient and very much larger in numbers than the force they had at the present time, and at a very much less cost to the country. He believed they had in the staff of officers in the Permanent Force material enough to educate and drill a large volunteer force with a small nucleus of the Permanent Force, but the officers did not like that. They wished to remain as they were at present. He strongly objected to raise up in this democratic colony—as the Premier was so fond of calling it—a military class, for that was what they were rapidly getting into. That was inconsistent with the character of a free country. He held, possibly, more democratic views than the Premier himself, and he might possibly develop them later on during the present session. What he wanted to point out to the Committee was that the amount set down was only a portion of what they were likely to have to pay for defence purposes in the colony. Certain promises had been made by the Premier, when in England, and those promises, he presumed, would be brought before the House, and would meet possibly with very serious opposition. Speaking for himself, he did not intend to vote one shilling of the people's money towards the protection of British commerce—not one shilling. If England could not defend her own commerce, she ought. With regard to that particular vote, he thought that if they gave the sum of £30,000 it would meet every requirement in the direction of the defence of the colony. It was absurd to say that the Government could not curtail expenditure in that direction; if they only got a certain sum of money voted they would have to do so. He intended to move an amendment on the proposition before the Committee; and in doing so he might say that he was not actuated by any desire to bring about the destruction of the Defence Force. It had been decided that such should be the system, and he wished it to be continued. He took his stand simply on the fact that the country was not in a position at present to vote such a sum of money for the purpose as had been asked by the

Government; more especially as they had been able to economise and to curtail expenditure in other directions. He moved, therefore, that the item be reduced by the sum of £7,746. That would leave £30,000 to carry on the force. There was no desire, as he had said before, in any way to destroy or to cripple the force, but the vote asked for was more than they could afford at the present time. He might add that that was only a part of the reduction he intended to propose. When a subsequent vote was moved he intended to move, as an amendment, that it be reduced by £2,500.

Question—That £30,000 only be granted—put.

The PREMIER said that before referring to the amendment moved by the hon. member who led the Opposition, which he accepted as a distinct challenge of the competence of the Government to conduct the business of the country in that respect, he proposed to refer briefly to some of the details of which the hon. member had spoken. The hon. member had referred to a reduction made last year in the expenditure on what he called the Defence Force of New South Wales. There was no defence force in that colony in the least analogous to that of Queensland—it was not comparable to it in any way. The expenditure on that force was reduced from £144,000 to £134,000, a reduction of £10,000.

Mr. MOREHEAD: The reduction was nearly £13,000.

The PREMIER: Call it £13,000. The simple fact was, that the expenditure being extravagant, they reduced it. What argument could be drawn from that? That their expenditure being economical, they should reduce it by a corresponding amount. It was absurd. As he had pointed out before, in New South Wales they maintained for £134,000 a force of about 50 per cent. more men than Queensland maintained for less than one-third of the money. He pointed out when moving the vote the comparative economy of the service of this colony to what it was in the neighbouring colony. Theirs was an extremely economical force—the other was an extravagant one; and that made all the difference. Then the hon. member referred to a general order issued by the Commandant when he (the Premier) was not in the colony—a general order which he was not there to justify. He had told the Commandant that he thought it an extremely ill-judged order, and one that should not have been issued; but the Commandant was driven almost to exasperation by some officers of the Government over whom he, not being in the colony, had no control. It was an extremely ill-judged order; but that was not the question they were discussing now. No doubt the Commandant had been guilty of an error of judgment, a thing to which most persons were liable occasionally—he himself was, at any rate. Then they were told that members of the Defence Force had been employed to keep the ground at a polo match. It was an extremely foolish thing to do, but he did not feel responsible for that; nor was it any reason why they should cripple the Defence Force. Those matters were entirely beside the question; they were dealing with a far larger question. If hon. members desired to censure an officer of the Government, let them do so, or let them even censure the Government; but the question had nothing whatever to do with the maintenance of the Defence Force. The question they were discussing—and he hoped hon. members would rise to the occasion and recognise the fact—was as to the proper basis on which they should maintain the Defence Force of the colony. It was no use going on from year to year, with the Defence Force continually threatened that if they did not do this or that—if they

did not please this member or that—if they did not take off their caps to this or that man in the street—the next time the estimate came on, the Defence Force vote should be struck off. That was not the system on which business of that kind ought to be conducted. The vital question was—Did they or did they not believe that it was necessary to have a Defence Force in the colony, to be kept in an efficient condition, and to defend the colony against any threatened hostile invasion? If hon. members thought it was not necessary, let them say so, and take the responsibility for saying so. Do not let them say, on the one hand, "You shall have a Defence Force," and on the other, "But we will take care that you do not get enough money to make it efficient." It was as if the owner of a steamer were to say to the engineer, "You shall drive the steamer fifteen knots an hour," and when the engineer said, "To do that I must have so much coal," the reply would be, "I will give you only half the coal, but you must drive the vessel fifteen knots all the same." That was exactly what hon. members were saying. They wanted to have an efficient Defence Force without paying for it. What was the use of saying that there should be a certain number of men on the establishment unless they were prepared to vote enough money to pay them? He wished the hon. member had made his motion more concrete, and had said what he was striking at. They knew pretty well what he was striking at. The hon. member disclaimed any idea of destroying the Defence Force, but what was the use of saying that when the hon. member made a motion which, if it were carried, would have the effect of destroying the efficiency of it?

Mr. MOREHEAD: Certainly not. We give you less coal and let you go slower.

The PREMIER said that either the Government understood that business or they did not. The hon. member, by his speech, had shown that he did not; that he had as profound an ignorance on the subject as might be expected from a far less intelligent man. The hon. member had shown an absolute want of knowledge on the subject. He had told the Government to go slower. He (the Premier) had pointed out that it had been his business for the last two or three years to make that branch of the service as economical as he could. Whenever it had been in his hands—as it had been all the time, with the exception of an interval of five months when he was away—there had certainly been no extravagance. He had pointed out before—and he was not going to repeat the argument—that that force could not be kept up to anything like its present establishment for a much less sum than was asked for. The hon. member did not say, "Take away the staff officers": they were already too few to do the work without extreme over-work. He did not say "Take away some of the Permanent Force," who were too small in number. He did not want to strike at the Defence Force; he did not want to do anything in particular; but that there should not be money enough to keep them all going. What was the alternative? If that amendment was carried, and if the Government chose to accept it as meaning that the Committee thought them still competent to conduct the affairs of the colony, then it meant that the Government—on his advice, he supposed—would determine which branch of the service could best be dispensed with; and he had no hesitation in saying what he should do if the amendment was carried, and if he continued to administer the department. But before that he wished to refer to an argument used by the hon. member, that it was a continually increasing vote. To prove that, the hon. member quoted the Estimates for 1884-5. The

Defence Act came into operation in the month of December, 1884, and it was only in operation for less than six months of that financial year. The corps was scarcely formed; the thing was scarcely started; and the Estimates for that year were £23,000—for six months' work. But when the thing was fairly started, and they brought in Estimates for the system when it was on a proper footing the following year, the Estimates were £35,591.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Quite so.

The PREMIER: The hon. member did not mention that.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Yes, I did.

The PREMIER said he did not hear it. Since then the force had nearly doubled in number, and the expense was practically the same; so that to talk about a continually increasing expenditure was simply nonsense. Now, it was desirable that the Committee, before voting on the subject, should know exactly what the amendment meant. If the Committee meant that the saving was to be on the Defence Force, as distinguished from the volunteers, let them say so, and reduce the expenditure for that branch of the force. If they thought there should be no Permanent Force, let them say so, and reduce the expenditure for that branch. But if they reduced the expenditure on the whole vote, and if the Government chose to accept the responsibility of carrying on that branch of the service after that, then he should interpret it as meaning that the least efficient branch of the force should be wiped out; and he should certainly begin with the Volunteer Force, which he believed to be the least efficient and least useful branch of the force. He had no hesitation in saying that it was. The hon. member had stood up in part of his speech as the champion of the volunteers. Now, did they not know that one of the great grievances of the volunteer branch of the force was that they would not spend more money on them? Applications were continually being repeated to appoint a high-salaried officer in the volunteer branch of the force to do work for them; but he (the Premier) had declined to sanction it and would continue to decline to sanction it. He knew the Defence Force was starved—that there were not enough staff officers to do all the work that required to be done—but he was certainly not going to create fat billets for incompetent volunteer officers. As a matter of fact, with the exception of one or two volunteer companies, there were no competent officers in the whole volunteer force. There were some very competent officers, but he could count them on his fingers, he was sorry to say. If the vote was to be reduced absolutely, and it was left to him to say how it was to be done, he should proceed first of all to recommend the Commander-in-Chief to disband the volunteer corps, and then to disband the latest-formed corps of the Defence Force which could best be dispensed with. From the distribution of those corps throughout the colony it would be impossible to disband them one here and one there; they would have to select a whole district and disband the corps there altogether. They were not going to disband the corps altogether in Brisbane—there must be some force at the capital; but they would have to disband half the country corps and a considerable number of the town corps. Let hon. members fully understand what the position was. He understood the subject; and he hoped that if hon. members thought he did not, they would say so—they would say that he was not competent to conduct that branch of his department. If he did not understand the subject it was time that somebody took his place who was competent—the hon. member opposite, for instance,

1887—2 Y

who wished to run the Defence Force on entirely different principles. But let them understand one another. It had been long enough going on in that way—as if the Defence Force held its existence in a sort of way on sufferance. If it was only to continue to hold existence on sufferance, it had better disappear altogether; and let them have some Government that would undertake to defend the country without any force at all. But he hoped such a Government would be ready to make hostages of themselves when an enemy came. The hon. member made a great number of other criticisms upon which he (the Premier) did not think he could throw any light. He could give answers on any matters of detail, but the attack had been mainly on the system and not on details. The hon. member said that officers of the force had been guilty of indiscretions. He (the Premier) would admit it, not that he knew it was the case; but suppose they had been guilty of indiscretions! Was the system good or bad? If it was a bad system, sweep it away; if it was good, keep it up efficiently: but do not go playing with it, saying, "You shan't have money to carry on with." He would not accept that position. He was willing to do the work that attached to the administration of that branch of the department, but he was not prepared, any more than the engineer he had spoken of, to undertake to maintain an efficient force if Parliament refused a sufficient sum of money to make it efficient.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he was not quite certain from the Premier's tone and utterances whether he meant to challenge the amendment as a vote of no confidence. That was what he understood when the Premier rose and said he accepted the challenge from that side of the Committee. Of course if the hon. gentleman chose to make it that, he would compel his followers to support him; but it was certainly unstatesmanlike and unworthy of the position the hon. gentleman occupied. The hon. gentleman found fault with the hon. leader of the Opposition for not singling out the items of the Defence Force estimates which he thought ought to be reduced. Now, it was competent for every member of the Committee to understand the question as thoroughly as the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government. The hon. leader of the Opposition had taken the course which was usual in the House of Commons when any reduction was made in the British Army. Year by year the amount of money required by the British Army was voted, and the number of men required was stated; and if the House of Commons thought that the amount of money and the number of men were too great it simply reduced the amount of money, and let the Government deal with the responsibility of reducing the number of men.

The PREMIER: No.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said every member in that Committee who knew anything of the subject knew it was so.

The PREMIER: No; they reduce the amount and make a specific reduction in the number of men always.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said the House of Commons left the responsibility entirely on the Government to say what branch would suffer, if any.

The PREMIER: No.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: I say yes.

