

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**TUESDAY, 27 SEPTEMBER 1887**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

*Tuesday, 27 September, 1887.*

Questions.—Personal Explanation—Enoggera Election.  
—Formal Motion.—Supply—resumption of committee.—Adjournment.

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

## QUESTIONS.

Mr. BROWN asked the Minister for Works—

If the Government intend to proceed with the erection of the new post-office at Townsville?

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

Yes; as soon as money is available for the purpose.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN (for Mr. Hamilton) asked the Minister for Works—

Is it the intention of the Government to carry out a survey of a line of railway from Herberton to Georgetown?—and when will such survey be commenced?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied—

Not at present.

Mr. NELSON asked the Minister for Works—

1. Is the Government aware that scrub timber is being used in the construction of the bridgework on the second section of the Cairns and Herberton Railway?

2. Was such timber used or tested on any other railway before being approved of for this section?

3. Does the department consider the right to use such timber one of the concessions made to J. Robb in his amended tender?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied—

The hon. member's questions were wired on Saturday to the Chief Engineer, who is now at Cairns, and he replies this morning as follows:—

"Two excellent descriptions of local timber are being used for bridges on Cairns Railway, section 2. They are strictly in accordance with specifications; no concession of any kind with regard to timber has been made to contractors."

Mr. NELSON said: Mr. Speaker,—I did not hear the answer given to my question by the hon. gentleman, but having now had an opportunity of reading it, I should like to draw his attention to the fact that it is not an answer to one of the questions I asked, which was—"Was such timber used or tested on any other railway before being approved of for this section?" There is no reference whatever to that interrogation in the reply given by the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said: Mr. Speaker,—The only information I could supply was such as I could get from the Chief Engineer. I admit that the answer is not satisfactory to myself, but it is the only information I could get. It is, as the hon. member is aware, difficult to get a satisfactory answer to questions by telegraph. I may, however, receive further and complete information on the subject by post. The question asked by the hon. member was wired to the Chief Engineer so that he might not have any difficulty in answering it.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: You see he does not answer it.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: He does not answer it; there is no doubt the reply is not satisfactory.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

## ENOGGERA ELECTION.

Mr. DICKSON said: Mr. Speaker,—I desire to say a few words in reference to a statement made in the debate last Friday on the motion proposed by the hon. member for Ipswich, Mr.

Macfarlane, for a return showing the number of votes recorded at the recent election for Enoggera. The Premier, in his concluding remarks, said :—

"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."

I do not wish in any way to reflect on the returning officer, who, I am sure, discharges his duty properly, but I desire to say on behalf of myself, and I may also do so on behalf of my late opponent, that the only intimation we gave to the returning officer was when he asked whether we were satisfied with the conduct of the election, to which we replied in the affirmative. We in no way gave any expression of opinion as to the duties of the returning officer or how they should be discharged. I therefore wish it to be distinctly understood that the candidates did not in any way interfere with the duty imposed by the Act on the returning officer.

#### FORMAL MOTION.

The following formal motion was agreed to :—

By Mr. NORTON—

That there be laid upon the table of the House copies of all agreements entered into in respect to the £50,000 vote for central sugar-mills.

#### SUPPLY.

##### RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE.

On the motion of the PREMIER, the House went into committee to further consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

##### DEFENCE FORCE (LAND).

Question—That the sum of £37,746, moved for the Defence Force (Land), be reduced by £7,746—put.

Mr. NORTON said he was very much surprised, when the discussion took place on that vote on Friday last, that the Premier should have thought it necessary to make it a party question. A question of that kind should be decided solely on its merits; and to make it a party question was unfair to the Committee and to the country. In connection with the matter they should consider the divisions in the party opposite who now, should he say, supported the Premier—or rather, who consented to retain him in power—that was the better expression to use, because the hon. gentleman had himself admitted that he was practically defeated, and that he simply retained his position on sufferance. He asked, was that a fair party to decide a question of that kind? That party, if left free to vote upon a question of that kind, could not be depended upon to give the Government their support in carrying the proposal submitted to the Committee. He saw on the opposite side of the Committee gentlemen who, like the hon. member for Darling Downs, Mr. Kates, sat there in a state of expectancy in regard to the *via recta* and the Goondiwindi railway. Other members on the same side were in a similar position—in the position of Tantalus—and had certain things dangled before their eyes and hoped to be able to grasp them before the end of the session. They appeared to be actuated by the peculiar idea of the duty of a member of that House attributed to the Chairman. That hon. member was reported as having said recently that a member's first duty was to his party, and his second to the country. He hoped the hon. gentleman had been misreported. There were members on the other side who at one time might be fairly considered firm supporters of the Government, and who now supported them only

on certain questions, and, he might say, for the sake of obtaining certain advantages for their constituencies or for their party. When that was the state of affairs they might well say the Government party was bound together by unfulfilled promises connected with that unfortunate £10,000,000 loan; and if it were not that that was the position of affairs he did not hesitate to say that the Government would be left in a minority. That, then, was the condition of the party that was asked by the Premier to support him in carrying that vote for £37,746 for the Land Force of the colony. He did not know whether it was that the Premier took the same view of affairs himself, and made it a party question to carry the vote, because he doubted whether he could carry it unless he did so. The hon. gentleman since his knighthood appeared to aspire to become a sort of military dictator, and from the way in which he talked the other evening it looked as if he would like to compel the Committee to adopt his views whether they would or not. It looked very much like compulsion, as far as the hon. gentleman could make it compulsory on his own side to follow him in connection with this matter. There was one thing he would point out to the Government, and that was, that the Permanent Force was not a popular one with the country. As far as the public were concerned, the Volunteer Force was much more popular, and always had been. If that was the case, the question, which had been put before the Committee in such an ambiguous way, would before long be tested again at the ballot-box, and he trusted the answer the hon. gentleman would get at the ballot-box would be similar to that which had been given upon another question at the recent election for Enoggera. The Premier described himself the other night as the man who knew best. It might be that the hon. gentleman knew best with regard to that particular matter, but there was a public outside who knew better than the hon. gentleman what they wished, and what they would have, and they would not be guided by what the hon. gentleman said in favour of the force as it at present existed. They would be guided by their own wishes, by their own sense of justice, and by the wish of the country. There were a large number of persons outside the Committee, and a large number of members within it, who, if they would only give expression to their feelings, desired to encourage a national spirit throughout the country. That spirit would not be encouraged by the establishment in the colony of a military caste; it could only be promoted by the encouragement of the volunteer system of defence. The defence of the colony, he maintained, must at all times, whatever might be the nature of the Permanent Force, largely depend upon the volunteers, whether the Permanent Force were called a standing army or anything else. Such a force would never be able to resist invasion, or attempts at invasion, without the aid of a large volunteer body to support them in all their movements. There was a feeling—he did not know how far it extended, but it was one which he had heard expressed—that the Premier rather favoured the establishment of a sort of—should he say?—mercenary force. He did not like the term; it was too strong.

The PREMIER: I never heard it before. I generally hear slanders early, but I never heard that one before.

Mr. NORTON said it was perhaps just as well, then, that the hon. gentleman should hear it from him. He had heard it expressed very strongly, and in more quarters than one.

The PREMIER: They all come from the same source.

Mr. NORTON said that was what the hon. gentleman always said. The Premier's action in dismissing the police from their barracks, that the Permanent Force might occupy them, before any provision was made for the police, did much to give rise to it. The public looked upon the police as their own soldiers, who defended them from enemies that attacked them every day and every night. They were just as much for defence purposes as any military force that could be established, and the sympathies of the public were with the police when they were turned out of their barracks to make room for the Permanent Force, more especially when the general opinion was that they ought not to have been settled in the town at all. That feeling, to which he was referring, was greatly strengthened by the action of the hon. gentleman when in England, in connection with the naval force which was proposed to be established, the cost of which was to be largely supplemented by the Australian colonies. That, however, was a subject which hon. members would have an opportunity of discussing fully afterwards, and all he need say now was that action of that kind was eminently calculated to crush all national spirit in the people, just as the establishment of a permanent force was calculated to crush it. With regard to the particular question before the Committee, he did not intend to go into the details of Colonel French's report, nor into the general details connected with the question of defence. Personally, he did not object to the system of defence they had adopted. They had passed an Act some time ago in order that that system might be initiated, although what the cost was to be none of them knew. Had they known it would have been so large, there would have been a great deal more care exercised upon it than was actually the case. He might also say that he did not take any exception to the reports. In pointing out what they did, the officers were simply performing their duty. It was required of staff officers that they should show where improvements could be made in the service, and he gave them credit for the open manner in which they had pointed out what improvements they considered necessary, and showing that if carried out they would result in a considerable increase in the expenditure. It was their business to show all the faults in the existing system—all the faults in the force as now established—and if they had not done so they would have failed in their duty. But there their duties ceased. It was not their concern whether the Government intended to carry out their recommendations or not. That was a matter that rested with the Government. Not only did he not attach any blame to the gentlemen who made the reports, but he gave them credit for the straightforward manner in which they had represented the true position of affairs. But he did object most strongly to the arguments used by the Premier when dealing with the subject the other night. The hon. gentleman, in his reply to the leader of the Opposition, practically admitted, as everybody must admit, that the force they had now was not an efficient force.

The PREMIER: I did not. It is a very efficient force. The hon. member cannot have been here on Friday night.

Mr. NORTON said he was there on Friday night, and heard what the hon. gentleman said. He hoped he would not get angry. He (Mr. Norton) asserted that the force they had now was not an efficient force; that was, that it could not defend the colony if attacked at present. Surely, the hon. gentleman would admit that. They must have something more than that to defend the country. Up to a

certain point, perhaps, the force was efficient, but it would be found very inefficient if an attack were made on the colony at the present time. The hon. gentleman, in arguments he brought forward, spoke as though he were of opinion that the force was an efficient one.

The PREMIER: You said just now that I said the opposite. What do you mean?

Mr. NORTON said that what he said was that the whole of the hon. member's arguments were to the effect that the force was not efficient. "We must have an efficient force or none; if we are to have a force let it be an efficient one." That was the tone of the hon. gentleman's argument, and no doubt it was right, but it would take years to make an efficient force; it could not be done in one year, or in five years, or in ten. It would be simply impossible, except with a very much larger expenditure, to establish a force similar to the one they had now, which would be sufficient for purposes of defence in case of an attack from outside. The hon. gentleman's argument against the reduction of the expenditure would apply with equal force if the expenditure were double or treble what it was now, and if the deficiency in the Treasury were double or treble or ten times what it was now. It was no use saying we could not afford to reduce the sum; we could afford to reduce it if we had not the money. The hon. gentleman's argument on other questions had been, "How can we do this if we have not the money?" He wanted to know how the endowment of £2 to £1 was to be paid to the divisional boards if there was not the money to pay it with. Well, how was he going to pay for the Defence Force if he had not the money? The same argument applied to one case as well as to the other. If the hon. gentleman was not going to spend money until he got it, he must cut off the expenditure somewhere, and there was just as much reason for cutting it off in the present vote as anywhere else. He (Mr. Norton) thought a reduction might be made, but he did not think the Premier was justified in asking that side of the Committee where the reduction should be. The hon. gentleman professed to be the man who knew all about it; he ought to know where the reduction could be made.

The PREMIER: I told you where it would be made.

Mr. NORTON: Yes; the hon. gentleman had told them it might be made by getting rid of the volunteers; but the hon. gentleman dared not get rid of the volunteers. The hon. gentleman knew that the feeling of the country was such that if he dared to interfere with the volunteer system the ballot-box would tell a tale very unsavoury to him.

The PREMIER: I really do not think you know what the volunteer system is.

Mr. NORTON said he did know, and he believed in the volunteer system; but at the same time he thought it was only fair to say that the volunteers ought to consider it was their duty to submit to authority. He thought that in the resistance to authority to which reference had been made, the volunteers, or those who were responsible for their action or inaction, made a great mistake. If the force was to be effective it must have a head, and that head must have authority over the different corps, so that when he gave a legitimate order it should be carried out. He thought the volunteer forces throughout the colony recognised the fact that if the country was to pay the expenses they incurred, they might not merely indulge in playing soldiers, but they must submit to proper authority. The great evil which existed at first, and led to the failure of the volunteer

system up to a few years ago, was that there was no head which had authority to direct the movements of all, or which, having that authority, used it. He spoke plainly on that matter, because he did not wish it to be supposed for a moment that he sympathised with the resistance to authority which was shown a short time ago. The volunteers ought to recognise that it was a duty they were performing, and not merely a pastime; and if they were willing to do that, he believed a large and effective force of volunteers might be formed throughout the whole of the colony. No doubt the Permanent Force was very good so far as it went, but for purposes of defence it was almost useless except for the capital. The forces along the coast were so small that for all purposes of defence they were practically useless, and the only way of resisting a raid on any of those places would be by shifting the forces as rapidly as possible from one part of the colony to another. He regarded the matter in this way: If they were in a position to go on with the expenditure they had been incurring, they might do so, but their position was very much worse now than it was this time last year. Even at that time there were a great many voices raised in opposition to the expenditure in connection with the Permanent Force, and since that time they had an admitted deficit on the 30th June last of over £400,000, and a real deficit very much larger. Hon. members who objected to the large expenditure a year ago must feel that they were bound to object still more strongly now, when, instead of a Treasury with a small balance, there was a very large deficit, and when it was admitted by the Premier himself that that deficit was increasing very largely during the current year.

The PREMIER: I never heard that before.

Mr. NORTON said the hon. gentleman's Estimates showed it. Would the hon. gentleman not stand by his Estimates? He (Mr. Norton) took them as an admission that they were over-expenditure during the current year as they did last. It had been shown that there was an over-expenditure last year, and it was shown on the Estimates what the over-expenditure would be this year. Surely the hon. gentleman did not intend to draw back from that!

The PREMIER: Is that what you call "largely increasing"?

Mr. NORTON said he did call it largely increasing, and he thought he was justified in calling it largely increasing. Not only was it largely increasing, but the proposals the hon. gentleman brought forward to meet that largely increasing over-expenditure had been practically rejected by the House. Now, the question before them should be treated as one of great concern. The Defence Force they had now, if it was not such as could be reduced, would not be too large if they had only a population of half the number they had, or a third the number. Could they with a population of that kind still profess to say that it could not be reduced? The hon. gentleman's arguments all seemed to mean one thing—"We have this force, and we must support it as it is." He did not admit that argument. He did not think it necessary even to compare their expenditure with that of New South Wales, where, as had been pointed out, there had been a large reduction in expenditure in connection with those matters. They might have been overpaying men there or incurring unnecessary expense in connection with the force in many ways, but they were in a better position to go on even wasting money than Queensland was to go on as they were doing now. They had sources of taxation there that had not been touched upon, and which Queensland had exhausted. That was the difference between the two colonies.

The PREMIER: What resources have they that we have exhausted?

Mr. NORTON: Here they dared not go on adding to taxation in the way they had been doing lately. They dared not go on adding to the *ad valorem* duty.

The PREMIER: What are the resources we have exhausted?

Mr. NORTON said the hon. gentleman seemed to think that they were not exhausted, because he (Mr. Norton) supposed he (the Premier) did not care that there should be any limit to taxation. He seemed to think that the people of the colony could not be taxed too much, and called it a "parrot cry." If the hon. gentleman thought taxation a parrot cry because the resources in that direction were not exhausted, he doubted very much if the people would regard his theory in that way. He (Mr. Norton) said the difference between the two colonies was that New South Wales had still sources of taxation untouched that Queensland had, in the opinion of a large proportion of the public, exhausted, and their theory was that instead of taxation being increased it ought to be reduced. And if they were to reduce the expenditure of the colony in order to keep it within their revenue, then he said that the cost of that military force ought to be reduced as well as any other item on the Estimates. He did not pretend to say in what direction that should take place if the vote was cut down. The Premier must take that responsibility upon himself. If he chose to cut off the volunteers that was his business, and it would have to be discussed in a larger assembly than that Committee. He thought, circumstanced as they were, there was necessity not only for general reduction, but for reduction in connection with the military system which they were attempting to carry out. In better times, when the revenue had improved, if the public were in favour of it, the number of the force might be increased; but at the present time he was inclined to support the amendment of the hon. the leader of the Opposition in favour of the reduction.

The PREMIER said the hon. gentleman did not often afford him much astonishment, but he had certainly afforded him a great deal of astonishment that afternoon. From the first part of his speech one would suppose that he was not present during the discussion on Friday, and had no idea whatever of what was the subject of discussion or of having heard anything that was said about it. From one part of his speech, any stranger listening to it would have supposed that the question under discussion was the maintaining of a large standing army in Queensland, under which the men were paid for the whole of their time, and were officered by a large number of men of a distinct military caste. From another part one would suppose that the volunteer system was very popular throughout the colony.

Mr. NORTON: So it is.

The PREMIER said the hon. gentleman then thought the Defence Force was inefficient and almost entirely confined to the capital—although the Volunteer Force was popular throughout the colony. Then the Defence Force being inefficient—not being large enough—the proper thing to do was to cut it down and make it smaller. That was the argument the hon. gentleman brought forward. If he had taken the trouble to have listened to the statistics he (the Premier) had given on the subject, or to have read his speech, he would have seen that the facts were quite inconsistent with his arguments, which, indeed, actually contradicted one another. Then the hon. gentleman spoke about establishing a military caste here, and said that he (the Premier) was in favour of it. When had he heard him

speak in favour of anything of the sort? He (the Premier) had always maintained that it was a citizen force and had strongly condemned establishing anything like a military caste here. He dared say somebody had stated he had said it, but that was the first time he had heard that particular slander. He had always said the very opposite—that the force for which the money was now asked was a citizen force. The hon. gentleman did not seem to know that.

Mr. NORTON: Yes, I do.

The PREMIER: Then the hon. gentleman ought not to have spoken as if he did not know it. For the last twenty-four years they had been trying in that and the neighbouring colonies to establish a disciplined force without paying the men for the actual time it was necessary that they should be absent from their ordinary avocations, and it had been a failure. Then Parliament determined to adopt a different system, and it had been adopted. The men were volunteers in every sense of the word, except that they got pay for the time they were actually taken away from their ordinary avocations; and unless they had that system they would find, as they had always found before both here and in all the other colonies, that the men would not attend—that they could not be relied upon. They were determined to establish an efficient force by paying the men for the actual service they rendered to the country in becoming efficient defenders. He would not give them a farthing for services they did not render. He considered the payment, simply payment for services rendered at the lowest rate of wages, and it was given simply for the time the men were actually away from their ordinary business. Take the men who attended the last camp—how many of them could have afforded to be there for a week if they had not been paid? Not more than 150 out of the 1,200. The result would have been that those men could not have been trained. When they arrived at a state of things that so many men, the bone and sinew of the country, could afford to give their time and were willing to do so in order to become efficient, then they might revert to the other system, which up to the present time had been a total failure.

Mr. NORTON: No.

The PREMIER: He contended that it had been a total failure here and everywhere else where it had been tried, except in England.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS of the Opposition: No.

The PREMIER: They might get the right class of men for volunteers there, but they did not get them here.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: You refuse their services.

The PREMIER said their volunteers were not the same class of men. Let them look at the population and see who were the people who could afford to give their services for that purpose without payment. He did not see any reason why the defence of the colony should be confined to those men; but he saw strong reasons why it should not, because they turned out when the fancy suited them, and when it suited them they stayed away. They could not become disciplined in that way, and, with a few exceptions, they had not disciplined or efficient officers.

Mr. CHUBB: They captured Brisbane the other night.

The PREMIER said he had mentioned the other day that there were exceptions—that some of the officers were highly competent. It was perfectly well known to whom he referred, and he supposed it was also known to whom he referred as incompetent officers.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: You know all about it.

