

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 11 OCTOBER 1899

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

WEDNESDAY, 11 OCTOBER, 1899.

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

PAPER.

The following paper, laid on the table, was ordered to be printed:—

Loan Appropriations and Expenditure to 30th June, 1899.

QUESTIONS.

INSPECTOR OF TOTALISATORS.

Mr. TURLEY (*Brisbane South*) asked the Home Secretary—

Did the Public Service Board, in accordance with section 36 of the Public Service Act of 1896, certify that there was no person in the service available and qualified to fill the position of inspector of totalisators?

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. F. G. Foxton, *Carnarvon*) replied—

An inspector of totalisators was appointed by the Department of Justice for twelve months from the 1st of April last, the necessity for such an appointment having been brought under the notice of the Minister by the Under Secretary of that Department. On the recommendation of the Public Service Board the officer appointed was excepted from the operation of the Public Service Act.

PERMITS FOR TOTALISATOR.

Mr. TURLEY asked the Home Secretary—

1. What was the number of permits granted by the Government to run totalisators during the years 1895-6-7-8-9?

2. To whom were such permits granted?

3. What amount of money passed through the various totalisators during the same years?

The HOME SECRETARY replied—

1. 406.

2. The answer to this question will have to be given in the shape of a return which I am having prepared.

3.—

The year ending 30th June, 1895	...	£156,365	8	6
" " " 1896	...	157,061	13	6
" " " 1897	...	206,351	13	0
" " " 1898	...	209,578	14	0
" " " 1899	...	273,440	18	0

ALLEGED STUFFING OF BALLOT-BOX.

Mr. DAWSON (*Charters Towers*) asked Mr. Mackintosh—

1. Is he correctly reported in *Hansard*, No. 7, page 250?

2. If so, will he state the polling place where 400 votes were actually counted although the roll only provided for 150 legitimate votes?

3. Does he know of his own knowledge, or has he good reason to believe, that such stuffing of the ballot-box actually occurred?

4. If so, will he furnish the House with all the information in his possession?

5. Does he accuse me of stuffing, inducing, influencing, being instrumental in, or in any way responsible for such stuffing of the said ballot-box.

Mr. MACKINTOSH (*Cambooya*) replied—

1. Yes.

2. The statement made to me by the person alluded to in my speech, in the presence of the member for the electorate, and not contradicted by the latter, referred to a polling-place north of Brisbane.

3. I made no statement to the effect that the ballot-box had been stuffed.

4. Answered by the answers to Nos. 2 and 3.

5. As I made no charge that the ballot-box had been stuffed, it follows that I could not have accused the honourable member of an offence which I am not aware was committed.

LEPROSY STATISTICS.

Mr. DAWSON (for Mr. Lesina, *Clermont*) asked the Home Secretary—

1. How many cases of leprosy have been reported to the authorities during the twelve months—30th June, 1898, to 1st July, 1899?

2. Districts from which they came?

3. Nationality of the patients?

The HOME SECRETARY replied—

1. Twenty-two.

2. Ayr, 1; Brisbane, 2; Bundaberg, 1; Cairns, 1; Charleville, 1; Cooktown, 1; Childers, 1; Geraldton, 1; Ingham, 1; Isisford, 1; Mackay, 9; Nambour, 1; Townsville, 1. Total, 22.

3. English, 1; Danish, 1; Queenslander, 1; Aborigines, 2; Chinese, 1; Pacific Islanders, 14. Total, 22.

THE TRANSVAAL CONTINGENT.

The PREMIER (Hon. J. R. Dickson, *Bulimba*) in moving—

That this House renews the assurance of its loyalty and devotion to the Throne and Person of Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen; and as evidence of its sympathy with Her Majesty's subjects in the South African Republic, who have for so long a period suffered burdensome disabilities and grievous injustice, desires to support the determination of Her Majesty's advisers to secure the immediate recognition of British rights in that Republic. This House therefore views with approbation the proposal of the Government to equip, despatch, and maintain a military force volunteering for service with Her Majesty's army in South Africa, consisting of 250 officers, non-commissioned officers, and men of the Queensland Mounted Infantry, together with a machine-gun section of the Queensland Regiment of Royal Australian Artillery—

said: It is with feelings of very great satisfaction, indeed of supreme pleasure that I rise to move the resolution standing in my name, concerning the offer made by the soldiers of Queensland, who have volunteered for service in the Transvaal.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Oh, oh! and laughter.

Mr. FISHER: Blowing your own horn.

The PREMIER: That offer was exceedingly creditable and patriotic to that band of men who, sympathising with their fellow-citizens in their sufferings in the Transvaal—

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Oh, oh! and laughter.

The PREMIER: I say these men, sympathising with their fellow-citizens in their ill-treatment under the harsh administration of the Transvaal Government, have come forward under a true sense of patriotism, not only as soldiers of Queensland, but as soldiers of the Queen, to maintain British supremacy in the Transvaal, which is at present manacled by the inhabitants of the Transvaal.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: I consider that the men who have been accustomed to military service, and who have volunteered for service in the Transvaal, deserve the thanks of the country.

Mr. McDONALD: You have not got 200 yet.

The PREMIER: The hon. member will have an opportunity to deliver himself on the matter hereafter, but I hope that he will not do so in a pessimistic manner, or attempt to show that our soldiers here are not of the same stock and material as those anywhere in the British Empire. I am sure that hon. members will recognise that our soldiers possess the same stamina, the same ardour, and the same patriotism for military service that characterises any other portion of the British dependencies. I have very great satisfaction in recognising the loyal offer made by our soldiers.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: What about the overcoats?

The PREMIER: And, at the present time, I feel that any expression of dissatisfaction that may have arisen is due to an imperfect view of the present position. I may explain we are not contemplating sending the Defence Force of Queensland outside the colony—it is merely aiding and assisting to equip, maintain, and defray a volunteer service in the Transvaal, which will be united with the British army.

Mr. GIVENS: At whose invitation?

The PREMIER: It is not the great number of men that are willing to roll up to the standard—to enlist in the British army—that is its great strength, but I say that a great moral lesson is conveyed by this patriotic offer, which will stand for all time in the history of Queensland, and which shows that Queensland possesses men worthy to be classed as sons of the great British Empire. I wish to prevent the House falling

into any misunderstanding as to the action the Government have taken in this matter. The Government are not compelling, or even inviting, the Defence Force of Queensland to accept service in the Transvaal, or do anything beyond their legitimate duty to the State.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: They were invited in the first instance.

THE PREMIER: No. The volunteers came forward and requested the Commandant to see if the Government would accept their offer.

MR. McDONALD: Why did you not lay those papers on the table?

THE PREMIER: All the papers dealing with the matter have been laid on the table.

MR. McDONALD: No. Where is the letter from the men to the Commandant?

THE PREMIER: This was merely a verbal representation. You might as well ask that the correspondence between the Commandant and myself be laid on the table. All the literary correspondence has been published. The Commandant represented to me, and I had no reason to doubt his *bona fides*, that he had been requested by a large number of volunteers to request the Government to ask the home authorities to accept their offer to serve in the Transvaal, without any conditions.

MR. GLASSEY: Before that, Parliament should have been consulted.

THE PREMIER: We will come to that presently. I say distinctly that the action of these men in asking to be permitted to serve in the Transvaal showed a most praiseworthy and patriotic spirit. The correspondence shows that the offer has been gratifyingly accepted, and that a high compliment has been paid to Queensland by the Imperial authorities in so doing. I think it should be recorded in *Hansard* that a telegram was received on the 11th July from Mr. Chamberlain to this effect:—

Her Majesty's Government highly appreciated the loyal and patriotic offer of Queensland, but hope that no occasion would arise for the service of these men, but if it should they will gladly avail themselves of the offer.

That offer has been accepted in such a form as conveys an honour on Queensland, and the fact that Queensland was the first to volunteer for service to assist the mother country in the Transvaal—to assist her in any emergency that may threaten the Empire—will always be recorded to her credit.

MR. DAWSON: How many volunteers have you got now?

THE PREMIER: Quite sufficient to be despatched, as soon as the vote is taken.

MR. DAWSON: What number?

THE PREMIER: We have offered 250 men and a machine-gun section, making altogether 271 men, and that offer will be fulfilled. In fact the difficulty is to satisfy the aspirations of several men, who have been officers in the Imperial Army and in our Defence Force—and who have offered to proceed with the contingent in any capacity whatsoever, even as private soldiers—I say the difficulty I am in is really to set aside these men's desires with a view to allowing our Defence Force and others, who were the first to volunteer, to come forward and make up the number which was represented as available for the contingent. This comes at an exceedingly proper time. I consider that in connection with the great subject which we have recently discussed—namely, the great subject of federation, which has now been thoroughly accomplished—I say that this comes as a complement to that great measure, showing that—not, as some pessimists urged, that federation would be the first stepping-stone to cutting the painter with the British Empire—but this goes to show that the heart of the people of Queensland—and later on we will see the heart

of the people of Australia—instead of being affected by federation to such an extent as to hold aloof from all sympathy with the movement in the Transvaal—has risen with one great natural impulse to show their desire to maintain that filial bond which knits Australia to the solidarity of the British Empire.

MR. TURLEY: Does not that refer to early closing, too?

THE SPEAKER: Order!

THE PREMIER: The mere fact of sending 250 or 260 men to aid the British army in the Transvaal will not make or mar the fortunes of the British army. If the number were multiplied by 100 it would not very considerably affect the position, for I firmly believe in the impregnability of our great British army in its operations in the Transvaal; but this is an object lesson that shows that the Australian States recognise that they are part of the great British Empire, and are desirous when that Empire is menaced in any way of showing their readiness by allowing men to volunteer for such service, to assist the British army in conducting what may be a very severe campaign. I believe the men who have joined in this movement deserve the thanks of the country. They have shown their loyalty, they have shown their patriotism, and they have also shown that they sympathise with the Uitlanders in the Transvaal, who, we know from all the reports that we have received, are suffering the most harsh and brutal treatment—

MR. LESINA: Question.

MEMBERS of the Government: Hear, hear!

THE PREMIER: As reported by the Press.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Ah! oh!

THE PREMIER: I presume that the Press reports can be accepted as veracious.

MR. MAXWELL: They were not last night.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: They were last night.

THE PREMIER: I cannot understand why hon. members opposite should be so prejudiced in connection with these reports. I am sure they are presented to us for no other reason than to afford us information.

MR. TURLEY: What about the Canadian offer?

MR. DAWSON: That was in the Press.

MR. ANNEAR: What about the 300 mayors in Canada?

MR. McDONALD: They want mules not mayors.

THE PREMIER: Let anyone read the following, 5th October, this present month—

News from Johannesburg states that the Transvaal authorities are expelling all the British residents remaining at that place, the expulsions being enforced in a ruthless manner. Persons of all ages are huddled into open railway trucks, and they are not only suffering from the coldness of the weather, but are actually starving, as no food is provided for them.

Is that the work of what is supposed to be a civilised State, in the nineteenth century?

MR. DUNSFORD: Don't you think there may be another side to that question?

THE PREMIER: Again, on 6th October the following appears:—

It is reported that the Boers are behaving like frenzied semi-savages towards the refugees in the trains which are conveying them from the Transvaal, pointing their rifles at them, striking the women and children, and seizing the babies from their mothers, with the object of provoking the husbands and fathers to retaliate.

There are now thousands of destitute refugees from the Transvaal at Lorenzo Marques (Delagoa Bay), and a transport steamer has been sent to convey them south.

I could read innumerable paragraphs.

MR. McDONALD: Let us have them.

MR. TURLEY: The Press made just such statements as that in 1891 about men in Western Queensland.

The PREMIER : Again, on 9th October—

Intense indignation has been aroused by the brutal treatment by the Boers of the refugees who are now leaving the Transvaal. The reports of the treatment to which the refugees have been subjected show almost incredible brutality. It is alleged that the Boers spat in the faces of ladies, and addressed to them insults of the vilest character. It is further asserted that seventy women and children were crowded into a cattle-truck, and then kept on a railway siding for thirty hours without either food or water. Two children died from exposure, and several children were born during the journey to the frontier.

Mr. MAXWELL : Did the Boers behave like that when they had Jamieson in their power?

Mr. GIVENS : Was that news published at the time the Queensland offer was made?

The PREMIER : These things have transpired since. These brutalities have been culminating. They were reported before. Of course hon. members know that the Press for the last three months has been full of nothing but telegraphic messages reporting brutalities and maltreatment which no civilised nation could possibly be expected to direct towards innocent people residing in their midst.

Mr. McDONALD : What did England do about the Armenian atrocities?

Mr. FISHER : Did we offer to send troops to assist Armenia?

The PREMIER : We are now offering volunteers to assist our own countrymen, and to assist Great Britain in the present contest, and I think no one will deny but that Great Britain is at present placed in that position that she has to assert her authority in South Africa if that authority is to remain paramount for all time. In that light I consider the offer as being most opportune, as showing the desire of Australia to aid Great Britain in the contest which is now coming on, and where her supremacy is being assailed by a people who, I maintain, at the present time are acting in a manner which outrages all modern feelings of civilisation. As I have said, this small volunteer offer is not only creditable to the men who have offered but creditable to the colony which has made the offer; and in this light it has a good moral effect, and is a good object lesson.

Mr. DAWSON : To whom?

The PREMIER : To the great powers of the world. (Opposition laughter.) Hon. members may laugh. I hope they enjoy their laughter.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER on the Opposition side : You were laughing at the idea yourself.

The PREMIER : My remarks may not receive the approval of hon. members opposite, but I feel confident that what I say will be accepted by the intelligence of the people of Queensland—that that is the true feeling and attitude of Australia at the present time as part of the British Empire. What is Europe just now but one huge camp of militarism, which is just waiting for a match to be applied to set it in combustion? The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland—our mother country—is she loved at the present time by those powers? Not a bit of it! They are all jealous of her supremacy, and the nations of Europe would all like to have a fling at her if they could do it with impunity. Great Britain has been the greatest colonising

[4 p.m.] power in the world; she has set her foot over all portions of the globe, and she has set it there to remain; she has built up colonies of her own British stock, which are worthy of her best traditions. These colonies are young; it is a day of small things, but at the same time even the small effort we are making now to show our fellow-feeling with our great mother country is worthy of praise, and will exhibit to the great foreign military powers the fact that these colonies, while they have tended to

aggrandise Great Britain—for trade has followed her flag here—are now becoming factors of potency to her which will tend to make her great Empire permanent for many future generations. This is the view which I submit to the House at the present time in connection with this matter. This motion is not proposed because 250 men can make or mar the defence of the great British Empire, but it is simply an initiatory effort to show that these great dependencies, whether they are dependencies in Australia, or in South Africa, or elsewhere, will support the supremacy of the mother country when she is menaced in future, and that she will find in them a storehouse of inexhaustible supplies whenever the contingency may arise that requires their assistance.

MEMBERS on the Government side : Hear, hear!

The PREMIER : I trust that such a contingency may long be averted; but at the same time I cannot refrain from expressing satisfaction that Queensland has had the opportunity, the grand opportunity, at this present time of submitting to the mother country a practical proof of her loyalty and devotion to the integrity of the Empire. In that light I hope this motion will be received. Hon. members opposite would in ordinary political measures fairly criticise the action of the Government, as it is their duty to do so; but I fervently hope that in a matter of this sort they will put everything else at one side, and placing our colony in the forefront, support the Government. Beyond all other things the solidarity and maintenance of the Empire is a matter that should guide all Australian statesmen, and notably Queensland statesmen, at the present time. It may be alleged, and at first blush there is a great deal of force in the contention, that Parliament should have been consulted primarily. But I would again remind hon. members that the offer is not to send our Queensland troops as members of the Defence Force, but to assist to despatch and to maintain men who have volunteered for service in the Transvaal, and who are not going there in their capacity as members of the Defence Force under our Defence Acts.

Mr. GLASSEY : The offer has been made and has been accepted.

The PREMIER : Yes, the offer has been made and accepted, and I want to show the House why Parliament could not have been made acquainted with the offer earlier. I think it is due to the Government to show that there was no desire to hide from Parliament the action which was taken at the time. The offer was made, as hon. members will see from the correspondence, on the 6th of July.

Mr. DAWSON : The 10th, was it not?

The PREMIER : Quite so; on the 10th of July. Hon. members will know that Parliament had by its own action deferred its sitting until after the 2nd of September.

Mr. GLASSEY : Then the offer should not have been made until after that.

The PREMIER : Then the emergency might have passed away. The offer was made and accepted, and the very first thing the Government did on the opening of Parliament was to indicate in the Governor's Speech what had been done. Hon. members do not seem to remember that in the Speech from the Throne this paragraph occurred—

The relations between Her Majesty's Government and the Transvaal Republic are, I regret to state, in an exceedingly strained condition, and the treatment meted out by the Boer authorities to our fellow-subjects resident in their territory cannot but excite sympathy in the breast of every Australian lover of liberty. That a very acute feeling exists on this subject in Queensland is demonstrated by the fact that a large number of members of our Defence Force have volunteered for service in South Africa, and my advisers, believing that our Mounted Infantry would be peculiarly

fitted to render assistance in any crisis that may occur, have thought it desirable to offer a contingent of this branch in the event of an outbreak of hostilities. A reply has been received stating that Her Majesty's Government will gladly accept the offer if necessity arises.

Mr. COWLEY: And that was adopted by the House without division.

The PREMIER: Yes; it was adopted on the following day without division. Could the Government have informed Parliament earlier? Not in any sense. Of course if we were sending our Defence Force as a Queensland force Parliament should have been summoned for the occasion, but this was merely a proposal to subsidise a body of volunteers, who might not be called for active service, as the very acceptance of their offer indicates. Therefore it was out of the power of the Government to have consulted Parliament earlier; they have consulted Parliament at the earliest opportunity, and before a single shilling of expense has been incurred; although the necessary arrangements have been made for the despatch of these volunteers if this vote is passed, yet the Government have not committed the country to any expense beyond that of a formal character. Hon. members who have been in Administrations, and other hon. members who are yet to accede to Administrations, will learn that there are crises in the history of a country when the Executive has to accept responsibility.

Mr. GLASSEY: That is so, but is this one of them?

The PREMIER: This is one of them.

Mr. GLASSEY: I don't think so.

The PREMIER: Time was the very essence of the action; there was no opportunity for delay; and as to vacillating as to what should be done at the time the offer was made, that would have exhibited an infirmity of purpose unworthy of the greatness of Queensland, and would also have exhibited, as the poet has termed it, a "craven fear of being great."