The PREMIER: That is not the practice.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: The House of Commons did not take the Executive branch of the Government into its hands,

The PREMIER: They reduce the number of men.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: They reduced the vote, and the Executive were left to reduce the men in the same way that the hon. gentleman would be left to do so. It was not a question of his (the Premier's) competency to manage the department. No doubt he was as competent as anyone they could put in his place as far as that department was concerned, although he thought the hon. gentleman prided himself upon having more competency than he (Mr. Macrossan) gave him credit for. The hon. gentleman had brought back not only a spirit of imperialism from England, but also a military spirit. He seemed to have become imbued entirely with the spirit of Colonel French with regard to the volunteer system. He (Mr. Macrossan) did not think a more disgraceful report ever was placed before a House of Parliament than that gentleman's report upon the volunteers. It was worse than anything that had appeared in England about the volunteers. That gentleman actually took up the position of the head of the Government; he argued the case as the head of the Government would do in that House, if he was opposed to the volunteer system, which he (Mr. Macrossan) was sorry to find he was. What did he say about the volunteers? He used the words that the hon. the Premier used before tea—that the volunteer system had collapsed; that it was a failure in every way. The hon. the Premier also said the volunteer system was a failure.

The PREMIER: So it is.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: He said it was not. Colonel French said:—

"By the above action the worst feature of volunteering—the "go-as-you-please" system—has been emphasised in a very marked manner; but even from this evil much good may be deduced"—

That was the evil of volunteers, not forgetting that they were citizens as well as soldiers—

"much good may be deduced, if it has the effect of opening the eyes of those who, despite the collapse of the purely volunteer system as a sole means of defence in this and every other Australian colony, still persist in saying that a volunteer force is *all* we require."

Mr. FOXTON: Go on!

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: The hon. gentleman could read the rest if he chose. Whoever said that the volunteer system was all that they required? He had not heard anyone in that House say it. The hon. gentleman at the head of the Opposition had not said it. He had simply maintained that the Volunteer Force was a good force, and he (Mr. Macrossan) maintained the same thing, in spite of Colonel French and his military experience. Colonel French's military experience had given him no more knowledge of the working of the volunteer system than was gained by those who read of the working of volunteer systems all over Europe—all over the world he might say. So far from the volunteer system being a failure, it had been a success in every country where it had been well tried and well worked. Who were the men who gained American independence? Were they regular soldiers? Were they not men who had sprung up as volunteers and in a few short months fought and defeated the best army in Europe, army after army? And who were the men in France who resisted the invasion of nearly the whole of Europe? Volunteers who sprung up from the soil.

The PREMIER: Oh!

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: The hon. gentleman laughed, but a million of men invaded France and they were met by volunteers with a sprinkling here and there of a few old soldiers,

and they fought and beat the best soldiers in Europe. Again, through the civil war in America, what had she to depend upon except her volunteers? What was her standing army for 60,000,000 people? 23,000 or 24,000 men, who were doing duty more as police than soldiers. For real defence purposes her force was volunteers; and so it was in Canada. And England would be in a very poor position to-day were it not for her volunteers. She made a very poor show as it was, as a military nation, and she would make a miserable show indeed were it not for her 240,000 or 250,000 volunteers. Then Colonel French went on to talk of the principle of a defence force, and referred to their volunteers being paid by land-orders under the old system and sneered at it, as if that was his business. His business was to do the work he was paid for as a military man—to make the force efficient as fighting men—and not to sneer at the policy they had adopted either in the present or in the past. Then he said:—

"Taking the Estimates for the current year it will be seen that the total amount asked for on account of pay of the Defence Force (exclusive of Permanent Force and Staff) is £12,273; and if these men were volunteers their capitulation grant would amount to £5,000. These facts should be noted, as there appears to be much misunderstanding on the subject."

No doubt the amount would be £5,000; but what would be the number of men? It would be 5,000 instead of 2,000.

The PREMIER: No, no!

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: Oh, yes!

The PREMIER: Divide $2\frac{1}{2}$ into 5 and you do not get 5.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said he thought it would be much better if Colonel French had left out all reference to the £12,000 for the Permanent Force. On looking at the schedule accompanying the Estimates-in-Chief, he found that Colonel French was drawing £1,130 a year—or close upon one-twelfth of that £12,000 which was required for the pay of the Defence Force.

The PREMIER: How do you make that up?

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said he would read how it was made up:—"G. A. French, commandant, £900, forage allowance £100, quarters valued at £130; total £1,130." That was how it was made up. He would give the hon. gentleman some more information:—"J. S. Lyster, brigade major, £400, forage allowance £50, rent allowance £100"—that was the pay of a colonel in the British army—£550. "J. A. Grieve, major commanding A Battery, £550, forage allowance £50; total, £600. C. H. Des Voeux, infantry staff officer, £400, forage allowance £50; total, £450." He would stop there. Those four gentlemen drew between them £2,730 out of the £12,000 required for the Defence Force. It would, therefore, have suited Colonel French very much better to have said nothing about that £12,000, seeing that he and three companions in arms drew nearly one-fourth of the total amount asked for that force—not the total amount voted, but the total amount asked for. There were other ways of looking at the question besides looking at it through the military spectacles of the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government. He did not think that even with the advantage of the military men whom they had got from Europe, if their soldiers came in contact with the regular trained soldiers of Europe, they would show a much better front than their volunteers; and he thought that if the volunteer system got more encouragement, and the men were trained in the manner that they could be trained, they would make a better show than the Defence Force under the present system. He believed thoroughly in

the volunteer system. He believed in every man in the country being compelled to fight for the country when required; and the man who was not willing to fight for it ought, he thought, to have no stake in it.

The PREMIER: That is not the volunteer system.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: He said that every man should fight, and those who did not do it willingly should be compelled to do so.

The PREMIER: That is the system you are striking at now.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: No, it is not.

The PREMIER: It is.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said the system he spoke of was the militia system attached to the volunteer system.

The PREMIER: Have you read the Defence Act?

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said, of course, he had read it, and assisted in the passing of it, although he did not approve of it very much. There was another way of looking at the amount of money that they had been asked to expend for the Defence Force. They were asked to expend £50,000 altogether including the cost of naval defence, and that was the amount required to pay interest on one and a-quarter millions of money at 4 per cent. That was a point worth considering in the present state, not only of the Loan Fund, but in the present state of the Consolidated Revenue Fund. Now, the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government, when asked to make a railway for which money had been voted years ago, said that he would not do so until he found out the state of the Loan Fund and its liabilities, and yet that £50,000 which they were asked to vote for defence purposes would actually pay interest on one and a-quarter millions of money, which might be much better expended, with all due deference to the military knowledge of the hon. gentleman, than it was likely to be expended on defence. But it was not the intention of hon. members to destroy the force altogether.

The PREMIER: Yes, it is.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he believed a certain number of men were necessary, but he did not think they required to expend £37,000—in fact, he was certain they could not afford it; and if the hon. gentleman had a thorough idea of economy, as he ought to have, and as he (Mr. Macrossan) was afraid he had not, he would find means to economise. The hon. gentleman was a military man, or he (Mr. Macrossan) looked upon him as one, and he should certainly, instead of being asked to economise, have done so voluntarily. If the hon. gentleman did not know where to begin, they could not tell him. If he chose to disband the volunteers, let him take the responsibility of doing so. Upon him would rest the responsibility, not upon the Opposition. They said £30,000 was quite enough to expend on defence at the present time. He thought himself it was a little too much. He thought that a little more should be spent on volunteering and less on the Defence Force, and the country would be much better off. Now, the hon. gentleman had made comparison between the colony and New South Wales, and he thought very unfairly, in estimating the amount of money spent yearly in New South Wales upon the defence force. The hon. gentleman said they were more extravagant down there, and he thought the Defence Force here was conducted much more economically. But the hon. gentleman must remember that in addition to the ordinary volunteer system of New South Wales there was a permanent force of 378 men,

who were continually employed—a good many of them in the batteries and the balance at Paddington Barracks. Now, if they looked at the system they would find that the Permanent Force here, including officers, numbered seventy-eight men, and cost £6,184, and if they multiplied that by five, which was about the number of times that the permanent defence force in New South Wales was larger than that here, it would come to over £30,000; so that there was that sum spent upon permanent defence.

The PREMIER: They pay £12 per head to their men.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: The permanent force, as the hon. gentleman knew, was a standing force the same as ours. They were paid a much higher sum than £12 a year.

The PREMIER: They pay £12 to our £5 to all the force.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said that the system here was managed more economically, but that was no reason why they should spend £37,000 when they could only afford £30,000. Now, it was no use trying to frighten hon. members by saying that if the amendment was accepted the force must be disbanded. That was merely a threat, and it was an idle, useless threat, he hoped, as far as hon. members were concerned. If the hon. gentleman only got £30,000 to spend he would only spend £30,000.

The PREMIER: Disband the force.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he was quite sure the hon. gentleman would spend it the best way he could, but whether he disbanded any companies of the Defence Force or the volunteers entirely was a matter which would be left in his hands. He would take the responsibility of doing what he could with the £30,000 which they wished to give him, and he hoped the hon. gentleman would accept it as gracefully as he possibly could.

The PREMIER said he wanted to say a word or two, not in reply to the hon. member, but something which he had forgotten when he was replying to the leader of the Opposition. The hon. member referred to the Lytton fort and said it was entirely unsafe; but as a matter of fact there was nothing particularly the matter.

Mr. MOREHEAD: It seems to be pretty rickety.

The PREMIER said he rose in order that he might allay any apprehension that might prevail. He had had an opportunity of going down to Lytton on Saturday, and he found that during the heavy rains at the beginning of the year some of the earthwork had slipped away on the inside. He did not know whether that was anything to be surprised at, considering the weather they had had; but that could be repaired at a moderate cost. There were very few large embankments that would not slip away under such circumstances. As to the guns having been displaced, they had not been. No foundation had sunk to the extent of the eighth of an inch.

Mr. MOREHEAD: I spoke about placing the guns.

The PREMIER: As to the magazine being flooded, there was a small trickle from the roof, easily repaired, but which was not surprising, considering the rains. With reference to the guns on the Lytton hill, those were guns that were ordered a considerable time ago, and had not yet been mounted, because it had not been decided what was the best place for them. They were to be mounted on the disappearing system. They were raised by hydraulic power, and disappeared below the parapet when fired. Various positions had been suggested by the military advisers to the Government,

and indeed that was the object with which he went to Lytton on Saturday—to decide the position of those guns. Two of the guns now at the fort were sent for on the recommendation of the late General Scratchley. They were guns exactly the same, so far as dimensions and construction were concerned, as some of the most modern and best guns, but they were muzzle-loaders, whereas guns of the same calibre were now made as breech-loaders. He did not know what Government ordered them, but he thought it was a great mistake. They were not service guns; they were a new description, but General Scratchley recommended them, and the Government accepted his recommendation. At the present time no guns of that kind were made as muzzle-loaders, and what was proposed to be done was to substitute breech-loaders, and have the present guns converted into breech-loaders. As to the fort being defenceless, that was not the case, and he wished it to be known.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: Where can the guns be converted?

The PREMIER: They would have to be sent to Elswick at a cost of £150 for each gun, but that would be cheaper than buying new ones.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: That was rather expensive advice to get from General Scratchley.

The PREMIER said it was. He took the liberty of criticising military advice as well as any other advice the Government might receive. He wished again to assure hon. members that there was no foundation for the report that Lytton fort was not in an efficient state.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he simply read from Major Grieve's report. He did not know whether the guns had subsided or not. He was not included in the military. If he had gone on further he could have shown the utter uselessness of that battery as it stood. Major Grieve said in his report:—

"The 6-inch R.M.L. guns at present mounted in the fort do not work satisfactorily. The blocks jam invariably after firing a few rounds. No. 2 gun from the right frequently misses fire. I would recommend that these guns be altered or converted. The recoils of these two guns differ."