The PREMIER said he thought he knew as much about it as the hon. member who had just spoken, and a little more. The hon. gentleman had also told them that the force was practically confined to Brisbane. He evidently did not or would not know. If he looked at the Estimates he would see that over 450 men went into camp at Townsville the other day.

Mr. NORTON: I know.

The PREMIER said that was a considerable number in proportion to the number in other parts of the colony. Then the hon. member argued that the Volunteer Force was popular. He (the Premier) did not care whether it was popular or not; he would do what was the right thing to be done. The hon. gentleman also said that the vote was not a popular one. No doubt the public were told a lot of untrue things about it. It was represented that the money was spent for purposes entirely different from the real purposes; and then it was asked, "Do you approve of that expenditure?" Of course they did not; nor did he himself. He should not be there to ask for the vote if the money was to be devoted to any such purposes, but he was quite sure the public did approve of the expenditure of the money for the purposes to which it was devoted. Now, as to the volunteer system being popular, what were the facts? He had stated them the other day. At the present time there were only five volunteer companies. One at Rockhampton—

Mr. MOREHEAD: They are discouraged by the Commandant and the Government.

The PREMIER said there were more than that, he found. There was one at Rockhampton, one at Ipswich, one at Toowoomba, which had been established within the last twelve months; one at Roma, and one at Gladstone. Those were all the volunteer companies there were out of Brisbane.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: Whose fault is that?

The PREMIER: Whose fault is it?

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: The Government refuse their services: they are discouraged.

The PREMIER said the Government had within the last six months refused the services of two companies at Gympie, and why? Because there was no money for them. He would gladly have recommended the acceptance of their services if there had been any money for them, but hon. members said "Spend money, but when you ask us to vote it we will not do it." It was the business of Government to find the money, but the business of Parliament not to vote it. The hon. member said the people disapproved of taxation. He dared say that was so, but they must raise the money before it could be expended. Now, how many volunteer companies had ceased to exist during the last twelve months?

Mr. NORTON: I do not wonder at it.

The PREMIER said there was a company of garrison battery volunteers at Cairns. They became a company of the Defence Force and declined to continue as volunteers. The same thing happened with the battery at Bowen; the same with a company of mounted infantry at Gympie; the same with the mounted infantry at Bundaberg; the same with a company of mounted infantry volunteers at Mackay; the same with the volunteer rifle corps at Southport; and the Maryborough and Hughenden volunteer companies had been disbanded. That showed how popular the volunteer movement was.

Mr. BLACK: Read further on. The Commandant said that, notwithstanding that, the force was stronger than last year.

The PREMIER said he was not reading from the report; he was reading the list of companies which he had quoted before. He had no doubt those facts were summarised in the report. So that the Volunteer Force was by no means the most popular force, and with the exception of the companies of the Brisbane Rifles (Major Thynne's corps), there was no branch of the volunteer corps which could be said to be thoroughly established at the present moment. Yet hon. members would have the Government disband the other corps which had done good work, were thoroughly drilled and well disciplined, and go back to a system which had been tried for years and years and found wanting. Now, with respect to economy. The Government were told that they ought to be more economical, and that they could save money in the Defence Force branch of the service as well as in any other. He did not think they could. He did not think that was to be considered in the same light as endowments to divisional boards, or the erection of public buildings, or anything of that kind.

Mr. NORTON: The same argument applies.

The PREMIER said he did not think the same argument did apply. The first point was, was it necessary to provide for the defence of the country. They might say "Yes," it was, or "No," it was not. If they said it was not necessary then all those things were luxuries, and they could increase or diminish the vote from time to time as their funds would allow; but if they said it was necessary, then the question was, what was the least amount of money they could afford to spend in defence, what was the least amount that would procure an efficient force? The answer to that was, could they provide for the efficient defence of the colony with a less number of men than were provided for at the present time. He had given particulars of the corps. Now, which could be best spared? Some hon. members did not think there was room for any force, and that was an intelligible position to take up, but he should be sorry to be the Minister who had the responsibility of defending the colony if that policy was to be carried into effect. Then if any portion of the force was unnecessary, what companies should be disbanded? which were the luxuries? Some hon. members thought all the force unnecessary, with the exception of the volunteers; but he would not disband it and substitute the volunteer system. He said that distinctly, and that was the other alternative. He could only repeat what he said the other day—if they were to have any defence outside of Brisbane, was it too much to have a company at Gladstone, Townsville, Cairns, and Bowen? They could not disband half the men at any place. Had they too many mounted infantry? They had four companies scattered over the colony; which of them should they disband? Did they spend too much money on engineers? They had one company. Was the Moreton regiment too large? In the same way they had two companies at Maryborough, one at Gympie, one at Howard, and one at Bundaberg. Was that too many for the Wide Bay district, and which company should be disbanded? At Townsville there were two companies, Charters Towers two, one at Ravenswood, and one at Mackay. Which of those should go? He did not know which should go. Numerous other offers had been made, but had to be rejected because there was no provision made for more men. There were three inland companies at Toowoomba, Dalby, and Warwick. Possibly they might be disbanded, as those towns were less likely to be

subject to invasion than the coast towns. Now, he had pointed out that the present force served under a three years' engagement on certain fixed terms, one of which was that they received 6s. a day for every day they were away from their work. It might be said they should reduce that to 5s. a day. That would make a reduction of £200 or £300, but it was not the pay that amounted to so much; it was the contingencies—such as arms, ammunition, drill-sheds, and other contingent expenses, which it must be remembered would still exist if the volunteer system were substituted entirely for the present force. Hon. members must make up their minds. Did they intend to maintain the defence system—would they call upon men to give their services, and pay them what their services were worth, or would they go back to the system which was a total failure wherever it had been tried? It was not a question of cutting down expenses, and economising here and there. It was a question of whether they were going to study and look after their own interests—were they going to defend themselves? He maintained it was their first duty to defend themselves, and if they accepted that as a duty, then what was the least sum they could defend themselves efficiently upon? It was just as absurd to say that they could not afford to defend themselves as that they could not afford to administer justice; that they could not afford to summon juries and pay witnesses and have gaols, and that, therefore, all criminals must go free. Those were the first elementary duties of every civilised state; but, while recognising that, they ought not to be extravagant in respect of them. Hon. members must understand the question thoroughly. The more it was understood the better. If they were going to defend themselves that was an intelligible position; or, on the other hand, were they going to treat the Defence Force as a luxury and an excrescence, and adopt the volunteer system? If they adopted the volunteer system pure and simple, hon. members knew what to expect. The Government said they wanted the men to come out, and the volunteers said "We will not come." Money might be spent upon them one year or saved the next, but if they were really going to have a defence system, then they must be prepared to pay for it. He hoped hon. members would consider the matter in its real light. He considered it most important that they should well consider it. He did not propose to enter into the question of naval defence. The hon. member for Port Curtis had referred to that, and spoke of it as a new idea which had sprung into existence during the last six months, when, as a matter of fact, there had been many preliminary negotiations, preliminary meetings, discussions, and resolutions, reports of which had been laid on the table of the House, and had excited not one word of adverse comment. He was prepared to take all the blame he deserved, but he was not going to take more than he deserved.

Mr. CHUBB said that during the discussion the Premier had continually taunted members who opposed the vote with not pointing out any particular detail in which it might be cut down. He quite agreed that the matter ought not to be made a party question.

Mr. NORTON: The Premier made it a party question.

Mr. CHUBB said he was not going to refer to that point further, because he considered the matter of more importance than party. The question was whether they could have an efficient force for less money or not. He thought they could, and before he sat down he hoped to be able to show certain items in which a saving might be effected. In the first place they were

asked to vote £23,188 on the Estimates for 2,572 officers and men; but on reference to the Commandant's report it would be seen that the total strength of the Defence Force on the 30th June last was only 2,231, so that the Government were asking the Committee to vote pay for 341 more men than were in the force on the 30th June. That alone, at the lowest estimate of £3 12s. per head, which was the amount paid to privates, was over £1,000 more than was wanted. Then it must be remembered that all these companies were set down at their full strength, whereas he did not believe any one of them was anything like up to its full strength.

The PREMIER: Some are.

Mr. CHUBB said there might be one or two. Consequently a proportion of that money was not wanted for pay, and was used for some other purpose named on the Estimates. He found, on reference to the amount set down for "Permanent Staff," that £900 was required for the Commandant. That officer was paid under engagement, so that his salary could not be reduced. Then there was the brigade-major at £400; and he believed that officer well earned his money, for he was the most hard-worked officer in the service. The next officer of the permanent staff was paid £400, besides which he received £38 as a contribution towards his salary payable to the Indian Government. Now, he did not want to do that officer an injustice, but he did not know what work he did. He was supposed to be musketry-instructor, but he was not aware that he had given any instruction whatever during the past year. There certainly was no report in the papers showing that he had done anything, or what he did, and whether he did anything for his salary was more than he knew. If he was not wanted he might be dispensed with, and an officer of the Defence Force might be appointed to do the work. Then the paymaster, he thought, might be dispensed with, because he held that every regiment ought to manage its own finances, send in returns to the Brigade Office, and receive from that office the pay apportioned to it; and the regimental officers should be responsible for the expenditure.

Mr. FOXTON: That is what is done now.

Mr. CHUBB said he did not think a paymaster was wanted, as there could not be much work for him.

The PREMIER: There is a great deal of work for him.

Mr. CHUBB said the next saving he would suggest was to cut off all the pay to officers, and let the men only draw pay. He would give pay to all the men below the rank of lieutenant, but cut off the lieutenant-colonels, majors, captains, and lieutenants, who ought to go to drill and camp at their own expense as they used to do. That would save nearly £1,000 a year. Under "Contingencies" there was a sum of £850, being an allowance of 10s. for each efficient, but as the Committee were told by the Chief Secretary that the Defence Force was highly disciplined he presumed that the great majority of the men were efficient.

The PREMIER: That is for volunteers.

Mr. CHUBB said it was 10s. for each efficient member of the Defence Force. He knew what he was talking about. Therefore a large portion of that £850 ought not to be wanted if the Defence Force was as highly disciplined as the Chief Secretary said it was. Then the sum of £2,500 was put down as capitation allowance for efficient volunteers and cadets, and he thought a portion of that might be taken off, because the number of volunteers—officers and men—as given by the Commandant was only 1,027. The amount of capitation was at the rate of £2 10s. per

head, and perhaps it might be allowed to stand, though he did not think it would all be required. Then there was a sum of £2,000 for uniform and accoutrements, and half that amount ought to be enough. The men had uniforms at present, and the money was only required for new uniforms to replace old ones, and for repairs. Moreover, it was only wanted for the Defence Force, because the volunteers had to buy their uniforms out of their capitation allowance. Then there was the large sum of £2,500 set down for incidentals, forage, lodging and travelling allowances, repairs, and contingencies: and he believed £1,500 of that might be taken off, because there would be a good deal of saving effected on the pay, as not all of the men would attend drills or go into camp. In the items he had mentioned, he believed £5,000 or £6,000 might be saved without affecting the efficiency of the force. The Committee had been told more than once by the Chief Secretary that the Defence Force was a highly disciplined force, and that the volunteers were not so satisfactory. He rather doubted that. They were probably fairly drilled; but their discipline was another matter. Only the other day an inspection parade was notified; but because the pay had not been handed over, not more than twenty-five or thirty men turned up. One company was represented by an officer. That was an instance of discipline. It was not long ago that that occurred; so that he did not think the discipline of the Defence Force was much better than that of the volunteers. He did not want to disparage the force in any way; but when they were told that the force was thoroughly disciplined, and effective, and so on, and much better than the Volunteer Force, one felt inclined to give the evidence he had in respect to that matter. Now, they were further told that the officers were also very effective. He believed some of them were, but at the same time, amongst those officers there was a lieutenant-colonel who had never passed a single examination in the Defence Force to that moment. It was true that some officers of the Volunteer Force were not able to pass the examination. He did not give it as of his own knowledge, but he believed that was owing partly to the fact of many of the questions being upon military law. No doubt they should know a considerable portion of the practical details; but a good many questions were asked about military law, and so on, which were not at all necessary for even officers of the Defence Force. What they wanted was men who were up in drill—practical drill—and who would make good fighting men when they were called upon. He might add that he believed there were a great many men in the Volunteer Force now who were old Defence Force men, and of just the same class as the men in the Defence Force.

The PREMIER: Not very old. The Defence Act has not been in force three years yet.

Mr. CHUBB said he believed it to be the case. When he said the Defence Force he did not mean the force as under the present Act, but men who had been in the Volunteer Force before, and who remained in it under the Defence Act, who had received pay and left, and were now in the Volunteer Force.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: A good many of them.

Mr. CHUBB said the scheme of the Defence Act was that the men in the Defence Force were supposed to be paid as an inducement to give up their time and go into camp. But really, after all, he did not think that the small amount paid would tempt a better class of men to go into the Defence Force than into the Volunteer Force. What was the maximum proposed pay to be given to privates? Six shillings



per day, and the maximum number of days was twelve days. That was £312s. Could anyone think that £312s. would induce a better class of men to become members of the Defence Force than of the Volunteer Force? He did not think it would. From his observation he thought the class of men in the volunteer companies were exactly the same as those who were in the Defence Force. He saw no difference. If they were all put together he did not think anyone could tell the difference. He thought the Brigade Office was responsible for a great deal of what he called extravagant expenditure. They had a system, introduced from home, of going in for most expensive uniforms and accoutrements. If any hon. member looked at the "Votes and Proceedings" of last year he would see fifteen pages of dress regulations; and in the *Gazette* there was a page and a-half of articles of clothing to be supplied to officers. Of course, he knew the officers paid for that out of their own pockets; but did they want a system which required an officer to pay £80 for a full-dress? He had been told that that was the cost of a full-dress of an officer in the infantry.

The PREMIER: What officer?

Mr. CHUBB: A lieutenant-colonel. If they looked at the *Gazette* they would see the articles which were advertised there—sabretaches, seven or eight guineas; belts, five or six guineas; cocked hats, plumes, and all those things. They were very pretty, and "fine feathers made fine birds." No doubt the officers looked very well in their full-dress clothes; but that was not the sort of thing required in a country like this. They wanted a simple uniform. He would rather see men in red shirts and moleskin trousers, and able to handle a rifle, than walking about like a lot of peacocks. That was one way in which they were encouraged to be extravagant. If the officers wore extravagant uniforms, the men must necessarily approach them in some degree, and more money was spent in uniforms than was really necessary. Hon. members might laugh, but he (Mr. Chubb) had been in the Volunteer Force himself and knew what uniforms cost, and he thought it was a waste of money, which might be spent more advantageously.

The PREMIER: We only pay for the men's uniforms.

Mr. CHUBB said the fact of dressing the officers in expensive uniforms encouraged the men to go in for more expensive uniforms than would otherwise be the case. He did not know what was the cost of the men's uniforms, but he thought it was not less than £5, which was too much. People might not think moleskins and red shirts would be quite ornamental enough, but something very simple would be sufficient. The officers of the American army could hardly be distinguished from the men. They had a simple stripe on the shoulder or a star on the collar, which was all a general sometimes wore. But here some of the officers were as gorgeous as a field-marshal. It was the expensive uniform that kept good men out, as officers.

Mr. FOXTON: The companies are as full as they were before.

Mr. CHUBB said the Moreton regiment was out on parade the other day. There were 200 men with one officer, on foot; and he would like to know whether the hon. member called that "full"? A regiment should have two lieutenant-colonels, two majors, and an adjutant. There was no other reason that there were not that number than this, that they had not the officers; and yet the hon. member said the regiment was full. That showed that they had not the proper number of officers. He dared say that the corps the hon. member referred to was full, but he believed others were not. He

should be very glad to be corrected if he were wrong, but he did not believe the Moreton regiment had ever been out with two lieutenant-colonels.

The PREMIER: There is only one on the Estimates.

Mr. CHUBB said there ought to be two. That was the proper military strength for the regiment. But those gentlemen ought not to be paid. No officer over the rank of sergeant-major ought to receive any pay. If a man became a volunteer and accepted a commission in the force he should do it for the honour and glory of the thing, and if he had not to pay for such an expensive uniform there would be no necessity for him to draw any pay, which, after all, was a very small sum. A system that required a man to wear an expensive uniform was totally unnecessary. There was another question which was referred to by the Premier, and that was the question of an Australian fleet. They would be asked by-and-by, probably not this session, to pay their quota towards that. It was against foes beyond the sea that their defences were required, because what they had to provide against was the landing of an expeditionary force of no great strength probably. They would not require such a large army if they had their fleet strengthened, and therefore there would be no necessity for increasing the number of men. He believed from the figures which he had quoted that it would be quite sufficient to maintain the strength of the force at that which was given in the Estimates, but which did not exist at present. That would effect a very large saving.

The PREMIER: Some of the companies are not full.

Mr. CHUBB said he knew they were not full; he did not believe any of them were full, and he was quite certain that no company ever turned out anything like its full strength.

The PREMIER: Some of them are more than full; they have supernumeraries.

Mr. CHUBB said there might be one or two companies which had more than their strength, but he believed the great majority had not, and if that was so the saving which would be effected on the pay would be enough to provide for some of the other expenses and still leave a surplus in the vote. If he did not think that economy could be effected he would vote for the estimate as it was, because he believed they must have a defence force, and that it should be effective; but he was of opinion that a reduction might be made in some of the items he had indicated, and that a very considerable saving could be effected without impairing the efficiency of the force.

The PREMIER said he would just say a few words in reply to what had fallen from the last speaker. The hon. member seemed to be under some strange delusion as to the cost of uniforms. The cost varied from £2 to £2 10s., and the greater part of that cost was for making up the uniforms. He (the Premier) was informed that if imported from England ready-made the cost would not be much more than half of that. It was, however, thought desirable to have them made in the colony although the cost was nearly double. As to the cost of an officer's uniform it could be as much as he liked to pay for it; if he wished to go in for everything that a colonel was entitled to wear he might run it up to £80. But all that he was required to get for the purpose of performing his duty properly could be obtained for about £15. So that the hon. member's information on that point was altogether wrong. As to colonels for the Moreton regiment there was only one at present. With regard to not paying officers, he (the Premier)

thought that would be a mistake. He did not think it was desirable to confine their choice of officers to any particular class of persons. Every man in the force ought to be able to look forward to get a commission when he showed that he was entitled to it by his competence.