MEMBERS on Government side: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: Queensland has taken the foremost step in this direction, and maintains it in advance of her sister colonies, in the offer which has been made on behalf of Queensland, and on behalf of the men who have so nobly come forward to say that they would form a contingent for service in South Africa. Now, I wish to inform the House what the probable expenditure may be. The position is that Queensland equips, transports, and lands a force of 250 men with a machine gun section at Capetown under instruction of the home authorities, but they provide that—

From date of disembarkation forces are to be treated as integral portion of Imperial forces. After that date Imperial Government will provide pay at Imperial rates, supply ammunition, and defray the expenses of transport back to colony, and pay wounded bounties and compassionate allowances at Imperial rates. Troops to be embarked not later than 31st October, proceeding direct to Capetown for orders.

I consider that is an exceedingly generous offer on the part of the home authorities. I do not wish it to be understood that the pay offered by the Imperial authorities will compensate those men.

Mr. GLASSEY: Certainly not!

The PREMIER: It is proposed, as hon. members will see from the correspondence, instead of 1s. 2d. a day, to pay them double the rate of the present Defence Force remuneration, that is 4s. 6d. a day for privates. When the men enter South Africa they will at once be enrolled as British troops, and 1s. 2d. per day will be provided for them by the Imperial authorities, Queensland supplementing the difference between that amount and 4s. 6d. per day. In addition, there will be compassionate allowances as pro-

vided by the Imperial authorities, and it is the intention that Queensland shall insure the lives of her soldiers in the Transvaal for the time they may be expected to remain there. It is expected by competent authorities that six months will witness the conclusion of the campaign, and should it extend longer, the only additional claim upon Queensland will be the difference between the Imperial rate of pay and that which the colony provides.

Mr. KEOGH: 5s. a day to be shot at is very little.

The PREMIER: I do not believe they go there for the pay. They go there out of patriotism, and out of a sincere desire to become proficient in the military art. We are paying year by year a gradually increasing amount, which has now attained large dimensions, for our Defence Force.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Too large.

The PREMIER: We have reason to be proud of the condition in which they are at the present moment. I believe they were never in a better or a more efficient condition, but, notwithstanding their efficiency, they have not had practice in actual warfare. They have never been out where shots have been fired in anger, and these men are now anxious to have an education in military school alongside those heroes who have made Great Britain famous and have upheld the dignity of her great Empire. It will be a splendid school for them. I have no doubt they will prove themselves thoroughly efficient and worthy of the colony they represent, and I am sure the country will honour them when they come back after such service.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. GLASSEY: Whenever they do.

Mr. DAWSON: What is the estimated cost?

The PREMIER: The estimated cost for a six months' campaign, including despatch equipment and everything, is £31,980.

Mr. LESINA: That's a big price to pay for a title.

The PREMIER: If they remain beyond the six months the monthly pay thereafter will be £1,560. I think these figures need not alarm hon. gentlemen, and I do not think they alarm my hon. colleague, the Treasurer. I say the offer of troops for the Transvaal from Queensland has been under all the circumstances—I do not like to use the word "advertisement"—it has been a fine exhibition of national spirit. It has placed Queensland in the foremost rank amongst the Australian colonies, and it has stimulated her sister colonies to go and do likewise. As hon. gentlemen are aware, similar expeditions are now being formulated by the sister colonies of New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, West Australia, and Tasmania.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: And New Zealand.

The PREMIER: And New Zealand should particularly be mentioned.

Mr. W. HAMILTON (*Gregory*): They first asked the consent of Parliament to make the offer there.

The PREMIER: Because it so happens that their offer is made while Parliament is sitting. Sir George Turner is doing in Victoria now, what I am doing. He is acting on precisely the same lines, and is asking the approbation of Parliament for action which has been taken, and which had to be taken at the time it was taken, if that action was not to have been sadly circumscribed in its effect, and its prestige throughout all portions of the British Empire greatly lessened. I consider the letter from Johannesburg is of itself a grand tribute to the wisdom of this Government in the action they took at the time. I have no hesitation in reading it for it will bear reperusal, not only as showing their appreciation of the action of

Queensland, but as showing also the necessity which has arisen in the Transvaal for the sympathy of the other portions of the British Empire. This is the letter:—

Offices of the Uitlanders' Council,
Johannesburg, S.A.R., 8th August, 1899.

SIR,—I have the honour, by request of the Uitlanders' Council in Johannesburg, and on their behalf, to convey to you—and through you to the people and Government of Queensland—their most hearty thanks for the ready and practical manner in which the just cause of the Uitlanders in the Transvaal has been espoused by the Government and people of your colony. And I am to assure you that nothing could have given greater satisfaction to Britons struggling for their rights in the Transvaal than the prompt, generous, and patriotic manner in which Queensland has taken up their cause. I have, etc.

WM. HOSKEN.

MR. LESINA: Another of Cecil Rhodes's tools. Another Jamieson man.

THE PREMIER: I can quite understand that some hon. members will not be animated by patriotism.

MR. LESINA: It is not patriotism. It is scoundrelism.

THE PREMIER: I can hardly believe that any hon. member of this House at the present time can be unmoved by the spectacle exhibited in the Transvaal through a harsh and autocratic Government depriving their fellow-citizens of their just right, treating them in a most barbarous manner, and treating their wives and families in such a manner that I think the heart of Christendom must be moved and awakened by the atrocities being perpetrated on those people.

MR. LESINA: It is merely a Jew's war.

THE PREMIER: I do not anticipate objection, therefore, to the expenditure proposed, though it is liberally framed, when I say that £32,000 is likely to be the maximum for the six months' expedition, and that it is asked for to support the equipment, transfer, and maintenance of the men who volunteer for service. Such an exhibition of military ardour by these men should in no way be circumscribed by this Parliament from any apprehensions as to the cost. I do not wish to take up the time of the House unnecessarily. I have said all I think necessary in this matter, and I hope nothing will be said by speakers who will follow me to diminish the effect of the offer made by Queensland. I am quite prepared to accept the blame of not having consulted Parliament, if it is deemed an inexcusable offence. I say, however, it was impossible to consult Parliament at the time the offer was made, and if it was to have its due effect on the citizens of the great Empire it had to be made at the time and in the manner it was made.

MR. GLASSEY: Merely a rush in order to be first?

THE PREMIER: We had no idea that the other colonies would follow after we made our offer. I am free to admit that I desired particularly to encourage these men who constitute our Defence Force, and I say that the country and the Government are desirous of giving them every legitimate opportunity to distinguish themselves as efficient men. When they came forward and requested to be allowed to perform service in the Transvaal, I think to have kept them in suspense any longer than I possibly could would have been reprehensible.

MR. MAXWELL: In view of the federal spirit at the time, could you not have asked the other colonies whether they would stand in with you?

THE TREASURER: Stand up and speak it.

THE SPEAKER: Order!

THE PREMIER: Hon. gentlemen will have an opportunity of expressing their views on this matter. I must say that the Government feel that they have taken the right course. They have not the slightest desire to conceal anything

from Parliament, or to hide their actions in any way. They are prepared to accept the full responsibility which must attach to their action. I repeat that the Government must be prepared at all times to accept the responsibility of urgent action when it is needed. I yield to no hon. member in this House in my desire to confine Executive action within constitutional limits. The Government should consult Parliament whenever it is practicable, but there are and there must arise crises in which the Government of the day will have to accept the responsibility of immediate action and submit their action subsequently to the judgment and verdict of the Parliament of the country.

MR. GLASSEY: Hear, hear! But this is not a case in point.

THE PREMIER: That may be the view on the other side of the table, but I believe that if the hon. gentleman were in my position he would see with my lights on the present occasion. At any rate, I do not think that any hon. member, although he persists in saying that Parliament should have been consulted, will deny that it is a right thing to do to send these men who are wishing to volunteer their services. I have no doubt they will render a good account of themselves and the colony. I feel a very deep and gratifying sense in moving this resolution, and trust that the House, in criticising it, will recognise the spontaneous offer of these men who form a part of our Defence Force, and who have not, in times past, received that amount of recognition which their self-denying labours entitled them to.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

THE PREMIER: I believe they recognise it by their desire to be soldiers in the true sense of the word. They want to acquire skill in battle in company with their compatriots in the British army, which is famous in all parts of the globe. Under these circumstances I have no hesitation in submitting this resolution to the House, and I shall be glad to furnish any other information which may be desired. I have not given details of the total equipment, but I shall be very happy to lay them on the table of the House. I trust the House will unanimously accept this motion, and so send our soldiers in the name of the Parliament, and in the name of Queensland to do the good and patriotic work which they have desired to be entrusted with, and which I have no doubt they will discharge with great honour to themselves and great credit to the Parliament of Queensland. In conclusion I may say—and I say it emphatically, because repeatedly I have asked the information from the Commandant and Lieutenant Colonel Lyster in his absence as to the feeling of the men as to volunteering—I have no hesitation in saying that, notwithstanding whatever rumours there may be in the air, there is a sufficient number of men duly qualified to proceed on this expedition as a volunteer force. Such men, including officers, will be submitted to medical inspection before they are enrolled for service in South Africa.

MR. LESINA: You will find plenty of ticks.

THE PREMIER: I do not think I can furnish any further information. I have great pleasure in submitting the motion to the consideration of the House.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWSON (*Charters Towers*): I may say I have listened with a great deal of interest, not unmixed with a great amount of pleasure, to the speech delivered by the Hon. the Premier in introducing the motion this afternoon. I assure him that it affords me as much pleasure to stand here on the floor of the House as an opponent of the proposal as it afforded him pleasure in proposing it. It is a most remarkable thing—and it

impressed itself very forcibly on my mind during the time the Hon. the Premier was addressing the House—that is the war craze, this thirst for blood, the jingoistic spirit, the overwhelming desire to hit somebody in the front and knock him out. It has manifested itself not only among hon. members in this Chamber. It appears to me we are all in a warlike spirit this afternoon. Even the old and honoured public man like the Premier—a peaceably-inclined man—has got the war spirit. There is nothing that struck me or so impressed me as the belligerent tone in which he opened his remarks. He was simply influenced by this wave of jingoism that is passing all over the country.

Mr. LESINA: He fights by proxy.

Mr. DAWSON: I think that instead of encouraging a spirit of this kind, the more sober inclined and those of a cooler nature should discourage the thing, so that we may not have so many belligerent spirits sitting in this Chamber, particularly those who, by an accident of the moment, may be occupying leading positions. There are many matters that I wish to refer to, and particularly mentioned by the Premier; but, first of all, I should like to point out that while the hon. gentleman seems somewhat indignant at members on this side laughing with derision at these fearful tales of war that have been published by the Press of the awful barbarity and cruelty of the Boers to the Uitlanders of South Africa, we laughed in derision for a very good reason, because we know, by bitter experience, what the Press is capable of doing if they want to create a scare, particularly when a war fever is around. I would ask hon. members to remember that, in this colony of Queensland, no later than the year 1890, the very newspapers that the hon. gentleman quoted from had awful tales of war and horrible cruelty published about the Western men in the Western portion of Queensland.

Mr. FISHER: The Warrego outrage.

Mr. DAWSON: Yes, the Warrego outrage, the poisoned water, the poisoned apples, and all that kind of thing. I hope the hon. member is not going to send the Police Commission travelling to inquire into those particular matters.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. DAWSON: We are judging these things from a distance. We are reading prejudiced opinions, undoubtedly.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. DAWSON: Those who can afford to pay pressmen to write up sensational things and have them sent all over the world, are those whose views are published. I would like further to remind hon. members that we have information from those who are living right in the Transvaal—the democrats and radicals in that particular country are not in favour of this Jewish invasion of the Transvaal at all.

The TREASURER: Give us their names.

Mr. DAWSON: The hon. gentleman wants the names. Surely the hon. gentleman [4 30 p.m.] man wants to get home to breakfast to-morrow morning.

Mr. J. HAMILTON (Cook): It is mere assertion.

Mr. DAWSON: I will mention that the radical papers in Great Britain, in Capetown, and in Johannesburg are all in favour of the Boers. The leading radical paper in England—*Reynolds's Newspaper*.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Oh, oh! and laughter.

Mr. DAWSON: That paper has several columns every week devoted to this particular question. You must hear both sides of the question. The Premier alleges as one reason why Great Britain should interfere—

The TREASURER: What about the Radical leaders in England?

Mr. DAWSON: The hon. member corrected the hon. member for Burke when he interjected, and asked him to make a speech afterwards. I would remind the hon. member of his remark, and ask him to do the same. Labouchere's *Truth* is another paper in favour of the Boers, and there are several others. I want to point out that the Premier has alleged as one of the reasons why the British Government should be supported in waging war on the Boers, is on account of the horrible cruelties perpetrated on the Uitlanders by the Boers. I say that before we come to a definite conclusion upon that we should look at the other side, and there we see statements absolutely contradictory to those appearing in those deluding papers called the *Courier* and the *Telegraph* in Brisbane. If we come to the question of cruelty, it amazes me to see the assumed—I cannot call it anything else—indignation of the Premier when he talked about resenting cruelties, and horrible punishments, and the infliction of pain, and the chorus of "Hear, hears" on the other side of the Chamber. Cruelties! Why, we are engaged in this Chamber debating horrible cruelties perpetrated in our gaols in Queensland much worse than any atrocities read out from those documents by the Premier this afternoon.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. J. HAMILTON: Do you compare British white subjects to criminals?

Mr. DAWSON: If it is legitimate to wage war on the ground of cruelty, I say that the whole of the civilised world ought to wage war on Queensland on account of its cruelties—not only on account of the cruelties which have been perpetrated in the past, but on account of those which there is apparently a determination to stick to and inflict every time there is an opportunity. I would like hon. members to look at the reasonableness of this thing. One statement is that the Boers are spitting in the faces of females, and striking females, pointing their guns at females, and snatching the babies out of their arms, in order that they might provoke the husbands and fathers to resent—leaving, of course, the natural presumption that they might have a chance to murder them when they did resent.

The HOME SECRETARY: Hear, hear!

Mr. DAWSON: I would like to ask hon. members to reflect for an instant. Can they imagine a state of affairs of that description to actually exist?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Yes.

Mr. DAWSON: I say "No." I have a better opinion of the average Britisher than to believe he would submit to anything like that. I say that if the Boer went along to the average Britisher, as I know him, and grossly insulted his wife, and snatched her child out of her arms, and he did not resent it, he would not be a Britisher worthy of the name of Britisher.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. DAWSON: I say the absence of the fact that these supposed outrages were resented is absolute proof to my mind that they were not committed because the Britisher would not permit them to pass without resenting them.

Mr. LESINA: They were committed in the newspaper offices.

Mr. DAWSON: Just by way of illustration, I would like to give a bit of information I got this morning, when it comes to a question of cruelty, and how we appear compared with the Boers. A man is sentenced in one of our gaols and ordered three floggings; he received his first flogging with the knotted cat, and it becomes clotted, and the brutal instrument of the law takes the blood out of the cat so that he might inflict the final punishment, and that man sentenced to two other punishments did all he

could to prevent the doctors from healing his wounds so that he might not be further punished. Then we talk about cruelty.

Mr. ANNEAR: The Boers have flogged little Kaffir girls to death.

Mr. KERR: The same thing has been done in Western Australia.

Mr. DAWSON: The Britisher works them to death.

Mr. ANNEAR: The Kaffirs are not criminals.

Mr. DAWSON: In connection with this matter of the Press, and the metropolitan Press, what they have to say about the Boers is to be taken with a very large grain of salt.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You do not say that when you read long quotations from the Brisbane Press.

Mr. DAWSON: I hope that is understood. I do not say they are always wrong; they may be occasionally right; they have their sane moments like the hon. member. I believe the *Courier* is a good paper, with a staff of good men, but they are under this awful influence the Premier is under, this wave of jingoism, and are carried on in spite of themselves, and they make this war business worse than it would otherwise be. In yesterday's *Courier* there is a very long statement about a Gordon Highlander who was at Majuba Hill. He gives a very lengthy and learned account of the fight at Majuba Hill, and how the Britisher is going to wipe out the Boers and revenge Majuba Hill when the declaration of war is made within the next few days. As a matter of fact if that Gordon Highlander was at Majuba Hill he must have been asleep at the time of the fight, because the statement he has made is absolutely contrary to a document recently written on the whole war, and particularly on the battle at Majuba Hill by officers of the army who were there, and I particularly refer to one by Major Hill in which he points out that, instead of the Boers being the awful cowards and brutes some people try to make us believe they are, as a matter of fact they were between two fires, and they were too brave and courageous to run away so they ran towards the British, and as they got near the Britisher he promptly bolted down the hill—the British army completely ran away.

Mr. ANNEAR: What does the hon. member for Rockhampton North think about that?

Mr. DAWSON: He is not a Highlander. Then there is another matter that the Premier mentioned. The centre of his contention was this: That he was not the responsible party in connection with this matter at all. He was merely an intermediate party—a kind of convenience—

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: A letter-carrier.

Mr. DAWSON: Yes; a letter-carrier or something of that sort. He made out that the real parties were the soldiers of Queensland, who invited the Premier, through the Commandant, to ask the Imperial Government to accept their offer in the event of war breaking out. It is on that very point that we desire to have some more definite information—information that we have not received yet. The information we have received up to date is this: That there were no volunteers who tendered their services to the Government or the Premier; but, as a matter of fact, it was an offer made without consulting the men at all.

MEMBERS OF THE OPPOSITION: Hear, hear!

Mr. DAWSON: The military authorities, so I learn, have been trying to get volunteers, and up to date they have not been very successful in their efforts. I asked the Premier this pointed question: "How many men had volunteered up to date?" If men came along and volunteered before he moved on the 10th July—now we are

in October—how is it that he has not got hold of sufficient volunteers now? The hon. member evaded that pointed question.

The PREMIER: I answered it most explicitly.

Mr. DAWSON: The hon. member distinctly evaded it. He gave a diplomatic answer—an answer which comes very glibly to the mouths of experienced politicians—he said the obligation of sending these men would be strictly carried out. That was not stating how many volunteers he had up to date. It was only giving us to understand that before the troops were put on board the ship, the full complement would be there. We want to know how many volunteers he has got for service in South Africa now?

Mr. FISHER: That's the question.

The TREASURER: Far more than is required.

Mr. DAWSON: How many?

Mr. LORD: Over a hundred.

Mr. DAWSON: I don't want an irresponsible statement from an irresponsible member. I want a statement from the hon. member who asks this House to agree with him in adopting a certain proposal, and who bases his reason for so doing, not on account of any action of his own, but because he, as Premier, has obeyed the will and wish of a number of volunteers. We want to know the number of volunteers who asked the Premier to take this action.