After that he thought the fort might be said to be in a not highly satisfactory condition. If the guns missed fire, jammed, and worked unsatisfactorily after firing a few rounds, unless they polished off the enemy with the first few rounds they would be at the mercy of the enemy after that.

Mr. MACFARLANE said he did not intend to refer to the reports on the Defence Force, but to go on the broad ground that the colony was not able at the present time to afford such a force, seeing that the expenditure per head of the population was increasing so rapidly. On reference to the tables relating to the Colonial Treasurer's Financial Statement, in Table L would be found the amount of contribution per head of the population for the last eleven years; and he would suggest that in future there should be a table showing the amount of expenditure per head, because such a table would be found very useful. During those eleven years the population of the colony had increased by 155,611, which was scarcely half of the whole population at the present time. He had made a calculation, and he found that the expenditure during those eleven years had increased from £6 19s. 2d. per head in 1876-7, to £10 17s. 1d. per head in 1886-7. If his calculation was accurately made, the amount per head in 1876-7 was £6 19s. 2d.; it was £7 10s. 6d. in 1877-8; £9 1s. 1d. in 1878-9; £7 19s. 2d. in 1879-80; £6 18s. 8d. in 1880-1; £7 6s. 3d. in 1881-2; £7 6s. 3d. in 1882-3; £8 1s.

6d. in 1883-4; £9 8s. 4d. in 1884-5; £10 6s. 4d. in 1885-6; and £10 17s. 1d. in 1886-7. If those figures were correct it was evident that the country could not afford, in the face of such an increasing rate of taxation, to keep up a defence force at a cost to the colony of £50,000 a year. Taking the total adult male population at 50,000 or 60,000, the colony was taxed £1 per head every year for the purpose of keeping up that force. There was no use in saying that the force must be kept up in the way proposed, or there must be no force at all. For his part he thought it better that there should be none than that the colony should pay so much. He had always been consistent in his opposition to the Defence Force.

The PREMIER: Hear, hear!

Mr. MACFARLANE said that, whoever could be charged with inconsistency in that matter, he could not. When the Act was being passed it was said by the Premier, and also by Sir Thomas McIlwraith, that the Volunteer Force had been a complete failure, and that opinion was expressed almost unanimously. But he would ask had the Defence Force been a complete success?

The PREMIER: Yes.

Mr. MACFARLANE said he could not see it. He knew the Premier was very enthusiastic as to the Defence Force, and that was a point on which he had never been able to agree with the hon. gentleman; and he should be obliged to support the reduction if the question came to a vote. He had already said that the population had more than doubled during the last eleven years. Was it not possible, then, to keep down the expenditure per head of the population as the population increased? Taking the last eleven years, the population in 1876-7 was 187,000; the increase in 1877-8 was 16,000; it was 7,000 the following year; 1,000 in 1880-1; 8,000 in 1881-2; 22,000 in 1882-3; 39,000 in 1883-4; 22,000 in 1884-5; 12,000 in 1885-6; and 21,000 in 1886-7. In spite of that increase of population the expenditure per head was still increasing, and though a good deal of that might be accounted for by the ten-million loan, and the amount of interest that had to be paid on it, the increase of population ought to pay for that. As he said before, he hoped the Treasurer of the day, whoever he might be, would supply a table to show the expenditure per head of population as well as the contributions per head. As to the Defence Force, he had always been opposed to that. He was not opposed to being defended, but he maintained that the colony could do perfectly well without that part of the force which was called the Permanent Force. Who were the natural defenders of the colony? Every man who had a house and family.

Mr. STEVENS: Every man under forty-five

Mr. MACFARLANE said he thought every man under fifty-five would be very glad to do his best in the defence of the colony. The farmers all through the country who were settled on their own land, and the workmen who had their own houses, would defend the colony quite as well as those men called the Permanent Force. He was very much afraid of the military caste growing in the community, and if the vote went on increasing every year there was no telling where it would end. At the present time the amount asked for was not so great as it would have been but for the financial straits in which the colony was placed, but when better times came, instead of the force costing £50,000 a year, the amount would more likely be £100,000. Therefore, before the force attained to such a growth, the Committee should do their best to stamp out the spirit of militarism, and have a force everybody felt interested in—that was a Defence Force,

without that part which was called the Permanent Force. It was the Permanent Force which ran away with a great deal of the money, as hon. members would see if they looked at the list of officers, majors, drum-majors, and all the rest of them. They would be astonished at the amount required by them.

The PREMIER: I wish you would look at them.

Mr. MACFARLANE said that in the very first line there were, "Commandant," "Brigade-Major," "Infantry Staff-Officer," "Staff-Officer, Northern District," "Paymaster," "Sergeant Instructor in Gunnery," "Sergeant Instructor Submarine Mining," "Armourer Sergeant," "Master Tailor," "Storekeeper," "Clerk," "Sergeant-Instructors," and "Sergeant-in-Charge, Sherwood Magazine." That was the first part, and they were all alike.

The PREMIER: There are no more like that.

Mr. MACFARLANE said in the next item there were fifty-five gunners and drivers, and if they looked at where the money went to, they would find it went to those who did not do the hard work. He did not think Major Grieve did much hard work.

The PREMIER: I do.

Mr. MACFARLANE said Major Grieve wanted a fence. Why did he not get all those men to put up a fence? There were seventy-eight men under him and it would not take them many days to put up a fence, and it would give them something to do. If he saw any return for their money he would not be so much opposed to the vote for the Defence Force; but the return was *nil*. He could see some force in the motion that was before the House on the previous night in reference to keeping rabbits out, and he believed in encouraging the sugar industry. There were returns there, but in the present case all the money would be lost, and therefore he hoped the Committee would take a stand and make a beginning by reducing that £37,000 to £30,000.

Mr. STEVENS said the hon. member who had just sat down had stated that he was in favour of money being expended in keeping out rabbits, because he could see something in it; but the reason why the hon. member could see something in it was that the rabbits were here. If an enemy were here he thought the hon. member would be quite as much in favour of expending any sum of money that might be considered necessary. Two or three years ago there was a war scare, and more than one hon. member of that Committee were seen parading up and down the city asking what the Government were doing to defend them; and he recollected one hon. gentleman—he would not mention his name, but he dared say the gentleman would recollect the circumstance himself—who was absolutely pale, and his limbs were trembling, whilst he was speaking about the danger to which they were exposed and yet the Government were doing nothing to defend them; whereas the Government were expending large sums of money. The work had to be done hastily, but it would have been effective in keeping away an enemy. The same thing would happen again, and, as sure as ever there was a war scare, not only hon. members, but the general public would be crying out for a very much larger sum of money to be expended than had been expended hitherto. The Bill was not drawn up during the war scare, but after the alarm had passed.

The PREMIER: No; before.

Mr. STEVENS said the principle of it was affirmed subsequently, when hon. members were perfectly cool, and when they had no idea of

there being any danger to their shores or themselves. The chief reason for bringing in the Bill was that the Volunteer Force had been a failure. They could not have a permanent force without the expenditure of money. How were they going to get experienced officers from older countries to come out and spend a great deal of time and actual labour in working up a force of that description unless they were tolerably well paid? One officer had been referred to just now in connection with a certain fence, and it was asked why did not that officer put up the fence with his own men? He supposed the hon. member who asked the question had men working for him; and did he go and do their work? If he wished to have a paling fence would he put it up himself? No, he would send for men to do it. They could not expect men to come out at great discomfort for a small salary. It was absurd to expect it. He had been informed by volunteer officers, who had felt rather sore at something which had occurred between them and the Commandant, that they admitted that a permanent defence force such as they had was a good thing, and a thing that it was absolutely necessary to have. Of course those hon. members who were attacking the vote maintained that they did not require anything of the sort. They believed in the volunteer system, pure and simple, and yet some of those hon. members, a good many of them, objected to the volunteer system when they had it, and said that it was not good enough. Would any hon. member who was at the last Lytton encampment say that the volunteers, as drilled men, were better than the Permanent Force? He did not think anyone could say that.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: It could not be expected.

Mr. STEVENS said the volunteers had not to attend so many drills or to go through the same discipline, and necessarily they were not so efficient. The volunteer system had broken down and another system had been established, which, although expensive, was efficient, and yet hon. members wanted to knock down a system which had taken a few years to build up, and at considerable expense, and wished to go back to the old system which was universally condemned. They would have the old thing repeated over and over again. In regard to the expense of maintaining the Defence Force, New South Wales had been quoted, and he was not sure whether South Australia had not been; but New South Wales had spent very much more money than Queensland, and yet their defence force was not more efficient.

The PREMIER: Not nearly so efficient.

Mr. STEVENS said, even if it were so efficient, so far as simple drill was concerned, they had not to defend the same line of coast that Queensland had. The Queensland coast was defended from end to end at a very much less expenditure per head than that of New South Wales, and in another colony further south the expenditure per head was as much or a trifle more than in Queensland, and they had to defend a very insignificant portion of coast. He was one of those who were prepared to maintain that the Defence Force as at present was a good and efficient one, and a very much better system than anything that had been proposed. By reducing the vote by £7,000 they did not strike a blow at the Permanent Force. If they were guided by what the Premier said—and he thought that hon. gentleman was perfectly right in saying what he did—if the force were to be reduced, it must be reduced at the least efficient end, and that without doubt would be the Volunteer Force. He was strongly in favour of volunteers, and had great admiration for them, and considered

they were patriotic in a very high degree. He would like to see the volunteer system encouraged thoroughly; but it must be done in connection with something on a sounder basis, and that was something similar, if not exactly the same, as the Permanent Force. Nobody had pointed out anything better than the Permanent Defence Force that they had at the present. It was pointed out that the vote had been increased; but he thought that was said in error. The vote had not been increased; it was a trifle less than last year. The principal item increased was in connection with the Volunteer Force, and that was a sum of £1,500. The increase which the admirers of the purely volunteer system objected to was the increase of £1,500 for capitation allowance for efficient volunteers and cadets. He did not object to that item at all. He was very glad to see that volunteers had increased; but experience went a long way towards disproving some of the arguments brought forward against the force. The hon. member for Townsville, in speaking of countries which furnished volunteers on several important occasions, mentioned America. He thought if the hon. gentleman would look into history he would find that the Southern States furnished the greater proportion of volunteers in the American war, and they got a lot the worst of it. The North had more trained soldiers, and when they were short of their own soldiers they employed foreign soldiers; but it was the trained soldiers, and the number of them combined, he admitted, which finally crushed the South. The bulk of the volunteers—the untrained soldiers—were found by the South, which was beaten by the North. There was no doubt about that. He hoped that hon. members would pause before they supported the amendment made by the leader of the Opposition. They had been spending time and money in completing their force and making it efficient. Some hon. members who had objected to the force had not said anything against its efficiency, but simply that the country could not afford to maintain the force. The question was whether they could afford to be defended when they were much better off than when they were poor. Did they want more defence when they were rich than when they were poor? He took it that their lives and property were just as valuable to them in one case as the other. There was no doubt that they should be economical in the public expenditure; but there was a wise economy and a foolish economy, and he contended that to reduce that vote to a less amount than was required for the efficient maintenance of the present Defence Force would be to aim a fatal blow at the best system of defence in this or any other colony.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said the hon. member who had just sat down had spoken as if the whole of the coast were defended. He would ask the hon. member what part of the coast was defended. Was there a single port in the colony that was properly defended? Brisbane was defended by its position, and so were Maryborough and Rockhampton. But that could not be said of other towns on the coast. Would any hon. member say that Townsville was defended? Why, a privateer could successfully attack Townsville.