Mr. BROWN said he supported the Defence Force vote last year, and he intended to do so again on the present occasion. He could not see how a reduction of the vote could lead to greater efficiency in the force. The hon. member for Normanby seemed to be of opinion that they should increase the number of volunteers, but he (Mr. Brown) did not see how a reduction of the vote could bring about that result. It would, on the contrary, require an increased vote. Other hon. members who had dealt with the question apparently thought that the Defence Force should be done away with and volunteers substituted. He had a conversation the other day with a gentleman of very considerable experience in the colony—something like twenty years, he believed—and he understood that gentleman to say that he was strongly in favour of retaining the Defence Force—that was, the force which was called the Defence Force. He (Mr. Brown), however, contended that they were all volunteers; he did not see any distinction between them, except that one set of men received a certain amount of pay for the year, and were under a greater obligation to perform certain military duties. If that vote was reduced he knew what the result would be. A large proportion of the forces in the northern part of the colony would be done away with. The wealth of the colony was practically in Brisbane; the banks kept their coin here, so that the metropolis must be defended. There must, of course, be some defence force in Brisbane. But such places as Townsville, Bowen, Normanton, Cooktown, and Cairns would lose their defence force if the estimate were reduced. It was stated in the course of the debate that they were too extravagant in the expenditure on the defences of the colony. Surely £50,000, which was the sum asked for both branches of the service, was not too much. There might be faults in the administration of the system, but that was a matter which did not affect the vote, and he thought the question of administration could very fairly be discussed on the Commandant's report, which had been laid on the table. But why should the Defence Force be reduced? They might just as well say that because there was a deficiency in the revenue they should cut down the Police Force, but he thought that members would not regard that as a proper thing to do. Probably the Police Force was much too small now. In his opinion the Police Force and the Defence Force votes were two items of expenditure which should not be reduced. He knew nothing more discouraging to the officers of the force—he was not alluding to the staff officers, but to officers scattered throughout the country who had spent a great deal of time and money in bringing the Defence Force and the Volunteer Force up to the present state of efficiency—he said he knew nothing more discouraging than for them to know that that vote would depend upon the feeling of the Committee, who might see fit to diminish or reduce it by one-half, or abolish it altogether. He thought that if £50,000 was necessary for the Defence Force it should be scheduled, as it were, so that it should be just as much a part of their expenditure as the salaries of Ministers. What was the good of a Government, or any other officials of State, if the colony could not be defended? Under these circumstances he thought that the Defence Force vote should be a fixture. If they were going

to discuss it every year, and cut it down or increase it just as they might wish, he did not see how they could expect men to take so much interest in the force and spend so much time in making it efficient. Last year they had an encampment at Townsville. He did not know much about military matters, but he went out to see it. He never saw a better-looking lot of men anywhere, and he was much pleased and gratified at what he saw. There were men down from Charters Towers, and from the Naval Brigade of Townsville. If he were to express a preference for a particular branch of the service, it would be in favour of the Naval Brigade. He believed the Scottish Rifles were a very fine body of men. If, however, he wanted to feel secure he would like to see a very much larger number of men, such as they had in the Townsville Naval Brigade. The encampment was considered a great success; the men seemed to look forward to it, and he was sure that, outside the benefits that would accrue from meeting and drilling together, the encampment would have a very good moral effect. A great deal had been said about the cost of the defences. The Government only asked for £50,000, which was for both branches of the service. Hon. members knew what was spent in the other colonies. They knew, as was pointed out the other night, that the sum of £361,000 was spent on defences in New South Wales. They knew that Victoria spent £319,000, and that South Australia spent last year £40,000, and the year before that £56,000. It was said that part of that expenditure was for fortifications, and he was perfectly well aware of that, and knew all the figures. The Government of New South Wales spent last year upon the volunteer force alone £147,000; but hon. members must not think that was nearly all they spent upon their forces, or that the whole of the difference between that £147,000 and the total amount of £361,000 was spent on fortifications, because it was not. In addition to their volunteer force they had a staff to keep up, and they spent £50,000 in supporting their permanent artillery; and in connection with their land force they paid the amount of £204,000, and that did not include military stores, although the small amount the Committee were asked to vote did include such military stores as they were using in Queensland at present. Then again, a very considerable sum of money was spent upon the naval forces in the other colonies. So that if hon. members would take the trouble to look up the figures they would find that the actual annual expenditure by New South Wales upon their forces reached the sum of £270,000; and if New South Wales could afford to expend that amount, surely they were not extravagant in Queensland in spending less than one-fifth of that sum, £50,000. A careful comparison of the amounts spent in all the other colonies would show that Queensland was spending upon that purpose very much less in proportion to her revenue than any of the other colonies. But whether they were or not, they must have a defence force, and he did not know of any more economical way of managing it than they had at present. It had been suggested that they might dispense with the Defence Force, and substitute for it a volunteer force, but it had not been shown that they would save a great deal of money in that way. The sum of £27,000 could not affect the matter much one way or the other, as it was a very small amount. The Government, however, said that the reduction would materially affect the efficiency of the force. Very well, he would not insist upon the reduction, and would let the Government have the full vote. If the force was inefficient they could discuss that matter again next year, or they could

discuss it now on the Commandant's report; but he did not think they ought to reduce the vote. There was another point worth considering in connection with the vote, and that was this: They heard a great deal, not only in this but in all the colonies, in connection with Australian federation. He did not allude to Imperial federation, for that was one of the popular fictions of the day, and they were not going to see it accomplished; but that could not be said of Australian federation. Suppose Australian federation were to take place, Queensland would have to contribute a proportion to the general expense for defence purposes of Australia. Each colony would have to contribute in proportion to its population and revenue, and if they found that they were spending less now than their contribution would be in the event of a federated Australia, they must be perfectly certain that they were conducting their own defence economically. Each of the colonies if federated would have for defence purposes to levy a contribution *pro rata*, and Queensland would have to pay more than she was paying now; and that, he submitted, was a good argument in favour of the economical working of their present system. At any rate, he was of opinion that the vote of £37,746 for the land force and £12,541 for the marine force, or about £50,000 in all, could be easily afforded and should be passed.

Mr. BLACK said there must be some misunderstanding in the Committee as to the real grounds of objection to the vote by the members on the Opposition side and by one or two members on the Government side. The chief ground of objection on his side to the vote did not refer to the Defence Force or to the volunteers, but more especially to what was known as the Permanent Force—a force numbering 110 men and concentrated entirely in Brisbane.

The PREMIER: How do you make that out?

Mr. BLACK said if the hon. gentleman began to interrupt, he would give him some information he was not prepared for. The information the hon. gentleman asked for was this: There was a permanent staff of 32, costing the country £4,731; there was a Permanent Force and school of instruction costing the country £6,184; and if the 78 were added to the 32, it would make the 110 he alluded to.

The PREMIER: And all in Brisbane?

Mr. BLACK: With the exception of some drill-instructors up north.

The PREMIER: All in Brisbane, except those outside.

Mr. BLACK said the drill-instructors in all numbered 20, and the hon. gentleman could make as many deductions as he liked, and debit the districts in which those drill-instructors were employed with the difference. Briefly, the Permanent Force of 110 men cost the country £10,915, or nearly one-fourth of the entire vote. Hon. members contended that that was an unnecessary expenditure, considering the work done by that body.

The PREMIER: You are the first to make the contention up to the present.

Mr. BLACK said he thought that was pretty well understood. Some members spoke of the Volunteer and Defence Forces as if they were one. He did not object in the least to the Defence Force, and he considered that in having their pay reduced as was now proposed they were being unjustly treated. They had been able to draw £4 16s. a year up to the present time, but it was now proposed to sacrifice them and make the maximum amount they could draw £3 12s., and what for? In order to maintain the unnecessary extravagance of the Permanent Force in Brisbane. They had now a permanent force

consisting of 110 men, and costing the country £10,915, according to the Estimates; and they had a defence force—which was decidedly popular and which had done good service to the country up to the present time—numbering 2,195, and the maximum amount they could draw per head being reduced to £3 12s. from £4 16s., the cost of that force according to the Estimates would be £12,273. When they compared the good work those 2,195 men were doing with what the 110 were doing, there was no comparison as to the efficiency of the two bodies of men; and if they were to sweep off the whole of that Permanent Force to-morrow and replace it with another body of 2,195 such as the Defence Force, they could do it at a less cost to the country, and leave a sufficient margin for competent officers to look after and attend to them. No doubt the Premier liked the Permanent Force, and liked to see them going about forming escorts with their gold lace and cocked hats, as it was quite in accord with the idea of a military despotism which the Commandant seemed so anxious to enforce in Brisbane lately. He said it was far better to disband the whole of the Permanent Force, and to encourage the Defence Force by every possible means, and not by reducing their pay, and they would then get a better force; and in time to come they would have a force properly drilled—as well as the Defence Force were now—to defend not only Brisbane but the more distant parts of the colony. He would ask the Committee of what use, in the event of an enemy attempting to effect a landing on their shores, would the present Permanent Force of seventy-eight men be to the whole colony as compared with the Defence Force which was really spread throughout the different parts of the colony? It was to the Defence Force primarily, and then to the Volunteer Force, that they must look for the defence of the colony—certainly not to the Permanent Force stationed down there in Brisbane. He had seen them frequently up and down Queen street on an evening. They were very fine-looking fellows—very handsome; they carried little canes in their hands, and he believed they were doing what was known as “swagger” drill. If he was wrong in using the word, the hon. member for Carnarvon, Mr. Foxton, would put him right, but he believed that was what it was called. He dared say those men were ornamental, and he would accept hon. members' words if they said they were useful; but those were the men that the bulk of the vote was being spent upon.

The PREMIER: It is not much.

Mr. BLACK said he thought it was a very considerable sum; it was a little over one-fourth of the entire vote for 110 men. He of course knew that it was necessary to keep up the staff of the defence system, but he thought they were paying too much attention to the Permanent Force, which was a mere handful, and ignoring the more efficient branch of the service—namely, the Defence Force and the volunteers. There was no doubt that the tendency of the remarks made by the Premier, and by the Commandant in his report, was to discourage the volunteer system, and it was a very great pity.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: It is intended, no doubt.

Mr. BLACK said the Premier had distinctly stated that unless they swallowed the vote *in globo*—if they attempted to make any reduction in it—he would at once begin to disband what he (Mr. Black) considered one of the most efficient sources of defence—namely, the volunteers. He fully admitted that the Defence Force was better, because they were under more stringent regulations; but the volunteers were a most

useful body of men, who found their own uniforms and cost the country little or nothing. They received £2 10s. per head per annum, only if efficient, and according to a return issued on the 30th June last they numbered 1,246 non-commissioned officers and men.

The PREMIER: That is the number on the establishment.

Mr. BLACK said the actual strength was 990. He gathered from what the Premier had said that the volunteer system had come somewhat into disrepute, and that the men had embodied themselves in the Defence Force. No doubt many old volunteers, under the previous Act, did join.

The PREMIER: I was not speaking of them. I was speaking of the volunteer corps established under this Act.

Mr. BLACK said they knew that, notwithstanding so many of the old volunteers had become Defence Force men, there was no falling-off whatever in the strength of the Volunteer Force. During the last year the Volunteer Force had actually increased by 167 men. That was no sign of a falling-off, and they all knew that the Volunteer Force was the chief source from which the Defence Force would be recruited. It was popular all though the colony; and in country districts, where men were not able to form themselves into sufficient bodies to become a defence force, they became volunteers.

The PREMIER: That is just what they will not do. It is the very opposite, in point of fact. The increase has been entirely owing to new corps formed in Brisbane.

Mr. BLACK said that if proof were wanted for his contention that the volunteer movement was popular throughout the colony, they had it in the Commandant's report, where he said:—

"Applications have been received, as below, for the formation of new corps"—

not in Brisbane—

"but provision on the Estimates has only been made for an infantry company at Mount Morgan and a mounted infantry company at Charters Towers:—

"*Volunteer Force.*

2 additional corps of the Queensland Irish at Gympie;

1 additional corps, Queensland Irish, Rockhampton;

1 additional corps, Queensland Scottish, at Maryborough;

1 mounted infantry corps at Rockhampton;

1 rifle corps at Charleville."

Did that look as if the volunteer system was unpopular throughout the country? He contended, on the other hand, that it was extremely popular; and it was from the volunteer corps that the Defence Force would be made up whenever it might be necessary to do so, or as soon as the Government could afford to put more money on the Estimates for the Defence Force. But really the actual difference in cost to the country between them was not very great. The volunteers got £2 10s. each a year if they were efficient, and the Defence Force was to receive £3 12s.

Mr. FOXTON: And their uniforms.

Mr. BLACK: How was the colony being defended now? Was it by the Volunteer Force and the Defence Force, or by the Permanent Force which was costing the country so much? That was a very simple question, and he contended that by giving increased encouragement to the volunteers and the Defence Force, and less to that other extravagant branch of the service, which was sapping the very foundation of the whole system and which was absorbing one-fourth of the whole expenditure, they would get as efficient a force as they could reasonably expect in the present state of the finances. But

the Government took up the opposite view, and the Premier had said that if they did not swallow the vote as it stood he would disband what he (Mr. Black) maintained to be the most serviceable branch of the force—namely, the volunteers, who were giving their services almost for nothing. The hon. gentleman would then probably proceed to disband some of the Defence Force, another force that returned full value for every sixpence they got, and who were only paid for the days on which they were actually out. If hon. members dared to say a single word against the Premier's pet—the Permanent Force—they were told they wanted to see the country left defenceless. What hon. members wanted was not to see the efficiency of the Volunteer Force or the Defence Force impaired, but to see that that unnecessary extravagance in the Permanent Force was cut down. They were absorbing £10,915 out of the vote of £37,000. The Premier had said that the whole of that £10,915 could not be properly charged to the Defence Force; and he admitted it, because he found that there were twenty sergeant-instructors, drawing from £60 to £150 each, and requiring a total sum of £1,530. Those men were necessary; they could not be dispensed with. He would gladly see their number doubled, or, at all events, he would gladly see their pay increased. What became of those twenty men? They were all men who thoroughly understood their drill, and were got out from England. Whenever a defence corps or a volunteer corps was established in any of the country districts, one of those men was sent out there. But what sort of pay did he get? He (Mr. Black) knew of his own knowledge that a man who should receive £100 a year to enable him to support his position was sent up to a country district and paid £70, and the people of the district were told that if they wanted to keep him they were expected to find him some other work, which would augment his pay by £30. It was not right to throw on a district a responsibility like that, which properly belonged to the Government, and for which the Government had ample money provided. The large contingency vote was a sum over which the Government had unlimited control; the Committee were very seldom able to get any account of the way it was really spent. His contention was that in order to encourage the volunteers, who were the backbone of the defence of the colony—really the only defence they had—the drill-instructors should be paid a reasonable salary when they were sent away from Brisbane, and not have to depend upon the whim of a particular district whether they were to be starved or not. He would like the Government to show the Committee how much of that £10,915—of course, there was the headquarters band in addition, £365—how much of that £11,000 had been spent out of Brisbane. They had a coast of 2,250 miles to defend; their position was totally different from that of Victoria or New South Wales. The whole of the available forces could be concentrated at a few hours' notice in either Melbourne or Sydney. Victoria had only one or two points where she was liable to be attacked, and in New South Wales it was the same; but with Queensland it was totally different. Probably in the event of danger arising the first point of attack would be one of the Northern ports, and what were the means of defence? They should encourage the volunteer system and the rifle clubs, and give the Defence Force that consideration to which they were entitled—not decreasing their pay; he would rather increase their pay, and give additional prizes for shooting, and so on. In the event of any attack, it would probably not be made on Brisbane, which was the best defended port of Queensland; it would be made

on some of the Northern ports; and what was the use to them up there of the enormous annual expenditure—an increasing expenditure if the Committee would allow it—on the Permanent Force? They were spending a sum of money out of all proportion to the men who were paid with it, and who would really not be able to render any effective service when danger came. Of course he knew it was a very difficult thing for the Opposition in their present position to carry such a reduction as they suggested; all they could do was to draw attention to the necessity for it. The hon. gentleman said he understood the subject best. What could they say to an hon. gentleman whose arrogance was so extreme as that? It was the principle of "Let all be equal, and I will be king." They were told that if they did not accept that vote the hon. gentleman would take it as a distinct challenge—he was reported to have said of the incompetency of the Government; but the Opposition never challenged the incompetency of the Government, they challenged their competency. No doubt it was another case of misreporting, but in *Hansard* the hon. gentleman was credited with having said "incompetency," a thing the Opposition never disputed. Were they to accept the same position with respect to the rest of the Estimates? Were they to be allowed to make any reasonable reduction? The hon. gentleman might just as well throw the Estimates on the table, and say, "Take them; dare to make the least reduction and I will resign." Why did not the hon. gentleman resign? He had certainly been unable to carry the financial proposals he wanted. The colony was in a depressed financial condition; the Government had been unable to pass their taxation proposals, which they said would make both ends meet, and the Opposition said that economy was absolutely necessary. They were perfectly justified in attacking the vote as it had been attacked by the hon. leader of the Opposition; and he contended that if they spent less on that excrescence, the Permanent Force, and more in encouraging the Volunteer and Defence Forces, they could easily knock off £10,000 from the vote, without impairing the security of the colony in the least. He hoped that hon. gentlemen, before recording their votes, would consider the way he had put it. Let it be distinctly understood that he, at all events, and possibly other members on that side of the Committee, did not wish in any way to impair the efficiency of the Defence Force. They wished to increase its efficiency and to encourage the Volunteer Force, not in the way the hon. the Premier suggested, by disbanding them, but by giving them encouragement to double themselves in numbers. That was what they wanted to do, and they contended that it could be effected by reducing the unnecessary expenditure on the Permanent Force, chiefly in the way suggested by the leader of the Opposition when he suggested that the vote should be reduced by the sum of £7,000.

The PREMIER said he would like to know if the hon. member had considered what he had just been saying. The hon. member said he desired to increase the numbers of the Volunteer Force and the Defence Force, and in order to do that he proposed to reduce the amount available for paying their expenses by over £7,000.

Mr. BLACK: I say, to take that off the Permanent Force.

The PREMIER said that was a much larger sum than the total amount payable to the Permanent Force. The hon. member knew well that £10,000 or £11,000 was not the expenditure on the Permanent Force; he knew that the total expenditure on the Permanent Force was £6,000, and yet he proposed to reduce the total

vote by £7,000, in order that more money might be available for the Defence Force and the volunteers. The permanent staff must be employed in any case; they had nothing whatever to do with the Permanent Force. The Commandant, he supposed, must be one; the brigade-major, the infantry staff-officer, the staff-officer for the Northern district—were any of those unnecessary? There was the paymaster—did the hon. member think that the accounts relating to about 3,000 men could be kept without a clerk to keep them?

Mr. MOREHEAD: There is a clerk.

The PREMIER: Yes, there was also a clerk at £100 a year. Did the hon. member think a clerk at £100 a year was sufficient to keep the accounts for 3,000 men?

Mr. MOREHEAD: There is a storekeeper.

The PREMIER: Well, could they do without a storekeeper to take charge of the ammunition and military stores? No doubt that was the way the hon. gentleman would do it—put them anywhere with no one in charge, and keep no account of them. Then there was a sergeant instructor in gunnery, a sergeant instructor in submarine mining, an armourer sergeant, and twenty sergeant instructors—could they do without them? If the hon. member had charge of the department, no doubt the men would teach themselves all that was necessary; they would want no instruction. Now, was the Permanent Force too strong? Up to the present moment nobody had made an attack on the Permanent Force. He had invited hon. members at first if they wanted a reduction to deal with the thing fairly, and not make an attack on the whole force and endeavour to destroy it. That was what he charged the leader of the Opposition with doing. Let them point out the particular item that they considered was objectionable. If they objected to the Permanent Force let them say so, and he would discuss that by itself, and point out the reasons for having a Permanent Force. That was an intelligible position to take up. However, he knew that many hon. members considered that the Permanent Force was necessary: some hon. members on the other side agreed that it was necessary, and so did everyone who knew anything about it.

Mr. MOREHEAD: It is evident you know nothing about it.

The PREMIER said many hon. members on that side had frequently admitted the necessity of a Permanent Force; the objection was to the Defence Force. Let them say how much that could be reduced; if they thought the country was paying too much let them decrease it proportionately. If they decreased the vote by one-fourth, for instance, then the Government would disband one-fourth of the force. That was an intelligible position. If they thought the Volunteer Force was unnecessary, let them move to omit that; but to strike at the whole system amounted to this: "The Government do not understand anything at all about it. The whole thing is wrong. Either take the £30,000 and the responsibility of spending it, or hand it over to somebody else." As he had said before, if the Government did take the responsibility of spending the £30,000, they would at once proceed to dismiss what they considered the least useful part of the force, and would begin with the volunteers, with the exception of, perhaps, one or two companies. That was clear enough. It was difficult to discuss the question of the Permanent Force and the Volunteer Force together. One hon. member got up and objected that it was not necessary to have a permanent force; but, as he (the Premier) had pointed out, the

arguments had entirely the opposite effect to the conclusion the hon. member endeavoured to draw from them. The £6,000 was required for the Permanent Force—for the services of men who were engaged hard at work from one week's end to the other, who were paid 2s. 3d. a day for work for which under ordinary circumstances the colony would have to pay 6s. or 7s. a day.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: What is it?