Mr. GIVENS: Prior to the 10th July.

Mr. DAWSON: Yes; prior to the 10th July. The hon. member for Stanley states they have more volunteers than are required. Well, how is it that the proposed commander of the Queensland contingent is travelling round the country now, getting up parades, etc.?

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Who is he?

Mr. DAWSON: Major Ricardo; and no doubt directly the Boers see him they will fly into their mountain fastnesses.

Mr. ANNEAR: Is that from a newspaper.

Mr. DAWSON: Yes, it is here. In the *Telegraph*, there is a wire from Toowoomba—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: But you don't believe that?

Mr. DAWSON: This is not a matter that depends on the respectability of the *Telegraph*, but on the respectability of some person in Toowoomba, and I have a very great respect for everybody in Toowoomba.

Mr. J. HAMILTON: The same thing applies to the cablegrams from England.

Mr. DAWSON: This commandant is inviting the men to turn out on parade; no doubt he makes a little speech, and then he asks them to volunteer for service in South Africa. At Toowoomba the large number of ten men responded. I want to know if the military authorities have got more men than they require to fulfil the obligation. If they have, why is it that the proposed commandant is now going round the country inviting men to volunteer? That is proof that they have not got a sufficient number of volunteers, and they are taking extraordinary measures to try and make up the complement.

Mr. J. HAMILTON: They want the best men—the pick.

Mr. ANNEAR: They will have volunteers from every town in the colony, I believe.

Mr. DAWSON: I am not concerned in what the hon. member for Maryborough believes. I am concerned about what the Premier knows. I feel sure that if the hon. member for Maryborough enlisted, the fight would be all over in no time. I was very pleased to hear that the men who are to be selected for this service will have to undergo a medical examination, and I hope that applies to the commandant.

Mr. ANNEAR: He's all right.

Mr. DAWSON: If the men are to be subjected to a medical examination, I think the commandant, above all others, should also undergo

that examination. Because, when our noble army goes over to South Africa, we don't want our commandant to be laid up in the hospital there. The Premier pointed out that he was not contemplating sending the Defence Force of the colony to South Africa, that he was not compelling the force to go outside the colony for service, and he said that with the air of a man who wanted us to understand that he was doing something of an exceedingly generous nature. As a matter of fact, no matter how hard the hon. member tried, it is beyond his power to send any member of the Defence Force to serve outside Australia. The hon. member puts the matter to us in the light of generosity, but it was a stubborn fact that he could not get over.

Mr. LESINA: Perhaps he would like to get under it. He would sooner crawl than climb.

The PREMIER: I don't want to get over it.

Mr. DAWSON: I have heard it said, I think by the highest military authority in Australia—and this is somewhat reassuring to me—that the Queensland contingent, in fact the whole of the Australian contingent, will not be called upon to fight at all. I am rather glad of that, for the sake of the commander's sake, if for nobody else. We are told that they will be selected to defend roads and bridges, and this is reassuring to me, because the best laid schemes fail at times, and the Boers might double round and give our noble army a lift in the rear. At any rate I hope that the medical examination will be as perfect when the contingent returns as when they left. Leaving these matters out, there is one other matter that the Premier laid very great stress upon—and that is that we should renew our expressions of loyalty to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen, and, to show that there is something more than mere lip loyalty about it, we are to offer to send this contingent of troops, and we hope Her Most Gracious Majesty will be pleased to accept them. Now, I want to know what act has been committed recently by the people of this colony of Queensland that reflects on our loyalty—that would cause Her Most Gracious Majesty, or the British Parliament, or anybody else on the face of the civilised world, to doubt that we are loyal to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen? And if there has been no act of this description committed by us, what is the reason why we should give a special pledge that we are loyal? And I would further like to know if the Premier, in any of his private communications from Royalty, or from those who represent Royalty, has received a hint that they are not quite sure about the loyalty of the people of Queensland, and they desire some outward expression of our loyalty? If the hon. gentleman has received anything of the kind, I am sure that other hon. members as well as myself would be very pleased to get the information.

The PREMIER: This is an evidence of sympathy—you have not read it carefully.

Mr. DAWSON: "That this House renews the assurance of its loyalty and devotion—"

The PREMIER: Quite so—that has been affirmed twice before.

Mr. DAWSON: I want to know what occasion has arisen which makes it necessary for us to renew our assurance of loyalty. If the hon. gentleman has done something himself, he should take the responsibility of it on his own shoulders, and not try and thrust it upon us. Anyway, I have a great objection to it. I deny the general proposition in this motion—that is that British subjects are labouring under "burdensome disabilities and grievous injustice." That is the burden of the whole motion—that British subjects are labouring under "burdensome disabilities," and it is necessary for Great Britain to go to war with the Boers

in order to relieve individual British subjects from those "burdensome disabilities." I deny the general proposition that they are labouring under any "burdensome disabilities." What is it the British subjects in the Transvaal want? They want an extension of the franchise. They want the present franchise liberalised much more than it is, and the Boer, thinking that if he accedes to that his own power is gone for ever, has refused it. But the Boer is in exactly the same position as the Conservative party in politics in this colony. The Labour party have desired to liberalise the franchise, and the plural voter, thinking his power would be gone for ever, has refused to grant it. But we have not declared war on the Conservative party.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Yes, you have.

Mr. DAWSON: And we have not asked the Boer to send over a contingent to assist us in liberalising the franchise. What is the position of the Boer in this matter? The Boer is offering much more liberal terms to the Uitlanders in the Transvaal than we offer to any foreigners in the colony of Queensland.

The TREASURER: No.

Mr. DAWSON: I say absolutely "Yes."

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. DAWSON: As a matter of simple fact, the way the law stands to-day in Queensland, if a man is born in Germany, France, Italy, or anywhere outside the British dominions, and he comes to settle in Queensland, he may live here forty years, but the mere fact that he has not proclaimed himself a loyal subject of Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen prevents him getting the franchise.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Neither can he in the Transvaal if he has not declared his loyalty to the Republic.

Mr. DAWSON: It is not the same in the Transvaal. That is exactly the point I want to make. We insist in every one of our British dominions that the man who exercises the franchise must first be a naturalised British subject.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: They do the same in the Transvaal.

Mr. DAWSON: He must swear allegiance to the Crown, otherwise he cannot get the franchise.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Do you think he has not to swear allegiance to the Boer Republic?

Mr. DAWSON: The Uitlander has not to swear allegiance to the South African Republic.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: He does. You do not know anything about it if you do not know that.

Mr. DAWSON: Of course the Secretary for Lands always knows everything.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I know as much as you on this subject.

Mr. DAWSON: It is a good thing for the hon. gentleman that he sometimes knows something; but if he only knew when he did not know much, he would be a wiser man. I may also draw the hon. gentleman's attention to this fact in regard to the franchise: How do we deal, say, with the Germans on the Australian continent? If a German gets naturalised in Queensland, and he leaves Queensland for another colony—say, New South Wales, he is made a German again when he goes into New South Wales. As a matter of fact, we have just come away from a very great struggle in order to get over that difficulty by having federation. Under federation once a man is naturalised in any portion of Australia, he will become a British subject, and can exercise his full rights as a citizen in any part of the continent. I further wish to point

out that even supposing these "burdensome disabilities" did exist, and the Boer was this very unjust man that we are asked to believe he is, then we should not view with great approbation the sending of a contingent to the Transvaal, for this very simple reason: that the services of any contingent we can send will not be of any material benefit to the British Empire to redress any grievances that a British subject may be labouring under in the Transvaal. The Empire is not in danger.

Mr. BROWNE: Hear, hear!

Mr. DAWSON: If Great Britain was in danger; if she was at war with a first-class power—a power that was a match for her, and that might challenge her supremacy—nay, even challenge her very existence—then it would be the bounden duty of everybody within the British Dominions to strain every nerve in order to defeat that power.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. DAWSON: And so maintain the supremacy of the Empire. But that day of danger has not arrived, and we are not called upon to exercise all our strength.

The HOME SECRETARY: We would send ten times as many men then.

Mr. DAWSON: As a matter of fact I do not think we would send any men then, for we would keep all our men here very carefully to defend this portion of the Empire, and very likely we would have to send to Great Britain to get some men to help to defend us.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is quite possible, and they would come.

Mr. DAWSON: Of course they will come.

The swashbuckler will go anywhere.

[5 p.m.] The Premier has given us an estimate of the probable cost of this contingent, which is roughly put down at £32,000. The hon. gentleman may be within the mark, or he may not; my impression of the matter is that it will be very difficult for even the wisest of men to say what it will cost the taxpayers of Queensland before that war is over. It is no use an hon. member standing up here and saying that he believes the war will be finished in six months; he does not know whether the Boer will be wiped out in six months or six years, and what we are committed to by this motion is to keep that contingent in South Africa as long as the war lasts. The contingent are not to be sent there for six months, but they are to be sent there at a certain cost per day to the taxpayers of Queensland from the declaration of war until they return to the colony after the war is finished. That may be six months or it may be sixteen years.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: It may be three months.

Mr. DAWSON: It may be three months, but my impression is that it will be more than a year or two before the Boers are wiped out—that is a Mackay expression for being defeated. It is rather a singular thing that this colony of Queensland should make a headlong rush into this expenditure of money without consulting Parliament, or the people who will have to pay the money, and without knowing what the colony is actually committed to by such a proceeding. This expenditure of £30,000 for an indefinite period was spoken of in a light tone by the very Ministers who pull a long face when any deserving member of this Chamber representing a deserving constituency, goes to them and asks them to provide some funds to carry out some necessary work in his constituency—they pull a long face, and say they cannot afford it. And not only do they not provide money for such purposes, but our hospitals are being starved, our libraries are being starved, and nearly all our public institutions are being starved at the

present time; and the reason given by members of the Government for that starvation is that they cannot afford to do any more.

The TREASURER: That is not so.

Mr. DAWSON: And yet they can spend any amount of money in sending a mob of swashbucklers to South Africa to show off their uniforms.

The HOME SECRETARY: You ought to be ashamed of yourself.

Mr. DAWSON: I am not ashamed of myself. I have absolutely no respect for the man in this colony who would volunteer his services to go over to the Transvaal. The man who would do that is in the broadest sense of the term a rank and arrant coward. I do not mean that he is a coward in the sense that if he were to meet the enemy he would run away from him, that he would turn tail and show the white feather, or that he is not game to stand up to a man of his own weight and either give or take a thrashing. But I mean that he is a coward in this sense—coward is perhaps not the correct term, cur is more correct, for he has more of the dog nature in him than human nature. My observation of dogs has been, that when one dog gets another dog down, every other mongrel in the immediate neighbourhood thinks it is his bounden duty to bite the dog underneath, and so I say the men to whom I refer have more of the dog nature than human nature in them. It appears to me that the exact position at the present time is, that we see a large mastiff and a little poodle snarling at each other, and other dogs of various sizes want to have a bite at the poodle. The man who rushes into a thing of that kind to try to obtain glory, and to get his name enrolled in the pantheon of the immortal dead, and to have it inscribed among the great in the book of history—I say the man who seeks glory in this way will never get it, and does not deserve to get it. If the grievances which have been mentioned do exist the British Government are well enough equipped to deal with the matter, and are able to redress those grievances, without this colony straining its nerves and starving its public institutions in order to send a contingent to South Africa. But, apart altogether from the question, even if it was admitted that it is a desirable thing to send this contingent to South Africa, then I say the action of the Government ought not to be supported. Before any definite offer was made on behalf of the people of Queensland to send a contingent there it was the duty of the Premier to ascertain the will of Parliament on the matter, and if Parliament did not desire it, then the offer should not have been made. The Premier, by his action, has left the House in this unfortunate position, that members will not be giving a vote this afternoon on the question as to whether it is or is not desirable to send a Queensland contingent to South Africa, but on the question as to whether we shall repudiate the action of the Government. So that is immediately a Government question—a question as to whether the Government shall be censured or not for doing something which was absolutely unconstitutional. I say the Premier is to be very severely reprimanded for the action he has taken in this matter. The hon. gentleman has stated that it was a matter of very great urgency, and he had laid down the rule, I believe it is a golden rule, that the Executive in times of great crises must be prepared to take responsibility—that they must act on their own initiative when the urgency of the case demands it. Nobody for a single instant disputes that; the Executive of any country that is not prepared to take action on their own responsibility when a crisis is at hand would not deserve to be in that

position, and they would not long remain in the position. But I absolutely deny that a crisis of that description arose in this instance. Where was the urgency, or the fearful crisis? If there was a fleet of Japanese boats coming down the coast, and Parliament was not sitting, the Premier should immediately take action.

Mr. BROWNE: He would; he would go up and dine with the captain. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. DAWSON: Now, as a matter of fact, on that particular point the Premier is entirely wrong in his facts. It is true that Parliament was not sitting at the time the offer was made, or when the offer was accepted, but I should like to remind the hon. gentleman that the Premiers of the other colonies which have offered assistance to the British Government first consulted Parliament.

The PREMIER: Because their Parliaments were sitting.

Mr. DAWSON: Their Parliament was sitting, but at the time the Premiers of the other colonies consulted their Parliaments our Parliament was sitting, and there was ample time for the hon. gentleman to have held himself in, and met this Parliament and asked their will before he committed the colony to this expenditure. Then we would have had a fair and square debate upon whether it was a good, a wise, or an unwise thing to send a number of ambitious young men over to South Africa, with a heavy leader. I view this matter very seriously, and I say it should not be in the hands of any one man, simply because he happens to be Premier for the moment, to commit the colony of which he happens to be Premier to indefinite expenditure and to taking part in something that the people of the colony would not desire to take part in. As a matter of fact Parliament should have absolute control over its own affairs, and should not in the slightest degree delegate any of its powers into the hands of one man and make him a despot. I deprecate the action of the Premier very much. As a matter of fact in plain terms what the Premier has really done is this: On behalf of the people of Queensland he has declared war against the Transvaal Republic, without consulting the people of the colony as to whether they are willing to go to war with him or not.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. DAWSON: I believe the trend of modern thought, and what is really provided for in most of the late Constitutions under which democratic countries are governed, is that the power of making a declaration of war is taken out of the hands of any one person and put into the hands of Parliament. What the hon. gentleman has done is to abolish, entirely on his own responsibility—at any rate without any authority from those who could give him authority—he has abolished the representative system of government, so far as a declaration of war is concerned, and has substituted for it a despotism, while he remains the despot.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: He is worse than Kruger.

Mr. DAWSON: On this latter point I intend to ask the House to express an opinion. I think it is a matter of very great seriousness, and I hope hon. gentlemen will understand the difference between the broad question of whether it is wise or unwise to send a contingent to South Africa to assist the British Government, and the other question as to whether it is permissible or an allowable practice that the Premier shall commit the country to a thing of that description without first consulting Parliament? It is in that direction that I desire to move an amendment. I move it because I think the action of the Premier is wrong, and also because I think it would be a very bad thing for representative

government and for the independence of the people of this country if his action were permitted to go without challenge.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. DAWSON: I also move it in order to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that at any rate there are some who believe his action was absolutely unjustifiable, and because it may act to some extent as a warning to him in future and to those who may succeed him. I beg to move, by way of amendment, the insertion of the following words after the word "Queen" in the 2nd line of the motion:—

but disapprove of the action of the Government in making an offer of troops to serve with Her Majesty's army in South Africa, and thus committing the colony to an indefinite and practically unlimited expenditure without the sanction of Parliament.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Question on amendment stated—That the words proposed to be inserted be so inserted.

The PREMIER: If the words proposed to be inserted by the leader of the Labour Opposition were in keeping or in symmetry with the resolution itself there would not be so much ground for complaint; but if these words are inserted I take it they will make the subsequent portion of the motion perfectly absurd.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Knock it out.

The PREMIER: However, we know the object of the leader of the Labour Opposition. He has not the courage of his convictions to say that he disapproves of this action.

MEMBERS on the Government benches: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: So he hides himself behind an insidious amendment which would render this resolution nugatory; which would put it in such a form that it would not be possible that it should be placed on the records of this House. Why does not the hon. gentleman, after the manner in which he has spoken, come out boldly and say, "I shall oppose this resolution on its intrinsic merits." I have fully explained, and I need not go over the ground again, how it was that Parliament was not consulted earlier. I say that Parliament was as early consulted as it was possible for the Government to consult it. Not only so, but I say that the House has already affirmed its approval of the action of the Government.

MEMBERS on the Government benches: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: Is the House now going to stultify itself? I say distinctly that it should not do so. On the abstract question of the propriety of the Government consulting Parliament, I am quite at one with the hon. gentleman, unless an emergency arises in which the Executive must necessarily accept responsibility of this kind. I say distinctly that responsibility was cast upon the Government. It was necessary that immediate action should be taken, and Parliament had by its own action precluded the possibility of a consultation earlier than the 12th September. I therefore decline to accept the amendment, and cannot admire the very disingenuous way the hon. gentleman is treating this great question. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman should not have the boldness and the courage to say "No" to the resolution, or to say whether Queensland shall send a contingent or not. There is a distinct issue here for both sides of the House. While I hold that Queensland should discharge its duty in this way, I give the hon. gentleman credit for conscientiously believing that Queensland should not send a contingent. That, however, is a distinct issue, but to agree to this amendment, which would have the effect of causing the resolution to appear ridiculous in the records of the House, would be to adopt a "Yes-No" resolution. I say that in

every respect the amendment is unworthy of the hon. gentleman, and I am quite surprised that he has not adopted the bold attitude of saying either "I am opposed to this resolution," or "While I criticise your action I intend to support the resolution." I had hoped that the hon. gentleman, from his opening remarks, would have approved of this motion.

Mr. DAWSON: Did you think I'd gone mad?

The PREMIER: But he gave us a long tirade which has really ended in nothing. Now he proposes an amendment in which he escapes either confirming or rejecting the resolution, and at the same time he wants to make it completely ridiculous by the introduction of words which are not in consonance or in sympathy with the context of the resolution. The introduction of these words and the subsequent portion of the clause would be self-contradictory.

Mr. DAWSON: You would get a vote on two points, on two questions.