The PREMIER: I do not think so; I have a better opinion of the Defence Force, which you want to wipe out.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government talked about the Defence Force as if it had been a complete success. What did that military critic—the Commandant—say on the subject? He (Mr. Macrossan) held in his hand the report of a great battle that took place this year, a tremendous

battle that occurred on the banks of the Brisbane, for the defence of the city of Brisbane. Let hon. members listen to what the Commandant said of the defence against the attack. After speaking of the natural features of the position where the attack was made, he said—

"The 'Garundah' gave further protection of the left flank, though, as a matter of fact, her share in the defence consisted in firing several rounds into the defenders, mistaking them for the attack, when they were moving into position."

That was a nice position for the defenders to be in, to be attacked by their friends. He was sure the Germans would like that kind of defence if they came to take the city of Brisbane. Further on in his report the Commandant said:—

"I noted:—The common error on both sides of men getting into clumps when under fire, instead of scattering as much as possible."

Mr. FOXTON: That is both sides—attack and defence.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said there was no difference between the two sides; according to the report they were both guilty of the same errors. If they were both guilty of the same errors, where was the excellent training and discipline and the better military knowledge of the officers and men of the Defence Force?

Mr. FOXTON: The hon. member does not know what he is talking about; there were volunteers there as well as the Permanent Force.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he knew there were volunteers there. The report stated that—

"The defence was reinforced about 2 p.m. by sixty-two of the Brisbane Volunteer Corps, seventy of the Queensland Scottish, and 167 of the Queensland Irish."

Mr. FOXTON: That is after the incident you speak of.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said the Commandant further remarked—

"I saw a company doubled across a bridge in fours, though the bridge was under the fire of about 150 men at short ranges."

Why, they would all have been wiped out in two or three minutes in actual warfare. It had been complained that officers were not being properly trained. Whose fault was that? Was it not the fault of the Government who allowed such men to hold commissions? If a man was not properly trained he should not be allowed to hold a commission. There was a certain time allowed to pass the examination, and if a man did not pass the examination within that time—no matter what might be his position, even if he were the Premier—he ought to be wiped out.

The PREMIER: Hear, hear!

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he contended it was the fault of the gentleman at the head of the military department that a system was allowed to continue under which men who were not properly trained retained their commissions. It was of far more importance to have trained officers than to have trained men. If they had trained men but had not trained officers, what would be the use of those men, unless the men could obtain officers from their own ranks? He hoped the hon. gentleman would do what he said he would do—wipe out the untrained officers, who would not undergo the examination; and, if they did attempt to undergo it, and did not pass, then let them be wiped out. If they were to have a defence force, let them have soldiers, and not simply men wearing uniforms.

Mr. STEVENS: Those are the volunteers.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he did not care whether they were volunteers or members of the Defence Force. He thought that

the officers should be capable of leading their men. He had not heard one single word from anyone that would lead him to alter his opinion as to the reduction of that vote. They could not afford to pay it. It was simply a question of money—whether they were able to spend that amount of £50,000 a year upon the two arms of their defence—the land and sea forces. He did not think they were, nor did he think they should be called upon to pay it. If the Government were really sincere in their endeavour to retrench and economise, they would certainly begin with the military force.

The PREMIER said the hon. member had stated that the question was whether they could afford to pay £35,000 a year for defence.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: No; £50,000.

The PREMIER said the amount was £50,000 for the two forces. That was not the question. The question was—Were they to have an efficient defence force? That was the first question, and then if they were to have an efficient defence force, what was the least money they could get it for?

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: £30,000.

The PREMIER said the hon. member for Townsville said £30,000; but he (the Premier) did not think so. The hon. member knew better than he did. Of course anybody knew better than the man who knew best. Unless he (the Premier) was totally ignorant of the business of his department, he ought to know better than the hon. member. He had endeavoured to put hon. members in the position to judge as well as he could himself by pointing out where the money was spent, where the different corps were established, and the places where they could be disbanded. He supposed the suggestion the hon. member would give would be that they should disband the Northern corps. That would be another injustice to the North, but it would save money. The hon. member said the North was totally undefended, but he did not think it was.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: I said Townsville.

The PREMIER said Townsville was connected with places by rail where most of the Northern corps were established, and there were very good officers and very good men there.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: I said that the port is not defended—that there are no fortifications there.

The PREMIER said that there were no great fortifications there, they knew; but what would be the use of fortifications if they had not men to man them? In the meantime the hon. member would prevent there being any men trained to man those fortifications when they were established. The hon. member also criticised the Commandant's report of a sham fight; but he (the Premier) said that the Commandant very properly pointed out the mistakes made by the officers. What was the object of a sham fight if it was not to discover what mistakes men would make—to try them? The hon. member said that the mistakes made on that occasion were a proof that the Defence Force was not a success. It did not prove that, but what it really did prove was that the officers after two years' training did not know everything in military matters. At any rate, they had been able to pass their examination, and retain the confidence of their men, although they had made mistakes—so might any man make mistakes. Better have that than a system under which they would have officers without training. The hon. member in a previous speech referred to French and American history, and told the Committee

that it was the volunteers who then resisted the invaders. So it was; but at what cost of life? If they had been trained men, having two or three years' training under such a system as there was here now, would there have been half the sacrifice of life? Any man who knew anything of history knew that untrained levies were simply food for powder. The hon. member's historical references were generally most unfortunate.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: Have you read of Bunker's Hill?

The PREMIER: Yes, I have.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: Have you read of Majuba Hill?

The PREMIER said he dared say that in a place like Majuba Hill a sharpshooter was better than a trained soldier. That was simply a case in which a body of men, led by an ignorant and incompetent commander, appeared on the sky-line in the face of sharpshooters, and were, of course, picked off one by one. He did not think any of their volunteer officers in this colony would take up so ridiculous a position as that.

Mr. SALKELD: He was not a volunteer officer.

The PREMIER: No, he was not; he was one of Sir Garnet Wolseley's pets, but he never came back from that field. He wished hon. members in dealing with the vote would take some special part of it. If they were sincere in their objections to the vote, they should take that position of the force to which they objected and deal with it. They would not do so, however. Let them take the Permanent Force—he invited them to do that; the salaries of the staff officers—he invited them to do that. But no, they would not do that. Let them take the Defence Force and say what should be done, or the Volunteer Force, and say what should be done with it. No, they did not do that; but what they wished to do was this: They would not take any detail, but take the whole concern and make it efficient. That was what they wished to do, to make the whole thing inefficient as some sort of slap in the face to the Commandant—to him, to the Government, or someone else. They would not say what was objectionable, and he had pointed out that it was impossible to carry out the system they had now with less money. What, then, were they to do? They could not reduce the pay of the men, and all that was left was to dismiss them.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: You ought not to make it a personal matter.

The PREMIER said that when he spoke that afternoon he had endeavoured to prevent it being made a personal matter, and he wished the whole thing dealt with on its merits. Let them strike out that part of the system which they considered objectionable, whether it was the Permanent Force, the Defence Force, or the volunteers. Let them say which was bad, and strike it out. Hon. members would not do that, but endeavoured to continue the irritation of one branch with another, which had really nothing to do with the system, with a view of crippling the whole. That would be the effect of the amendment moved by the hon. member who led the Opposition, but he would tell the Committee that if any corps was to be disbanded—if it rested with him to say which, or if he had anything to do with it—he should disband the volunteers.

Mr. HAMILTON said he did not think there was any intention on the part of the Committee to cause irritation between the different corps. At the same time he believed in the volunteer system and he thought the arguments used to

prove that system wrong cut the other way. For instance, the hon. member for Logan had referred to the fact that in America the Southern volunteers were beaten by the Northern regulars. The hon. member forgot that the Southerners were outnumbered by three to one, and he had heard many Northern men admit that the Southerners fought better, man for man, than the Northerners. They had also the history of the Indian mutiny, when the English volunteers so bravely sold their lives. At the same time, he did not wish to depreciate the Defence Force, as he considered it a very useful one, and it was not attempted by the present proposal to do away with that force. He was of opinion that Colonel French had been rather hardly treated, and he certainly had been most unjustly treated in connection with his presence at the meeting at the Town Hall. He did not see why, because the colonel was a soldier, he should be deprived of the rights of a citizen, and he had entered that hall for the purpose of giving his reasons for retaining the Victoria Park as a rifle range. It was most unfair and discourteous to prevent him from giving those reasons. It was also most unfair to take objection to the presence of the volunteers at that meeting, for the volunteers, besides being citizens, were citizens who consented to submit themselves to training for the purpose of defending their fellow-citizens. With regard to the polo matches, some unfair remarks had also been made. Those matches took place on a Saturday afternoon, when the officers were just as much entitled to be at liberty to enjoy themselves as clerks and other people, and when it did not interfere with their work in any way. Of course it must be admitted that the salaries of those officers were high, but he believed in paying good men good wages, and not one hon. member had attempted to show that those gentlemen were not fit for their positions. At the same time, when he considered the financial muddle in which they were landed, and that, as a matter of fact, they were insolvent and were £400,000 or £500,000 in debt, and further, that it was proposed to levy additional taxation to swell the taxation already imposed, he said they must cut their coat according to their cloth. At a time when they were dismissing efficient men against whom no charge was made, from the public service, and when Ministers informed them that they could not allow money to be spent upon any public works that were admittedly necessary, and could not expend money upon railways for which the money had really been voted for years, at such a time they must cut their coat according to their cloth, and the amount set down for that item must be reduced. The reduction would not by any means have the effect of wiping it out, and if, after a time, they found they could go on with it in its present proportions, they could act accordingly.

Mr. DICKSON said he intended to support the vote—not for the reason that the Premier had given, by making them feel that they were to regard the vote as a party vote, but simply because he was convinced of the necessity of supporting the vote in its present dimensions. It was a vote which hon. members were always accustomed to criticise very severely, and it was well for the sake of the Government and the country that the extent of that demand should be very keenly scrutinised, because there was no doubt a tendency in that department to gradually increase its expenditure, and escape the control of Ministers. He would give the Premier credit for having most carefully gone over every item in the vote to see whether it could be reduced by any possible means; and if he found it could be, he would have readily presented it to the Committee in a diminished form. If they were to reduce the vote in the manner proposed by the

leader of the Opposition, they would most certainly impair the efficiency of the service. The Committee had better look the matter in the face, and say whether it was, in their opinion, better to cripple the Defence Force, or vote the required amount and secure an efficient force. There should be no half-measures in a matter of that kind. If he could see his way to save to the Treasury £7,000 or £10,000 at the present time he would gladly do so. He did not vote the money for the Defence Force “cheerfully,” as the Appropriation Act had it. He only gave his vote for it as a matter of stern necessity, because he did not see that the Government could contract the dimensions of the vote at the present time without impairing the efficiency of the service. Hon. members on the other side ought to look at the question in that light, for they might be called upon at some future time to accept the responsibility of administration, and no one who had been a Minister of the Crown, or who was aware of the responsibilities of office, could shut his eyes to the fact that no Government could hold the reins of power for one month during the sitting of Parliament who refused to provide an adequate defence for the colony. If any Government were inclined to impair the efficiency of the service, or to cripple it in any way, they would deserve to receive the condemnation of Parliament, which he had not the slightest doubt would be very promptly extended to them. There was no use, therefore, in concealing the fact from themselves that that expenditure must be provided for. At the same time the Premier should endeavour to see that that estimate represented the entire expenditure of the force. There was a tendency, he knew, in the Defence Department, not only to expend the money appropriated by Parliament on that vote, but also to obtain an additional expenditure from the Works Department and other branches of the service, which prevented Parliament from knowing exactly what the entire expenditure was. If the expenditure for the year could be kept within the amount asked for, hon. members might be content to let the vote pass in its present dimensions. With other hon. members who had spoken, he did not desire to see a military class or caste arise in the colony. There were certain officers of the force who did not consider so fully as they might that the service was not a very popular one—that the vote obtained annually from Parliament was given, he might say, grudgingly, and only as a matter of necessity, as an insurance premium upon the prosperity of the colony. It was not granted willingly and cheerfully. Officers holding positions in the Colonial service should bear in mind that they were not entitled to the privileges and perquisites which attached to the Imperial service. Here in this colony the inhabitants had not yet been educated up to the military demands of the mother-country, and he hoped there would never be any necessity to burden the taxpayers of the colony with a vast military establishment. At the same time it was only right that they should be protected from danger, and he could not agree with those hon. members who considered that because they were now in “the piping times of peace” they might reduce the Defence Force to an inefficient condition, to be suddenly extended, possibly in an emergency, or when troubled times arrived. The service should be kept in such a state of efficiency that it would, at any rate, form the nucleus of a really substantial and serviceable line of defence. Considerable discussion had arisen as to the possibility of increasing the Volunteer Force, and relying more upon it. It was certainly not desirable to exclude the Volunteer Force altogether. They ought, on the contrary, to encourage by every possible and legitimate means the formation of the spirit of

volunteering amongst the colonists; and he was not disposed to accept the experience of the past as sufficient to justify them in accepting the position that volunteering was a total failure. He believed the volunteering spirit might very properly be encouraged.