THE PREMIER said he had asked hon. members over and over again to refer to Major Grieve's report for the last two years. Some of them seemed to think that valuable stores, ammunition, and guns could take care of themselves. It took skilled men to keep those things in order. Guns, ammunition, gun carriages, and all those things would be useless in a month if they were not looked after. Hon. members might as well get a large stable with horses, carriages, and harness, and employ no men to look after them, and when they wanted to use them after a month or two bid the horses get into the harness and into the carriages by themselves. What would be the condition of horses, carriages, and harness under such circumstances? And surely valuable stores and complicated machinery required as much looking after. Major Grieve's report for the last two years had been to the effect that the number of men were not capable of doing the work they had to do, and that that was the reason why there had been so many deserters from the battery—because they were harder worked than was reasonable. That was the real position of those men—doing work which, if not done by them, would have to be done by labourers—not common labourers, but skilled men, whom they would have to pay 6s. a day at the least. At the same time they were available for the purpose of forming guards of honour. He believed they ought to have the means of forming guards of honour in the colony sometimes. He had never heard of any country where there was not one, but it would not do to keep men for that special purpose alone. They must also have some men for maintaining permanent works. For instance, they could not do without a permanent regular staff at Fort Lytton. At any rate they must have a certain number of men. They might call them by another name—they might not wear uniforms; but the expense would be much greater than under the present system. That had been found in every country where people had to deal with the same thing. Some hon. members spoke of what was proposed as if it were something perfectly ridiculous—some fad of somebody's, instead of being a proposal that was carried out in every country where any attempt had been made to keep munitions of war and take care of them. It was a thing that was proved by universal experience to be necessary, and yet hon. members got up and said, "What is the use of this—we do not see it?" He wanted them to inquire. If they would only make themselves acquainted with the facts, they would see that so far from the system being extravagant it was very economical indeed. The hon. member for Mackay, as usual, while objecting to the expenditure of the money, yet complained that the expenditure was not large enough. He was always doing that. He would say, "Look at this miserable economy; why don't you spend a great deal more money than that?" If they followed that hon. member's advice the estimate would be increased by at least £10,000, and then, to give effect to his argument, the hon. gentleman proposed to give them £7,000 less. That was just like the hon. gentleman's usual argument. He said in effect, "Spend as much money as you please; don't reduce salaries, but don't spend so much money." He (the Premier)

was obliged sometimes to reply in the same way to the old worn-out arguments that were used. He could not always invent new answers to such arguments. He would take that opportunity of saving a word or two in reply to objections that were raised on Friday last. One of the great objections to the Permanent Force—the only one he had heard last week—was that they had been sent to keep the ground at a polo match. That did not seem to him to be a very serious objection. As a matter of fact, the men wished to go to the polo match, and offered, if they were allowed admission to the ground free, as spectators, to keep the bounds. As they got pay at the rate of 2s. 3d. a day the charge for admission to the ground would be rather a considerable item to them, so they were allowed to go in free on condition of giving their services in that way. He did not think that was sufficient ground for disbanding them. Another serious charge made against the Commandant was with respect to the removal of a fence in Victoria Park. That, he (the Premier) had not heard of before; and the facts were these: When the rifle range was removed he (the Premier) gave orders to remove the fence and re-erect it so as to divide the park from the foot reserve, and it seemed to him a very proper thing to do. The rifle range certainly belonged to the Government, and so did the park, but unfortunately part of it had been vested in trustees. At any rate he thought they were perfectly justified in using the fence for fencing in their own property, and he therefore gave instructions that it should be done.

MR. MOREHEAD: You were not here.

THE PREMIER said he gave instructions when he was here, and they waited to do it until the men were not otherwise engaged, he supposed. He thought the fence was very properly used in dividing Victoria Park from the reserve. He wished hon. members to address themselves to one part of the vote or another. Some members objected, in order to cut down the Defence Force, others, in order to cut at the Government; others to make an attack on the Permanent Force; so that they were combining all the opponents on every possible ground, with the object of throwing the whole thing into confusion.

MR. MOREHEAD said they had heard a dozen speeches from the Chief Secretary on the question of the Defence Force, but one point he had carefully kept clear of—that was the question whether they could afford it.

THE PREMIER: I referred to it twice.

MR. MOREHEAD: The hon. gentleman never dealt with the financial aspect of the question at all.

THE PREMIER: I did, twice, at length.

MR. MOREHEAD said the hon. gentleman did not. He had previously touched upon financial reform in the Government departments; and he (Mr. Morehead) admitted that a considerable number of employés had been got rid of in the Lands Department, and he believed others were to be got rid of in the Works Department; and he contended that if the Government had done so in those departments it could also be done in the Defence Force Department. The hon. gentleman had complained that hon. members on that side of the Committee, including himself (Mr. Morehead), had not particularised what items in the vote should be reduced. To that he replied, as he had said before, that that was the duty of the Government. In fact, the Premier himself had admitted it, because only a few moments ago he said that if the Committee voted only the lesser sum the Government would reduce the expenditure by getting rid of the portion of

the force which was of least use. He said, further, that he would take it as an order to get rid of the Volunteer Force, which he considered the most useless portion of the service. He thought the hon. gentleman could not deny that statement, which was almost in the exact words he had used. Therefore, how could the hon. gentleman have any doubt as to what he was to do with the reduced sum, when he had stated over and over again that he was prepared to adopt a certain course should the reduced sum be passed? That was to say that he would get rid of the Volunteer Force. Well, of course, he did not agree with the Premier in arriving at that decision, nor did he think the majority of members of the Committee agreed with him, but, at any rate, it showed that the hon. gentleman had some definite scheme in view in the event of the lesser sum being voted. Now, he maintained that in times like the present their duty was to cut down and reduce in every possible way, and he thought, when it was considered by members of the Committee and people outside what such a large annual vote really meant, they would see the expediency of reducing the estimate. Fifty thousand pounds a year meant interest on one and a-quarter millions of the public debt at 4 per cent. That was a very straight way of bringing it home to hon. members. They were paying the interest on one and a-quarter millions of money in order to keep up the Defence Force. Now, with regard to the arduous duties of the Permanent Force men, he would point out that there seemed to be an enormous amount of work undone. So far as they could discover from Major Grieve's report the fort at Lytton was in a most deplorable state. Its guns were practically of no service, as it appeared that after two shots had been fired from them they were useless; and again there were two on the Lytton hill, where, he supposed, they would remain until they became the property of some other owner; but as far as the work done by the force was concerned, Major Grieve's report was a record of failure, and a continual cry for more money. More money, more men, and more everything! He said in times like the present, when the country was in the critical financial position that it was, they ought not to spend one shilling more on any branch of the service than they could afford, and he was certain financial reform could be exercised in that department as well as in any other department of the State. He thought they might well spend a little more money in retaining the services of the young men who were to be got rid of in the Works Department, rather than pay pampered officers brought here from the other side of the world. With regard to the Commandant, he (Mr. Morehead) believed he got a salary and allowances, together as much as von Moltke, or within a few hundred pounds. Possibly he might have the same amount of military genius, and possibly he had not. Colonel French received £1,300 a year, and he would point out, with regard to the emoluments which he derived from the State, that the Premier seemed to have made a mistake in estimating the amount of the salary and allowances drawn by Colonel French. He thought he was right in saying that the Premier stated the other night that the Commandant was allowed quarters which were valued at £130 a year.

The PREMIER : I did not say anything about it.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he knew it was stated, and he found that was correct by referring to the schedule attached to the Estimates. He could offer no opinion as to whether that valuation was a correct one or not. He had only seen the building from the outside, and possibly, in consequence of the opinions he held he was likely

to remain outside; but he would point out that in consequence of the Commissioner for Police losing those premises he was allowed a sum of £200 a year for other quarters. Therefore they might fairly assume that the quarters, at the time they were given to Colonel French, were valued by the State at £200 a year. That brought up the pay of the Commandant to more than was paid in New South Wales to a similar officer. Therefore he thought it might be fairly said that he was an overpaid man for the work he had to do. With regard to the expenditure of the gentlemen of the Permanent Force, the Committee had always been and were at that moment left entirely in the dark as to the travelling expenses of the officers when they went on circuit, or whatever they might call their tours, when they went up north or when they went to Sydney to have a picnic with the New South Wales volunteers. The Committee knew nothing about that. They were asked to vote a large sum *in globo* to cover all those expenses.

The PREMIER : The travelling expenses are fixed by regulation.

Mr. MOREHEAD said possibly they were. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would let them know how much had been spent, and how it had gone? It was a considerable sum. "Incidental expenses, forage, allowances, and contingencies, £2,500;" a very large sum out of the total vote of £37,000. They ought to get some information upon that point. Now, he was also told, and he did not know whether it was true or not, but he believed it was, that an item of 14s. a day which had been voted year after year to a captain was not paid to any officer of that rank. There were two lieutenants, a "Major, and Chief Instructor." He would like some explanation of that item. But, to go back to his contention. He maintained that the present were times for economy and retrenchment, and all that hon. members contended was that a substantial reduction could be made in that service without its efficiency being impaired. The Premier had himself admitted it, and stated his solution of the difficulty. They might not agree with him, but he had told them what he would do if the minor sum only was voted. His (Mr. Morehead's) only desire was to see some economy practised in that as well as in other departments. No one knew better than the Premier what a critical state the finances of the country were in, and how absolutely necessary it was to practise economy and retrenchment in every possible direction, in order to tide over the great difficulties the country was in, and which would go on increasing month by month if something was not done to check extravagant expenditure.

The PREMIER said he did not know that he could give any more information. He had, on two occasions, pointed out that the first question was—Were they to have a Defence Force, and the next, what was the least amount they could get one for? He could not add anything to that. He did not think they could get an efficient force for less than the sum asked for. If the present was a time for extravagance he should like to ask for a great deal more. He would like to give the men £4 16s. a year, and be able to accept the services of the numerous companies of men who were offering their services. He did not think, with the best information he had got, that they ought to reduce the number below that of last year. Cutting down the vote meant reducing the efficiency of the force. That was all it meant. He considered the volunteers the least useful branch of the force; but it would certainly impair the efficiency of the force if the volunteers were reduced. Hon. members must see what they were doing. The reduction of the vote



meant this and nothing more : the reduction of the efficiency of the whole force, and throwing it, to a very great extent, into confusion. That was the meaning of the amendment.

Mr. KATES said he did not know whether the Premier intended to make the vote a party question, but he could not accept it as such. He had no fault to find with the permanent staff, but he went on the principle that the colony could not afford to spend so much money. The year's estimated revenue was £58,000 short of the estimated expenditure, and it was their duty to cut down the Estimates year by year till a balance was effected. He had been told that a reduction could be made in connection with "A" battery of the Permanent Force—that it could be dispensed with, in fact—and that a saving of £6,100 might be effected in that way. He was told that by one who had been a member of the force for a considerable time.

The PREMIER: Was he one of the mutinous officers?

Mr. MOREHEAD: Are there mutinous officers among them?

Mr. KATES said the Premier knew as well as he did who it was. He did not mean to say that the statement was correct, but he believed that if the Premier would go into the matter he could reduce the amount set down for the Permanent Force by £3,000 or £4,000, and he wished the hon. gentleman would do so. The Premier ought to be the first to encourage the Committee to cut the Estimates down, and as Treasurer he ought to be very grateful to hon. members for doing so.

The PREMIER: The Government have cut them down as low as possible.

Mr. KATES said that where there was a will there was a way, and he believed that if the vote were reduced the Defence Force would go on just as well as last year. If they voted £60,000 it would all be spent, but if they voted only £30,000 that would be enough. He would not mind voting £60,000 or £70,000 if the colony could afford it, but the colony was not in a position to afford it, and he hoped the vote would be reduced if only to give the members of the Defence Force to understand that the Committee had decided not to allow the vote to increase annually.

The PREMIER said the hon. gentleman might give the Government credit for having done everything they could with a view to cutting the Estimates down. They had scrutinised them carefully and minutely, and the result was that they only put down £37,000 instead of £50,000 or more. The hon. member spoke as if an army of citizen soldiers, or any other kind of soldiers, could be got together by whistling. But they could not get the men together one year, disband them the next, call them together again the following year and disband them again the year after. The hon. gentleman seemed to think it was a question of luxury—that the Committee ought not to vote much at present, but when they were well off they might vote a lot more. But they could not get men to come and go like that, and if they could not afford to pay a sufficient amount as insurance for their defence they must submit to attack and take the consequences. To use a homely saying, they could not have their pudding and eat it too. They must either have defence, and pay for it, or do without it; they could not have it and at the same time not pay for it.

Mr. FOOTE said that was just the position he liked to take up—either they must have a defence force or no defence force. His own opinion was that the taxpayers of the colony had not received one shilling of value from the force from the time the first volunteer company was

formed up till the present time. He was aware that the war scare a few years ago helped to bring the force to its present position—in fact, gave it a basis it never had before; but the money for the volunteers had always been voted in a most half-hearted manner, and was always considered to be a great waste.

The PREMIER: So it was.

Mr. FOOTE said he was prepared to give the Premier credit for the efficiency of the present force, but the colony did not want it. There was no necessity for it in the expectation of any war or filibustering expedition to the colony. If it did come there was not a great deal to steal.

The PREMIER: Oh!

Mr. FOOTE: What was there? Only a few houses to knock down. As for gold, it was a rare thing to see a sovereign in Brisbane nowadays. Most of the money was paper, and if they destroyed that plenty more could be created. As his hon. friend, the member for Fassfern, said the other night, one had only to turn a handle and the thing came out just as they wished. But—to be serious—the point to regard was whether the colony could afford the money or not. He held that they could not afford it, and that the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition was a very moderate and reasonable one. Therefore he hoped the Committee would go with him, because it would have a salutary effect in more ways than one. It would help to keep the Government in check—hon. members knew they required it—and would help to bring about a better state of the finances at the end of the year. He should support the amendment.

Mr. SALKELD said the Premier had complained that hon. members had not indicated the items they wished to have reduced. The hon. gentleman could not complain of that on previous occasions, because the details had been pointed out. But it had been found that that mode of attack was of no use in regard to the expenditure on the Defence Force. When they pointed out where they thought a reduction could be made they had been out-voted, and he was glad to see that there was a greater chance of a reduction being made this year. In a good many of his arguments the Premier assumed, in the first place, that if war broke out the colony would be subjected to attack, and, in the next place, that the Defence Force secured to the colony immunity from danger. If those were facts and could be accepted as truth, he would not have one word to say against the vote.

The PREMIER: I asked for the vote on that assumption.

Mr. SALKELD said he would not object to voting £50,000 for the Defence Force, if that was the case. He was not a military man, any more than the Chief Secretary or other members of the Committee—he did not include the hon. member for Carnarvon.

Mr. FOXTON: And the hon. member for Normanby.

Mr. SALKELD: And the hon. member for Normanby. He had not sufficient military knowledge to give an opinion, but he believed that persons who were competent to do so were of opinion that the defence of the colony would be futile in case of an attack by a foreign power. He believed the first wrong step in connection with the increased expenditure on the Defence Force was in raising the Commandant's pay from £700 to £900 a year, and giving him a residence, put down at £130, for which they had to pay £200 a year as compensation to the Commissioner of Police for loss of quarters. Of course, they knew that it was altogether beyond the means of the colony to secure themselves immunity from attack along the whole of



their coast line. It might be possible to defend Brisbane by centring all the forces there, and spending all the money in defending it; but that was only one item. If they considered what kind of force would be likely to visit the shores of the colony in the event of a great European war, which would most likely be a filibustering or privateering expedition, their present policy might be able to hold it in check; and their rivers might be of great use as a means of defence in case heavily armoured vessels should come. But, again, if a European war were to take place, in which Great Britain might be engaged, they might have a fleet of such vessels sent out—in fact they might be on their way before war was formally declared—and what would be the use of their batteries at Lytton or Townsville, for instance? Would they offer any effective resistance to armoured vessels? He did not think they would for one moment. And then, with regard to landing forces, of what use would their defences, say at Townsville, be to defend the town from a hostile attack, if the enemy were to land a force? The enemy could easily go to the north or to the south and find plenty of places to land and attack the towns; and so they could not reckon on their present system of defence to afford anything like immunity from attack. He did not think there was much in the contention of some hon. members that they could not afford to pay that money. That was something like the action of a man who was ill, who, on his medical officer telling him he must stop away from his business or else it would kill him, said he could not afford it. He must afford it; and that was exactly their case. If they really were in great danger from attack in case of war, and if by spending that money they could not secure immunity, let them do away with it entirely. As the Premier had invited them to point out where economy might be practised in connection with that vote, he wished to point out that there might be a reduction in the first two items. The first item was the permanent staff, costing £4,731, and he thought that might be cut down to some extent. The next item was "Permanent Force and School of Instruction, £6,184." That might be done away with altogether. He knew they would be told that that included the Defence Force. But in what way did it affect other parts of the force; what assistance did it afford to the companies of the Defence Force in Ipswich, Toowoomba, Maryborough, Rockhampton, and Townsville, and other places? Certainly, it might be all right in Brisbane; but he did not think there was much in that argument. He certainly did not think that those seventy-eight men, who were going to be such a great safeguard, should cost £80 per head. That item might well be reduced. Although he hoped that the whole vote would be reduced, he was not prepared to say that it should be reduced by exactly £7,000, but it should be reduced by the cost of the Permanent Force. There was one thing he would point out: If the vote was not reduced and the amendment was negatived, the debate would not have been useless in the interests of the colony; year by year debates had taken place upon the vote, and he certainly thought that it was merely the thin end of the wedge when the Defence Act was first passed. That was why he did not like it, and he was certain that if a vigorous defence had not been made in the Committee, the vote would have increased year by year a great deal more than it had. He was sure that the debates that had taken place on the subject had been the means of keeping the amount down. He gave the Premier every credit for being firm in keeping it down, but he believed they started the defence business on the wrong tack. He had been looking at the Commandant's first report,

of March, 1884, and he must say that officer appeared to have not only one grievance, but grievances all round. He complained of all the departments of the Government. He complained of the Railway Department, the Colonial Stores Department, the Post and Telegraph Department, and the Police Department; and generally all round. The Commandant was at loggerheads with whoever had anything to do with him. He (Mr. Salkeld) understood the real gist of it, and had given his opinion before. The gentlemen with military instincts looked down upon everybody else as ordinary mortals compared with themselves. If the Commandant were allowed his own way in the matter he would override them all very quickly, and vote them useless. That officer who set himself against all of the departments had shown an utter unfitness for the position—he did not speak from a military point of view or in regard to that officer's technical knowledge on military matters. He (Mr. Salkeld) would give a reason why that officer was not fit to be the head of the Defence Force in a colony like this—in what they might term a democratic colony—where the general feeling was that they did not want standing armies as they had them at home; and where there was a great amount of freedom, and every man thought he was as good as anyone else. That was the kind of feeling that rendered Queensland an unsuitable place for a man with military instincts. It was the wrong place for men with military ideas. They had seen other cases where the Commandant had gone out of his way very much, and he was blamed by nearly every sensible man for his want of discretion. He (Mr. Salkeld) did not think it was want of discretion. A man who committed himself once through want of discretion would guard against it again. The Commandant made a mistake in attending that meeting at the Town Hall, and in the fight he had with the trustees of the Queen's Park, which they had all heard about. Again, in attempting to issue those instructions to his officers, and in endeavouring to make short work of the Postmaster-General's and the Minister for Works' departments. The people could not tolerate that sort of thing. The officers in any other departments would not dare to go on in such a way. The Commandant seemed to believe that the military party were outside the ordinary rules affecting Government officers in the colony, and such a state of things ought not to be allowed to go on. If that gentleman had been kept more within his lines he would have been a better officer, and would have understood his position, which would have kept him from committing a great many mistakes that had reflected discredit upon himself and upon the whole of the Defence Force. He hoped that the Premier would reconsider what he said: that if the reduction of the vote were carried he would operate on the Volunteer Force. He hardly thought the hon. gentleman would do anything of the kind. Every hon. member who had followed the debate would see that, if the amendment were carried, it was intended to affect the Permanent Force and not the Volunteers. There was no wonder that volunteering had got on so badly in the colony, at least comparatively so. It had been greatly discouraged. The volunteers at home had had exactly the same thing to contend with, and any person who was at all conversant with the history of the volunteer movement in its early days would see that it was then considered by military men inefficient and unreliable and all the rest of it. If they wanted reliable men, there were just as good men in the Volunteer Force as in the Defence Force, and as good officers as there were in the Defence Force; but they wanted to be treated in a different way. He