The PREMIER: On the abstract question of the Government acting without parliamentary authority under ordinary circumstances, no one could dispute that position; but there were urgencies arising which necessitated immediate and prompt action. I think the hon. gentleman should take up the position of either disapproving or approving of what is proposed to be done, but he has no right to emasculate the resolution in such a form as will be done by the addition of the words he suggests, and which, if adopted, would be discreditable to the House. If I thought the House would confirm it, which I do not apprehend for one moment, I would consider it my duty to withdraw the motion.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. BROWNE (*Croydon*): I may say I was rather surprised at the tremendous amount of virtuous indignation assumed by the Hon. the Chief Secretary and showered on the head of my friend, the leader of the Opposition, in which he accuses him of not having the courage of his opinions. I think he made himself very plain. I do not think any man in this House could have expressed himself much plainer—in fact, I think a great deal too plain for some hon. members opposite, from the way in which they howled and squirmed.

Mr. ANNEAR: We will answer by-and-by.

Mr. BROWNE: I am always prepared to hear any hon. member's answer. I am going to support this amendment for the very reasons given by the hon. the leader of the Labour party. I am not going into a long discussion as to the merits or the rights and wrongs of this quarrel between Great Britain and the Republic of the Transvaal. Personally, I believe there are wrongs on both sides, that both sides are at fault. I am not one of those who is prepared to get up and howl because somebody in that country is feeling, and happens to be, I believe, involved in a little trouble. We are perfectly right in looking at both sides of the question, and consider that other people may have rights as well as Great Britain. As far as I know, from travelling about, and the few I have met, and what I have read, I am quite prepared to admit—it may be a different opinion to that of some hon. members—that I do not think the Boers are the most desirable and best neighbours in the world. I say at once, without the slightest hesitation—I have knocked about the world a good deal—that I have always found it better to live in the British dominions; but I am not going to be led away by any jingoistic fever, or to take up with the doctrine that the Lord created the world for the one nation—that, in fact, it was designed by a London architect and built by a Scotch builder. I will not go as far as that. I believe there is room for a great many

people in the world. At the same time we know that that very big foot that the Hon. the Premier spoke about so enthusiastically has got down on so many places in the world, and has spread out in so many parts of the world. Where it gets it down it sticks, and I believe that when all is over it will be found by the unfortunate Boers the foot will get there and will stick there. At the same time, when it is going along walking over a small foot, I do not see any reason why every little crippled foot should go and rush to the aid of the big foot and wipe out the other little foot. It seems to me that the excuse given by the Premier is that this was a question of urgency. He would have us believe that Great Britain was lying down and the Boers were tearing her all to pieces—that the whole metropolis was in flames, and that the whole of the people were being swept into the ocean; and he came forward as a sort of David with his little sling, not to sling it at Goliath, but actually to get behind Goliath and sling it at somebody smaller than himself. The hon. gentleman, to look at him, was not such a belligerent spirit. He was benevolent-looking, peaceful in his ways, and so very smooth in his manner; but all of a sudden he blossomed forth into a bloodthirsty character without consulting anyone except the commander of the forces, who, as my hon. friend remarked, at once declared war against the Transvaal, and claimed it as a right that Queensland should support him in it. As to going to war, I am opposed to it at present. I say that if Great Britain was in extremity—that if it was a case of war with any other great power and she was likely to get the worst of it—I believe that 98 per cent. of the people of Australia would spend their last shilling and lend a helping hand to Great Britain in her trouble. That trouble has not come. We are asked to lend a hand—not to take a hand in any war, but to take part in a sort of circus and run round like little dogs jumping on a little dog that has a bone. I do not think that is any credit to Queensland. There is another more serious phase of the question. The Premier, in speaking on this matter, referred to the present state of Europe. Europe, we know, is one huge army camp or series of army camps. Every nation is fully armed. A great many of them have not too much love for Great Britain. What the cause may be we do not know. It may be envy, it may be jealousy, or they may be wanting to wipe out some old scores. But we know it is so. We know that when a small war starts it is like a fire. A very small blaze starts; but you never know when it is going to stop. It is the same on this occasion, and we have to look at this matter very seriously. If this war, which, I believe, is almost certain—although I must say that since Oom Paul heard of the offer of Queensland troops he seems to have backed down a good deal. Whether this message that the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government sent him, or whether there has been any private communication with him; or whether it is the simple fact that we are going to send a contingent from Queensland I do not know; but he certainly does not seem as anxious for war as he was a week or two back. At the same time I believe it is inevitable. If it starts in South Africa, there is not a man in this Chamber or in Queensland who can say where it is going to end. Just at present we are fooling round, and, just to show our loyalty to the nation, we are going to send men to take part in a war in which we have no interest at present, and at which their presence is absolutely not needed; but in a few months, for all we may know, it may be a large war all over the world, and Queensland and all the other colonies may want all the men they can possibly get or raise to defend Great Britain in this part

of the world. That is what we have to guard against. We are just rushing this country into expense—well, when it is perfectly needless. The hon. gentleman laid great stress on the patriotic motives of all these people, and what these men were being raised for. In the correspondence we have got here there is no evidence of this great loyalty or patriotism. The very first entry in it is this bald letter from the Commandant, Colonel Gunter—from the very gentleman who is raising the troops now—

THE COMMANDANT, Q.D.F., to THE CHIEF SECRETARY.
Headquarters, Queensland Defence Force,
Brisbane, 6th July, 1899.

SIR,—I have the honour to submit for approval a recommendation that the services of a contingent of Queensland troops, consisting of 250 officers, non-commissioned officers, and men of the Queensland Mounted Infantry, with a machine-gun section, be offered for duty with the Imperial troops in the event of hostilities breaking out between Great Britain and the Transvaal.

If this recommendation is approved, I suggest that the communication be made to the Imperial authorities by a cablegram.

I have, &c.,
HOWEL GUNTER, Major-General.

There is not one word of patriotism or loyalty about that. It is the recommendation of a professional soldier. I am not saying it in any offensive way; because at present, unfortunately, in the state of the world's history and in our present social condition, we must have professional soldiers. It is a man looking at it purely from a professional point of view.

[5.30 p.m.] It is not a question of loyalty or patriotism with him—it is simply a question of giving the soldiers a bit of training. Only lately I noticed another gentleman connected with the Queensland Defence Force—a very able and estimable officer, I believe, from what I have heard—Lieutenant-Colonel Hutchison—has been in Roma, trying his utmost to induce men there to volunteer; but I do not see that he said a word to them about serving their country or their Queen. Here are his words, taken from the *Western Star*—

Any member of the Roma corps who desired a change from the humdrum of ordinary everyday life could send in an application to be included in the contingent. There would be a certain amount of risk in going to the Transvaal, but a man getting on horseback risked his neck more or less, so the risk was not so great after all. However, there might be some members in the company actuated by the spirit of the thing—the spirit of adventure—who would like to take the trip, and he had mentioned the matter so as to give them the same chance as other regiments.

There again is the professional soldier appealing to a lot of young men, and telling them that if that they would like to change their humdrum life on stations or farms, with £1 or 30s. a week, for 4s. 6d. a day and a nice trip to the Transvaal and meet those terrible Boers they had a good chance of being enlisted.

THE HOME SECRETARY: That is taken from one of those unreliable newspapers.

MR. BROWNE: It is a Government organ, at any rate. I believe as a rule they are unreliable, but when I read anything to this House I read it as given by the Press. We have to form our opinions largely from what appears in the Press; and though, as has been said to-day, it is the man with most money who can get his side of the question best reported, as far as ordinary newspapers go, I give what appears in them when I make a quotation, and I do not think a newspaper published in Roma, which happens to be represented by the Attorney-General in this House, would publish a thing connected with an officer of the Defence Force of this colony if it was not true. There has been nothing about patriotism in this from the start. The idea originated with the professional soldier, it was communicated by him to

the Chief Secretary, the Chief Secretary caught hold at once, so that he could score by being ahead of the other Premiers. I do not want to throw out any insinuation, but I may say that K.C.M.G.-ships and stars and garters are to be got by other ways than by bashing Boers. In some instances they can be got in that way, but anyone with the Artemus Ward spirit, who is willing to spill the blood of all his relatives and the blood of all his fellow-colonists in battle, often stands a bigger chance of honours than the men who go into action. As far as the money question is concerned, we are told that it will be a mere bagatelle, but when any attempt is made to better the condition of the unfortunates who at present have no better prospect than Dunwich what is the answer from the Treasury benches? The hon. member for Kennedy has brought forward his motion with regard to old age pensions, and he has been met by the question, "Where are we going to get the money?" There is no money for the aged and distressed in this colony, but £32,000 can be found to send a lot of our young men away to the Transvaal. I say the thing is not fair at all. Ever since the Premier has been a member of this House he has been in favour of increasing the population of this colony, and this year he is proposing to spend money to bring hundreds of newchums into the country; on the other hand, he is proposing to send 250 picked men, as far as physique is concerned, out of the colony to be made food for powder if the Boers happen to drop across them. It would be much more to the interest of the colony and the interest of Great Britain as well, if we made a cash offer of the £32,000, or even £50,000, to the British Government, so that they amongst the overcrowded population of that country could get men to go to the Transvaal, and let us keep the men we have here to form the nucleus of an army we may possibly want in the future. We shall be gainers if we keep those 250 men, because we have to pay £12 or £13 a head for the men brought here—men not so well able to fight the battle of life in this colony. I do not intend to detain the House long. I am opposed to the motion right through. I believe firmly that this warlike spirit, this jingoistic spirit, is spreading. I believe that if this war starts in the Transvaal—and I say it honestly—and our troops are sent there, there will be excitement and a warlike feeling amongst the people of Queensland, and I believe the men protesting against it will be the big minority of Queensland. But because that is so it does not deter me from giving my opinion on the whole matter. When these waves of excitement come along I believe it is the duty of public men to stem any unhealthy excitement of this kind if they can. This has been spoken of as a land that has always been peaceful and always will be peaceful. In a young country like this we should wait until we were asked for assistance, or until the old country needed that assistance, or until we were attacked, and then do our best to show the old country that we do not want to drain every man and shilling we can get out of her, but are willing to defend ourselves as our forefathers defended themselves; but to start unasked, uncalled for, and offer to send a lot of our young men out to train them up as butchers into a quarrel they had no hand or part in, and which they know nothing about is the thing that should be deprecated by every member of this House.

MEMBERS on the Opposition side: Hear, hear!

MR. BROWNE: So far as the merits of the quarrel go, I admit that when a man is a soldier he has no right, if he remains a soldier under present conditions, to inquire into the merits of the question. The justice or the injustice of the quarrel should be nothing to him. He is there,

paid and sworn in as a part or portion of a fighting machine, for defence or warlike purposes. If war broke out at any time, and every man serving in the army was allowed to exercise his own opinion as to the merits and demerits of the quarrel, and if he thought the quarrel not justified, and packed up his traps and went home, of course we know that sort of thing would never do. That is what makes this case so much more serious. I do not believe in initiating this system by which we are going to raise a military caste in this colony, under which men, without being allowed to exercise their own reason, can be sent away to active service, perchance to fire a few shots. I am opposed to the motion, and I will support the amendment. I think this is a big constitutional question, and there was nothing to hinder the Premier waiting for the action of the other Premiers. If this is such a great object lesson—if the matter were dealt with in a true federal spirit, the hon. member should have consulted the other Premiers, so that united action could be taken by the whole of Australia at once. If such a big advertisement was to be made out of this matter, why did the Premier make this isolated offer, without any authority, and without consulting the other Premiers, and practically asking them to follow him?

Mr. J. HAMILTON: It might be a big advertisement for Queensland.

Mr. BROWNE: Yes, it might be, but the hon. member who has introduced this motion might have shown a far better patriotic Australian spirit than he has done by his present action. I don't think any hon. member has any objection to the first part of the resolution, which deals with loyalty and all that sort of thing. At any rate, I have no objection to it, but, like the hon. member for Charters Towers, I can't see the necessity for it. Before I was a member of this House I had the honour of swearing allegiance to Her Majesty, and it never did me any harm. But I do not know that it did me any good, or that I would have been any the worse off had I not taken that action. I think I would have been just as loyal had I not sworn this allegiance, but I am not going to quarrel with this part of the motion. Summing it all up, I am opposed to the motion because there is no necessity for it; because it is creating a dangerous precedent; because it will mean a great expense to the colony which we cannot afford at present; and because I think the manner in which the business has been done is thoroughly unconstitutional. For these reasons I shall support the amendment.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (*Lockyer*): The hon. member who has just resumed his seat spoke in the earlier part of his speech about the loyalty of hon. members, and yet he objects to Queensland having made this offer to send a contingent to South Africa. Where, then, does the hon. member's loyalty come in in these words? Is it not true that a man who offers his loyalty quickly practically gives twice? And it should not be a question of waiting until the actual requirements of a situation require a man's help and assistance. I do not understand the arguments of the hon. member, but he has given me an opportunity of rising to answer some remarks made by the leader of the Labour Opposition. The hon. member for Croydon has debated the main question, as well as the subject matter of the amendment, and I suppose the same courtesy will be extended to me. That hon. member attributed to hon. members on this side of the House, in applauding the sentiments expressed by the Premier, a feeling of jingoism. I may say here that I do not hold a brief on behalf of hon. members on this side of the House, but I say this—and I think my sentiments will be

echoed by every hon. member on this side—that there is no more jingoistic feeling felt by hon. members on this side of the House, than there is by hon. members on the other side.

Mr. STEWART: Question.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: We are just as sincere in our wish that this trouble should be overcome without a single drop of blood being spilt as hon. members on the opposite side. I am also as sincere in my wish that the difficulties surrounding our own kith and kin—our own flesh and blood almost—in South Africa shall be redressed. The leader of the Labour Opposition travelled over a great deal of ground, but he did not express any sound contention until just before he resumed his seat. Then he objected to any contingent being sent to South Africa, because he denied generally that certain British subjects were living under disabilities in South Africa. That was the real ground of his contention, and it was the only ground that he did take up. I ask him and all other hon. members on his side of the House, if they have read a recent blue-book on the subject of the South African difficulties. This is a very good work, which I hold in my hand now. It is a New Zealand paper on the subject—an epitome of the British blue-book. The whole of the difficulties which have culminated in the strained relations which now exist in South Africa are there dilated on, and at the risk of wearying hon. members, I intend to go through them and I ask hon. members to listen to them. You will find here that there are not only the one or two difficulties in the question which have been casually spoken about by the leader of the Labour Opposition, but there are hundreds of others, and I shall read them in detail.

Mr. TURLEY: What is the society that issued that paper?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: The society comprises the authorities of the British Houses of Parliament.

Mr. TURLEY: But I am referring to the paper which is an epitome of that blue-book.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I am dealing with the paper which the hon. member for South Brisbane objects to.

Mr. TURLEY: No, I don't object to it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I will give hon. members my reference. I am going to quote from the blue-book issued by the Colonial Office so late as June, 1899. This document is compiled after reference to the British Consuls at Pretoria, Johannesburg, and the High Commissioner in Cape Colony. These documents are all here available to every hon. member, and I think no hon. member can possibly impugn their veracity.

Mr. McDONALD: We have never had a chance to look at it.

Mr. BELL: There is a copy of it in the *Times*, which you can see in the library.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Dealing with these grievances, I shall first read them in order. The first is what is known as the objection to the judges' law. The next is the objection to the Press law; the next to the municipal law. Then there are the objections to the concessions which have been given, such as the dynamite concession, the objections to the expulsion of aliens, the objections to "commandeering," the objections to the education system, the objections in regard to the franchise, the objections to the regulations of the Executive of the Transvaal with regard to the supply of Kaffir labour in the mines, and the objections of a similar nature with reference to the supply of white labour to the mines. Then there are the objections to the liquor law, to the taxation of food stuffs, to import duties on explosives, the heavy railway rates, and the pass laws. This is a long list of objections,

Mr. LESINA: Matters of purely domestic policy.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Is taxation without representation a domestic question?

Mr. LESINA: Entirely.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: The hon. member and I differ so entirely—in fact we can never agree under any circumstances—that I would ask him to refrain from interjecting till I have finished, because I am going on with my remarks, supported by the documents in my possession, whether the hon. member attempts to lead me off the track with interjections or not. Dealing with the first of the abuses which I have enumerated—the objections to the application of the liquor law in the Transvaal—there is a law there which fixes the number of licenses in proportion to the population of the different towns. In Johannesburg, where the great bulk of the Uitlander population is settled, while they are only entitled to eighty-eight licenses, no less than 438 have been granted. I have no doubt my hon. friends opposite will say that this is domestic, and ask what this has to do with the matter? It has this to do with the matter—that it seriously impedes the industry of the Uitlander, and the Uitlander is the man whose industry is directed to the development of the mines in the Transvaal, and it is well known that those mines at the present moment produce the whole of the wealth which goes to make and support the Transvaal Republic. Representations have been made with regard to the wretched manner in which the liquor laws are administered times out of number—not alone by the capitalists—as I shall be told by hon. members opposite—but every Uitlander—English, American, Italian—Uitlanders of every nationality. They have all asked the Boer authorities to cancel a large number of these licenses. But they will not cancel them, because every one of those licenses means so much money to the Transvaal Executive, and, therefore, the reduction of the number would entail a loss of revenue. The difficulty that this law puts the Uitlander to does not trouble Kruger or the Executive. They take little or no notice of these requests. The effect of the law upon the working of the mines is shown in the statistics I have here.

Mr. TURLEY: Its effect upon the coloured races.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Upon coloured British subjects.

Mr. TURLEY: Upon all the coloured races.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I will answer that in a minute. It is found that the mining companies require to maintain 20 to 30 per cent. more persons to work in the mines than are necessary, because this percentage is generally incapacitated through drink, and the Uitlander holds that, if the drink traffic were under proper control, this gross abuse would not occur. The hon. member for Brisbane South interjected that it is the Kaffir who suffers. We know that he does suffer; but, after all is said and done, the great difficulty of the Uitlander is to get a sufficient supply of labour to work the mines.

Mr. TURLEY: All coloured labour.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Coloured labour or white labour.

Mr. TURLEY: No.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Yes. At the present time white labour is earning from £18 to £30 a month, and they cannot get sufficient.

Mr. TURLEY: There is plenty available.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Not available for the simple reason that there are so many restrictions placed upon the Uitlander in the Transvaal that you cannot get white men to go there.

Mr. DUNSFORD: Nonsense! I was there, and I ought to know.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I have known the hon. member in this Chamber for six years, and these very great difficulties have only arisen since he has been in this Chamber.

Mr. LESINA: What right have we to interfere with the domestic policy of any people?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Will the hon. member refrain from interjecting? I go out of the House when he is talking, and leave it entirely to him.