Mr. MURPHY: It wants fostering.

Mr. DICKSON said he regretted that friction had arisen between the Defence Force and the Volunteer Force during the past twelve months. By a little judicious and conciliatory treatment on both sides that feeling might be suppressed, and both branches of the service might work together very cordially. There ought to be great room for the expansion of volunteering. At the same time he looked upon the Defence Force as forming the real nucleus of the service. Holding those views, therefore, he should certainly support the Government in the vote asked for.

Mr. STEVENSON said there had been so many compliments paid to the Volunteer Force, that he, as a member of the Volunteer Force, felt some diffidence in rising to say a few words on the subject. The Premier had told them that if the vote was reduced the first thing he would do would be to disband the volunteers. By what the hon. gentleman had said, he had done a great deal, if not to disband them, at least to discourage them. There was not the slightest doubt about that. If the hon. gentleman had any idea of fostering the volunteers, as the hon. member for Barcoo put it, he would not have spoken of them in such a bitter way as he had done that night. Before proceeding further into the merits of volunteering he would ask the Premier whether, when he spoke of a certain volunteer corps which had ostentatiously gone to a picnic on their own account instead of going into camp at Lytton, he referred to the Queensland Scottish Volunteers?

The PREMIER said he was not quite sure what corps it was, not having been in the colony at the time; but he believed it was the Queensland Scottish. The incident, he was informed, had occurred.

Mr. STEVENSON said that, as an officer of the Queensland Scottish, he would say that it was simply untrue. If the volunteers were to be discouraged in that way—if they were to be talked about in that insulting manner by the Premier—why were they encouraged to go into volunteering at all? The Commandant, in his report for last year, wrote as follows:—

"The Brisbane Rifle Volunteer Corps and the Queensland Scottish are excellent corps, and give every promise of permanency. I should much like to see the latter extend its operations to all the principal towns in the colony, and thus evoke a strong national sentiment to supplement the military one."

Well, a good number of persons who took an interest in the volunteer movement followed that advice. The Queensland Scottish officers took a very great interest in it indeed. He was not speaking of himself, because he had not very long been connected with the corps; but since he had been connected with it he also had taken a great interest in it, and wished to see the movement extended to other towns of the colony. The consequence was that instead of the two companies they had at this time last year, comprising 6 officers and 164 men, they had now six companies, comprising 16 officers and 392 men; while the whole of the other volunteer corps of the colony that last year consisted of 25 officers and 665 men had this year 21 officers and 598 men. It was a very strange thing that when they had formed new companies, as they had been invited to do, they were now talked about as if they were a burden

to the State, and had done nothing to try and qualify themselves for the defence of the colony. Both officers and men had done a great deal to qualify themselves. Most of the officers of the Queensland Scottish had gone to a great deal of trouble, and had spent a lot of their time, and their money too, to try and qualify themselves to pass their examination. They had frequently gone to the expense of taking private lessons, and they had to a very great extent been successful. Of course it did not follow that because a man passed a certain examination he was competent to manage a company—it depended to a great extent on what sort of examination it was—but an officer, even if he was not very competent as a military officer so far as drilling his men was concerned, could often do a great deal of good to his company and the Volunteer Force generally. He had no exception to take to the Commandant's remarks about himself, and he wished to say nothing disrespectful of the Commandant, with whom he was personally friendly; but that gentleman had not encouraged the volunteer movement in any way. He (Mr. Stevenson) thought the Volunteer Force ought to be encouraged; if ever the colony had to be defended, he was sure it would have to depend a good deal upon the volunteers. Now, with regard to the encouragement the volunteers had received in the way of money. The Queensland Scottish comprised 392 men and 16 officers—nearly one-fifth of the whole Defence Force of Queensland. The Committee were asked to vote £37,700 for the land force of the colony, and they voted something the same last year; in fact, in the two years they might say they had spent nearly £80,000. Out of that, £685 was spent in the two years on the Queensland Scottish. The private subscriptions to the corps during that time were £727 4s., to say nothing of what the officers and men had to expend on themselves—on their uniforms, and the time and money they had spent in qualifying themselves for their different offices. It did seem hard that when several people had done so much to bring a corps to a certain amount of success everything should be done to try to discourage them, if not to disband them. Personally, except for the interest he took in the volunteer movement, he did not care a rap; he would just as soon be out of it, because it cost him a very great deal of time and trouble, to say nothing of expense. But after having taken all that interest in it, and encouraged others to take an interest in it—he had induced his friends here and in Rockhampton to subscribe largely towards it—he thought it was rather hard that it should be talked of in that way. He would show some of the obstacles that had been thrown in their way. Last year, seeing that their numbers were so great, and that the amount of clerical work was too much to be done by an unpaid secretary, Lieutenant-Colonel Sir Thomas McIlwraith and himself, and one or two other officers, waited on the Acting Chief Secretary, Mr. Dickson, and asked for £100 or £150 to get a paid secretary. They were simply refused. Everything they had asked had been refused. One of the captains of the corps took the trouble to go to Maryborough and try to form a company there. He succeeded before long in inducing eighty-five men to offer their services, but after all that trouble their services were refused; yet the money they were getting for volunteers was simply a mere bagatelle compared with what was paid to the Permanent Force. He would give another instance. He happened at one time to be paying a visit to Rockhampton, and was going up a good deal to see the Queensland Scottish Company there. Just at the last moment, when he had made all

his preparations for going up, he happened to hear that the company there was getting rather disorganised, and it struck him that it would be well to take the drill instructor attached to the Queensland Scottish, Sergeant-major Jamieson, up with him. He was a very good man amongst men; had always a good deal of influence over them, and as he (Mr. Stevenson) had said, he thought it would be wise to take him up with him. He consulted with Sir Thomas McLlwraith and got his consent to do so. He had not time to go to the Defence Force office; he did not know whether he should have gone or not. The regulations said the drill instructor was under the command of the officer in command for the time being, and he thought he was perfectly justified in taking Sergeant-major Jamieson up. They went up for a few days, and a great deal of good resulted from their visit. The company was a splendid one, in capital order, and the visit was the means of getting large subscriptions for the company. When he returned a voucher was sent in for Sergeant-major Jamieson's expenses; the amount was not large—£4 5s. That was not all his expenses, because he (Mr. Stevenson) did not include the steamer fare, which he had paid himself. However, that voucher was sent back to him with, written across it in red ink: "Who authorised Sergeant-major Jamieson to go to Rockhampton?" He (Mr. Stevenson) wrote back to Major Lyster stating that Sir Thomas McLlwraith had authorised him to go on his recommendation. The voucher was again returned to him with some more red ink plastered over it to the effect that the amount was disallowed. That was the kind of way in which volunteering was encouraged in the colony. Complaints had been made that they were not efficient, and yet they were debarred from getting any assistance to make either men or officers efficient. He did not know what steps were taken to encourage officers to make themselves efficient. What encouragement did they get from the Brigade Office? He had been a pretty regular attendant at drill whenever he could go, and he had never yet seen a single officer of the Permanent Force present at the weekly drill except one, Major Lyster. He had never seen any other officer of the Permanent Force there to give any encouragement, or help, or instruction whatever. He knew that Major Des Vœux held classes sometimes at the barracks, but very few officers could leave their business in the afternoon to attend those classes; and it would be great encouragement to both officers and men if the officers of the Permanent Force put in an appearance at ordinary drill, and saw what the officers and men were doing, and not merely to judge them on special parades, when they knew they were simply called out to be looked at and inspected. Of course, officers did get flurried under those circumstances, and made a mess of drill even though they knew perfectly well how to drill men under ordinary circumstances. He contended that it was not fair to judge men under those circumstances. Instead of deprecating remarks being made under such circumstances some encouragement ought to be given. He believed in making officers make themselves efficient, but at the same time it was only fair to them to consider the circumstances under which they had to do so. Very few officers passed at the last examinations, but some did. Amongst those who passed were two of the Queensland Scottish, both very creditably, one being highest amongst all the officers who went up for examination. He knew perfectly well that there were several officers—very good officers—who did not pass the examination. One was an officer, who had done

more for the volunteers than most men in the colony connected with the force. He referred to Captain Ricardo. He was plucked, and consequently resigned, and a very good officer was lost to the force. He (Mr. Stevenson) thought it was a great mistake to have such very stiff examinations for volunteer officers. He believed that Captain Ricardo knew a great deal about his drill—that he knew it very well indeed; but, owing simply to some difficult question he could not answer, he was plucked, and therefore resigned. The examiners had come to the conclusion that he was not competent to pass and he therefore resigned, as he had good right to do if he thought that he could not qualify himself any better. He (Mr. Stevenson) would now say a word or two with regard to the reason why the Queensland Scottish did not go down to camp. They had been twitted with it over and over again, and as it had been a good deal talked about, he would tell the Premier the reason. It was this: At that time certain Ministers were fighting the Brigade Office and the Brigade Office was fighting certain Ministers, and it was very hard to know what to do. At any rate, under the circumstances he did not feel justified in ordering his men to go. A good many of the men had been talking about the circular that had been issued in certain departments, and which was referred to in the general order which the hon. the leader of the Opposition had read. A good many of the Queensland Scottish were in the Civil Service and they were afraid to go down and remain all the time. There were only two holidays—Monday and Tuesday. If the order had been made to go into camp on Saturday, the men could have gone and remained there from Saturday until the Tuesday; but the order was made to go down on the Monday; so that those who could not stay longer than the Tuesday would have had only one night in camp—one day to go down and another to come back. Was it any use taking the men down for such a short time as that, he would like to know? He put it to the men themselves very fairly. He was anxious to go to the camp himself, and the other officers were very anxious to do so, but at the same time he thought it was only fair to put the matter before the men and ask them what they thought themselves. He told them that he was not prepared to go into camp with a mere handful of men, but if he got a good following he was quite prepared to go. He took a show of hands on the matter and there was not a single hand held up in favour of going into camp, simply on account of the trouble that was going on at the time between the Ministers and the Brigade Office. Reference was made to the matter in Colonel French's report. He said, "It appears that some of the corps preferred to get up a sort of entertainment on the Darling Downs." He (Mr. Stevenson) could say that it was never contemplated to get up any entertainment on the Darling Downs. At one time it was contemplated to go for drill to the Darling Downs from Saturday until Tuesday, and to pick up the Ipswich and Toowoomba companies on the way, but as for going in for any entertainment it had never entered into their heads. They were going for work if they went at all, and as they could not see their way to do so at that time, they determined to have simple rifle practice, and they made as good use of their time as they could. Then at the end of the encampment the Queensland Scottish turned up when they were wanted. Now, he would say something with regard to another matter which had done a great deal to discourage the officers of his corps, and that was the way they were spoken to by the Commandant on a certain parade some time ago.