did not think that the Volunteer Force had been properly treated in the past, and he believed that the failure of the volunteer system was principally owing to the fact that they had not officers who knew how to treat the men. They knew that a large proportion of the men who enlisted in the British army were scapegraces, men who had no other way of getting a living, and hardly dared look at their officers. It seemed as if the same thing was expected out here, but they could not get men to act in that way in this colony, and he would be very sorry if they could. He thought it was one of the best signs possible that the men here had a little spirit, and he regarded all the talk about volunteering being a "go-as-you-please" system, as military cant and humbug. He believed that if volunteers were properly treated they would attend to their duties properly, but they did not want to be under the thumb of any officer who chose to assert his superiority. The hon. member for Normanby had spoken about the Queensland Scottish, a corps with which the hon. member was well acquainted, and he thought it was very much to the credit of the hon. gentleman that he had refrained from saying anything about himself, and had kept his own personal matter out of the debate. Objection had been taken by some members to his speaking about his own corps, but he (Mr. Salkeld) contended that the hon. member was perfectly justified in referring to the corps with which he was associated, because he was intimately acquainted with its affairs. He (Mr. Salkeld) did not know whether £7,000 was the right amount by which the vote should be reduced, but there certainly ought to be some reduction in it. If hon. members would look at the Commandant's report they would see that he and his officers thought of nothing but spending money, and that they still wanted a great number of things done which would involve a considerable expenditure. They had been told that the men of the Permanent Force worked very hard. What did they do? He was credibly informed that they kept the Commandant's garden and pleasure grounds in beautiful order. He believed that there was some fencing required round the barracks, and he would like to know whether it would not be more soldier-like work for the men to put up that fence than to attend to the Commandant's garden. Hon. members were all aware that the state of the Treasury was such as to demand the most rigid economy at the present time, and he would like to know, if they could not reduce an item of that kind, how they were to retrench in any other part of the Estimates? If that vote were allowed to pass as it stood, they might just as well pass the whole of the Estimates in five minutes, let them go, and make no stand for retrenchment. He thought that the Government should have seen that, and have taken the responsibility of reducing the Estimates wherever possible. In his view there was no more suitable place for retrenchment than in the present vote, and he believed that was the honest opinion of every member of the Committee, and that it represented the feeling of the country generally.

Mr. CAMPBELL said the Premier had several times during the debate asked them to point out where the reduction should take place in that vote. He thought it had been very fairly indicated during the last hour by several speakers that it should take place in the officers of the Permanent Force. For his own part, he had never been able to see what their highly paid officers did for the money they received. The Commandant received something like £1,300 a year, Major Grieve about £550 and forage allowance, and Major Des Vœux something like £450 and forage allowance. He had often wondered, since he saw that those officers received an

allowance for forage, whether the polo ponies, of which they had heard so much, were being fed from that allowance. If they were, the sooner the Government put a stop to it the better. He thought that vote would very fairly stand the reduction that had been proposed by the leader of the Opposition, and he would give it his hearty support. It seemed monstrous that a people of about 320,000 souls, exclusive of Asiatics and Polynesians, should be called upon to vote something over £50,000 a year for the land and marine forces of the colony. He did not know where the thing would end if it was allowed to go on. He had very little sympathy indeed with the Permanent Force, especially when they knew that the officers of that force had shown such antagonism to the volunteer system in this colony that they had never missed an opportunity of disparaging it as much as they could. Hon. members had only to look at the report of the Commandant for proof of that statement. He thought that the volunteers, if properly treated, would become a very efficient body of men, but at the present time several country corps were actually without drill instructors, while they had something like thirty-two officers and forty-eight men of the Permanent Force in Brisbane. He was sure he did not know what they did. They saw from Major Grieve's report that the forts were in a very bad state; that if an enemy came to the colony to-morrow they would be almost useless, and that if the guns were fired twice, they would shoot back into the chocks, and would not work. He thought it would be far better if the officers of that force took the men down there whom they took out to the polo-playing, and placed those guns in proper condition; then they would only be performing some of the duties for which they were highly paid by the country. He thought it was but fair that they should do that. On Friday last the hon. member for Stanley, Mr. White, made a suggestion which he (Mr. Campbell) thought might very well be acted upon, and that was that competent drill instructors should be appointed to travel about the country and meet the different corps in their respective districts. That would have a very good effect indeed. He was quite sure that they could get thoroughly competent men to do the work for one-fourth the amount the Commandant received, and he believed they would do it with greater efficiency. He would like to ask how often the Commandant had made inspections of the different corps throughout the colony. He paid a flying visit to Toowoomba some twelve months ago to select horses, he (Mr. Campbell) understood. The Commandant had the men mustered, and gave them a few words of advice, which he (Mr. Campbell) believed they did not think much of. In a democratic country like this, they should discourage as much as possible that high military class display which was being flaunted in the faces of the people here until they were becoming tired of it. He would relate a little incident that occurred on the day of the opening of Parliament. He did not know whether the gentleman he was going to speak of was present, but he would not say anything offensive of him. When he took his seat in the other Chamber with other members of the Assembly he saw a very highly dressed military man standing on the right hand of the Governor, and he asked some hon. member who he was. He did not catch the name, and in the evening in town he met two gentlemen who had cards of *entrée* to the opening ceremony, and they asked him who the highly dressed gentleman was. They said he must be very high in the service, and asked if he was Colonel French. He told them he could not be

the Colonel, for he knew the Colonel; and they then said he must be above the Colonel. He said that was impossible, as the Colonel was head of the military here. They said his dress indicated it and he looked like a field-marshal. He found afterwards that the gentleman alluded to was Lieutenant-Colonel Adams. He trusted the amendment would be carried, and he believed it would be a good thing for the present Government if it was, as it would indicate to them that the country was not prepared to allow them to go on with the extravagance they had gone on with. He should certainly support the amendment. As he had said, it would be a good thing if drill-instructors were sent to different points throughout the colony. He was told by the captain of the corps in Toowoomba that he had repeatedly applied for a drill-instructor, and not only did not get one but he could get no response to his application very often from the Commandant; and he was so disheartened at present that, as he (Mr. Campbell) understood, he contemplated resigning his position.

Mr. MURPHY said the hon. member for Auburn argued that they paid the gentlemen at the head of their military system too highly. He took exception to that remark, for the reason that if they were to have any military system here at all they could not pay too highly for thoroughly efficient men. He did not mean to enter into any defence of Colonel French, but he believed he was a thoroughly capable officer, and was sent to this colony by the British Government as being a thoroughly capable officer, and one in whom they had every confidence. He was satisfied that unless they paid gentlemen of his stamp highly they would not come here at all. Colonel French had been, perhaps, a little indiscreet, and perhaps very indiscreet, both in his writing and speaking, and he had done something to discourage the volunteer movement in the colony, for which he might be somewhat to blame. But, notwithstanding that, he was still of opinion that Colonel French's faults were not of a very grave nature, and were not such faults as they could set against the undoubted ability he must possess to warrant his being sent out by the British Government to take charge of their forces. The question stated by the Premier was, were they to have a military system or not?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: No.

Mr. MURPHY said an hon. member said "No," and his reply to that was that if they were not to have a military system it was their duty to strike out the whole of the item at once. He would support such a vote as that if he thought a military force was not necessary; but he thought no member of the Committee would get up and say that it was not necessary. They knew, on the contrary, that it was absolutely necessary, and that being so they must accept the fiat of the Government that the vote proposed was absolutely necessary to keep that force in an efficient state. Hon. members on both sides got up and argued against it, but it was a question upon which they were not in a position to form an opinion, and they must accept what the Government said upon the matter. It was, therefore, his intention to vote against the amendment of the leader of the Opposition, because he thought they must have a military system—a system of defence—and it would be a pity, now that they had got one under weigh, to cripple it merely for the sake of £7,000. Other hon. gentlemen argued that they must commence somewhere to apply the pruning-knife to the Estimates, but he thought they could not have chosen a more unfortunate item in the whole of the Estimates to which to apply the pruning-knife.

He would be glad to assist his own side of the Committee, or any hon. member, in reducing the Estimates wherever he possibly could, and wherever, in his opinion, they could be reduced; but the item at present under discussion could not well be reduced. Comparing their expenditure upon the military system with that of the other colonies, they found that in proportion to their population their expenditure was in a very much less ratio than that of the other colonies. He did not think they would be acting unwisely in following their lead to some extent, and they were all spending large sums of money to make the defence of their ports and shores as effective as possible. They must surely consider that the other colonies were acting with some measure of wisdom in that matter; and for them to go in the exactly opposite way and say that their seaboard, vast as it was, wanted no protection, was, in his opinion, the height of stupidity. He could remember a little history, which might be of some use in the consideration of the question. He remembered that the Berry Government dismissed the Victorian Permanent Force, and what was the consequence of that dismissal? That force was an artillery force, known as the garrison artillery, and after it had been trained for years and become thoroughly efficient, and was acknowledged to be as fine a body of men as was to be seen anywhere in the world, the Berry Government in a fit of economy disbanded a large number of them. What was the consequence? A war scare came up twelve months after that, and the Government would have given thousands of pounds if they could have got those men back again. They had to start *de novo*, and hunt all over Victoria to get the proper stamp of men to again recruit that force, and they had not even to the present day—although they had largely increased the number of the force—succeeded in getting that force back to the state of efficiency in which it was when it was disbanded by the Berry Government. That should be something of a lesson to them in Queensland.

The PREMIER: They passed a vote then for three years permanently.

Mr. MURPHY: Yes; they passed a vote then to take it out of the power of any Government for three years to repeat what the Berry Government had done in disbanning the permanent artillery of Victoria. He did not think he need say more on the matter, beyond remarking that, in his opinion, a good deal of the opposition to the vote arose out of some personal hostility to Colonel French.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: No, no!

Mr. MURPHY said it seemed certain to him that many hon. members were going to vote for the amendment because they were personally hostile to Colonel French. No doubt the Commandant had in some measure given them colour for what they were going to do, because of his indiscretion; but he looked at the question from a much wider point of view, and believed that a military system was absolutely essential, and that to impair the efficiency of the system they had started would be folly. He should therefore vote against the amendment.

Mr. S. W. BROOKS said he was pretty much of the opinion of the hon. member who had just sat down—namely, that into the discussion of the question before them there had been introduced far too much of the personal element. Hon. members had talked everlastingly about the indiscretions and foibles of Colonel French. He did not know Colonel French, and he did not suppose that Colonel French knew him; but they were not discussing Colonel French. They were discussing something far

greater, and he should vote against the amendment because he thought the colony could not afford to pass it. The colony could not afford to pass it for two reasons. In the first place, that Parliament had passed the Act on which the Defence Force was founded. A great deal of money had been spent in working it up, and he, for one, felt most decidedly opposed to crippling it in any way, and thereby wasting the large amount of money that had been expended in bringing the force up to its present condition. His second reason was, perhaps, stronger. Some hon. members had said that the colony could not afford the money which the Government asked for. But did those hon. members think for one moment that European complications, and consequently our danger, would depend upon whether the financial condition of Queensland was sound or not—whether the colony had or had not a deficit? That was not at all likely, and European complications were just as likely to happen when they had a deficit as when they had an overflowing Treasury, and *vice versa*. It would therefore be imprudent to manage the defence system on principles which would not be accepted by any man of business. It was simply a policy of assurance, and men of business insured against fire whether they were having a good year or a bad one. The Defence Force was a sort of assurance that must be kept up, unless they wished to lay themselves open to the charge of wasting money and foolishly going back upon their policy. He wished he could feel as Ruskin felt when he expressed the opinion, in one of his minor works, that the country which would disarm absolutely would be the safest country in Europe. But they could not feel like that, unfortunately. He did not like the vote, but they would not be safe without spending the money, and they ought to spend it. As to the volunteers, he had never been a volunteer, nor was it likely that he would ever become one; but he could not but admire the enthusiasm with which they went through their military duties. He had seen them at drill, and had heard them yelled at and howled at by their officers, and they stood it all in their enthusiasm to work up the efficiency of their various corps. The hon. member for Townsville on Friday night criticised, with some degree of ridicule, the report of the Commandant with respect to the sham fight. That report struck him in an altogether different fashion; he looked upon it as a really creditable report. The Commandant was there to do his best to work up the Defence Force into the very best condition, and, seeing the spots where it was weak, he had fairly and honestly pointed them out. It struck him that the report was really a good one, and it made an entirely opposite impression on his mind to that which it seemed to have made on the mind of the hon. member for Townsville. Something had been mentioned to him in the street—it was in opposition to the report, and it might be altogether wrong—about there being thousands of uniforms lying in the military stores, and being eaten by rats and moths and absolutely wasted. The report said there was no such thing—that there were no surplus stores or clothing. Exception had been taken to the remark in the report that the expense of making up uniforms in the colony was exactly three times the English rates; but he was not in a position to offer an opinion on that subject. He should vote for the original estimate because he believed the colony could not afford to alter it and cripple the force. There was no doubt that if another war scare were to arise the Government would be praised if they spent three times the amount asked for in a single month in order to preserve the colony from danger.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said that while he was as anxious as anyone to guard the public purse and to protect the interests of the taxpayers, he could not say that the arguments of those hon. members who had spoken in support of the amendment had convinced him that he ought to vote for it. In the arguments of nearly the whole of them there seemed to be a little bit of personal animus against Colonel French—

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Certainly not.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL: Mixed up with a desire on the part of the Opposition to seize the opportunity to baffle the Government and trip them up, knowing that there were also a number of malcontents on that side. The hon. member for Mackay went so far as to ask why the Government did not go out, seeing that they had been defeated on their taxation proposals, and could not carry any of their measures. He would tell that hon. member the reason why. The Government did not go out because they could not see anybody in the House capable of filling their places. If the present Opposition were in office they would be the very men to support the vote, and he had no doubt they would feel much relieved even now if the Premier were to ask them to pass the vote for three years, as was done by the Service-cum-Berry Ministry in Victoria, after Berry had disbanded the entire force, and the next Government was compelled to re-establish it. It would relieve them of a good deal of difficulty in the event of their getting on to the Treasury benches after the next election. He looked upon the Permanent Force as the school of instruction, the nucleus, and the essential item for the formation of a defence force, not only of its present size but of a very much larger one. It must be obvious to every common-sense man—to every man with any intelligence—that in very large establishments, whether merchants' warehouses, Government departments, banks, or any other institutions, there was always a permanent staff of highly paid officials, who perhaps did not work so hard with their bone and sinews, but who possessed the brain-power to control the whole of the departments under them. It was necessary for the success of any undertaking that those men should be of the highest intelligence, and they could not be got unless they were highly paid. Fancy the effect in any large mercantile business of discharging all the heads of the departments and letting the clerks run the business; that was about what it amounted to. It was all very well in these piping times of peace to preach economy and bluster in a pot-valiant way that the Defence Force was no defence, and that the people would be quite able to defend ourselves; but if there were a war scare to-morrow, and the hon. members who opposed the vote had sent the brain-power—the nucleus of the whole force—to the right-about, he knew who would be in the greatest perplexity. £50,000 to defend 300,000 people was only 3s. 4d. a head, and that was not an excessive sum to pay for life insurance. He would tell the hon. member for Aubigny, and a good many other hon. members, that if they wanted to save a paltry £7,000, they had much better cut off their two guineas a day each: that would save precisely the same amount. That was where hon. members ought to begin if they were going in for trenchant economy—do away with their own screws. Of course the amendment was only a tentative motion to try and embarrass the Government; and he really would like to see what the leading members on the Opposition benches would do if they got on to the Treasury benches through carrying that motion.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: It is not a party matter.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said he did not say it was a party matter; he treated it on the grounds of common sense.

Mr. MOREHEAD: I wonder you ever found those grounds.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said it was obviously necessary that there should be intelligence at the head of the department. He was not claiming for himself or any other citizen the power to judge whether the Commandant was an efficient man; but he did not believe that gentleman would have been sent out if he was not efficient.

Mr. MOREHEAD: He was not sent here.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL: He was recommended then.

Mr. MOREHEAD: He was engaged in England by Sir Thomas McLlwraith.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL: Then he ought to be a good man, according to the views of hon. members on the Opposition side. No doubt Sir Thomas McLlwraith had a recommendation, and he believed Sir Thomas McLlwraith's opinion carried weight on the Opposition benches.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Apparently it does with you.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said he had not known it was on Sir Thomas McLlwraith's recommendation, and that would rather make him change his opinion than otherwise. He had not that implicit faith in Sir Thomas McLlwraith that a great many hon. members of the Opposition had. Nothing had been pointed out to the Committee to show the incapacity or inefficiency of the Commandant, and as for the rest of the staff, he considered they were wholly necessary; and the school of instruction as well. That was the nucleus and beginning of a corps which as the colony grew would grow with it. Though he would like to see that peaceable state arrive which had been depicted by the hon. member for Fortitude Valley, Mr. S. W. Brooks, when the nation which disarmed would be the happiest and safest nation in the world, he was afraid they would have to take things as they were in this world, and not as they ought to be, and the best security for peace was to be well prepared for war. They could not with their population and means maintain a standing army, nor was it necessary for them to do so, but he believed the day was not far distant when the Australian colonies would be able to take rank with the strongest European power, and defend themselves against any hostile attack or aggression. He felt sure the time was not far distant when they would be independent of any Imperial assistance, and would be able to maintain their own freedom, their own independence, their own armies, and their own navies. He looked upon it that the amount of taxation they underwent to initiate that order of things was really very moderate. He would vote for the item as it stood.

Mr. SALKELD said he could not allow the remarks of the three hon. members who last spoke—that the hon. members who were attempting to reduce the vote were actuated by personal motives—to pass without contradiction. He (Mr. Salkeld) had never spoken to any of the officers of the Defence Force in his life, except to Colonel French a few days ago, and certainly that gentleman was as courteous as any gentleman could be. He had not the slightest cause personally to feel annoyed in any way whatever with the officers of the Defence Force, and he thought that was the experience of nearly all the members of the Committee. He did not believe there was any personal feeling in the matter, but when the Commandant, or anyone else in the public service, went out of his way to do things which they believed to be injurious to the whole

community, then they had a right to speak without being charged with personal motives. The hon. member for Barcoo, and then the hon. member for Fortitude Valley (Mr. Brooks), and lastly the hon. member for Cook (Mr. Hill), were surely measuring hon. members by their own bushel.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL: We do not measure you by our bushel.

Mr. SALKELD said he did not think any member of the Committee had any personal feeling against Colonel French; they were taking the present step on public grounds.

Mr. CHUBB said he would ask the Premier how much of the £22,420, together with the £2,000 deferred pay appropriated last year, had been actually paid?