Mr. LESINA: It is only out of courtesy that I am staying here. I am suffering.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: These difficulties are so great that it is nearly impossible to secure white labour. The hon. member for Charters Towers says he was there. When was he there? He was there probably in the early days when the franchise was more liberal than it is at present. It is beyond controversy that every succeeding period of years since 1850 has seen more and more oppression and the restriction of the franchise, so as to curtail the strength and the hold that the Uitlander was getting.

Mr. COWLEY: Hear, hear!

Mr. ARMSTRONG: If the hon. member does not read his history, I will teach him. At last this has culminated in these troubles, and the Uitlander can get no redress. I shall deal with the franchise question last, because the Uitlander holds that all the other objections would be overcome if he was given a fair amount of representation in the First Volksraad. He has the power of getting into the Second Volksraad after a period, but if he got the right of burgher—to vote for the First Volksraad or become a member of it—his difficulties would all be overcome.

Mr. TURLEY: Which he can do, under certain conditions.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Which he can do under the condition that he is forty years of age and has been fourteen years in the country.

Mr. McDONALD: Thirty years of age! Look at your history.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I know what the proposed amendment is, but I am perfectly right about the law at the present moment. At any rate, these difficulties were so acute that in 1897 the Transvaal Executive itself appointed a commission to inquire into the whole of the grievances of the Uitlander; and this commission of their own nominees represented to the First Volksraad that certain reforms were necessary. The First Volksraad made one concession, but they hedged it round with a large number of conditions. The only concession they made was that the railway rates should be reduced, so that £100,000 worth of taxation which fell upon the Uitlander was removed; but at the same time they placed heavy import duties on twenty-eight necessities which were entirely consumed by the Uitlander. The pass law has never been put into operation. The Uitlanders have asked that it shall be administered in the spirit in which it was passed, but there has never been any surveillance over it. Another very great grievance is about the administration of the gold theft law. The authorities who gave evidence before the commission to which I have just referred stated that the amount of gold stolen every year from the mines amounts to between £700,000 and £800,000. I have no doubt my friends opposite will say that it is the capitalist who loses this. Probably it is, but the loss indirectly falls on the working man. The Uitlander has approached the Transvaal Executive, and asked that the law should be administered in regard to these thefts. The Uitlanders attributed the gold thefts, which amounted to some £800,000 per annum, to the indifference of the police to a great extent, and it was well known a few years back that one

officer of the police lost his position because it was found that the thefts were actually connived at by the police.

[7 p.m.]

The Secretary for Lands suggests that they may have shared in the profits, but that does not appear in the blue-book. The industrial commission which was appointed by President Kruger suggested to the Executive that there should be an advisory board constituted to deal with the matters to which I have referred, and to advise the Executive upon them. But the First Volksraad, when the question came before them with a view to give effect to the recommendation of the commission, refused to act on the suggestion, and instead suggested "that special detectives should be appointed by the Government under a trustworthy and competent person." They admitted in the course of the debate on the subject that the administration of the police had been bad, and said they hoped the difficulty would be overcome in the way they suggested. I would also point out—I just touched on the subject in reply to an interjection by an hon. member opposite—that in considering the report of this industrial commission the Volksraad removed a certain burden of taxation in the shape of certain railway rates, but immediately placed heavy import duties on the commodities required for the sustenance of the Uitlanders. The Uitlanders obtained redress on one point to the extent of £100,000 a year, but the increased duties to which I have referred amounted to £200,000 per annum. And at the very same sitting at which those duties were decided upon which proved such a heavy impost on the Uitlanders, a tax of 5 per cent. was imposed on the profits of the gold-mining industry.

Mr. TURLEY: That's what is the matter.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Hon. members opposite seem to think that I have got something up my sleeve, and that I wish to hide things.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: No, no!

Mr. ARMSTRONG: If they will only inquire they will find that everything that is in that blue-book will be given to them to-night. I am not here to attempt to give one side to the House; I am giving the case as it appears in the blue-book. So far, I have come to the matter of this 5 per cent. tax on the profits of the gold-mining industry, and it is hailed by hon. members opposite with pleasure, because no doubt certain of those hon. members will attempt to show that this agitation springs from the capitalists.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. ARMSTRONG: But cannot hon. members opposite see that if that 5 per cent. is demanded from the industry the capitalists will make it up from somewhere else?

Mr. McDONALD: We have heard all that before.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: And we can prove it to be a fact.

Mr. McDONALD: You can't prove it economically, anyhow.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: This impost was placed upon the gold-mining industry, and only twenty-four hours' notice of it was given. I hold that that directly affects the general position of the Uitlanders, because it must affect wages, and it must affect the working miner. But what was the result? This 5 per cent. tax was strongly objected to. We find that out of the 218 mines that are working on the Transvaal goldfield, only twenty-eight are dividend-paying concerns. The non-dividend paying mines represent £27,983,000 of British capital.

Mr. TURLEY: Actual?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Yes, actual capital. The whole production of the gold-mining industry, including non-paying as well as dividend-

paying mines, amounts to 3,034,678 oz., valued at £10,583,616; and out of that £10,000,000 there was only £2,713,000 paid in dividends.

Mr. FISHER: And the 5 per cent. is on that.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Yes, they imposed 5 per cent. on that amount.

Mr. FISHER: We do that here.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: We do, but our miners do not have to pay the same heavy duties on dynamite and other necessities of the mining industry as they have to pay in the Transvaal, and it is to those duties that the Uitlanders strongly object. They do not object to the principle of the gold tax; the league says distinctly that they do not object to that, but they do object to every scheme of taxation that is introduced by the Volksraad being placed on the commodities consumed by the Uitlanders. And this 5 per cent. gold tax is in addition to those other taxes. Another matter which has given cause for great complaint in the Transvaal is the Judicial Law. Up till 1897, the Uitlanders in the Transvaal had the fullest confidence in the judiciary, but at that time there was a suppression of some newspapers—the judges having interpreted the law, not in accordance with the wishes of the Volksraad, but in accordance with the spirit of the law. So the Volksraad, in 1897, passed a law which made it compulsory on the judges to accept a resolution of the Volksraad as being absolute law irrespective of what legislation might have gone before. They followed that up by saying that if there were more than one resolution of Volksraad on any one subject the last should be the one to be taken as law for the judges to carry out. The judges were placed in this position—they were not to interpret the law, but simply to carry out the dictates of the Volksraad. It is well known to hon. members that one of the judges who had more backbone than some of them—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The Chief Justice.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Yes, Judge Kotze, who was the Chief Justice, resigned because he would not be placed in such a position. In this way the Uitlander was placed, not at the mercy of the law courts, under which he would have been happy to live, but at the mercy of the Volksraad, and not of the Second but of the First Volksraad, in which he had no representation until he had been fourteen years in the Transvaal.

Mr. TURLEY: Twelve years.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I will deal with the interjection of the hon. member for Flinders presently.

Mr. McDONALD: The hon. member for Flinders did not interject at all.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: He did before tea.

Mr. McDONALD: Oh, he did last week, too.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I said I would deal with the interjections of that kind when I came to deal with the question of the franchise.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Can't we read all this in the history of the country?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I have risen for this purpose: I am a Queenslander, and I am going to put this on the history of Queensland. Another objection is that the jury by which an Uitlander is tried can only be a jury of burghers. He objects strongly to this, and asks, as you or I would, that he should be tried by his fellow-men and not only by men who have no sympathy with him, and whose whole history has shown that they are opposed to him, and especially opposed if he is an Englishman.

Mr. KIDSTON: What jury are Japanese tried by here?

Mr. RYLAND: We do not have Chinese juries.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I think it is a regrettable fact that the Government of Queensland did not think it necessary to circulate, as has been done in New Zealand and in the other colonies, these tabulated statements of the grievances of the Uitlanders. If they had been in the possession of hon. members many days ago they could have looked into the question and they would perhaps have modified their views upon this subject. I have a paper here which was laid on the table of the New Zealand House of Representatives, and dealing with the question of trial by jury in the Transvaal, it says that juries are—

Only drawn from the ranks of the burghers or naturalised aliens. They are mostly ignorant of English, incompetent from want of training and knowledge, alien in sympathy to, and having a huge contempt for Uitlanders (especially Englishmen). The most serious crime is rampant, and perpetrators of serious crimes frequently escape punishment.

Mr. BROWNE: That is the case here.

Mr. ARMSTRONG:

The conduct and attitude of the police is only a reflection of the hostility and contempt of the legislature and Government. This hostility has its natural result in setting up a corresponding antagonism on the part of Englishmen, who otherwise would be friendly enough with their Dutch neighbours.

I hold that is true and even a worm will turn, and if there is some spirit of retaliation amongst the British who have been oppressed in this way for years who can blame them for it? We would do the same thing. Now, the Press law is another cause of complaint. We, in this country, and at any rate hon. members opposite, always argue that the Press shall be free because it affords a means of ventilating grievances. I agree with them thoroughly in that. I hold that the Press should have the utmost license, and no bounds should be imposed upon the Press so long as it is conducted in a high and elevating manner as the generality of the Press is conducted. Now, what do we find in the Transvaal? Unless a paper absolutely sides with President Kruger and the Transvaal Executive, it is liable to suppression. We have two papers, one the *Critic* and the other the *Star*, as instances of this. The *Critic* newspaper was suppressed, and because the proprietor had not the means to go further, his paper ceased issue. The proprietor of the *Star* appealed against the action of Kruger in suppressing his paper, and his appeal was upheld by the judiciary. Since that appeal was upheld the law I spoke of a few minutes ago was passed, and the First Volksraad said, "It does not matter what the law is a resolution of the Volksraad shall be final," and they passed a resolution giving themselves the power to suppress any newspaper.

Mr. COWLEY: They have since arrested two others.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I am informed by the hon. member for Herbert, that they have since arrested two others; but I am more concerned with the two papers I know have been suppressed. The judge in the case in which the appeal against Kruger was upheld, held that he could not suppress matter that was unwritten, and that he could only suppress a newspaper when it was published. At any rate, the Uitlander objected to the suppression, as the newspapers were the only means he had for the ventilation of his grievances, as hon. members may be aware that in the Transvaal there is no right to hold open-air meetings. Now, the municipal law is another of the difficulties the Uitlander is labouring under. After much agitation the President decided to give the residents of Johannesburg a measure of local self-government. This was given last year, but like every concession given by the Executive of the Transvaal they hampered it with unbearable

restrictions. The system provided was that they should have a municipal council of twenty-four members, half of whom were to be appointed by the burghers, of whom there are only about 1,000 in Johannesburg, and the other half by the whole Uitlander population. The chairman of the council, the burgomaster, was to be the appointee of President Kruger, and was to receive £1,000 a year, and he was to have full control of the working of the council in the interim. The Uitlander found that the burghers, representing only 5 per cent. of the people of Johannesburg, were to have the same representation as the whole of the 95 per cent. Uitlander population.

Mr. STEWART: England was as bad a few years ago.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Do you justify it?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: He found also that though the burghers had twelve councillors, and the burgomaster on their side, within three months of the constitution of this august body President Kruger came along, and gave the contract for a large drainage scheme to a newspaper proprietor named Mendlesohn, who had supported him in his policy in the Transvaal. The Uitlander asks, "What is the use of giving us this measure of municipal self-government, if, on the other hand, you remove these large businesses out of our hands and give these concessions over our heads for which we have to pay." It was given without any plans or specifications being shown to that body. It was purely given as a sop.

Mr. ANNEAR: Who paid for that?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Probably one of the most important causes of friction, second to education and the franchise, in the Transvaal with the Uitlander is the present dynamite monopoly, which was given by the Transvaal Executive to a certain company there.

Mr. LESINA: They have taken it away now.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I do not take the word of the hon. member for it. In all these matters I prefer the blue-book to the interjections of the hon. member for Clermont. As I have already said, he is perfectly welcome to follow me and take the blue-book and discover any misstatements I am making.

Mr. McDONALD: You have not been quoting from the blue-book.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Every word I have quoted is taken from the blue-book.

Mr. McDONALD: Where?

Mr. LESINA: Give us the pages.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I will read it presently.

Mr. RYLAND: We want something reliable.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: With regard to this dynamite concession, dynamite is an absolute essential to the life of the mines and the life of the Uitlander in the Republic. He cannot prosecute his calling without it. The dynamite concession was given for fifteen years, in the first instance, to a French company. The English and German authorities objected to this concession being given to one nation, and an amendment was made giving it to French, English, and German alike. This company carries on the manufacture of dynamite in the Transvaal, and the import duties on imported dynamite are so great that it gives the locally manufactured article a preference of something like £2 or £2 5s. per case.

Mr. DUNSFORD: Are you not a protectionist?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: To a certain extent. That is over and above what the imported article could be landed from Europe for. Hon. members opposite cannot possibly argue for one moment that the giving of this concession is not a great hindrance to the mining industry. Why, it costs them £600,000 a year. Then over this there is £117,000 a year, which has to

be paid to the Transvaal Government. The Transvaal Government takes 5s. a case on every case manufactured in the Transvaal, and, under the terms of the concession to this company, they also receive 20 per cent. of the net profits. So the more profit the company can make, the more profit Mr. Kruger and the Transvaal Executive can make. As the Uitlander has shown, this money has to come out of the gold-mining industry, and he has asked to be allowed to import from Europe the same class of dynamite, paying the Government the same amount of duty on it as they get on the locally manufactured article.

Mr. LESINA: Why do you want to go there to fight monopolies? Have you not got enough here?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I hold that there is a good deal in the contention of the Uitlander. He wishes to escape this indirect taxation of £717,000 a year.

Mr. McDONALD: Isn't Queensland the monopoly of monopolies?

Mr. LESINA: There is not a cyanide monopoly here, is there? There is no dynamite monopoly in Queensland, is there?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I would point out that the cost in the Transvaal of dynamite and blasting gelatine is 107s. 6d. per case; but if imported from Europe, and paying the 5s. per case duty, it would mean from 58s. to 77s. 6d. per case, according to the quality of the material. This is one of the objections the Uitlander takes. I want to deal shortly with the question of education. I think that in the whole of the British dominions there is not a country which is more liberal in its educational system than we are in Queensland. Therefore, we can afford to look on the trouble of others with a far more liberal eye than we otherwise would. We have done everything as far as we can possibly afford at the present time, and must look with a sympathetic eye on the difficulties of our countrymen in the Transvaal. The position in the Transvaal is this: There are thousands of children on the goldfields who are not even receiving the very rudiments of education. Hon. members opposite will say it is their own fault.

Mr. McDONALD: It is not so.

Mr. LESINA: It is not true. The Transvaal Government teach English in four schools.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I will correct the hon. member. There are six schools there where the system of education is English; but on the goldfields it has ultimately to be carried on in Dutch.

Mr. TURLEY: At what stage?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I will give the particulars.

Mr. TURLEY: It is the fourth standard.

Mr. DUNSFORD: In the Transvaal they teach two languages.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: They have altered it since you were there. The system there is that the Government will subsidise schools in which English is taught, on the distinct understanding that, in the first instance, they can get a fit and proper teacher to carry on the school work. The qualification of a fit and proper teacher is that he shall be a Hollander, not a Dutchman born in the south of Africa, who shall have resided for three months in Great Britain. As soon as they have secured him, they will subsidise the school, with this distinct proviso—that in the first year of the life of the school one hour per day shall be devoted to the teaching of the Dutch language, that in the second year two hours per day shall be devoted to the teaching of the Dutch language, that in the third year three hours per day shall be devoted to the teaching of the Dutch language, and that in the fourth year the whole educational system

shall be carried on in Dutch. I will refer now to the blue-book issued in England in July last, so that there can be no mistake about it. It is on page 77.

Mr. DUNSFORD: Do you want us to teach Japanese?

Mr. LESINA: Do we want to teach the Germans German in our schools?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Three-fourths of the children in our schools are not Germans.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: The total amount it costs the Transvaal Government to carry on the system of education is £220,905, and, at any rate, three-fourths of that is provided by the Uitlander. The Uitlander therefore asks that he shall have some measure of education given to his children; education in his own tongue. The cost is £9 15s. 1½d. per child on each of the whole of the Uitlander population on the fields, and there are only 229 who receive the benefits of education. Out of the number of children educated by the State—namely, 11,438—only 216 come from the goldfields. That is the position. The Uitlanders have provided, by subscription, £100,000, and have promises of £15,000 a year for subsidising and carrying on their own schools; but they say, "When our taxation is so great as it is at present, we should receive some measure of consideration from the Transvaal Executive." Two years ago, after repeated representation on their part, the authorities promised that something should be done, and in 1897 they placed £30,000 on the Estimates for the specific purpose of paying for the education of the Uitlander children. But in that year they only expended the small sum of £3,050; and although last year

[7.30 p.m.] £50,000 was placed on the Estimates the Uitlanders say that if they only get the same proportion as in 1897 their position will not be any way better than it was then. And I fancy all common-sense men will agree with them.