He was not present himself, but he read the remarks of the Commandant, and he certainly was not pleased with them. Colonel French said:—

"Captain Wilson, officers, and men of the Queensland Scottish: Apart from my inspection, I have had the pleasure of seeing you on parade before, and am very glad to compliment you not only on your appearance to-night but on your appearance in the streets. The men always look smart and tidy. Some of the non-commissioned officers have been up to headquarters to qualify themselves for their positions, but I should like to see their example more followed by the officers. It is creditable to the non-commissioned officers that they are making themselves fit for their work, and I must speak in the highest terms of the way in which Sergeant Dickson worked, qualifying himself in a month."

The Commandant took credit to the officers of the Permanent Force for what they never did. Sergeant Dickson had paid special attention to his drill before he went there at all, and he (Mr. Stevenson) was told that he was thoroughly qualified to pass his examination before he went to the class. He believed that was so, and he did not think it fair to take any credit from the Queensland Scottish and give it to the permanent officers. Colonel French went on to say:—

"I am sorry to say that none of the officers have yet qualified themselves for their positions, nor do they appear to have tried to do so."

That was not fair, because some of them had tried to do so, and, as a matter of fact, most of the officers had only been connected with the company for a very few months—only two of them for over twelve months. He went on again:—

"I hope those officers who have not yet qualified will at once do so. Under the regulations each man has twelve months in which to prepare for examination. I have given some of them two years, but they do not appear inclined to qualify."

Now, there were only two of them that had been in the corps for two years.

Mr. FOXTON: Why skip the intervening part?

Mr. STEVENSON said he did not think it worth reading; there were only two lines. The hon. gentleman always seemed suspicious. However, he would read what he had left out:—

"I must thank Captain Oswald for bringing his men, and such a good muster of them, all the way from Ipswich for this inspection. I am extremely sorry the Queensland Scottish were not in camp this year. Men should not think of themselves and their own inclinations in such a matter; the good of the whole force should be their first consideration. Now, this cannot go on. It is not fair to the men that they should have unqualified officers placed over them; they are a fine corps, a very fine corps, and should be commanded in a proper manner."

Well, the colonel was right to a certain extent, but he did not think such remarks should be addressed to the officers before the men. Colonel French had plenty of opportunity of warning the officers without doing it on parade. He must, however, say this for the Commandant: that he made some slight amends in replying to a leading article which appeared in the *Telegraph*, although he did not know whether it was meant for apology. The letter was as follows:—

"TO THE EDITOR.—Sir,—A leading article in yesterday's *Telegraph* has just been brought to my notice. I regret very much that you should credit me with 'charging officers of the Queensland Scottish with inefficiency and dolt-like stupidity.' I certainly never used such language regarding them. I am sorry that you should have cast this slur on a body of gentlemen, who compare favourably with the officers of any other corps in the colony, and against whom I have nothing to urge except that there has been unnecessary delay on the part of some in passing the examinations required by the regulations.—Yours, etc."

Well, so far as he could see, that did not speak so badly for the officers of the Queensland Scottish. He did not include himself, because

he did not consider himself in any way competent. He did not say that the other officers were quite competent either, but they had done a great deal to try and qualify themselves to be a credit to the volunteer corps to which they belonged, and he was perfectly satisfied that they were doing all they could to qualify themselves now. Personally he had taken a great deal of trouble. For three days in the week for several months he had had an instructor out at his house at 7 o'clock in the morning. That showed, at any rate, some desire to try and qualify himself, and showed that some little interest was being taken in the volunteer movement by someone. He knew that several other officers had been taking lessons in the same way, and he thought it very unfair, after they had taken that trouble, that they should be talked about as an incompetent body of men.

Mr. FOXTON said he did not intend to follow the hon. gentleman who had just sat down through the whole of his Scottish grievances. He regretted that the hon. gentleman should have thought that there was any degree of suspicion on his (Mr. Foxton's) part in consequence of a portion of the quotation read having been omitted, but it seemed to him that it was a fair thing when an hon. member quoted a passage out of some remarks made by a gentleman who was not present to speak for himself, that the whole of the quotation should be read, or the omitted portions which had been carefully omitted, supplied by someone else. Possibly the hon. gentleman had done it inadvertently.

Mr. STEVENSON: No, I did not. There was nothing in it.

Mr. FOXTON said it was only with a desire to see fair play that he would read the portion omitted by the hon. member. He might be wrong, but he did not hear the hon. gentleman read the following:—

"I am sorry to say that none of the officers have yet qualified themselves for their positions, nor do they appear to have tried to do so."

Mr. STEVENSON: I read that distinctly.

Mr. FOXTON: I did not hear it.

The PREMIER: I did not either.

Mr. FOXTON said there was another sentence he did not hear the hon. gentleman read:—

"To-night more than one company was 'boxed' i drill, and that more than once."

The hon. gentleman had complained that the remarks of the Commandant were made before the men. But if the companies were "boxed" before the men, anything the Commandant said could not make matters much worse; and if it was true that the companies were "boxed" by the officers, nobody knew it better than the men, and in his opinion the remarks were perfectly justifiable. He said that as one to whom similar remarks had been made. They all had to learn their trade, whatever it might be. None of them were born officers any more than they were born legislators; and there was nothing in the matter which any hon. member need have brought under the notice of that Committee. It was a matter of military discipline to which all those in the force must submit; and he had no doubt that the hon. member, if he had done his duty, had spoken to those under him in stronger terms than those used by the Commandant when addressing those officers on the occasion to which he had referred. He might say that it did not need the hon. gentleman's assertion that night to show that he was new to volunteering, because there was not an officer who had been more than twelve months in the force who had not some grievance or did not

think he was hardly used. He himself should like, for instance, to get back some of the money that had been re-surcharged against him during the twenty years he had been a volunteer; but he did not go there with a poor mouth and tell the Committee all about his grievances. When the hon. gentleman entered upon military life he must be prepared to put up with a good deal.

Mr. STEVENSON: I am able to put up with as much as most people.

Mr. FOXTON said he was inclined to think from what the hon. member had told the Committee that he could not.

Mr. STEVENSON: I was not talking about myself.

Mr. FOXTON said the hon. gentleman was not talking about himself, but about his own particular corps. That was not the place to air his grievances. His proper course was to go to his superior officer.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Thank God he is not my superior officer!

Mr. FOXTON said he had no doubt the superior officer was quite as glad as the hon. member. If it were thought worth while to make an inquiry into the matter, he was sure that very good reasons could be assigned for what had been done in reference to the hon. gentleman's corps. He was of opinion that the corps to which he belonged did not receive that amount of consideration which it deserved from headquarters on various matters, and he had referred to them, not as a matter of complaint, but as one which he thought worthy of the consideration of the Minister in charge of the Estimates. He had represented matters in connection with his corps to the proper quarters, and they had not been attended to; but the responsibility was off his shoulders. No doubt there were reasons why those grievances had not so far been redeemed, and they had simply to put up with it. A great deal had been said as to the efficiency of the Volunteer Force as compared with the Defence Force—he was not speaking now of the Permanent Force—and the hon. member for Townsville, Mr. Macrossan, very adroitly managed to twist a passage of the Commandant's report on field manoeuvres into a sort of admission that mistakes were made by officers of the Defence Force. The following was the passage quoted:—

"I noted the common error on both sides of men getting into clumps when under fire, instead of scattering as much as possible."

There were no volunteers on the attacking side, but there were several companies—crack companies—of the Defence Force on the defending side; the Engineers, who were admitted to be one of the best corps in the force, and also the Naval Brigade, were on the defending side. There might have been others with whom fault was found, but the expression "error on both sides" evidently meant on the attacking side and on the defending side, and not volunteers and members of the Defence Force. Probably the best generals in the world sometimes made mistakes, which would have been fatal had the other side been in a position to take advantage of them. Then it had been stated that the Commandant had no sympathy whatever with the volunteers; and the hon. member for Townsville, Mr. Macrossan, quoted a passage from the report of the Commandant to give point to the remark; but when called upon to read the whole passage the hon. gentleman said he would leave that for him (Mr. Foxton) to do. Therefore, he would proceed to read it as a matter of justice, because he did not like those garbled extracts to be made from reports. The following

was the passage immediately succeeding that read by the hon. member for Townsville, and on which he relied:—

"To prevent misunderstanding regarding my views on the question, I beg to state that, while I consider that every assistance should be given to the development of volunteering as a most useful adjunct of our defensive forces, it is altogether too unreliable a form of military labour to be trusted as a first and only line of defence."

That was all the Commandant said. They had had proof in the colony before now, that, as a first and only line of defence, a volunteer force was not to be relied upon. It was costly; and he did not hesitate to say that, notwithstanding what the hon. member for Normanby had said about the small cost of the Queensland Scottish Corps, volunteers were far more expensive than the Defence Force as at present organised. To establish that position, he would ask the attention of hon. members while he quoted a few figures. In 1883, which was about the last year during which the old Volunteer Force existed, they had a total in all ranks—officers, non-commissioned officers, and men—of 973, and that force cost the country something like £23,000 per annum. Those were round figures. As against that, they had now as efficient a total of all ranks of 3,288 men, in addition to which there were the police, numbering about 700, who were available under the present system. Of course it would be impracticable to include them in a purely volunteer system. The number included in rifle clubs was 897, and then there were the marine force and cadets. So that, roundly speaking, they had about 4,000 men, irrespective of the police, the marine force, and the cadets, all of whom were better disciplined, and better equipped for the purpose for which they were intended, than the old Volunteer Force in its palmiest days, and cost per head very much less. That they were more efficient they might very fairly claim, as he had served under both systems. He entered the force as a gunner and had worked his way up to the rank he now held, and he might state that he had passed every examination before he was given that rank; but he would come to that matter presently. He knew which system was the best. For efficiency there could be no doubt that the one under which they were now working was far better than the purely volunteer force. What was the position a few years ago? The £20,000 or £25,000 a year which they were paying was continually complained of in that Committee as being thrown away—that the result was simply playing at soldiers. So it was to a great extent, and through no fault of the men, but through that of the system; and yet some hon. members would like to see them return to that system. The men were both willing and anxious to learn; but there was no means of compelling attendance at drills. A few would turn up to drill, and others would stop away. There was not then the same hold upon the men that there was now, and the consequence was that there was always a large number on the books, of whom the commanding officers saw very little. He knew that there were some honourable exceptions, but what he had stated was, generally speaking, correct. It seemed an extraordinary thing that that force should be more expensive per head than the present force when men were paid, but one of the reasons was that at the annual Easter encampments a very large amount of hired labour was necessary. A large number of drays and workmen had to be engaged to do the work necessary to keep the encampment going, irrespective of mere military work, such as drill and training. That work was now done, and creditably done, by the members of the Permanent