The PREMIER said that, as he had mentioned in moving the vote, the actual amount of pay last year was £18,821, exclusive of deferred pay, which was previously included in the contingency vote. There had been a considerable increase in the number of men this year, and £22,188 would be the exact amount spent if all the men attended drill on every day. As it was quite certain they would not do so, it was considered that the amount of £1,000 set down would, with the savings from ordinary pay, be sufficient to cover all the deferred pay.

Mr. MURPHY said the hon. member for Ipswich seemed to think he (Mr. Murphy) had charged him with personal hostility to Colonel French, but he had done nothing of the kind. What he meant was, that the hon. member was trying to punish Colonel French through the Defence Force, because Colonel French had publicly offended him—offended him in his public capacity.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he thought the hon. gentleman who had just sat down, as well as some other hon. members, had very little reason to charge any member with having spoken on the question with personal motives. It was quite unbecoming to charge any hon. member with personal motives. He, for one, did not know Colonel French. He had been told that that officer was in the gallery, but he certainly could not pick him out; so that so far as personal motives were concerned he had none. He must say that he disliked the tone of that gentleman's report, and the portion he disliked most was where he condemned the volunteer system *in toto*. But every military man did just the same thing, and Colonel French had imbued the Premier with his military ideas. That he condemned in Colonel French and also in the Premier. So far from believing that there was any truth whatever in the condemnation of the volunteer system—when he said "volunteer" he meant purely volunteer, because the Defence Force was a volunteer force also, as the men entered the force voluntarily—he meant the volunteers who paid the biggest part of their own expenses,—he held that there was no reason whatever for the condemnation uttered by the Premier of that force. The hon. gentleman was not quite so sweeping that night as he was on Friday. He had not reiterated the assertion that if the reduced amount were carried he would dismiss that portion of the force which was least efficient.

The PREMIER: I did.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said if he had he had not heard him. He believed the volunteers were not the least efficient; on the contrary he believed that another portion of the force was less efficient and less useful to the country than that force was. But the hon. gentleman found fault with the Volunteer Force because they would not attend drill, and enumerated certain companies

that had changed their system from being purely volunteer to become part of the Defence Force. But he had forgotten to tell the Committee that the present Government had persistently and consistently discouraged the Volunteer Force. They had thrown every impediment in the way of forming volunteer companies. The hon. gentleman had referred to one officer, not of the Defence Force, but of the Volunteer Force, who was efficient. That officer he (Mr. Macrossan) believed was Major Thynne. Now, that gentleman was prepared to give the Government 1,000 volunteers of the Queensland Irish, but they would not accept them; and yet the hon. gentleman stood up and condemned the volunteer system, and said it was not popular in the country. That was a fact that the Government could not deny.

The PREMIER: It is new to me.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said it might be new to the hon. gentleman, but it was not new to his Government. He (Mr. Macrossan) had it upon the authority of Major Thynne himself that he had sent in offers to the Government to raise companies in certain towns in Queensland, and stated that he was prepared at the same time to make continuous offers until there were 1,000 volunteers of that corps, but the offers were refused. Was it not a fact also that the Government had refused companies of the Queensland Scottish?

The PREMIER: Where?

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said in Maryborough. In fact, they had done all they could to discourage the volunteers. Another thing which he was free to assert, believing it, was that had the Queensland Irish been accepted most likely the Queensland Scottish would have doubled through the kind of generous rivalry of national feeling that existed between the two nationalities. They could not encourage that feeling too much; when combined with the natural sentiment of defending the country there could not be a better feeling. In the same way they might also have had the Queensland Welsh, until at last they would have had a large volunteer force dependent entirely upon the Government, whether they were made efficient or not. It was entirely the work of the Government to make a volunteer force efficient, and he was quite sure they could be made as efficient as the force they had at present.

The PREMIER: They have always failed.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said that was entirely the fault of the Government. The same class of men composed both forces.

The PREMIER: Failed under every Government everywhere.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said the hon. gentlemen was mistaken in his facts. He would give him a little incident that he had seen himself—a thing that came under his own observation. A good many years ago, just before the breaking out of the American civil war, he saw a British regiment going through its exercise—a crack regiment in the British army—and he saw them making continuous blunders. A few weeks afterwards he saw another regiment—a volunteer regiment, in the city of New York—going through its drill by moonlight. It was composed of men who could not afford the time to learn their drill by daylight; they had to go through all their parades by moonlight, and that regiment compared favourably with the crack British regiment he had seen only six weeks previously. That volunteer regiment, a few short months after, went to the front in the civil war, and made a name for itself in the American Army as the Seventh New York Volunteers—a name well

known in the history of the civil war. That proved that volunteering could be made as efficient as any other system, if the Government, or State, or whatever it might be, only infused a proper spirit into the men; but if the men were constantly discouraged, told they were no good, and told, when they were doing their very best, that they were inefficient, and that they did not compare favourably with those men who went out twelve days in the year, then how could such men be expected to become efficient? The very best men would become discouraged under such circumstances. He contended that it rested entirely with the Government whether the Volunteer Force became efficient or not. The hon. gentleman had spoken about some volunteer corps which did not muster on parade—who disappeared when they ought to have been present. Now, it was only about a month since a paragraph appeared in one of the Brisbane newspapers stating that a company, or regiment—he was not certain which—of the Defence Force was to be mustered; and how many men appeared on parade? Five! and upon another occasion, a few nights afterwards, there were only three. That was the Defence Force the hon. gentleman boasted about being so efficient, and made comparisons between them and the volunteers, who had not appeared on parade—or, as Colonel French called it, the “go-as-you-please system.” He (Mr. Macrossan) did not believe one single iota of the statement made by the hon. member for Barcoo, and he did not think that the hon. gentleman himself believed it upon the same grounds as he had stated—that because Colonel French was selected at home, and sent out here, therefore he was an efficient officer. He (Mr. Macrossan) did not know whether he was efficient or not; he had no doubt he was efficient, but he did not think he was efficient simply because he had been sent out here by the English Government. Far from it. A Government that sent out bayonets that bent, guns that would not fire, and ironclads that would not sail—that capsize—would be just as careless in selecting a man to take command of the forces in the colony. Whether that officer was sent out or engaged by Sir Thomas McIlwraith he did not know, neither did he care; but the fact of his being here, having been engaged at home, was, he took it, sufficient proof that he was efficient. They had had a very long discussion over the vote, and although he was not prepared to go the whole length stated by the hon. member for Mackay about the Permanent Force, still he thought a good deal of money might be saved in connection with that force. He did not think the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government quite understood how the Permanent Force were employed. If they were employed, as he supposed them to be, in looking after the guns and stores at Fort Lytton, why were they not located at Lytton?

The PREMIER: All the stores are not at Lytton.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: The guns are there.

The PREMIER: Only four.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said those four guns had to be looked after. He was told quite the reverse of what the hon. gentleman stated with regard to those men. His information might be wrong, but he had been told that the Permanent Force had very little duty of that kind—that they were employed on every kind of work which was not expected to be done by men who were engaged to defend the country. He quite agreed with the hon. gentleman that there ought to be a good force of artillery, but whether they should be permanent men or not was the question; but

he should be in favour of volunteer artillery, because they could have a much larger number of them; whilst the small Permanent Force that cost so much would, in the hour of danger, be of very little advantage to the colony. Now, as to the northern part of the colony being attacked, he did not think there was much danger of that. He did not believe an enemy coming to the coast of Australia would advertise his presence by attacking the northern part of Australia and leaving the southern part time to make its preparations for full defence. If any portion were attacked it would be done by surprise, and most likely Melbourne or Sydney would be the first, and, following them, Brisbane and Adelaide, and the northern part of Queensland was only likely to be attacked by a force that had been driven off and, going away in disgust, landed a party by way of retaliation. But if the North were in danger of attack he did not think it had any means of defence, nor was it likely to have any for a long time to come, and the best means of defence would be by having a sufficient supply of arms and encouraging the stalwart Northern "nomads," as they had been called, to use those arms effectively. If they were given arms and instructors they would probably make short work of an enemy, and acquit themselves more creditably than the Permanent Force in Brisbane. He hoped that the Opposition would carry the amendment, although he was very doubtful about it. He should be sorry if the Government carried the original motion, because he believed that in no branch of the service could retrenchment take place more effectively than in the Defence Force vote.

Mr. MORGAN said the hon. member for Townsville abused the Government for not accepting the services of quite a number of volunteers who aspired to military glory, and on the other hand advocated a reduction in the vote. They were told that companies of Queensland Irish and Queensland Scottish and Queensland Welsh had been tendering their services, and if they had been accepted he supposed they would next have Queensland Germans and Queensland Chinese, the latter sending in a requisition for a supply of tom-toms. The Commandant had been found fault with by some hon. gentlemen for having condemned the purely volunteer system. He (Mr. Morgan) thought that anything but full justice had been done to Colonel French in reference to his remarks on the Volunteer Force. Only portions of the report had been quoted, and he thought it only fair to read the whole of Colonel French's remarks on the volunteers. He spoke of the conduct of the Queensland Scottish in not turning up at camp, and continued—

"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."

But the report went on to say—

"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."

He thought that was not an unqualified condemnation of the volunteer system. The Commandant looked upon it as a very useful adjunct to their defensive system, and he (Mr. Morgan) thought most men would agree with him; but as a sole line of defence it was utterly inefficient. Now, most undoubtedly personal feeling had

been introduced into the debate. He did not say that any personal animus had been displayed, but feeling had been introduced, and it had given rather an unfortunate tone to the debate on more than one or two occasions. But they had been told frequently since the House met that economy was necessary; that they should cut down expenditure in every direction; and they were asked to give assent to additional taxation. If they wished to economise he held that the vote under discussion gave them a very good opportunity. He thought they might well economise to the extent proposed by the leader of the Opposition without impairing the efficiency of the Defence Force, and he intended to speak in support of the amendment, though he could not vote for it, having paired with an hon. member holding opposite opinions to himself. But he thought and hoped that the amendment would be carried, because he believed they could save £7,000 on that and £2,000 on the following vote, or say £10,000 upon the two votes, without impairing the efficiency of the force. He would vote with great pleasure for the reduction after hearing the Premier say that he proposed to commence reducing by disbanding a number of the volunteer corps. He did not think the colony received anything like a fair return for the money expended on the volunteers. He knew many hon. members would not agree with him, but that was his opinion, and he spoke with some experience. In his opinion there was a vast difference between the services rendered by the Defence Force of the present day and by the purely volunteer force of the old days. Formerly they had bodies of men sufficiently numerous, but badly drilled, and officered by men who knew less about their drill than the men whom they assumed to command; and he thought matters had not very much improved in regard to the volunteers, of late. Quite recently a number of officers went up for examination, and many of them were plucked, and very properly plucked. One gentleman distinguished himself by getting 0·2 per cent. of marks. He did not get a commission; at least he (Mr. Morgan) hoped he did not. Now, what could be expected of bodies of men commanded by such officers as that? Then again, the discipline was extremely lax. It was not as with the centurion of old, who said to his men "Go," and they went; but here it was a case of "Come," and they stood still, and "Go," and "I'll see you damned first." When an order was given, as the Premier had said the other night, there was a show of hands to see whether it should be obeyed or not. At present they had three lines of defence. They had the Permanent Force, the Defence Force, and the volunteers. He did not think the colony could afford to maintain three distinct forces. He thought two was quite as much as they could afford, and he would propose to abolish the least efficient—namely, the volunteers—and maintain the Defence Force as it stood. If they wanted a feeder to that he thought they could find it by providing a sufficient supply of ammunition and arms, and sending them into the country, where they could be used by men who would form themselves into rifle clubs and hold rifle matches. Any fighting they were likely to have to do for years to come would not be of the nature of regular battles, but more of the nature of guerrilla warfare, and the men who could shoot straight would be of the most value. So it was in Africa only a few years ago, when Sir George Colley led his trained men against men who were untrained, as far as drill was concerned—the Boers—but who got the best of it simply because they shot straight. Therefore greater encouragement should be given to rifle clubs. He



admitted that the Government had done something to encourage rifle-shooting, but they had not done enough. It was not enough to enable men to practice rifle-shooting at 2d. a shot; ammunition should be placed at the disposal of men willing to qualify themselves for a nominal amount. The proposed reduction was not a very serious matter, and he thought the Government might, even if the vote were reduced, maintain the force at about its present strength. If it were necessary, they might even go to the length of abandoning the encampment for one year; he thought a good deal of money was expended in that way for which there was no adequate return. An hon. member near him said it was the most useful expenditure of the lot, but he doubted that very much. He thought the force tried to achieve too much, but in reality achieved very little indeed. There was a sum of £675 put down for a band. That was a large sum to pay for music, but he supposed it was no use thinking of reducing that, for the simple reason that some men, particularly Scotchmen, could not fight without music. There was one very important matter that had not been referred to by any hon. member. One of the first essentials to effective defence or attack was an adequate supply of arms and ammunition. Major Lyster in his report said, under the sub-heading of "Arms":—

"The stock of rifles is totally inadequate to the number of men in the force."

He did not know how they were to have an effective Defence Force without arms to arm the men. Possibly they would be sent out with swords and pikes. The report went on to say:—

"I would suggest that, in addition to the actual requirements of the authorised establishment of the force, a reserve stock be obtained and be stored ready for immediate use."

From that it might be inferred that there was no reserve stock. Under the sub-heading "Small-arm ammunition," Major Lyster said:—

"Sufficient has been received for the annual requirements of the forces; but, in addition to the annual indent, I would suggest that a reserve stock of at least 300 rounds per rifle be kept and never drawn on except in case of emergency."

He thought that showed there was an insufficient supply of arms and ammunition. The Commandant also, in reference to the same subject, said on page 3 of his report:—

"The force has increased so much in the last two years that there are now very few Martini rifles in store. With the prospect of the early adoption of a magazine rifle in the regular service, it does not seem desirable to purchase the older weapons if it can be avoided. There are some 900 Snider rifles in store, which could be issued on an emergency. The stock of Martini ammunition is at present low; 400,000 rounds are expected shortly. As, however, the annual expenditure is considerable, it would be well to keep 2,000,000 rounds in stock, as there is such delay in obtaining ammunition when wanted."

Now, 400,000 rounds would be scarcely sufficient for more than one engagement, and after that they might dispense with the celebrated order "to trust in Providence and keep their powder dry," as they would not have any powder to keep dry. The Commandant said there was great delay in getting ammunition from the old country, and that brought him (Mr. Morgan) to a matter upon which he would touch briefly—namely, the establishment of a powder and small-arms factory in Australia. He knew the matter had been considered by the Governments of New South Wales and Victoria, and he trusted that whatever Government might be in power in Queensland when it was proposed to establish such a factory in Australia, the proposal would be favourably entertained. It was a question of very great moment to Australia, and he should like to see it brought to a practical issue before very long, because then the colonies would not be at the mercy of foreign powers to the same extent as now.

The PREMIER said that correspondence had taken place with the Governments of other colonies with reference to a small-arms and ammunition factory, and the Government had expressed their willingness to assist as far as they could in establishing and supporting such a factory, but no definite arrangements had been made up to the present time. Two or three proposals had been made to the Government, and the last communication was from the Government of Queensland to the Governments of the other colonies. As to the quantity of arms in stock, he did not quite understand the reference in Major Lyster's report, though he made himself acquainted from time to time as to the arms and ammunition in stock. It was never the practice, however, to give exact statistics in any country—to tell the enemies of a country how many rifles were in stock—but they had quite enough to arm all the men in the force and a good many more.

The HON. J. M. MACCROSSAN said he had seen that day, in a late English paper, a statement that the English Government had asked the different Australian Governments what contingents they would be able and willing to supply in case of complications in Asia. Had such a request been made to the Queensland Government?

The PREMIER: Where did you see that?

The HON. J. M. MACCROSSAN: I saw it this evening in the Library.

The PREMIER said no such request had been communicated to him; and he thought he might say it was highly improbable that any such request had been made to any Colonial Government.

Mr. McMASTER said that at the commencement of the debate, and even now, his sympathy was with the reduction, but after the able defence made by the Chief Secretary, and also by the member for Enoggera, Mr. Dickson, he had somewhat altered his mind on the question. Two years ago they passed an Act providing for a permanent force; and they had spent a lot of money in furnishing that force with arms and ammunition and other requisites. Now, if they reduced the vote they would have thrown away all the money that had been spent. The Premier said that such a course would interfere with the efficiency of the force, and he (Mr. McMaster) considered it would be a penny-wise-and-pound-foolish policy on their part. The Premier said he would spend only the money the Committee voted, and would reduce what was in his mind the least efficient part of the force, that was the volunteers. He (Mr. McMaster) objected to cut off any of the Volunteer Force. It was only last Sunday morning that the volunteers actually took the city, in a manner. They carried the bridge at Norman's Creek; at least so they were told by the Premier. To his mind, the volunteers ought to be encouraged, and he confessed that if the Committee wished to strike off the Permanent Force he would be with them. But not one single member on the other side, except the hon. member for Mackay, had stated from what item he would like that £7,000 taken away. That hon. gentleman said he would take it out of the Permanent Force; but the Premier said that the Permanent Force did not expend more than £6,000, therefore there would be £1,000 over. A great deal of personality had been introduced into the debate, and Colonel French had come in for a good share. He was not sure that the Commandant did not deserve a good deal of it. His name had been mentioned in connection with Colonel French, but he had no personal animosity against him. He happened to have been in a celebrated battle with him on one occasion—in



the Town Hall; but he might state that the civilians got the better of it. The force that came and stormed the platform were defeated and had to retire. He was certain that there was no vote on the Estimates that was regarded with less favour by the outside public than the one before them. They looked upon it to a great extent as money thrown away, and there was no doubt that the feeling was very much against the Permanent Force, which he attributed to the officers. It had been shown that the officers were trying on all occasions to force a military caste upon the colony. Now, he was glad to see that the people of Queensland were determined to have none of that military caste in the colony. At the same time, he did not say that they ought not to have efficient officers to take charge of their Defence Force and their volunteers as well. He was not at all in love with the Permanent Force, and he did not believe if an enemy landed on their shores to-morrow they would be the men to defend them. He would very much rather trust the volunteers than get behind what was called the Defence Force. He was not a trained volunteer; but he was quite sure that if the Permanent Force was all they had to depend upon, they would soon have to defend themselves and stand in front of them. He had read the whole of the reports carefully—Colonel French's, Major Grieve's, and Major Lyster's. Major Grieve's report was an excellent one. He spoke out straight, and said exactly what he wanted and what he meant, and he said it in very few words. He did not know the gentleman, but he heard a great many people talking about him, and he believed that Major Grieve and Major Lyster were the best men, if not the only good men, in the force. He would not know them if he were to meet them, and did not know even if they were then in the gallery. He inferred what he had said from what he had heard, and public opinion gave a good index of which way the wind blew. He must confess that Colonel French made a very serious statement in his report. He did not know the reason for certain, but the one he ascribed was an ungenerous one. However, he would give what he considered to be the reason. The remark was made for the purpose of catching votes from the North. Speaking of the encampment at Townsville, Colonel French said:—

"On military grounds, I beg to protest against such ultra-centralisation."

In that paragraph Colonel French wanted to "boss" the railways; but he did not suppose the Minister for Works cared one iota whether the colonel protested on military grounds or on any other grounds. He would not get charge of the railways from the present Minister, and it was quite certain he would not have got it from the late Minister for Works. That was thrown out as a strong grievance for the North—that they could not get a special train to take them to their encampment; but, strange to say, the officer in charge of the encampment, Major Haldane, complimented the Railway Department on the facilities offered for taking men there. Colonel French said that he had to send 700 miles to get a special train, and how to make that statement agree with Major Haldane's, he did not know; but he supposed the colonel would be able to explain. He (Mr. McMaster) could not see his way clear to vote for the amendment, although he would like to reduce the vote one way or another. He would like to reduce it by cutting off the Defence Force.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: By how much?