Mr. DAWSON: What do we do in Queensland with regard to the Catholic schools? They are Uitlanders.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I have lost the number of the page to which I wish to allude here, but I want to point out to hon. members opposite that, although the Uitlander has to find that large amount of taxation, his children who do attend the schools are insulted and chaffed about being the children of English parents, and are made to feel their position most acutely by the Boer authorities in the school. It is shown there that they are subjected to insults on all sides. The expulsion of aliens is another question that has given rise to a great amount of friction. The Executive have the power to order anyone who is not a Boer subject to be removed from the Transvaal or to live in such portion of the Transvaal as they think fit. There is no freedom, and the Uitlanders have been placed in very unfortunate positions on many occasions. But the matter which gives the greatest amount of trouble to our fellow-beings in the Transvaal is the system of commandeering which is practised by the Boer authorities. Only a very few years ago there was an expedition being fitted out to suppress the natives in Magato's country; and although it is absolutely laid down as being against the spirit of the convention under which freedom was granted to the South African Republic, British subjects, both white and coloured, were commandeered for that purpose. And it was perhaps not the mere fact of the commandeering that sunk so deeply into the feelings of the Uitlanders as the way in which it was carried out. This commandeering went on for a period of some eighteen months. To

give some idea of the brutalities committed, I intend to read an extract or two, to which I invite the special attention of the leader of the Labour party, so that he may see whether the Premier was not using the right words this afternoon when he said it was a pleasant thing for him to think that our people in Queensland were going to help to put down the savage atrocities which are carried out in the Transvaal. Hon. members opposite do not like these facts. The leader of the Labour party said he did not believe they occurred. Well, I am going to read certain sworn affidavits which were sent in because the people have no opportunity of discussing their grievances at public meetings. They sent in their affidavits to the British Consul, and these came through enclosed in a despatch from the acting British Agent at Pretoria, Mr. Edmond Fraser, to the High Commissioner at Capetown. At the risk of wearying the House I must quote one or two of these affidavits. The first, with regard to these commandeering brutalities, was sworn by one Caroline Lingevelt, who says—

I am a widow, and live at 7 Wohluter street, Johannesburg. I have been in Johannesburg nearly four years. I am a native of Oudtstroom, Cape Colony, and a British subject. I carry on business in washing and ironing in Johannesburg, and support myself. I am coloured, but my grandfather was a white man—a Scotchman. At 11 o'clock on Saturday night, 29th October, my son, Abram Longevilt, who lives with me, came to me and said that the fieldcornet (Lombard) wanted his pass. At the same time I heard some one shake the back door and say, "Open the door, or I will kick it open." I replied, "Wait till I have put on my dress." "No!" answered Mr. de Koch, "open at once or I will kick it open." I then opened the door and said, "I am a widow, my husband has been dead for eight years, and there is no man here; there is only my one son in the room at the back." I afterwards looked out, and saw that the yard was full of men. Mr. de Koch is the pass-officer here. Another man, long and stout, whose name I do not know, came into the house, and pulled the blanket off the bed on which my daughter Caroline, aged sixteen, was lying, and did the same to the bed in which were Mabel Blommestein and my little nephew. The night was cool. After having looked under the bed and behind the screen the man went out. My boy was taken to prison because he had not a pass. Since then I have bailed him out for £3, which was returned to me on his acquittal. Mabel Blommestein was nine years old, and I boarded and lodged her. This little girl Mabel became suddenly ill later in the night, having been frightened at the noise and excitement, and on my calling in Dr. Croghan he said she had a severe attack of inflammation of the lungs, directly caused by the fright and exposure. She had to go to the hospital, and has since died there.

Annexed to this is Dr. Croghan's certificate to the effect that the cause of the girl's death was as stated in the affidavit. That is one case. It is brutal enough, and if hon. members want anything more brutal there are twenty-five more affidavits of the same kind I might read, but I will content myself with reading the next one, that of Sarah Mehring, who says—

I am a married woman, living at 7 Wolhunter street, Johannesburg. My husband works at the battery of the Ferrhia Company, and lives with me. I carry on business as a washerwoman. I was born at Somerset East, Cape Colony, and am a British subject. I can read and write, but owing to a sore hand I am at present unable to sign my name. I came to the Transvaal three years ago. I am a "Cape woman"—my father was a white man. On Saturday, 29th October, about 11 o'clock p.m., when my husband and I were asleep in bed, I was woken by a noise next door, and woke my husband. The fieldcornet (Lombard) was there. He had a great crowd of men with him, who filled the yard. They knocked at my door. I asked who was there? The reply was, "Don't ask; I will kick it open if you do not open it." It was De Koch, the pass-officer, who spoke. I opened the door, and they took my husband away because he had no pass. He is a Capeman, born in Worcester, Cape Colony, and a British subject. The officials were very rough and noisy, and frightened me very much. I was in the family way—seven months gone. In consequence

of the fright, I was prematurely confined and was dangerously ill. My life was in danger, and I am still ill—not quite better.

It is not necessary for me to read these other affidavits, but this blue-book teems with them. They are not the affidavits of women only, but of men, whose oaths I have every reason to believe were entitled to as much belief as those of other Englishmen, and they were handed to the British agent at Pretoria. Hon. members opposite say that other evidence can be adduced, but how can other evidence possibly be adduced in a country which will not allow people to meet together to discuss their grievances?

Mr. KERR: The Gattion outrage knocked that on one side.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I may point out that these commandeering reprisals having lasted for eighteen months, certain representations were made to the Executive of the Transvaal by Sir Alfred Milner and Mr. Conningham Greene, and they asked for the suspension of this man Lombard, who must have been a fiend in human form. The authorities then constituted a court of inquiry into the whole business, and the court, as every Dutch court has proved to be, was entirely in favour of the Dutchman. This man, after inquiry, was reinstated, but the bitter feeling that had been engendered between the police, headed by this man Lombard, and the Uitlanders culminated in a disturbance which took place on 24th December, when a man named Edgar was killed. The facts of that case were shortly these: This man Edgar was a boiler-maker, an Englishman, and a British subject. He had been out during the evening and was returning home between 12 and 1 o'clock, and when nearing home someone made an insulting remark to him, and he, as most Britishers would do, knocked the man down. This man, Foster, who was knocked down, was under the influence of drink, but his friends immediately set up a hullabulloo for the police and they appeared on the scene. In the meantime Edgar had gone quietly into his house a few yards away, and proceeded to go to bed, his wife being in bed at the time. The police came up; three of them rushed the house and attempted to get in at the window—mark you without warrant of any description! Then a fourth policeman appeared—a man called Jones, who pulled out his revolver, rushed to the door, and attempted to force it. Edgar's wife was in bed, and he was in the act of undressing to get into bed when he heard the door being forced, and he naturally ran round into the other room to prevent it if possible. At the very moment he arrived the door swung open, and Jones, without any warning, as was sworn to by a witness named Shepperd, shot Edgar as he stood in his tracks.

Mr. TURLEY: What countryman was Jones?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Jones was a burgher of two years' standing.

Mr. McDONALD: He was a Britisher.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: They are sympathising with the police now.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Yes, I am glad to hear that the hon. gentlemen sometimes sympathise with the police—even Dutch police. Now, that man Jones, who committed the murder, rushed away from the scene and was afterwards apprehended by the Boer authorities. They apprehended him on a charge of justifiable homicide, and the same day allowed him out on bail of £200, but not on his own recognisances. He was allowed out on the recognisances of his fellow-policemen who agreed to allow a moiety of their monthly pay to be deducted should he abscond. The British Consul objected to this man being arraigned on a charge of justifiable homicide, and insisted that he

should be tried before a jury for murder. Subsequently he was tried by a jury for murder, but what happened? At the trial the man Edgar's wife, and those who happened to be witnesses and who were not Boers, gave their testimony, and not only did the jury acquit Jones on the charge of murder, but the judge, in his comments, said he agreed entirely with the verdict, and he hoped that the policemen would always, under similar conditions, know how to do their duty. As much as to say, "Well done, policeman! Go and do it again—shoot a few more." The Uitlanders were so incensed at the action of the Court in acquitting this man Jones that they came together in a mass meeting and handed to the British Consul a petition signed by 5000 persons asking Queen Victoria to intercede on their behalf to redress their grievances. Now, that petition was never presented, because it contained an informality, which I believe was that it touched upon a political question which her Majesty's consul at Pretoria did not feel disposed to send without first making representations to the Executive of the Transvaal. That petition will give a better idea of what the position of the Uitlanders really was than any words of mine, and I will therefore read it. It was handed in to the British consul at Pretoria on 28th December, 1898, and reads in this way:—

The meeting of the British subjects held at Johannesburg on 24th December for the purpose of endorsing a petition, to be presented through the British Agent, to Her Majesty's Government in connection with the shooting of the man Edgar by a policeman, was attended by some thousands of people. The proceedings, which at first were quiet and orderly, later on assumed a somewhat unpleasant phase. Owing to the crowd resenting some remarks disparaging to Britishers made by a Boer, as one of a party assembled apparently for the purpose of showing their contempt for the proceedings, the crowd closed in upon the party of Boers, and hustled them about. Sticks were freely used. The police came to the rescue of their countrymen, and managed to find a shelter for them within the post office walls. An appeal was made to the British to act quietly, and the excitement subsided, and the business of the meeting was proceeded with.

Mr. C. D. Webb asked the crowd to accompany the committee to the British Consul's office, for the purpose of presenting the petition which had been drawn up. The time had come when the British subjects should assert their rights for justice. The petition committee then proceeded to drive to the consulate, but the horses were unharnessed, and the crowd dragged the carriage to its destination. The British Vice-Consul, Mr. Emory Evans, received the deputation on the balcony of the Standard Buildings, and intimated that there were to be no speeches, simply the reading of the petition. The petition, which was read by Mr. Dodd, was as follows:—

The humble petition of British subjects resident on the Witwatersrand Gold Fields, to Her Britannic Majesty Queen Victoria:—

1. Your loyal subjects on these fields are by law denied the free right of possessing such arms as may be necessary to protect their lives and property, and such obstacles are placed in their way as to render the obtaining of the necessary permits almost impossible; consequently the Uitlander population of this State is, to all intents and purposes, an unarmed community.

2. On the other hand, the burgher section of the community, irrespective of age, is permitted to possess and carry arms without let or hindrance, and are, in fact, on application, supplied them by the Government free of charge.

3. The police of this State is exclusively recruited from the burgher element, many of the police being youths fresh from the rural districts, without experience or tact, and in many instances without general education or a knowledge of the English language. The force, as a whole, is entirely out of sympathy with the British section of the community, which forms the majority of the population.

4. The foot police of Johannesburg, in whose appointment we have no voice, is not a military force, yet its members not only carry batons, but are also armed with six-chambered revolvers, invariably carried loaded.

5. Under these circumstances, given an unarmed community policed by a body of inexperienced rustics carrying weapons of precision and utterly out of

sympathy with the community they are supposed to protect, it is not surprising the power placed in the hands of this police force should be constantly abused.

6. For years past your subjects have in consequence had continually to complain of innumerable acts of petty tyranny at the hands of the police.

7. During the last few months, however, this antagonistic attitude of the police has assumed a much more serious and aggressive aspect. Without warrant they have invaded private houses and taken the occupants into custody on frivolous and unfounded charges never proceeded with; violently arrested British subjects on the public streets on unintelligible charges; and generally displayed towards Your Majesty's subjects a temper which undoubtedly tends to endanger the peace of the community. In adopting this demeanour, the police are supported, with but few honourable exceptions, by the higher officials, as instanced by the continual persecution in the courts of many of Your Majesty's coloured subjects at the very time when negotiations are proceeding between Your Majesty's representative and the Transvaal Government with regard to their status. This feeling is also strongly evidenced in the particular case which we now bring to Your Majesty's notice.

8. The lamentable tragedy which has been the immediate cause of this our humble petition cannot be regarded as incidental, but as symptomatic.

9. This case is that of the shooting of Tom Jackson Edgar, a British subject, by Police Constable Barend Stephanus Jones, a member of the Johannesburg constabulary.

10. From the accompanying affidavits already published and sworn by eye-witnesses of the tragedy, it would appear that the deceased, while in the occupation of his own house, was shot dead by Police Constable Barend Stephanus Jones, as the latter was in the act of unlawfully breaking into the house without a warrant.

11. P. C. Barend Stephanus Jones, though in the first instance placed in custody on a charge of murder, was almost immediately afterwards let out on bail by the public prosecutor, who, without waiting for any magisterial inquiry, reduced the charge on his own initiative to that of culpable homicide.

12. The bail on which the prisoner was released was the same in amount—namely, £250—as that required a few days previously from an Uitlander charged with a common assault on a member of the Government secret service, and the penalty for which was a fine of £20.

13. The widow and orphan of the late Tom Jackson Edgar have been left absolutely destitute through the death of their natural protector.

14. To sum up—

We humbly represent to Your Majesty that we, your loyal subjects resident here, are entirely defenceless, since—

(a) The police are appointed by the Government and not by the municipality;

(b) We have no voice in the government of the country;

(c) There is no longer any independent judiciary to which we can appeal;

(d) There is therefore no power within this State to which we can appeal with the least hope of success; and as we are not allowed to arm ourselves, our last resource is to fall back on our status as British subjects.

15. We therefore humbly pray:—That your Majesty will instruct your Representative to take such steps as will secure:

(a) A full and impartial trial, on a proper indictment, of P. C. Barend Stephanus Jones, and adequate punishment for his offence, if found guilty.

(b) Proper provision by the Transvaal Government for the needs of the widow and orphan of the deceased Tom Jackson Edgar, killed by their agent.

(c) The extension of Your Majesty's protectorate to the lives, liberties, and property of your loyal subjects resident here, and such other steps as may be necessary to terminate the existing intolerable state of affairs, and your petitioners will ever pray.

That was the petition handed in, and that was what first gave rise to the difficulties which have now assumed such an acute form. The men who led those men into the consulate to present that petition were arrested for having incited the people, though there was no attempt at addressing the crowd.

Mr. McDONALD: What about the unionist prisoners?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: When they were let out on bail after being arrested they had to find recognisances in £1,000 each, whereas before

then a murderer had been let out on the recognisances of his fellowmen to the amount of £200. That is justice for you! It was at this point that the British South African League came into prominence. They wished to protest against the harsh treatment of Messrs. Dodd and Webb by the Boer authorities; so they wrote to the Transvaal Executive, and said that as they were not allowed to hold an open-air meeting they applied for permission to hold an indoor meeting, and the subjects to be discussed were plainly laid before the Secretary of State and the State Attorney of the Transvaal. They were shortly:—

- (1) To protest against the arrest of Messrs. Dodd and Webb;
- (2) To condemn the Public Meetings Act;
- (3) To endorse a petition to Her Majesty Queen Victoria praying for her protection.

The Boer authorities knew the [8 p.m.] meeting was to be held, and they organised to prevent it being held. There were 200 men at work on what is known as "The Main Reef Road," and they were sent with instructions to block this meeting. The consequence was that the meeting ended in chaos. The position of the whole matter is summed up in the despatch from Sir Alfred Milner to Mr. Chamberlain, dated 5th April, 1899, which reads—

Government House, Capetown,
5th April, 1899.

SIR,—I have the honour to forward herewith the certified and attested copies of affidavits which form an enclosure to Mr. Wyberg's letter, transmitted to you in my despatch of the 28th March, but which did not reach me in time to catch the last mail steamer."

There were twenty-six sworn affidavits, which it is not necessary for me to read. The despatch further reads—

1. That early on the morning of Saturday, the 14th January, the foremen in charge of the various camps along the main reef were instructed to tell a certain number of their workmen to be at the Amphitheatre in Johannesburg at 2 p.m., where they would be addressed by an official of the Public Works Department, Mr. P. J. Malan.
2. That the affair had been planned beforehand, and that Acting Road Inspector Papenfus and others systematically visited the various camps on that morning in order to beat up recruits, and that was made in some cases to ensure that the persons sent should be "treu"—i.e., Boer or Afrikaner workmen, who might be expected to take the side of the Government. The Russian workmen were not asked to go.
3. That the men were paid two hours earlier than usual, and that those men who were ordered to go were told if they could not get Government carts, they should hire and recover afterwards.
4. That in some cases, as that of the Boksburg section, the men were conveyed the greater part of the way by Government carts.
5. That when the men arrived at the Amphitheatre, a man who was either Mr. Bosman or Mr. Boshof, and perhaps both of them, told them to go to the police station.
6. That on arriving at the police station they were addressed by Mr. Broeksma, and told they were to break up the meeting.
7. That they then went into the Amphitheatre, and that there were present besides Mr. Broeksma, Mr. Papenfus, Mr. Jacobs, Mr. De Villiers, and Mr. Burgers; also, an official as well as several prominent members of the town and special police.
8. That the police did not make the smallest effort to check the disturbances which occurred, and they maintained an attitude of indifference.
9. That Broeksma and Lieutenant Murphy of the morality police actually assisted in breaking chairs and encouraging the rioters.

I have, etc.,

A. MILNER,
Governor and High Commissioner.

Now, that is an official document dealing with this matter, and I may point out that the Uitlanders had received permission to hold this meeting in the hope of redressing some of their grievances. It was broken up by the Boers. The Uitlanders then proceeded to write a petition, and it was quietly circulated among the Uitlanders for signature, and 21,684 names were

obtained—all Uitlanders. That petition has been presented to the Queen, and that is the petition that the present negotiations are based upon. This petition was sent by the British Agent at Pretoria to the High Commissioner at Capetown, and thence to the Queen. It reads—

The humble petition of British subjects resident on the Witwatersrand, South African Republic, to Her Most Gracious Majesty Queen Victoria.

Sheweth that:—

1. For a number of years prior to 1896 considerable discontent existed among the Uitlander population here, caused by the manner in which the government of the country was being conducted. The great majority of the Uitlander population consist of British subjects.

2. It was and is notorious that the Uitlanders have no share in the government of the country, although they represent the wealth, intellect, and energy of the State.

3. The feelings of intense irritation have been aggravated by the manner in which remonstrances have been met.

4. Petitions signed by large numbers of Your Majesty's subjects have been repeatedly addressed to the Government of this State, but have failed of their effect and have been scornfully rejected.

5. At the end of 1895 the discontent culminated in an armed insurrection against the Government, which also failed of its object.

6. On that occasion the people of Johannesburg placed themselves unreservedly in the hands of the High Commissioner, in the fullest confidence that he would see justice done.

7. On that occasion President Kruger published a proclamation in which he again held out hopes of reforms.

8. Instead of the admitted grievances being redressed, the spirit of the legislation adopted by the Volksraad during the past few years has been of a most unfriendly character.

9. In proof thereof, we refer to such measures as the following:—

The Immigration of Aliens Act.

The Press Law.

The Aliens Expulsion Law.

Of these, the first was withdrawn as being an infringement of the London Convention of 1884.

By the second the President is invested with the powers of suppressing wholly, or for a stated time, any publication which, in his individual opinion, is opposed to good manners or subversive of order. This despotic power he has not hesitated to exercise towards newspapers which support British interests.

The Aliens Expulsion Act draws a distinction between the burghers of the State and Uitlanders, which we humbly submit is in conflict with the Convention of 1884. Thus, whilst burghers of the State are protected from expulsion, British subjects can be put over the border at the will of the President, without the right of appealing to the High Court, which is, nevertheless, open to the offending burgher.

This law was repealed, only to be re-enacted in all its essential provisions during the last session of the Volksraad.

10. The promise made by the President with regard to conferring municipal government upon Johannesburg was to outward appearance kept; but it is an ineffective measure, conferring small benefit upon the community, and investing the inhabitants with but little additional power of legislating for their own municipal affairs. Of the two members to be elected for each ward, one at least must be a burgher. Besides this, the burgomaster is appointed by the Government, not elected by the people. The burgomaster has a casting vote, and, considering himself a representative of the Government and not of the people, has not hesitated to oppose his will to the unanimous vote of the councillors. The Government also possess the right to veto any resolution of the council. As the burghers resident in Johannesburg were estimated at the last census as 1,039 in number as against 23,503 Uitlanders, and as they belong to the poorest and most ignorant class, it is manifest that these burghers have an undue share in the representation of the town, and are invested with a power which neutralises the efforts of the larger and more intelligent portion of the community. Every burgher resident is qualified to vote, irrespective of being a ratepayer or property owner within the municipal area.