Force. They, of course, were trained all the year round, and did not need the same amount of training in the camp that the Defence Force proper and the volunteers required, the encampment being more especially for those he had last named. The saving by employing the Permanent Force for the purpose which he had mentioned must be very considerable indeed, but he could not give the exact figures. Another fault in the old system—he did not know whether it was complained of in the House—was that it was impossible to get officers at that time. He remembered when the Moreton regiment, including four or five companies, had only three or four officers. The force was languishing for the want of officers. Men could not be induced to join it. They would have to go straight into the ranks, a thing which many of them did not like to do. He had asked many gentlemen to join in the old days, and they generally replied, "I would like to very much, but I do not care about going into the ranks." They were men who, from their social position, knowledge, and education, would pick up their duties quickly; but the only means at their disposal to make themselves efficient was to go into the ranks, which they did not care to do, and the reason was obvious. Others were less particular and availed themselves of the chance. That objection had now been removed by the establishment of a Permanent Force, where, as had been said by the hon. member for Normanby, classes were held for the instruction of officers; and he ventured to say that at the present time the force, taken as a whole, was exceedingly well officered. Comparisons had been made between the efficiency of the force here and that of the force in New South Wales. He had heard comments and received reports made by men who were capable of judging between the two, and who had had opportunities of watching the two forces in their annual encampments, and they unhesitatingly stated that if the efficiency of the force of this colony was not superior it was certainly not inferior to that of New South Wales. With respect to the cost to the colonies for their defences, he would say nothing, as that had already been dealt with by several hon. members. The hon. member for Townsville, Mr. Macrossan, and others had laid great stress on the fact that volunteers had always been successful as to fighting. What was their Defence Force proper? Were they not volunteers? Undoubtedly they were, in every sense of the word. They were certainly paid volunteers. The actual work they did and the time they lost in devoting themselves to their military duties the State paid them for. The amount they received was not a very large sum, still it was a sufficient inducement to men to enter the service, and that was what was wanted. The hon. member for Ipswich had objected to the Permanent Force. He (Mr. Foxton) could not speak from personal experience of that branch of the service, because he had not undergone a course there. He had heard some who were not in love with it say that it was no good, and he had heard others who, he thought, knew what they were talking about say that the men worked very hard. There was, however, no doubt that the material or military stores they had at the present time required a considerable amount of looking after, and if the Permanent Force were disbanded it would be necessary to employ somebody to look after the stores which were now in the colony. They represented a very considerable sum, and a very large proportion of the expenditure for defence which had taken place. It would therefore be worse than folly to allow those stores to be uncared for and rendered of no value when they might be wanted. He would not detain the Committee much longer, but there

was one other matter deserving attention about which he wished to say a few words. Reference had been made by the leader of the Opposition to the attitude taken up by Colonel French on two occasions in attending public meetings; also with regard to a certain body of trustees of which the hon. gentleman was so distinguished an ornament, and the circular with reference to distinguished members of the Government and other Civil servants who proposed to prevent men from attending the encampment. Colonel French was a gentleman who was responsible for the due and successful administration of an Act passed by the Legislature, and he (Mr. Foxton) contended that the Colonel would be failing in his duty if he did not use every means in his power to render the administration of that Act successful. Possibly he had been guilty of indiscretion in the way he had gone about it, but that very fact showed that the man was zealous; that he had the welfare of that arm of the public service—if such an expression might be used—fully at heart; and that he desired to further its purpose and object in every possible way. He (Mr. Foxton) thought it was but fair to the Committee to place that before them as a legitimate cause of complaint in considering the action of Colonel French upon all those occasions. He certainly thought that those hon. members who took upon themselves to say that that vote should be reduced by £7,000 were taking upon themselves a very serious responsibility. They unquestionably left it to the Government, as the Premier had pointed out, to decide which branch of the force, if any, should be sacrificed. For his own part, he agreed with the view taken by the Premier, that the latest organised and least efficient branch of the service—namely, the Volunteer branch—should go; that was, of course, a matter of opinion. On the other hand, some hon. members seemed to think that they might knock off a man here and a man there without impairing the efficiency of the force. In his opinion, those who held that view had really not got a proper grasp of the subject. It was impossible to reduce the numbers of the corps below those which were now established as the proper strength of the various corps in the colony. For instance, he would take his own corps as an illustration. It had now on its strength some fifteen or twenty men less than it had at one time, and, in the opinion of every man, from the officer commanding the corps down to the latest recruit, there were not sufficient men to do the work that would be required in the event of its being called out for active service. It would certainly have to be increased, for it would be impossible to man the four guns, with which the corps was armed, unless it did receive additional men. Therefore he contended it was impossible to maintain the efficiency of the corps throughout by simply knocking off a man here and there. One branch of the service must go if the proposed reduction was determined on. It was therefore a question for hon. members to consider whether it was desirable for the sake of £7,000 that the Defence Force of the colony should be put on such an inefficient footing as would arise from the proposed reduction of the vote.

Mr. SHERIDAN said that having been a volunteer himself for many years he deemed it his duty to say a few words about the vote now before the Committee. Two or three years ago, standing in that very place, he had heard an hon. member describe the volunteers as a disorganised rabble. He dared say that some hon. members present recollected the words. He was pleased, however, to hear that evening from the same lips that the volunteers, as now existing, were quite sufficient and capable for

the necessary defence of the colony. He began to think, when the statement was made, who was the cause of it, and at length it occurred to him that in the meantime the Permanent Force had been established and a commandant for that force brought to the colony, who not only took the Permanent Force in hand, but also the volunteers. He had every reason to believe that the efficient state in which the volunteers now appeared to be was entirely due to the influence of the Permanent Force, and to their being taken in hand by Colonel French. He regretted that distinctions had arisen as between the various companies of the volunteers in the colony. He considered they should all be Queenslanders here. This was the land that gave them their bread, and he did not think it wise or prudent that they should have either Irish volunteers, English volunteers, or Queensland Scottish volunteers. He thought they should be one and all the same—shoulder to shoulder and foot to foot, ready to fight and stand by the colony. They would be better without those distinctions, which did not lead to anything good, and which in the old country had been the cause of a great deal of strife, and which strife should never be introduced into this colony. He noticed that a threat was used by Colonel French to punish certain Government officers, because they did not, at his command, attend the Lytton encampment. He held that no Government officer should join the volunteers, as they had plenty of work to do in their own offices. He knew a case where an excellent Government officer came from some distance to attend the Lytton encampment and he got a severe cold there, and when he got home was confined to his bed for about six weeks, and was almost dead from the cold he caught at the camp. Therefore, he thought Government officers had sufficient to do without joining the Volunteer Force. For his own part he had not any particular regard for headquarters, but he knew, on good authority, that the colony was singularly fortunate in having secured so efficient an officer as Colonel French to command their Defence Force. He was a man who had distinguished himself in his career as a soldier, and his name was well known in North America and on the Red River, and he (Mr. Sheridan) understood that at Woolwich he was greatly appreciated, and, in fact, that they would be very glad to get him back there again.

Mr. KELLETT said he should not like to give a silent vote on the amendment. He had never had the honour to be a volunteer, but he had heard the subject discussed pretty freely outside the House during the last few weeks in anticipation of the vote. He had heard various things said, and a good deal of dissatisfaction expressed at the ways of the Commandant in some instances. From what he had heard that night, he did not think it had been shown that it would be at all advisable for them to knock off £7,000, as was proposed by the leader of the Opposition. If the force was inefficient and they were not getting value for their money they should wipe out the whole vote; but while the present Minister for War said they could not make the force efficient for less than the amount asked for, he did not see how the Committee could ask him to cut down the vote by £7,000. If it could be said that the Commandant was not the right man in the right place, or that any of the other officers were inefficient, then they should get rid of them; but to say simply that they should make a sweeping reduction of £7,000, and leave it to the Government to decide how it was to be done, he did not think at all desirable. He thought that in many ways it might be possible to curtail the expenditure, or to see that the money expended was put to better use. For instance, he had always been of opinion that

the Permanent Force should be stationed at Lytton, which he thought was the proper place for it; and if they were stationed there the embankments would not be falling in, as they were said to be, as the men would be on the spot to do the necessary work. Those were simply matters of opinion, and not worth much probably. However, the discussion would probably do some good, and the Commandant might be made a little more careful, and would see that it was not always well for him to act without instructions. No one had, so far, said he was not an efficient officer, and was not working to the best of his knowledge to put the force in proper order and make it ready for any time of emergency. He might have made some little mistakes, but, so far as he (Mr. Kellett) could learn, he had endeavoured to conduct the Defence Force to the best of his ability. For those reasons he was not inclined to support the amendment.

Mr. ALLAN said he rose particularly to take exception to the remarks of the hon. member for Carnarvon as to volunteers, the expenses of volunteer corps in the colony, and their inefficiency. He considered that such a force as the Scottish Rifles, forming one-fifth nearly of the whole Defence Force, and costing only £700 for the last two years, as against £80,000 for the whole force, showed that if economy was to be practised in connection with the Force they should certainly not disband the volunteer corps. Most of them knew something of the Queensland Scottish volunteers, and they knew that they were a fine body of men, and comprised the very material for making the best of soldiers. The Queensland Irish were also a grand body of men, and he thought they should encourage the establishment of such corps—volunteers who were prepared to defend their hearths and homes.

The PREMIER: You must be under some strange delusion; 135 is the number of those two companies.

Mr. ALLAN said that even if they only amounted to that number, it could be seen that they cost but a fraction of the total amount. It should not be forgotten, however, that there was a company at Toowoomba, another at Maryborough, one at Rockhampton, and elsewhere.

The PREMIER: Yes; but we are talking about the Brisbane companies.

Mr. ALLAN said that, at all events, was his opinion as to the volunteers. At the same time he wished most distinctly to say that he was altogether in accord with the Government. He did not consider the present a party question in any way, nor did he think that the vote should be reduced by one shilling below the amount stated to be required. He considered if they could manage to get 4,000 men in fair order and equipment, with a fair knowledge of drill and able to use the rifle well, for such a sum, they would do well. He believed they were doing better than any of the other Australian colonies or than any other part of the world that he was aware of. Before he sat down, he would be able to submit to the Committee statistics which would show there was not the slightest doubt about that. Hon. members who had objected to the vote had not particularised any item in which it could be reduced, so that the Committee might have something to go upon; and he thought that to say they should cut off the Permanent Force, the Defence Force, or the Volunteer Force, was wrong. It would be a dangerous thing to upset a system of that kind which had taken so many years to form. Only four or five years ago they had an unorganised force of 1,000 men, which cost between £20,000 and £30,000 a year. Now they had a well-organised force of 4,000 men, which

could be easily raised to 5,000 or 6,000 for £37,000 a year. It might be that the Commandant or some of the other officers had shown a want of tact. That could be remedied, but it would be difficult to remedy or to restore such a system as that which they now worked under if it were once allowed to become inefficient. It was no new question to him. In 1882 he brought before the House a project which he thought worthy of consideration, and regretted that it had not been carried out—namely, the establishment of a military school. Probably, now that federation was so much talked of, it should take the form of a federal military school—like the one at West Point, in America—from which they would eventually be able to take officers of their own training. The West Point military school had been in existence for three-quarters of a century, and it was now in a more efficient state than ever. He would carry out the system, on a smaller scale, of course, in every school in the colony. There were at present 25,000 boys in the public schools who were being educated by the State, and there was no reason why those boys should not be trained to carry a rifle and do some drill. They got their education at the expense of the State, and they might be able, some day, to make a return to the State for what they had received; they would be able, when the necessity arose, to aid in defending the hearths and homes of their native country. He would not delay the Committee at that late hour, but he would read a few statistics, which had been handed to him by a gentleman better versed in figures than himself, but which he had every reason to believe were perfectly correct, showing that the relative cost of the Defence Force was much smaller in Queensland than in any other of the colonies. The revenue of Queensland for 1886 was £2,868,294; and the expenditure on its Defence Force, naval and military, was £50,302; or under 2 per cent. The revenue of New South Wales for the same period was £7,594,300; and the expenditure on its naval and military Defence Force was £361,022, or over 4½ per cent.