Mr. McMASTER said the Premier told them distinctly that he would not do away with the Permanent Force, and he did not suppose the

hon. gentleman could do so. He presumed that the House only could do away with the Permanent Force. The House passed a Bill for the establishment of a Defence Force, and they sanctioned the Permanent Force, and no Government could do away with it without asking the House. He thought the volunteers were rather the better of the two branches of the force, and he would rather cut off the Defence Force. A good deal was said on Friday night about the Scottish corps not going to the encampment, and he regretted very much that they did not go. He did not know who was at fault; but it was to be regretted that the officers in charge of the corps had not made themselves efficient for the positions they held, and that there was no person to tell them they were not competent to take charge of it. As he stated the other night, he believed that if the enemy came it would be the Scotchmen and Irishmen who would be put in front to meet them. He therefore hoped that the officers in command of the Scottish corps would make themselves efficient so as to be able to take their position properly, and not give any opportunity to persons to say that they were not capable of taking charge of their force. He did not think it necessary for him to say any more on that subject. He hoped, for the reason he had stated, that the vote would be carried—for the reason that they had already spent a large sum of money for defence purposes, and they could not afford to throw that away. If they were going to keep a defence force to defend their cities they must expend money; and, as the Premier had pointed out, if the Permanent Force was done away with, they would have to expend a considerable sum, probably as much as that vote, to keep their arms in good order. The hon. member for Aubigny, Mr. Campbell, had made some remarks about Colonel Adams and his uniform. He (Mr. McMaster) could inform the hon. member that the colonel was an old soldier and an old officer, and paid for his uniform, so that it did not cost the country a single penny. He would rather see those old officers and soldiers who had seen hard and active service drilling their volunteers than men who had simply learnt their drill by theory. He remembered that on the ship in which he came to the colony, about thirty years ago, every man became a volunteer. Every man was furnished with a musket and cutlass, and there was an old soldier on board who drilled them twice a week on deck. The voyage occupied about three months, and by that time the men had become very active. They came out during the Crimean war; no one attacked them, and they arrived safely. Hon. members might laugh at that, but he repeated that no one attacked them, and they got here safely. He would, however, tell hon. members what did take place. A few days before they sighted the coast of Australia a very smart-looking vessel came close upon their track. The captain asked her what was her name, but she refused to give it. Although she came pretty close she went by without giving her name. The captain did not believe that she wished to put anything on board for their comfort, and had all the men mustered on deck, and showed that if there was any fighting to be done there were men on board to do it. Nearly all of them were Scotchmen. Something had been said about music, and it had been stated that they were spending a lot of money for music. An hon. member, he believed it was his colleague, interjected something about bagpipes. He (Mr. McMaster) believed that very few soldiers cared to go into battle without music. The hon. member spoke in a sneering way about the bagpipes. He (Mr. McMaster) would point out to him that the pipes of the Scottish corps

cost the country nothing, as the persons who took a delight in the bagpipes—himself amongst the number—paid the pipers. He did not think any hon. member would object to hear the bagpipes provided they were a little distance off. There were many things connected with the volunteers and the Defence Force with which hon. members on the other side and also on his side of the Committee found fault. It was said that the force was very expensive. No doubt it was, but there was a large amount of money spent on volunteer corps, and on some of those that had joined the Defence Force, which came from the general public. Therefore, those hon. members had very little to complain of. He thought, as he had said before, that they would be unwise in cutting down that vote. Further on in the Estimates he would be prepared to reduce other expenditure, if possible, to the amount of the £50,000 that they were told the revenue would be deficient in, but he did not think the present was a proper vote in which to make the reduction. He had therefore made up his mind to vote against the amendment of the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MOREHEAD said the hon. gentleman had stated that he had made up his mind to vote against the amendment. He could only say that it took the hon. member a great deal longer to make up his mind than to alter it, because if there was one hon. member of that Committee who had asked him to move in that matter, it was the hon. member for Fortitude Valley. If there was one member who had expressed his desire that that expenditure should be reduced it was the hon. member, and hon. members on that side of the Committee and also on the other side knew that as well as he (Mr. Morehead) did. The hon. member said he was quite prepared to accept a general reduction, and not go into any particulars, and believed that was a proper policy for any members opposed to a vote of that kind to adopt. The hon. member now stated that he would vote for the amount as it stood on the Estimates, as he would not like to see the volunteers cut off; he would cut off the head, while the Premier would cut off the tail of the force. That appeared to be his view that evening, and if any member could be induced to move a reduction in the Permanent Force he would vote for their reduction; in other words, he would vote that the Permanent Force should be done away with. He (Mr. Morehead) had stated, as every member on that side of the Committee knew, and some on the other side also, that there was no intention on his part to suggest in any way on what the reduction should be made; but he proposed the reduction for purely financial reasons, and with the belief that the money voted for the purpose of the Defence Force could be very materially reduced. One of the strongest advocates for that course was the hon. member for Fortitude Valley, Mr. McMaster. Yet the hon. member now got up—he (Mr. Morehead) supposed he had been called back to his allegiance—and stated that he would oppose the amendment, and that one of his reasons for voting for the sum as it stood was, that there were only two good men in the Permanent Force—Major Lyster and Major Grieve.

Mr. McMASTER : I did not say so.

Mr. MOREHEAD said the hon. member stated that those two officers were the only two good men in the force, and that he had never seen them. Those were his own words. Whether they would be benefited by knowing the hon. gentleman he could not say, but the hon. member seemed to have a great admiration for the two majors of the Permanent Force. He had given the Committee a wonderful account of his

almost conflict with a stranger who did not give his name, and had not done so up to the present time. It was quite possible that, seeing the face of the hon. member—he might almost call him the gallant member—over the bulwarks, the vessel sheered off. It appeared to him, from what the hon. gentleman had stated, that they need not have gone to England for a commander-in-chief. All the hon. gentleman wanted was a pair of bagpipes—no, a set of bagpipes—in order that he might make a dreadful noise; and that, coupled with his appearance, would be sufficient to terrify any enemy and make him run away. The hon. member would evidently be invaluable for that purpose, and after what had fallen from the hon. member he was sure he would be content to act without requiring any pay from the State, and all that would be necessary would be to provide him with bagpipes and abolish the whole of that vote. Possibly that was the hon. member's view when he had stated to him that he would be in favour of any motion brought on to reduce the vote. The hon. member certainly said so, and if any member was pledged to the reduction the hon. member for Fortitude Valley was. The hon. member had given no reason for altering his mind as he had done. Possibly he was rather alarmed at the action of his colleague, with whom he hoped to run in couple at a future election for the Valley, and he thought he might imperil his chance of election if he did not alter his mind. The hon. member appeared to some extent afraid of the position he took up no later than Friday night last, and though he had altered his views he had given no reason for such alteration.

Mr. McMASTER said he had remarked before that a good deal of personality had crept into the debate. What annoyed the leader of the Opposition was that he found he (Mr. McMaster) was not such a tyro as he took him to be, and he found now he was not to be caught with chaff. The hon. member had said he (Mr. McMaster) had pledged himself to reduce the vote. He did nothing of the kind. He had frequently said, and he said again that night, that he would like to reduce it, but he had given his reason for changing his views. He had said he was induced to change his views by the speeches of the Premier and of the hon. member for Enoggera, the late Treasurer, which tended to show that the vote had been reduced as much as it possibly could be reduced. It was no discredit to an hon. member to say that after he had listened to a debate for two nights in that Committee he was induced to change his opinion. He had never made a definite promise that he would reduce the vote. The first time he heard of it was when the hon. gentleman asked him what was to be done with the Defence Force vote, and he said he would like to see it reduced. The hon. gentleman always approached him on the subject, and he had never approached the hon. gentleman on the subject. The first time the hon. gentleman spoke to him about it was in Fortitude Valley shortly after he had come out from home. The other evening, going into the Refreshment Rooms, the hon. gentleman told him he was going to move the reduction of the vote by a lump sum, and he told him he thought that the best way to deal with it. He admitted that, but having heard the speeches of the Premier and the hon. member for Enoggera he thought it was no discredit to him to say he was convinced he would be doing wrong by voting for the amendment. As to the hon. gentleman's sneers at his gallantry, he was not sure that he would not stand fire as well as the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MOREHEAD said that what the hon. member said exactly bore out what he had said himself.

Mr. McMASTER: You always approached me in the matter.

Mr. MOREHEAD said that was not so. It was quite evident from the hon. gentleman's own statement of the remark he made to him on going down to the Refreshment Rooms, and the hon. member's reply that that was the best way in which to deal with it, that what he had said was correct, and to any reasonable man that statement would indicate that there had been further communications between them before it came to that, and so there had been many.

Mr. McMASTER said certainly there were. He was walking along Wickham street one morning when his name was called out, a buggy pulled up opposite him, and the leader of the Opposition complimented him upon something he had done, which the hon. gentleman seemed to regard as a snub for Colonel French. The hon. gentleman said at the time, "Wait till the Estimates come on, and we will cut him off." He had more sense than to think they could cut off Colonel French without paying him. The hon. gentleman's own party had engaged Colonel French for a couple of years, and though a couple of hundred pounds were added to his salary, it was in accordance with a promise made to him before he left England. He came out under engagement at £700, with the promise that it would be raised to £900, and the Premier had stated in the House that he was not going to repudiate the action of his predecessor in office, and go back upon the agreement made with Colonel French.

Mr. MOREHEAD said the hon. member was perfectly correct. He had stopped his buggy to congratulate the hon. gentleman upon doing what, belonging to the opposite party, he did not think he would have had the hardihood to do—and that was to beard the officers of the Defence Force. He was not aware that he had said that they would cut off Colonel French's salary when the Estimates came on, though he might have said it; but he certainly did not propose it that night, or on Friday night, though that was exactly what the hon. gentleman proposed.

Mr. MACFARLANE said he did not find fault with the hon. member for Fortitude Valley for changing his mind, but he did find fault with him for detailing a private conversation with another member.

Mr. STEVENS: It was only done in retaliation.

Mr. MACFARLANE said that he was fully under the impression that the hon. member for Fortitude Valley intended to support the reduction. That was understood from conversations with the hon. gentleman, and the leader of the Opposition was not alone in thinking that the hon. member was going to support the reduction. He merely rose to say that he did not approve of the hon. gentleman's repeating a private conversation in the Committee.

Mr. HAMILTON said that some hon. members appeared to think that the reduction of the vote as proposed would annihilate the army, but it had been clearly shown that it need not affect its efficiency in any way if simply extra economy were shown in its administration. It was generally admitted that the volunteers, although they cost less than the other branches of the service, were quite as efficient, and it should be the policy of the Government to encourage the establishment of volunteer corps and rifle clubs in a colony like Queensland. The Premier appeared to think them like chips in porridge—neither good nor bad—but it was a great discouragement to the volunteer corps to think that they should be looked upon with such contempt by the

Premier. The Defence Force, he considered, was also a useful force, and he agreed with the hon. member for Mackay that a reduction might be made by studying a little more economy in the management of the force, and by reducing a portion of the Permanent Force. He would not do away with some of the officers, because he believed them to be efficient and capable. With regard to Colonel French, he might state that he had been speaking about him to an hon. gentleman in the other Chamber, and that gentleman had told him that he had been perfectly astonished to hear the high terms in which Colonel French was spoken of in some of the leading clubs in London by first-class military authorities. Colonel French was, perhaps, not a good diplomatist, because he was more of a soldier than a diplomatist, and no doubt some of his contributions in the House had not tended to make him many friends. They knew very well that military gentlemen generally had not a very warm feeling for volunteers. It was stated by the hon. member for Townsville that, by objecting to the estimate in the way he proposed, they could just as well apply their objection to the Police Force; but it had been so applied. The Police Force was admitted last year not to be overmanned, and since that time the population of the colony had very largely increased, and large centres of population had sprung up where before there was not a soul to be seen, and at the same time the Police Force had not been increased. It seemed rather absurd that while the Government should refuse to reduce the cost of meeting their foreign enemies they had reduced the force required to meet the actual enemies in their midst, and to protect their lives and properties. They had heard, during the debate, of an officer whose uniform alone was worth £80, and in those hard times it was almost worth while to kill such officers for the sake of their uniforms. He had been amused at the manner in which the Premier expressed himself in favour of the Permanent Force being used as guards of honour. No doubt, influenced by the imperialistic ideas with which he had been imbued since his return from England, nothing would be more gratifying to that hon. gentleman than to see half-a-dozen members of the Permanent Force, headed by an £80-uniform officer, walking up and down in front of the Colonial Secretary's office, and the inmate of that establishment having one of those decorations suspended to his neck which were supposed to be worn by those aristocratic friends with whom he associated at home, and which were worn in the colony by the "King Billies." As to the efficiency of the officers of the Defence Force, he heard about one of them the other day. Mr. Drake, the gentleman who so ably contested the Enoggera electorate in the interests of the Government, went up for examination as an officer. He had studied military law and was well up in it. One of the questions put to him was, "What is the course of procedure at courts-martial?" Officers on the staff might be well up in such questions, but Mr. Drake had never sat on a court-martial; he was not up on the subject; and that was one of the questions on which he was plucked. They might as well pluck a candidate for parliamentary honours because he was not well up in the Standing Orders of the House. The Premier stated that one of the uses of the Permanent Force was to keep the arms in good condition. The only arms which he (Mr. Hamilton) had had an opportunity of examining were the two large and expensive guns on board the steamer "Otter," and they were both in a disgraceful state outwardly; and one or two of the members of the Opposition who were present, and who looked down the barrels, stated that inspection

proved them to be rusting. That was how the arms were kept by the Permanent Force. The reduction asked for was not a large one, and at the present time, when they were dismissing officers from the Civil Service, not on account of their inefficiency, but solely on account of the state of the finances, there could surely be no objection to reducing the vote by the sum proposed.

Mr. JESSOP said he was not actuated by any feelings of hostility towards Colonel French. He looked at the system generally, and he was of opinion that the expenditure upon it was much too great. The volunteer system, if properly carried out, would be a great improvement upon the present one. If volunteers were properly drilled, and taught how to shoot, they would be much more useful than the Defence Force. He would also like to see the police receive a military training; it would add greatly to their usefulness in the event of war, or a riot, or any disturbance breaking out. If they were trained to the use of arms and properly drilled they would be all that the colony at present required.

The PREMIER: But what would you do for police protection?

Mr. JESSOP: That could be met by increasing the force.

The PREMIER: It would cost a great deal more than the present system.

Mr. JESSOP said another thing he wished to refer to was the way in which country corps were not drilled. All the drilling seemed to take place at Brisbane. In many country places they had been forced to almost abandon volunteering, simply because they could not get drill-instructors. If a country district went to the expense and trouble of forming a company, surely the least they could expect from the Government was to afford them instruction in drill. There was no drill-instructor at Dalby, and he believed it was the same at Roma and Toowoomba.

The PREMIER: There is an instructor at Toowoomba.

Mr. JESSOP said he knew there was not one at Dalby, and he had heard the same complaint from other places. Without drill it was impossible for volunteers to become efficient. Then they were supposed to have rifle butts. It was two years since he drove Major Des Vœux out, at Dalby, and showed him the place which had been granted by the Government, and surveyed for the purpose; and that was the last they had heard of it. Up to the present time there was no such thing there as a rifle range. What was the consequence? The volunteers could not come down to the encampment because they were not able, from want of drill, to compete with the metropolitan companies; and they could not compete for prizes, because they had never had an opportunity of learning how to shoot. That was unfair, and it was one of the reasons why the defence system should be reorganised. The only thing that would induce young men to join the force was that they might be able to shoot for prizes, and also be skilful marksmen if ever they should be called out for active service. The cost of the force might be materially lessened, and he should like to have seen the leader of the Opposition move for a greater reduction. He should vote for the amendment.

The PREMIER said he should like to say one word. The hon. member for Dalby, like many others who had spoken, had pointed out a number of defects in the system. The Government admitted them all, but they were all owing to want of money. How were they to provide

additional rifle ranges and additional instructors without money? The remedy the hon. member proposed was to reduce the amount of money available, and that had been the argument all through. The hon. member for Aubigny said they had no drill-instructor at Toowoomba. They could not afford to pay drill-instructors heavy salaries; they were obliged to do the best they could by paying them small salaries, and getting them something else to do. The drill-instructor sent to Toowoomba said he could not live on the small amount of his salary, and took service in the gaol as a warder. Until arrangements were made to allow him to combine the duties of warder of the gaol and of drill-instructor, it necessitated the suspension of his duties as drill-instructor. That was where the difficulty came in. The force was starved at the present time. There was not enough money to carry it on as efficiently as it ought to be; but the Government were endeavouring to carry it on as efficiently as possible with the money they had. If hon. members insisted on reducing it still further, they must be prepared for the natural consequence.

Mr. JESSOP said his contention was that the young men in the country had as much right to be instructed and drilled as those in the metropolis.

The PREMIER: And no more.

Mr. JESSOP said he did not ask for any more; he only asked that they should have a share, and they did not get that share. When young men were induced to join those companies, they were told, "You will be drilled; you will be taught to shoot; you will have rifle butts and a rifle; you will have your ammunition at a cheap rate, so that you will be able to compete for prizes at the shooting matches." But what was the result?

The PREMIER: Parliament comes in and says, "You shall not have the money to do it."

Mr. JESSOP: All those necessities or luxuries were found for the metropolitan companies, but the country companies were left out in the cold. Those young men were got to join on false pretences. If the Premier had to cut off some of the volunteers, let him cut off all the country companies—

The PREMIER: We shall have to do it.

Mr. JESSOP: And let the metropolitan companies be nursed and pampered; but do not let the young men in the country be induced to join and go through the drill, and learn the "goose step," to be afterwards deprived of the privileges that the other young men had.

Mr. BUCKLAND said a great deal had been said of the arbitrary and despotic conduct of Colonel French and the officers under him. He need not refer again to the celebrated battle of the Town Hall or any other battle that might have been fought, interfering with the privileges of the citizens, but he had a grievance which he thought might properly be brought before the Committee at that time. He referred to the way the inhabitants of Lytton had been treated over their water supply. During the late drought the divisional board borrowed a sum of money from the Government for the purpose of procuring permanent water, which at that time was very difficult indeed to obtain; in fact, they had to travel at least two or three miles to get sufficient water for domestic purposes. After sinking a well for upwards of twenty feet they obtained a permanent supply of water—he believed with the sanction of the Government—in the Government reserves.

The PREMIER: Who sank the well?

Mr. BUCKLAND said the divisional board sank it, timbered it, and erected a pump. Since then the Defence Force had taken possession of the well, taken down the pump and erected a windmill in its place; and during the encampment they effectually prevented the inhabitants from getting enough water for domestic purposes. More than that, they had erected platforms for rifle practice in such a position that it was dangerous while practice was going on for people to go to the well for water. More than that, the pipe which connected the pump with the water had been riddled by bullet-holes, which was a proof that it was dangerous for the inhabitants to attempt to get water there. He referred to that more particularly to show that a military caste was growing up amongst them, which was very undesirable in a democratic country such as Queensland. He had lived for some years in England in the neighbourhood of a military settlement, and knew exactly the despotic way in which those gentlemen liked to carry on. He hoped that the debates on the vote, which Colonel French and his officers had listened to, would do them a great deal of good, and that they would have no more of those tactics which had been referred to. He would refer to another matter which showed the despotic way in which those gentlemen would carry on if they were allowed. It was a letter which appeared in the *Telegraph* of last evening, headed "Defence Force Fence-breaking":—

"TO THE EDITOR.—Sir,—I wish to ask if the Queensland Defence Force have the right to use the people's fences. On Saturday, the 24th instant, we had a detachment out our way, and although the damage done is not much, repetitions of breaking down some of the palings and burning a few would, as you can understand, become annoying and expensive. The fence in question faces the Logan road, and I fancy is a very convenient one for the horses to be tied to.—Yours, etc., WOOLLONGABBA."