11. Notwithstanding the evident desire of the Government to legislate solely in the interests of the burghers, and impose undue burdens on the Uitlanders, there was still a hope that the declaration of the President on the 30th of December, 1896, had some meaning, and that the

Government would duly consider grievances properly brought before its notice. Accordingly, in the early part of 1897, steps were taken to bring to the notice of the Government the alarming depression in the mining industry, and the reasons which, in the opinions of men well qualified to judge, had led up to it.

12. The Government at last appointed a commission consisting of its own officials, which was empowered to inquire into the industrial conditions of the mining population, and to suggest such a scheme for the removal of existing grievances as might seem advisable and necessary.

13. On the 5th of August the commission issued their report, in which the reasons for the then state of depression were fully set forth, and many reforms were recommended as necessary for the well-being of the community. Among them it will be sufficient to mention the appointment of an Industrial Board, having its seat in Johannesburg, for the special supervision of the Liquor Law and the Pass Law, and to combat the illicit dealing in gold and amalgam.

14. The Government refused to accede to the report of the commission, which was a standing indictment against its administration in the past, but referred the question to the Volksraad, which in turn referred it to a select committee of its own members. The result created consternation in Johannesburg, for, whilst abating in some trifling respects burdens which bore heavily on the mining industry, the committee of the Raad, ignoring the main recommendations of the commission, actually advised an increased taxation of the country, and that in a way which bore most heavily on the Uitlander. The suggestions of the committee were at once adopted, and the tariff increased accordingly.

15. At the beginning of 1897 the Government went a step further in their aggressive policy towards the Uitlander, and attacked the independence of the High Court, which until then, Your Majesty's subjects had regarded as the sole remaining safeguard of their civil rights. Early in the year Act No. 1 was rushed through the Volksraad with indecent haste. This high-handed Act was not allowed to pass without criticism; but the Government, deaf to all remonstrance, threatened reprisals on those professional men who raised their voices in protest, and, finally, on the 16th of February, 1898, dismissed the Chief Justice, Mr. J. G. Kotze, for maintaining his opinions. His place was filled shortly afterwards by Mr. Gregorowski, the judge who had been especially brought from the Orange Free State to preside over the trial of the reform prisoners in 1896, and who, after passing of the Act above referred to, had expressed an opinion that no man of self-respect would sit on the bench whilst that law remained on the statute-book of the Republic. All the judges at the time this law was passed condemned it in a formal protest, publicly recorded by the Chief Justice in the High Court, as a gross interference with the independence of that tribunal. That protest has never been modified or retracted, and of the five judges who signed the declaration three still sit on the bench.

16. The hostile attitude of the Government towards Your Majesty's subjects has been accentuated by the building of forts, not only around Pretoria, but also overlooking Johannesburg. The existence of these forts is a source of constant menace and irritation to British subjects, and does much to keep alive the race-feeling which the Government of this State professes to deprecate. This feeling of hostility has infected the general body of the burghers. Most noticeable is the antagonistic demeanour of the police, and of the officials under whom they immediately act.

17. The constitution and *personnel* of the police force is one of the standing menaces to the peace of Johannesburg. It has already been the subject of remonstrance to the Government of this Republic, but hitherto without avail. An efficient police force cannot be drawn from a people such as the burghers of this State, nevertheless, the Government refuses to open its ranks to any other class of the community. As a consequence, the safety of the lives and property of the inhabitants is confided in a large measure to the care of men fresh from the country districts, who are unaccustomed to town life, and ignorant of the ways and requirements of the people. When it is considered that this police force is armed with revolvers in addition to the ordinary police truncheons, it is not surprising that, instead of a defence, they are absolutely a danger to the community at large.

17A. Trial by jury exists in name, but the juries are selected exclusively from among the burghers. Consequently, in any case where there is the least possibility of race or class interests being involved, there is the gravest reason to expect a miscarriage of justice.

18. Encouraged and abetted by the example of their superior officers, the police have become lately more

aggressive than ever in their attitude towards British subjects. As, however, remonstrances and appeals to the Government were useless, the indignities to which Your Majesty's subjects were daily exposed from this source had to be endured as best they might. Public indignation was at length fully aroused by the death, at the hands of a police constable, of a British subject named Tom Jackson Edgar.

19. The circumstances of this affair were bad enough in themselves, but were accentuated by the action of the Public Prosecutor, who, although the accused was charged with murder, on his own initiative reduced the charge to that of culpable homicide only, and released the prisoner on the recognisances of his comrades in the police force, the bail being originally fixed at £200, or less than the amount which is commonly demanded for offences under the liquor law, or for charges of common assault.

20. This conduct of a high State official caused the most intense feeling to prevail in Johannesburg. It was then thought that the time had arrived to take some steps whereby British subjects might for the future be protected from the indignities of which they had so long complained. It was, therefore, decided to make an appeal direct to Your Most Gracious Majesty, setting forth the grievances under which Your Majesty's subjects laboured. A petition was accordingly prepared and presented to Your Majesty's Vice-Consul on the 24th of December, 1898, by some 4,000 or 5,000 British subjects. The behaviour of those present was orderly and quiet, and everything was done to prevent any infringement of the Public Meetings Law.

21. Owing to a technical informality, Your Majesty's representative declined to transmit the petition to Your Majesty.

22. Immediately it became known that the petition would not go forward to Your Majesty, the Government ordered the arrest of Messrs. Clement Davies Webb and Thomas Robery Dodd—respectively the Vice-President and Secretary of the Transvaal Province of the South African League—under whose auspices the petition had been presented, on a charge of contravening the Public Meetings Act by convening a meeting in the open air. They were admitted to bail of £1,000 each—five times the amount required from the man charged with culpable homicide.

23. Thereupon Your Majesty's subjects, considering the arrest of these two gentlemen a gross violation of the rights of British subjects, and an attempt to strain unduly against them a law which had already been represented to the Government as pressing most heavily upon the Uitlander population, decided to call a public meeting in an enclosed place, as permitted by the law, for the purpose of ventilating their grievances and endorsing a fresh petition to Your Majesty.

24. Prior to holding the meeting the South African League ascertained from the Government, through the State Attorney, that, as in their opinion the meeting was perfectly legal in its objects, the Government had no intention of prohibiting it.

25. The meeting took place on the 14th of January, 1899, at the Amphitheatre—a large iron building capable of holding from 3,000 to 4,000 people. Prior to the advertised hour of opening, an overwhelmingly large body of Boers, many of whom were police in plain clothes, and other employees of the Government, forced an entrance by a side door and practically took complete possession of the building. They were all more or less armed—some with sticks, some with police batons, some with iron bars, and some with revolvers.

26. The mere appearance of the speakers was the signal for disorder to commence. The Boers would not allow the meeting to proceed, but at once commenced to wreck the place, break up the chairs, and utilise the broken portions of them as weapons of offence against any single unarmed Englishman they could find.

27. There were present several Government officials, justices of the peace, and lieutenants of police in uniform, and the commandant of police, but they were appealed to in vain, and the work of destruction proceeded, apparently with their concurrence. Several Englishmen were seriously injured by the attacks of the rioters, but in no case was an arrest effected, although offenders were pointed out and their arrest demanded; nor, indeed, was any attempt made by the police to quell the riot. Up to the present time no steps have been taken by the Government towards prosecuting the ringleaders of the disturbance, nor has a single arrest been made, notwithstanding the fact that the police officials who were present at the meeting admitted that some of the rioters were well known to them.

28. Those of Your Majesty's subjects who were present at the meeting were unarmed and defenceless, and, seeing that the rioters had the support of the police and of some of the higher officials of the State, they refrained from any attempt at retaliation, preferring to

rely upon more constitutional methods, and to lay a full statement of their grievances before Your Most Gracious Majesty.

29. The condition of Your Majesty's subjects in this State has indeed become wellnigh intolerable.

30. The acknowledged and admitted grievances of which Your Majesty's subjects complained prior to 1895 not only are not redressed, but exist to-day in an aggravated form. They are still deprived of all political rights; they are denied any voice in the government of the country; they are taxed above the requirements of the country, the revenue of which is misapplied and devoted to objects which keep alive a continuous and well-founded feeling of irritation, without in any way advancing the general interest of the State. Maladministration and peculation of public moneys go hand in hand, without any vigorous measures being adopted to put a stop to the scandal. The education of Uitlander children is made subject to impossible conditions. The police afford no adequate protection to the lives and property of the inhabitants of Johannesburg; they are rather a source of danger to the peace and safety of the Uitlander population.

31. A further grievance has become prominent since the beginning of the year. The power vested in the Government by means of the Public Meetings Act has been a menace to Your Majesty's subjects since the enactment of the Act in 1894. This power has now been applied in order to deliver a blow that strikes at the inherent and inalienable birthright of every British subject—namely, his right to petition his Sovereign. Straining to the utmost the language and intention of the law, the Government have arrested two British subjects who assisted in presenting a petition to Your Majesty on behalf of 4,000 fellow-subjects. Not content with this, the Government, when Your Majesty's loyal subjects again attempted to lay their grievances before Your Majesty, permitted their meeting to be broken up, and the objects of it to be defeated by a body of Boers, organised by Government officials, and acting under the protection of the police. By reason, therefore, of the direct, as well as the indirect, act of the Government, Your Majesty's loyal subjects have been prevented from publicly ventilating their grievances, and from laying them before Your Majesty.

32. Wherefore, your Majesty's humble petitioners humbly beseech your Most Gracious Majesty to extend your Majesty's permission to your Majesty's loyal subjects resident in this State, and to cause an inquiry to be made into the grievances and complaints enumerated and set forth in this humble petition, and to direct your Majesty's representative in South Africa to take measures which will secure the speedy reform of the abuses complained of, and to obtain substantial guarantees from the Government of this State for a recognition of their rights as British subjects.

Mr. TURLEY: Hear, hear!

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I thank the hon. member for South Brisbane for his ironical "hear, hear!" If the hon. member thinks he has a duty to perform I am always willing to listen to him.

Mr. TURLEY: Oh no; you are the man with a mission.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: The petition which I have read—and I must apologise for having had to read such long quotations—is the production of cool, sober-minded, and thoughtful men, and is signed by 21,684 persons. They ask for the redress of grievances which had been refused them by the Volksraad. President Kruger then saw that the matter was becoming very serious, and he proposed certain reforms. This brings me to the question of electoral reform. All the events which led up to the preparation and presentation of the petition to which I have referred, I have recounted as far as I was capable of doing it, but I know that I have overlooked some points. The Uitlanders then saw, as hon. members opposite profess to have seen in days gone by, that the way to overcome their difficulties was not to go growling outside, but to secure representation in the Volksraad. Hon. members opposite must be at one with the Uitlanders on that point.

Mr. GLASLEY: That is a tenable position.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I mention it as a compliment to hon. members opposite, because I am certainly one of those who thoroughly agree

with that plank in the platform of the Labour party. I say if they are taxed they should have representation. No man in this Chamber can ever attribute to me conservative notions on the question of representation in this House. I ask hon. members then to bear with me a little longer, while I look at this question of securing the franchise. The Uitlander, when he emigrates into the Transvaal, has to be a resident of that country for two years before he can be naturalised. He is eligible to vote for a member of the Second Volksraad as soon as he is naturalised. He then has to wait two years longer before he is eligible to become a member of the Second Volksraad, and then ten years more before he can become a burgher with the right to sit and vote in the Volksraad. That is the position at the present moment. In 1876, I think, for the purpose of overcoming the agitation, they admitted the Uitlanders to the Second Volksraad, still reserving to themselves full controlling power of the First Volksraad. President Kruger, in a speech delivered at Heidelberg on the 17th of March, a speech which was sent to him for ratification before it was published, said—

When a stranger had been in the country for two years he could be naturalised, and could vote for the Second Volksraad. A further two years after he was naturalised he was eligible for election as a member of the Second Volksraad, and then after ten years he could become a fully enfranchised burgher; thus only after fourteen years he could obtain full franchise.

That is, that in fourteen years a stranger could obtain the franchise, and, as a man must be twenty-one before he could be naturalised, he would be nearly forty before he could become a fully enfranchised burgher. And even then he could not vote for the President; that power was reserved entirely to the burghers of Dutch extraction.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: What about the children?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: The children of naturalised parents might receive the franchise, if they applied for it, when they were sixteen years of age, but if they did not apply for it during their sixteenth year they were treated as Uitlanders. When he found that difficulty had arisen in connection with this matter, President Kruger proposed to ameliorate the condition of the Uitlander by reducing the term in which he might become a burgher from ten to five years. We who had not considered the matter might think that a fairly liberal concession, as I did at first, but it must be remembered that an Uitlander would still under that proposal have to be a resident of the country for two years before he could be naturalised, two years longer before he could become a member of the Second Volksraad, and then five years before he could become a burgher, which makes nine years altogether. President Kruger only proposed to shorten the last period of ten years by five years, but even this concession was proposed with a restriction, the restriction that an Uitlander could only become a burgher if two-thirds of the burghers in his ward approved of his becoming one.

It appears to me very much as if [8.30 p.m.] you asked for bread and were offered a stone. The Uitlander strongly objected to it, and nothing has been done to remedy the objection. The agitation having started gathered and gained force as all agitations will in a cause that is right, and if the cause is not right the agitation will not gain force. Since the petition went home there has been a conference between President Kruger and Sir Alfred Milner at Bloemfontein, in the Orange Free State. No amicable arrangement could be come to as Milner wanted to get all he could for the Uitlander and President Kruger would not give way. So things have been going on from bad to worse

until we have arrived at the present strained relations which have led to the resolution submitted to this House to-day.

Mr. TURLEY: Remember the Transvaal proposal was to be retrospective.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Yes. There is one thing in connection with the franchise which should be mentioned. The leader of the Labour party made the distinct statement in this House this afternoon that we were asking for the franchise for the Uitlander without wishing that he should take the oath of allegiance to the Republic of South Africa. That is distinctly an absolute misstatement.

Mr. DUNSFORD: He was questioning the nature of the oath.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: The nature of the oath is such that the hon. member for Charters Towers would not ask a black in this country to repeat it. The oath is a disgusting and brutal thing, and it is full of innuendoes and insults to the head of our Empire; and if you asked a Britisher to take it his very stomach would rise at it.

Mr. FISHER: Have you read ours of 100 years ago?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I am dealing with the events of the present year. This oath of allegiance is required as it is required in every country.

Mr. GLASSEY: In every country in the world?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: And the Uitlander is prepared to take it, but you see the position is this, that the Uitlander has to be two years resident before he can be naturalised; and supposing he takes that oath of allegiance to the Transvaal Republic, there may be another resolution of the Volksraad, and he may find himself nowhere. He has lost his rights as a British subject, and he is nowhere.

Mr. BELL: And Great Britain exercises suzerainty over the Transvaal.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: And as the hon. member for Dalby reminds me—a fact I have forgotten to touch upon all night—the country is under British suzerainty. The country was given its independence by the English and by British blood.

MEMBERS on the Government benches: Hear, hear!

Mr. ARMSTRONG: The country was insolvent and in danger of being overrun by the Zulus, and the British secured their position for them and gave them their independence.

Mr. DUNSFORD: They fought for it and gained it themselves.

Mr. LESINA: They won it at Majuba Hill.

Mr. TURLEY: Your statements are questionable, anyway.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Very well; I hold my statement of the case to be right. I do not think I should close without touching upon one other question. Hon. members appear to consider the present state of affairs to be attributable to the Jamieson raid. That may or may not be so; I am not going to argue about it. I never approved of the Jamieson raid, but I point out the contrast between what the Uitlander has asked Great Britain to do for those who are suffering injustice in the Transvaal, and what the Boers asked after Great Britain agreed to indemnify the Transvaal for the Jamieson raid, and the cost of suppressing it. The President sent his bill along in due time, and this is it—

	£	s.	d.
(1) Expenses of military and commando services in connection with the raid	136,733	4	3
(2) Compensation to the Netherlands South Africa Railway Company for the use according to the concession of the railway during the commando on account of the Jamieson raid	9,500	0	

	£	s.	d.
(3) Disbursements for relatives of the killed and wounded	234	19	6
(4) For annuities, pensions, and disbursements to widows and children of slain burghers, as also to wounded burghers, a total sum of	28,243	0	0
(5) Telegraph Department's expenses for overtime work, several service telegrams in South Africa and several cablegrams	4,692	11	9
(6) Hospital expenses of the sick and wounded in Jamieson's troop	225	0	0
(7) Maintenance of the families of burghers called up on active service during the raid	177	8	8
(8) Compensation to be paid to burghers who answered the call to arms, for their services and for their trouble and anxiety	462,120	0	0
(9) Account of costs of the Orange Free State	38,011	19	1
(10) Moral or intellectual damages	1,000,000	0	0
Total	£1,677,938	3	3

I think that is a matter which at the present juncture should be stated.

Mr. TURLEY: The Chartered Company should have paid it, too.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: You will have noticed that the "moral and intellectual" damages amounted to nearly one-third more than the whole of the other claims for compensation to widows and laceration of feelings put together. You will see they made most ample provision for every one of the burghers' families because they thought they might loot Great Britain. Here we are asking for simple concessions for our own people, and we find we cannot even get simple justice from the people of the Transvaal. I would just say that hon. members on both sides, when they read these things with unbiased minds, must see that Great Britain could do nothing else but step in and help our fellow-creatures there.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Further, I make this statement on the floor of this House—that I regret to think that a man in my own colony could stand up here, in the Parliament of Queensland and call one of our own flesh and blood who is willing to volunteer to assist to redress these grievances—call him a "cur" for doing so.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I repudiate that, and I say that, though the hon. member leads the Labour party, and may aspire to a high position in politics in Queensland, he will find my words come true, when I say that those words of his will be remembered against him, and he will find that he has driven a nail in his coffin he will never be able to remove.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and laughter.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I do not prophesy. I state what is a fact. The hon. member has burned his boats behind him, and though he may aspire to a high position in Queensland politics, so long as this community remains a British community, he will never see that position.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: You are a false prophet.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Very well; you will see if am a false prophet. I say, that so long as this remains a British community, he will never see that position. Far from speaking of the men who have volunteered to help their own flesh and blood in the Transvaal in the way the hon. member has referred to them, I say I am proud of them, and they are brave men—braver men than the man who would slander them.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. McDONALD: You are one of them.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I am proud of their action, and of the country in which the offer has been made. I say it is not the contingent we are sending that is of account, but it is the sentiment our sending of them expresses.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ARMSTRONG: We show by our action that the traditions we inherit from the land from which we are sprung lose nothing by being placed in our hands, and we are going to preserve and protect them.