Mr. MOREHEAD: That is not correct.

Mr. ALLAN: Then perhaps you will correct me?

Mr. MOREHEAD: I have already pointed out that the expenditure on the Defence Force of New South Wales is £134,000.

Mr. ALLAN said he believed the figures he had quoted included the cost of defence works. The revenue of South Australia, during the same period, was £1,975,269; and the expenditure on the Defence Force, £40,995, or over 2 per cent. The revenue of Victoria was £6,481,021; and the expenditure on the Defence Force £319,938, or over 4½ per cent. Those figures showed that the cost of the force in Queensland, was less than half that of New South Wales and Victoria, and a little less than that of South Australia. If time allowed, he might refer to an article which had appeared in a foreign paper, *Plus Angletorre*, which had been received with enthusiasm by the enemies of England, showing that instead of France fighting Germany, all she had to do was to invade England with 10,000 men, levy a war indemnity of £540,000,000, and give the Cape and part of Australia to Germany in exchange for Alsace and Lorraine. Only the other day, right under their noses, they saw a German squadron land 1,300 troops at Samoa, where there was not a single British man-of-war, and, in the very presence of the American and British consuls, take possession of that island. Supposing that were attempted here to-morrow, what position would they be in?

Mr. MOREHEAD: We should shoot them all.

Mr. ALLAN said that if a telegram came out to-morrow stating that war had been declared against Germany or France, there would be very little opposition to the vote. He had been a cadet, and a captain of cadets; he had served Her Majesty in a small way, and would be happy to do so again if the necessity arose. The present was no time for reducing the Defence vote, especially as the force was more economically managed in Queensland than in any of the other colonies, or even in any other part of the world.

Mr. WHITE said he had suspected that the Defence Force was not on the right road, and the ill-feeling that had arisen between that force and the volunteers convinced him that it was actually on the wrong road. The colony, he was confident, would never suffer a standing army. The people would defend themselves; but the means were not forthcoming to put them in a position to do so. Why not send some of the drill instructors into the country, and let them visit, at stated times, the various centres of population?

The PREMIER: You will not give us the money for the purpose.

Mr. WHITE said the men to whom he referred, the drill sergeants, were content with very little. They did not want highly paid officers who would look down upon everyone who was not a soldier. They wanted men who were content with small pay, who would visit the centres of settlement at stated times, to drill all the young men who were working on the land. Most men of that class possessed a saddle-horse, and could get a holiday for half a day every week, and it would not be a difficult matter to get fifty of them together on stated occasions to be instructed in drill and the use of the rifle. Why should they come to the capital, unless it was threatened by an enemy? How did England and Scotland prepare to defend themselves against invasion a century ago, when their resources were exhausted after England's unwise war with America? There were no trains or telegraphs at that time, but the people expected the French to invade them, so they erected beacons on the highest hills, and the lighting of the beacons was to be the signal that the French were landing. A false alarm arose; the beacons were lighted by mistake, and his (Mr. White's) father was one of those who ran from the fields and equipped themselves in the village, and marched double-quick to face the enemy. That was the way England and Scotland were prepared a century back to resist invasion; and how effectually they managed it. Now, we were throwing away a lot of money and spoiling the men by keeping them about the city, instead of spending the money so as to distribute the discipline or the drill necessary to make men efficient for defence, where the people were, and where they would be ready if the need arose, to roll up and assist in repelling the invader. He considered that the jealousy against the volunteers must have arisen from the Permanent Force, and he would vote against the Permanent Force on that very account, and that lopping-off of £7,000, he took it, would come off the Permanent Force.

The PREMIER: No; not one penny will come off the Permanent Force.

Mr. W. BROOKES said: Mr. Fraser,—

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Adjourn!

Mr. W. BROOKES said he had no objection to adjourn, but he had not a great deal to say, and what he had to say was worth stopping to listen to. He had to confess that he had looked forward to the present debate with a good deal of uncertainty as to what course he should pursue. He had been very much inclined to

think that the vote should be reduced, but he could not say he thought so now. He was sorry to find so much friction between the volunteers and the Permanent Force, and the Defence Force. It was only the other day that he accidentally came across the opinion of Sir Garnet Wolseley, who stated deliberately that the success of the volunteer movement in England had raised the status of the British army in this way: In former times the British soldier was recruited from the lowest class of society, but since the volunteer movement had become so general and so popular, a man, however highly he might be educated, could now enlist in the British army and be quite sure of finding men as good as himself. That was a good solid tribute to the value of the volunteers, and consequently he would like to see the volunteer movement strengthened in this colony. He preferred the volunteer system of defence to anything that approached, however distantly, the nature of a standing army. One reason that he did not like the debate, and could not make up his mind what he should do when it came to voting, was that he had a complete and thorough distrust of the Commandant, who had been a sort of terror to him. Ever since that gentleman tried to burst up that meeting at the Town Hall, he (Mr. Brookes) had had a steady eye on him, and he must confess he was by no means satisfied with him now. The Commandant's report was just in the high-falutin military style, quite out of keeping with their colonial ways; and they could do very well without such gentlemen as Colonel French, unless they showed a very much greater adaptability to colonial ways and colonial ways of thinking. He found that Major Lyster, too, had a soldier's ideas; he recommended that the clothing should be obtained annually, made up by the Army Clothing Depot, London. Well, he (Mr. Brookes) would rather not see any of the Defence Force or Permanent Force or volunteers dressed up in clothes made at sweating shops: he believed they ought to be got in their own colony. He had been told the other day by a gentleman, who was present now, that in the corps to which he belonged they had had a conversation as to where they should get their clothes, and though the difference of cost was only 4s. 6d. a suit, yet they sent to London for them. It was the same with soldiers all over the world; they had no idea of the value of money any more than chickens. That was why he thought that debate would be a good practical lesson to all who had any military taste at all. They were all aware that a select committee on the Army and Navy Estimates had been sitting in London under the presidency, he thought, of Lord Randolph Churchill. He did not want to read more than two questions and two answers, and he would recommend Colonel French to pay particular attention while he read them, and all under Colonel French. All of them—Major Lyster, Major Grieve, and the rest—they were all on the spending tack. A question was put to a very eminent man, General Brackenbury, to this effect: "In fact the Intelligence Department keeps no record of the cost of the work you said it had to do?" And mark the soldier's answer! "Finance is exclusively the business of civilians. We soldiers are entirely without responsibility for finance, and therefore without responsibility for economy." The second question was:—Therefore whatever the Intelligence Department does, there is one thing it does not do, and that is to consider the question of money? The answer to that was, "It has absolutely nothing whatever to do with it." Now, if the colony was to be committed to an expense which was to be annually increased, then he thought they had better adopt the course of cutting the vote off altogether. He would rather dispense with

everything—Permanent Force, Defence Force, and even the Volunteer Force—than for the colony to get into that military spirit of expenditure. Still he thought that the debate would have so impressed itself on the Premier and the future Treasurer that the system that prevailed last year would be put an end to. Hon. members would remember that it had been said—he thought by the late Treasurer—that whenever anybody had money to spend they got to know how much was voted by Parliament and simply spent it.

Mr. NORTON: It was the Premier, the present Treasurer, who said that.

Mr. W. BROOKES: Then the present Premier said what was exactly true. What he (Mr. Brookes) was afraid of in connection with these military men was, that they would spend not only all they could get, but a great deal more—spend it in anticipation.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: That is what they have done.

Mr. W. BROOKES said he did not wish to take up the time of the Committee. He would recommend hon. members to look for themselves, and they would see from the way in which money was spent on soldiers in England that if they got into that sort of way they should come to count a £500,000 deficit as a mere drop in the bucket, because soldiers could spend as much money as ever they could get, and then go into debt. He had, however, come to this conclusion, that he should vote for the original sum.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh!

Mr. W. BROOKES said that seemed to excite a good deal of laughter, but he regarded it as a matter of strict business. To ruin the whole thing for the sake of the odd £7,500 would be downright folly. They had been told by one who knew, that to knock off that £7,500 would so cripple the whole machinery as to render it absolutely useless. He was content to believe that. He had faith. Hon. gentlemen opposite were lacking in faith.

The PREMIER: They understand it perfectly.

Mr. W. BROOKES: They knew all about it. He begged them to have faith. He believed the effect of the debate would be to set all parties in a good economical frame of mind.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Nothing of the kind.

Mr. W. BROOKES: At all events that was his opinion. He should vote for the original sum.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Adjourn, adjourn!

Mr. NORTON said he did not know whether the Minister for War intended to accede to the wishes of the Committee.

The PREMIER: How many members want to speak?

Mr. NORTON said he believed a good many wished to speak. Very few from the Opposition side had spoken. He himself wished to speak to the question, and would not like it to go to a division without having an opportunity of doing so. As the hour was late, he hoped the Premier would consent to adjourn.

The PREMIER said he did not wish to force on the debate if hon. members desired to speak on the subject. What he did want was that the question should be thoroughly understood. He was anxious that hon. members and everybody in the country should understand the real position of the matter. He had pointed that out pretty fairly just now—that if the vote was reduced, it meant disbanding some of the corps. They would have to select certain towns in the colony, and dismiss the men

in those places. That was what it meant. Of course, if they were selected in the northern part of the colony that would be a splendid handle for the Northern grievance-mongers, and possibly it might induce some votes to be given by hon. members opposite. He wished to impress upon hon. members that it was not simply a question of reducing what had been called extravagant expenditure. It was a question of dismissing the corps—disbanding the corps; and he hoped that both hon. members and the country would well consider whether that was the right thing to do. With the system which had been established for under three years they had been brought into the position of having instead of 1,000 inefficient men, 2,000 highly drilled men, at comparatively small expenditure, and the question was whether it was worth while to satisfy the animosity of some people, and because they could not please everybody, throw the whole thing into confusion. He put it broadly in that way. It might not be quite parliamentary to do so, but he did it deliberately. They had heard some of the grievances of the volunteer branch of the service that evening, and, as he had anticipated, the principal grievance was that they did not get money to spend; and in order to remedy that or to avenge that grievance—because they could not get money to spend, without authority, not voted by Parliament, without consulting the Minister—it was proposed to reduce the vote and throw everything into confusion. Application had been made for an adjutant, and it was refused by the hon. member for Enoggera, during his (the Premier's) absence in England—and very properly refused. It was renewed to him afterwards, but there was no money for the purpose, and it was again refused. And every application, so long as he had control of the department, would be refused if there was no money voted for it. That was the kind of grievance that had been brought forward. Then they had another curious illustration of the way in which the volunteer system was conducted—that a show of hands was taken as to whether a company should obey orders or not. That was the kind of thing they used to have before. Another illustration of the advantage of that system was that they could have officers who knew nothing of drill, although otherwise they might be very desirable persons. He certainly did not think that officers who knew nothing about drill, but were otherwise desirable persons, should have control of military affairs. It was all very well in time of peace, but in time of danger he was sure the public would be much better satisfied if they had officers who understood a little about drill, even if they were not otherwise, perhaps, such desirable persons. Those were matters that had to be borne in mind. It was a very serious matter, not a trifling matter at all, that they had to consider. If hon. gentlemen wished further time to consider the matter he had no objection to adjourn. He therefore moved that the Chairman leave the chair, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed; the CHAIRMAN reported progress, and obtained leave to sit again on Tuesday next.

ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that this House do now adjourn. It is proposed to put Supply at the head of the paper for Tuesday next so that the debate may be finished before we proceed with the Electoral Districts Bill.

The House adjourned at ten minutes to 11 o'clock.