He only brought up those instances of despotism because he was anxious that the gentlemen concerned should take warning by the debates which occurred upon that vote. Like a good many other hon. members, he was at first inclined to vote for the amendment, and he certainly would have done so but for the arguments he had heard during the course of the debate. He now intended to support the original vote.

The PREMIER said the hon. member had referred to two matters of which he desired an explanation. He (the Premier) would take the last one first. Last Saturday evening there was a sham fight on the other side of the river, and some palings were pulled off a fence. The very patriotic owner of the fence complained of the injury done to him, and it was given as an illustration of the despotic character of the military force. Now, he thought that was about the most unpatriotic person he ever heard of. How could a sham fight be carried on unless horses were tied up? As a matter of fact, a few horses belonging to the mounted infantry were tied up to a fence, and being alarmed by a sudden attack on the other side, they broke away, and pulled down a few palings. The total damage done to the fence was estimated at 20s. by the owner of the fence, and that amount would be paid if it were claimed.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Have you the 20s.?

The PREMIER: If hon. members would not give the Government the money, of course the unfortunate owner would have to suffer. The other instance of the despotic character of a military force was this: For the last five-and-twenty years the people at Lytton had no regular water supply. About a year and a-half ago the Defence Force, when encamped down there, sunk for water and found it in two places; and during all the dry season the supply of water

from those wells had been of great assistance to the people of the district, and had saved a large number of stock from perishing. Then the divisional board asked permission to sink a third well on the military reserve—which was necessarily a reserve, because they could not have people living all round about fortifications—and were allowed to do so. They now asked for the land as a reserve—to place a fence right in the line of fire on the rifle range. Hon. members would remember that not very long ago there were complaints about having the rifle range near town. It was removed from Victoria Park as they could not keep it there, and they made the best arrangement they could at Toowong. That, however, was a range of limited length, and they were told that if they wanted a longer range they must go to Lytton or somewhere else. They went to Lytton and made a range there. A range involved a place to fire from and targets, which, of course, must be a certain distance apart. Then the divisional board wanted to make a fence right in the line of fire, which would be absolutely dangerous, and the Government, of course, did not consent to it. The wells were open to them except when firing was going on, and so long as he had charge of matters of that kind he should not allow a reserve to be fenced off in the middle of a rifle range, which would be absolutely dangerous from the risk of shots glancing off. It would render the reformatory there almost uninhabitable. That was the history of the matter, and he was quite prepared to take the responsibility of it. He should never hesitate in a case of that kind, when he considered the request was unreasonable, and he was prepared to say that it should not be granted.

Mr. BUCKLAND said he had forgotten to mention that the Defence Force had two wells within about seventy yards of the one sunk by the divisional board, which was the one the people preferred to use. Therefore the people of Lytton considered they had a grievance. Then, again, they had erected a pump which had been taken down and removed at the instance, he believed, of Colonel Adams. That was the gentleman, he believed, who, during his late visit to London, drove about in a cab for two or three days trying to get an introduction to the Prince of Wales in all the glory of his uniform. He believed he failed in his object.

The Hon. G. THORN said he did not think he should have risen had it not been for the remarks of the last speaker. He was very much astonished to hear that hon. member speak as he had done. He had always been under the impression that the hon. member was a Liberal, or a Radical, but he appeared to be an advocate of the most autocratic form of government—a form of government which was only equalled by the Government of Russia. No doubt that was using strong words, but it was true. With regard to the question, he had stated, when the House was in Committee of Ways and Means, that he would be prepared to vote for the extinction of that vote—of the whole £50,000; and since then he had seen no reason to alter his opinion. He would have preferred to have gone for the elimination of the whole vote, but the leader of the Opposition was afraid that he could not carry it, and had proposed only a substantial reduction, which he (Mr. Thorn) would support. He only regretted that the hon. member had not gone for a larger reduction, because he considered that if there was one time more than another when they should go in for strict economy it was the present. And he held that the pruning-knife could be used on the Defence Force and Volunteer Force estimates without any injury whatever to the public interests. He maintained that the volunteer system was superior to the

Defence Force and the Permanent Force. He remembered the early days of the colony, when the volunteers were the only defence force they had. He was a member of that force.

The PREMIER: What rank did you hold?

The HON. G. THORN said there were a great many companies in the colony at that time. In fact, at the sham fights and reviews held at Brisbane and Ipswich as many men went into camp as went down to the encampment last year. He remembered that when they were encamped between the One-mile and the Three-mile Creeks, on the Toowoomba road, over 1,000 men stormed Ipswich.

Mr. FOXTON: I was there.

The HON. G. THORN: The hon. member was not a volunteer; he was only a youngster then. At that time the volunteers were a very efficient and capable body.

The PREMIER: What became of them?

The HON. G. THORN said he would tell the hon. gentleman presently. The force was then very efficient and popular. He held that it was just as necessary that a commander should be popular as that he should be competent. With popular capable commanders the Volunteer Force would be infinitely superior to the Defence Force—like "A" company or regiment in Brisbane, which was superior to many of the Defence companies at the present time. He could also say that some of the Scottish regiments would compare favourably with the Defence Force. He had nothing to say against the present Commandant, or any of the officers of the Defence Force, and only hoped that they would endeavour to foster the volunteering spirit in the colony. Under that system they would not have to pay to anything like the extent they had for the Defence Force. He would now tell the Premier what had led to the decline of the Volunteer Force formerly. It was the issue of land-order warrants to the men. That thoroughly demoralised them in the same way that the payment to the present Defence Force demoralised them. He had read in a newspaper the other day of a very small number of the Defence Force attending drill—five on one occasion. That did not prove that the Defence Force was a success, but rather that it was not a success. In his day, twenty years ago, there were nearly always as many as sixty and seventy volunteers on parade belonging to one company, and why should not those days come back again when they had a thoroughly good efficient Volunteer Force in the colony? They would be the nucleus of a good defence. At present, in the event of a war scare taking place, the force was perfectly useless. He had interests in the Northern and Central divisions of the colony, and he held that so far as the protection of those portions of the colony was concerned they might as well pitch the money now asked to be voted into the sea. It would do no good whatever for the Central district unless the coast line of railway was constructed quickly. They had communication on the south now right through to Adelaide by rail, so that in the event of an attack they could get assistance from Sydney; but Townsville and other northern ports were comparatively helpless, and would be so until the coast railway was completed. Then the ports could render assistance to each other. He hoped the amendment of the hon. member for Balonne would be carried, because it was the thin end of the wedge, although he would have preferred to see the whole vote eliminated. He thought it would be a very good thing for the Committee to take a stand upon the question, and go back to the good old days when they had an efficient Volun-

teer Force—a Volunteer Force pure and simple, which was far superior in all branches, artillery, infantry, and cavalry—they had cavalry in those days—than the present force. Let them have good arms, the best weapons, lots of ammunition, and they would get along swimmingly.

Mr. WHITE said he was rather pleased to see the hon. member for Fassifern had at last taken up his place on the right side of the Committee. He had been endeavouring to see matters in such a light that he might vote against the amendment, but he failed to see it in that way. He could not help noticing the small amount of pay the real workers of the force received. There were twenty drill-sergeants, and he presumed they received from £60 to £150 a year. The Premier had stated that the force was starved, but he could not say that the Commandant was, at all events, as his salary was equivalent to the pay of twenty drill-sergeants. He thought that such men should be encouraged. Those were the men they wanted to go into the country and instruct the natives in the use of arms, and yet they were starved out. He hoped that before long a better state of things would prevail, but at present he could not see his way to support the original motion.

Mr. STEVENSON said he believed they had pretty well got to the end of the debate, and before it closed he wanted to say a word in regard to what had fallen from several hon. members on both sides of the Committee in regard to personal feeling having been introduced into the debate. He could not understand why hon. members should think that members who opposed the vote were actuated by personal feeling. He could understand the accusation coming from some hon. members, but coming from others he was surprised at it. The hon. member for Barcoo and the hon. member for Gregory had accused those who differed from them with having a personal dislike for Colonel French. If members who differed from the Government were to be accused of having personal motives, and if they were bound to accept the assurances of the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government, then they might just as well pass the Estimates *in globo* and not go to the trouble of discussing them. If hon. members went on those grounds he saw no use in wasting time in discussion. Some of the remarks which had been made, no doubt, were meant to apply to him, at least so people outside would think, because there had been a little friction between himself, as commanding the Queensland Scottish, and the Commandant; but he did not think there was anything personal in the matter. As far as he was concerned there was nothing personal. He had no personal dislike to Colonel French or any other officer of the Permanent Force, and he hoped the same feeling existed on their side. The friction had been entirely official, and he hoped it would never become personal. He therefore did not see why hon. members on the other side should accuse those who differed from the Government with having personal dislike to Colonel French. He knew, of course, that certain matters had been brought up about Colonel French and a meeting in the Town Hall, but those things he knew nothing about. He simply spoke as a volunteer, and the only fault he had to find with Colonel French was that he did not give that encouragement to volunteering that he might have done, and that, in a certain manner, he had discouraged it. He hoped hon. members who had made the accusation of personal feeling having been introduced would withdraw what they had said.

Mr. MURPHY said he was sorry that the hon. member for Normanby misunderstood his remarks. Perhaps it was his own fault for not having expressed himself properly. When refer-

ring to personal dislike to Colonel French, he certainly only meant that to apply to him in his official capacity; that the hon. members considered him a bad administrator, and that, because his administration was bad, they were trying to punish him by reducing the estimate. He still held that opinion, but he should be sorry to think that hon. members should misunderstand what he had said, and think that he would impute anything in the shape of personal dislike to Colonel French to them.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said he was one of those who might be charged with having imputed personal motives, although he had not the least intention of doing anything of the kind to the hon. member for Normanby. The people he referred to were the intense civilians who made such a fuss at the meeting in the Town Hall. He was inclined to agree with the hon. member for Normanby that Colonel French might have given more encouragement to volunteering than he had done, and he hoped in the future he would remedy that defect in his administration, but he did not see that cutting off £7,000 from the vote would assist the Commandant or help the Government to give additional encouragement to the volunteers. He looked upon the volunteers as a vital part of their defence system. He thoroughly believed in the volunteers; but, at the same time, he was perfectly free to admit that they must have a number of regulars and trained experts at their head to instruct them and lead them on. He hoped that increased cordiality between the two branches of the service would be the result of the debate which had taken place.

Mr. MOREHEAD said, referring to personalities, and speaking entirely for himself, he wished to say that he intended to express his opinion with regard to the qualifications, salaries, and positions of any men whose names were on the Estimates, whether his remarks were deemed personal by hon. members or not. He considered that to be his duty, and he did not care two straws what opinion was formed as to what he said.

Mr. WAKEFIELD said he was going to support the vote as it stood, because so much capital had been invested in the Defence Force, that it would be false economy to reduce the amount. He thought that the volunteers should be encouraged, because even if the Government paid them they had to find a much larger sum themselves. The payment they received from the Government did not cover the time and labour they gave in attending drill. There was one redeeming feature—namely, that the vote was not an increase on the amount voted last year; and he would like to see a Bill brought in providing that the present vote should not be exceeded till 1890. That would be treating the Defence Force the same as municipalities and divisional boards had been treated. There was no doubt that the Commandant had been indiscreet in many matters; but he was new to the colonies, and must be taught that Queensland was a free colony, and Queenslanders would not have their freedom interfered with. No doubt when he got accustomed to the ways of Queensland residents he would fall in with their views.

Mr. ADAMS said he supposed the two defective guns at Lytton represented part of the capital invested in the Defence Force. He had not intended to say anything on the question till the Premier said he was going to make the vote a party question, and that the volunteers had been a total failure; but now he thought it would not be justice on his part if he did not say a word or two on behalf of the volunteers in his own district. They had certainly received very little encouragement.

The drill-instructor had done his work without any remuneration for over six years; and last year when he (Mr. Adams) asked that a piece of land should be set apart for a drill-shed at Bundaberg his request was not granted. The moment the hon. member for Stanley, Mr. White, suggested that the reduction should be applied to the Permanent Force the Premier objected, and said it would be applied to the volunteers in the country districts. He did not know that the Premier—or even Colonel French—knew whether the volunteers in the country districts were efficient or not. He had known Colonel French to go to inspect volunteers, and go away again after remaining there an hour; but he thought it would take more than an hour to ascertain whether a corps was efficient or not. He believed that there were a great many gentlemen who had been volunteers who were quite able to teach the young men of the colony their drill; and that opinion was held by a good many people outside. It was rather remarkable that the hon. member for Cook, Mr. Hill, should twit members who opposed the vote with trying to embarrass the Government, seeing that the hon. member himself had done more than any other hon. member to embarrass the Government. He could not see how they were trying to embarrass the Government when they were simply trying to do their duty. Even the Permanent Force was not efficient at the present time, and the Premier admitted that it was not. The hon. gentleman said there were not enough men; and if the colony could not afford to pay any more, he thought the vote might very well be reduced. It had been said that the Commandant was engaged by Sir Thomas McIlwraith; but it must be remembered that he was engaged at £700 a year, and that he had been in the colony only a few years when £200 was tacked on to his salary. Now he received £900 a year salary, £100 for forage, and quarters valued at £130, making a total of £1,130 a year. Besides that, his expenses were paid wherever he went, so that he was paid nearer £2,000 a year than £1,000 a year. The brigade-major had only £500 a year—namely, £400 for salary, £50 for forage, and £50 for rent allowance. He believed that Major Lyster was a most efficient officer, and he did not see why his salary should be only one-half of that of his superior officer. They might as well take some off Colonel French's salary and add it to Major Lyster's, and even then the vote could be reduced. If the volunteers were properly encouraged there were plenty of young men who would join; and as soon as the railways in different parts of the colony were completed, sufficient volunteers could be got together at any time to repel any attack that might be made on the colony. He did not think that anyone would attack Queensland for many a day, and if they did it would be the capital they would go to, and not the outside districts. From what he had heard and seen, if they encouraged the volunteers they would soon have an efficient force, and for far less money than they were paying at present.

Question—That the sum of £30,000 only be granted—put, and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 21.

Messrs. Morehead, Norton, Macrossan, Thorn, Jessop, Hamilton, Foote, Salkeld, McWhannell, Adams, Lalor, Philp, Black, Stevenson, Pattison, Nelson, White, Kates, Ferguson, Macfarlane, and Campbell.

NOES, 22.

Sir S. W. Griffith, Messrs. Jordan, Dutton, Moreton, Stevens, S. W. Brooks, Groom, Lumley Hill, Kellett, Ruckland, Isambert, Wakefield, Higson, W. Brookes, Mellor, McMaster, Sheridan, Dickson, Foxton, Aland, Allan, and Wallace.

Question resolved in the negative.

Pairs :—For the amendment: Messrs. Morgan and Donaldson. Against the amendment: Messrs. Murphy and Brown.

Question—That the sum of £37,746 be granted—put.

Mr. BLACK said he was not quite aware whether the division which had just been taken prevented them from discussing in detail many of the items in that very large amount. At all events he did not think members should be prevented from getting information on some items in the vote. He would like to get some information respecting one or two matters, but would first ask for the ruling of the Chairman as to whether they would be in order in discussing the items.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member can discuss any item in the vote, but he cannot move the omission of any item.

Mr. BLACK said he found that last year there was a sum of £37,878 voted for the land force, and that only £35,536 was spent; so that £2,342 more was voted than was actually required. He would like to know on what vote that saving was effected last year, so that they might be able to ascertain whether some of the items they were asked to vote now were not in excess of what was actually required.

The PREMIER said he explained in moving that vote that the actual expenditure was £37,433. Of course the amount actually expended in any year varied according as the accounts came in before or after the 1st of July. The sum of £37,433 was the amount spent, exclusive of accounts outstanding.

Mr. BLACK said the item set down in that vote for incidentals, forage, lodging and travelling allowances, repairs, and contingencies was £2,500. How much was spent last year for those purposes, and in what way had it been spent?

The PREMIER said he was not prepared to give the details, but he could tell the hon. member how much had been spent altogether. The vote last year was largely exceeded, the amount expended being £4,400, and the deficiency was made up out of other votes. Hon. members must not, however, forget that a number of drill-sheds had to be provided all over the colony. As he had previously pointed out, there was a saving on the item for pay which was about equal to the excess on contingencies. Of course, although there was an actual saving in the former, the amount saved could not be appropriated for the other item, and the additional expenditure would have to be placed on the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. MACFARLANE said he would like to draw attention to a remark in the Commandant's report in reference to the uniforms. The Commandant there stated that "the vote for this service is never sufficient; the expense of making up in the colony is exactly three times the English rates." That he (Mr. Macfarlane) disputed, and would guarantee to get the uniforms made up in Queensland at a cheaper rate than in England.

The PREMIER: I should be very glad if you could. We called for tenders and accepted the lowest.

Mr. MACFARLANE said the next remark was that "there is never a stock of clothing on hand to allow of uniforms being made up in quantity and kept in stock." There was no occasion for that. Clothes could be supplied here within two months from the date of the order in any quantity required. They could make goods in the Ipswich factory just as cheap and just as good as those obtained from England, only they had not the dye required. The cloth

was pure and warm and light in texture. He knew, perhaps, as much about the quality of the cloth as the Commandant, or any of those connected with him. He did not say that because he was handling clothing now, but because he was brought up in a clothing factory. Although all of them might not seem to have the same finish, they would wear better and be more comfortable than the English clothes, and quite as cheap.

The PREMIER said he wished they could get the clothes made here at English rates. They called for tenders, but really there was such a great difference that it was a matter for consideration whether they should get them made in the colony at all; it was so much cheaper to obtain them from England. He did not see why the Ipswich factory could not get proper dyes. He had no desire to go abroad to buy clothing, but unfortunately the dyes of the Ipswich factory did not stand. He had no doubt, however, that they could get over that difficulty. As far as he was concerned, he would be only too glad to have the clothing made in the colony.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he would like to know whether the soldiers could not fit themselves to the colour of the Ipswich tweeds. He did not think that it was a matter of particular importance in what colour of cloth the gallant men appeared. He believed the Ipswich tweeds were very much better than anything of the kind obtained from the old country; but why the matter of dyes should come into consideration he did not know, because he supposed the men were prepared to die themselves.

Question put and passed.

The PREMIER said he did not propose to go on with the next vote as he believed there was something to be said upon it, but he would point out that they must make some progress with the Estimates or get another Appropriation Bill. He 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 the Committee obtained leave to sit again to-morrow.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

##### REVISION COURT FOR BLOOMFIELD.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that this House do now adjourn. We propose to go into committee on the Electoral Districts Bill to-morrow.

Mr. HAMILTON said: Mr. Speaker,—I take this opportunity of bringing a matter under the notice of the Premier. I have had a wire requesting me to endeavour to obtain a revision court at Bloomfield. Bloomfield is about forty-five or fifty miles from Cooktown, and has a population of 800 or 900 souls, and I think it is only fair they should have an opportunity of getting their names on the roll by the establishment of a revision court there. I have also received wires from Croydon to the effect that there are no electoral papers on that field, and they do not expect any for eight or ten days. The revision court will be held there in a few days, and unless they have some opportunity of obtaining these papers a great many of the people there will be disfranchised; and I would therefore suggest to the Premier that he might authorise some of the papers there to print the necessary electoral papers so that the men there may be able to get their names on the roll.

The PREMIER: I will take the matter into consideration to-morrow.

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at a quarter-past 10 o'clock.