Mr. BROWNE: So long as we get 4s. 6d. a day.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: We show that we are really the descendants of the people who have always fought for the emancipation of the slaves, for the freedom of their own subjects, and the freedom of the world.

Mr. STEWART: What about Ireland?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I am proud to think that we are going to lend a hand in this matter, and if it were possible for us to be sending more assistance I should vote for it. I hold that 99 out of every 100 reasonable men in Queensland will agree with the action proposed to be taken by the Government.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. J. V. Chataway, *Mackay*): I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Oh, oh!

The PREMIER: Before the motion is put, I desire to read a telegram from Sir George Turner.

Mr. DUNSFORD: It is unfair.

Mr. FISHER: I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr. FISHER: The point of order is this: I ask whether the Hon. the Premier will be in order, when the adjournment of the debate has been moved, in reading this telegram if it relates to the question which has been under discussion.

The SPEAKER: The Hon. the Premier is speaking to the motion for adjournment, I understand, and as far as he has gone, he certainly has not violated the rules of order.

The PREMIER: The telegram is—

The following resolution was passed last night in our Assembly by 67 to 13 amidst great enthusiasm—namely, "That this House desires to express its loyalty and devotion to Her Majesty the Queen."

Mr. KIDSTON: What has this got to do with the motion?

The PREMIER—

"And its sympathy with Her Majesty's Imperial Government in the difficulties that have arisen in South Africa, and is of opinion that Victoria should equip and despatch a military force for service with the Imperial army in the Transvaal."

Mr. DUNSFORD: That is humiliating.

The PREMIER: I have risen to speak to the motion. When in the earlier part of the day the hon. the member for Charters Towers, the leader of the Labour Opposition, proposed his amendment, he did it verbally, and I could not catch the exact tenor of it.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Oh, oh!

The PREMIER: I have now obtained a copy of it, and I say at once that, as a matter of courtesy, the hon. member ought to have furnished me with a copy of it before he submitted it to the House; but not having done so, I was unable to ascertain its full object and purport. I accept it now as a vote of want of confidence.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: I accept it as a vote of want of confidence, and I therefore assent to the adjournment of the House until to-morrow.

Mr. LESINA: That is what it was intended for.

Mr. DAWSON: I may say that I have no objection to the adjournment of the debate under these special circumstances—that is, if the Hon. the Premier takes the amendment that I have moved as a vote of no confidence in the

Government. Otherwise I would object to the adjournment. I would like to say this: that I am not conscious of any want of courtesy to the hon. gentleman. I did what I thought I was entitled to. I submitted it to the proper authority and found it was in order, and moved it in the ordinary course. The hon. gentleman was present when I moved it, and he listened very carefully to it.

Mr. FISHER: And he replied to it.

Mr. DAWSON: He replied to it. What is the use of him rising up now and saying he did not understand it after he replied to it? I certainly think the hon. gentleman thought that the real meaning of the amendment I had moved was a vote of censure on the Government, and it was his place, when he did reply to it, to have immediately issued the challenge he has issued now, moved the adjournment of the debate, and taken it then as a vote of no confidence, and have done with it. I think it was his plain and clear duty to have done it then. I really am surprised that it has taken him several hours to discover what was the real meaning of a simple amendment of that kind.

Mr. STEWART: Oh, he is a bit dense sometimes.

Mr. W. HAMILTON: He had no opportunity.

Mr. DAWSON: I may ask the attention of hon. members to this fact—that the Hon. the Premier is in the habit of replying to something he does not understand.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Oh, oh!

Mr. RYLAND: He has admitted that.

Mr. STEWART: It was evident, from the reply.

Mr. LESINA: Cruel, cruel!

Mr. DAWSON: I do not wish to be rude; but I should say it is evident every time he does reply. The hon. gentleman, I suppose, was in order. He took the opportunity to read this telegram. Will he read the telegram from South Australia which he did not read?

The PREMIER: I have not got it.

The TREASURER: You read it.

Mr. DAWSON: I will read it—

Adelaide, 11th October.

The Legislative Council spent three and a-half hours discussing the motion authorising the equipment and despatch of 125 men for the Transvaal. The Chief Secretary said the cost would not be more than £10,000. The proposal was heartily supported by some members and ridiculed by others. The motion was eventually carried on the casting vote of the President.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. DAWSON:

In the Assembly the proposal was debated until midnight. The Government were anxious to close the debate; but in a thin House an adjournment was obtained on the casting vote of the Speaker. Surprise is expressed at the small number of men offering their services.

Mr. STEPHENSON: That is not much to set against New Zealand and Victoria.

Mr. FISHER: It is a good deal to set against Queensland at the present time.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: It is all nonsense. Why don't you drop it?

Mr. DAWSON: I have merely read it in order that it may be put in as something to counterbalance the very favourable wire the Hon. the Premier read—

Mr. HARDACRE: He ought not to have read it.

Mr. DAWSON: In supporting the motion for adjournment, I may repeat that I have no objection to accepting the gauntlet thrown down by the hon. gentleman.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Thrown down by you.

Mr. DAWSON: Well, to his picking up the gauntlet and treating it as a vote of no confidence in the Government on this particular occasion.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: Hear, hear!

Mr. DAWSON: I suppose it will mean the usual thing—no other business shall intervene.

The PREMIER: Yes, that is so. It will take precedence to-morrow.

Mr. DRAKE (*Enoggera*): I felt a little bit set down by this motion for the adjournment of the debate moved by the Hon. the Secretary for Agriculture, under instructions from the head of the Government. It was the first time I have risen this session to address the House, and it is hard that the Government should immediately interpose and adjourn the debate. We have heard a great deal to-night about British justice. I should like to know what British justice there is in the Government allowing one of its own followers to take up several hours in filling up *Hansard* with a lot of inflammatory language, and, when a member on this side rises, puts up one of its own members to move the adjournment. This is a time when the public mind of Queensland is being influenced by all sorts of sensational telegrams, and when all sorts of sensational statements are being made by certain persons. It is a time when the few people who keep their heads cool should have an opportunity of expressing their opinion, and I for one protest against the action taken to-night by the Government in allowing one side of the case to appear before the public in *Hansard* and putting up one of their own number in order to prevent debate. I say, further, that the telegram that has been read by the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government has nothing at all to do with the adjournment of the debate. It is no justification whatever for adjourning this debate; and, if it has nothing to do with the adjournment of the debate, I submit that the hon. gentleman was distinctly out of order in reading it. I presume we shall have an opportunity on some future occasion of expressing our opinion; but I think I am quite justified on this occasion, before we adjourn, in recording, at all events, my protest against the action the Government have taken.

Mr. McDONALD (*Flinders*): I think the action of the Government, and especially the head of the Government, under these peculiar circumstances, is a shameful action, to put it mildly. The hon. gentleman has now treated the amendment of the leader of the Opposition, after a certain amount of debate has taken place, as a no-confidence motion, and thus debarred the leader of the Opposition from having any say in the matter by way of reply. Surely the leader of the Government has been long enough in the House to have a knowledge of the forms of the House, and to know how to conduct the Government. If he has not the ability to conduct the Government, why does not he hand it over to the Attorney-General or the Secretary for Agriculture? As a matter of fact the hon. gentleman has shown his incapacity to manage the affairs of the country, and yet he spoke in the early part of the afternoon about the statesmanlike manner in which Queensland had offered troops to the Transvaal. Here he is now, allowing a speech of nearly three hours' duration to intervene from the time the hon. member, Mr. Dawson, moved his amendment, and then he calmly permits one of his own Ministers—he would not even get an ordinary follower of the Government to do it—to ask for the adjournment of the debate. I think under the circumstances the Government ought to be severely censured for the peculiar action they have taken to-night. If the Government had taken that course when the leader of the Opposition moved his amendment I fancy there would have been no objection to it. I said so at the time. Surely when that amendment was moved the hon. gentleman should have taken it as a no-confidence motion and immediately moved the adjournment of the debate. But the hon.

gentleman did not do that. He got up and made a long rambling speech in reply to the amendment, and after he had made that long rambling speech what do we find? The hon. gentleman comes down now, at nearly 9 o'clock, and says, "I must admit I do not understand or know anything at all about the hon. member's amendment, or what I was talking about in that connection." That is practically the hon. gentleman's admission, and that is the present position of affairs. And I may remind hon. members that for the last three hours there has been a whipping up all through the House—an attempt to find out the position of the Government—and they see that in the event of a division being taken to-night it is quite possible they would be defeated, or if not defeated their majority would have been so narrow that it would have been almost impossible to send the troops away. That is the position at the present time, and if they are in the humiliating position of having to put up one of their own members to stonewall their own motion, and then afterwards to put up one of their own Ministers to move the adjournment of the debate, it is a position that no body of men with any honour or honesty in them, who are running the Government of the country, would occupy for five minutes.

Mr. BELL (*Dalby*): I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. member in order in using the expression he has just used?

The SPEAKER: To what expression does the hon. member refer?

Mr. BELL: The expression was to the effect that no body of men with any honour in them would have taken the course the Government have taken.

The SPEAKER: That is entirely out of order. It is unparliamentary, and I must ask the hon. member for Flinders to withdraw it.

Mr. McDONALD: I cheerfully withdraw it. I am sorry the hon. member for Dalby, with all his learning, did not quite catch my meaning. I meant to say that any body of men, with any political decency about them at all, could not remain there and keep the position they hold.

The SPEAKER: The language the hon. member is using now is also unparliamentary. I hope he will not proceed in that course.

Mr. McDONALD: I will change my line of argument, and I will say a number of gentlemen who have a very high sense of honour, judged entirely from a political point of view—that it could not be imagined in any shape or form that those spotless gentlemen, with all the political virtue that it is possible for men to have—

The SPEAKER: I must interrupt the hon. member. The question before the House is that the debate be now adjourned. I trust the discussion will be confined to that motion.

Mr. McDONALD: I quite agree with you, Sir, that that is the question before the House, and I am sorry that when the Premier started to make the announcement he did he did not confine himself to that, but deliberately went out of his way to read a telegram to the House that the hon. gentleman, under the circumstances, should have kept to himself, and that compelled the leader of the Opposition, in reply, to read another telegram. However, I do not desire to continue the debate further. I only wish, under the circumstances, to ask the Government to accept my sincere sympathy in the deeply humiliating position they are in at the present time.

Mr. BROWNE (*Croydon*): I am rather sorry to hear the hon. member for Flinders so indignant about this motion for adjournment. I am rather pleased about it myself. During the last two or three hours there has been a process going on of counting heads. If the Government

had been in the position that there was a sufficient number of members on the other side of the House to defeat the amendment, the senior member for Charters Towers, the leader of the Labour Opposition, would have been ignored, and we should have been spoken of as a faction. That not being the case, they have recognised the senior member for Charters Towers as the leader of the Opposition, and that he is not the leader of a faction, and they are prepared to fight it out as a grand principle that we have no confidence in them. For that reason I am pleased to hear the motion moved, and I intend to support it. It is no longer now a question of a faction. The senior member for Charters Towers and the members sitting on this side of the House are an Opposition which has no confidence in the Government. The Government recognise their own weakness. To use a phrase from the prize ring, they are "trying to get a little wind." For that purpose they propose to adjourn the House, and for that reason I have very much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. J. HAMILTON (*Cook*): If the hon. member for Flinders believes in his statement well and good, but I give him sufficient credit for common sense to think that he has not the slightest belief in the statement he wishes to go forth to the country. If he believes the Government have not a majority let him object to the adjournment of the debate.

* Mr. COWLEY (*Herbert*): I am pleased to hear from the hon. member for Croydon that the senior member for Charters Towers is now the leader of the Opposition. I congratulate him upon it, and I hope he is prepared to take all the responsibilities of his position. That being the case I would remind the hon. member that it is the custom in this House, and indeed in all parliamentary assemblies, to give the Premier due notice of his intention to move a motion of want of confidence or censure.

Mr. W. HAMILTON: Did you give the contents of your motion the other night.

Mr. COWLEY: I gave notice for three days of that motion, but that is quite a different question. The Premier, in speaking just now to the adjournment of the debate, said that when the amendment of the leader of the Opposition—I am proud to give him his full title—was moved, he was not possessed of its full significance, and he was bound to reply as a matter of courtesy. The Premier replied, although he was not seized with the full significance of the amendment. Now, I know for a positive fact that it was so, and although hon. members on the other side have said that the "whip" on this side has been sent round to count heads, and hence this adjournment, I am in a position to tell them that at a quarter to 7 this evening the Premier told me that he had, since the adjournment for tea, taken the view which he has now expressed of this amendment, and that he would cause the adjournment of the debate to be moved at the earliest possible moment, and he did so. He said he was sorry indeed that he had not moved it before the hon. member for Lockyer commenced his speech, and he suggested that I should move it. I said I was quite willing to do so, but afterwards the hon. gentleman said to me that he thought it better that a Minister should move it because he would have the right of opening the debate again to-morrow, as he himself would be unable to do so—having already spoken. That is the position. I did not myself understand the significance of the amendment at first, and I hold that on a question like this, such an amendment should have been given notice of. The Premier, at least, should have had notice of it.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. COWLEY: I believe in every Parliament in the British Empire when the leader of the Opposition proposes a vote of censure on the Government, he has the courtesy, if he has not had time to give notice in the usual way, to give it to the Premier himself.

Mr. DAWSON: We did not know it was to be taken as a vote of censure.

Mr. COWLEY: The hon. member, when he moved it, intended it as such. We have been told so.

Mr. BROWNE: Who told you that?

Mr. COWLEY: The vice-president of the party said so—the member for Croydon. What I say is that the Premier or any hon. member can be easily excused for not seeing the full significance of the amendment as it was read out at the time. Now, if we turn to the "Votes and Proceedings" we will see that in the Governor's Speech it was distinctly said that this offer had been made and had been accepted by the Imperial Government.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. DRAKE: I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. member in order in discussing the main question?

The SPEAKER: No. I think the hon. member is exceeding fair limits and is out of order in speaking to the main question.

Mr. COWLEY: In justice to myself I merely want to say that I was not going to discuss the main question, but wanted to show how easy it would be through the action of the leader of the Opposition himself on the Address in Reply, for the Prime Minister, or any other member to see the full significance of the amendment, especially when we remember that hon. members opposite voted unanimously on the Address in Reply.

Mr. DAWSON: Oh no!

Mr. COWLEY: They voted unanimously. The question went on the voices.

Mr. DAWSON: Read my speech. Did I not say what I was going to do? I did distinctly.

Mr. COWLEY: Why did not the hon. member take his objection on the Address in Reply.

Mr. DAWSON: Read my speech.

Mr. DRAKE: I again rise to a point of order. The hon. member for Herbert is continuing the debate in defiance of your ruling.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: He should know better.

Mr. McDONALD: Give us all the same treatment and we don't mind.

Mr. STEWART: He is the ex-Speaker.

The SPEAKER: I have expressed my opinion on the point of order, and I trust that the hon. member for Herbert will not further transgress the rules of debate.

Mr. COWLEY: I bow to your ruling, and will not transgress further than to say that any hon. member might plead justification after the action of the leader of the Opposition on the Address in Reply.

Mr. FISHER (*Gympie*): I did not wish to trouble the Chamber on this occasion, and what I have to say merely has reference to what has been said about the leader of the Labour Opposition.

The PREMIER: Leader of the Opposition now.

Mr. FISHER: He has been made so by another member.

Mr. J. HAMILTON: By the member for Croydon.

Mr. FISHER: What I wish to say is that it has been quite impossible to tell during the last nine years what the continuous Government would take as a want of confidence motion, and I would like to ask if anyone on this side submitted a motion which they considered a want of

confidence motion they would take it as such if they had plenty of supporters behind them? I remember a late leader of the Opposition, Mr. Powers, moving a motion of want of confidence direct, and it was neglected.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: He did not carry it.

Mr. FISHER: Discourtesy has been charged against the leader of the Opposition in not giving the Premier notice of the amendment.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You need not defend him. He can take care of himself.

Mr. FISHER: The point is this. Notice was given of a particular motion by the Premier yesterday. Had the leader of the Opposition any time to give due notice of his amendment?

Mr. J. HAMILTON: Yes; plenty.

Mr. FISHER: When?

Mr. J. HAMILTON: He had two or three hours in which to give notice.

Mr. FISHER: Was the leader of the Opposition, on seeing the notice of motion by the Premier, to rush off at once to the Premier without consulting his colleagues and hand him his amendment?

The PREMIER: He might have handed it to me at half-past 3. He had plenty of time.

Mr. FISHER: When the hon. gentleman moved his amendment he handed a copy of it to the Speaker, and if the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government had taken care to conduct the business of the House carefully, he could have obtained the amendment and read it carefully.

The TREASURER: I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. member in order in speaking to the motion? He is ready enough to call others to order, but he is the most disorderly person in the House.

The SPEAKER: The member for Gynpie is following the example set him by previous speakers, and is transgressing the rule of relevancy in addressing himself to the main question. I ask hon. members, if they wish to address the House further, to confine themselves strictly to the motion that the debate be now adjourned.

Mr. FISHER: I thank you for that ruling, and shall certainly obey it. I would like to say a word in reference to attempting to prevent any disorderly conduct. When I raised a point of order it was purely to prevent a debate of this kind during such a critical period. I thank you for calling me to order. I am always prepared to obey the ruling of the Chair, and I defy anyone to show that during my experience in the House I have ever been guilty of defying the Chair when called to order.

Mr. KIDSTON (*Rockhampton*): The leader of the Opposition had not the opportunity of replying to the statement made by the Premier. The hon. member for Herbert complained that the leader of the Opposition had not taken the proper course of stating that he would oppose this on the Address in Reply, but when the leader of the Opposition was speaking on the Address in Reply he distinctly gave the Government to understand that if they proposed to spend any money on sending troops to the Transvaal it would be opposed from this side of the House.

MEMBERS on the Opposition side: Hear, hear! Mr. KIDSTON: Here is *Hansard*, and this is what he said—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Is not that a debate of this session?

Mr. KIDSTON (*quoting*): "I can tell the hon. gentleman that if there is any sum of money on the Estimates"—

The SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman is quoting from a debate of this session and is therefore not in order. I have permitted him to

make a statement with regard to the remarks made by a previous speaker, and having done that I think he should be content.

Mr. KIDSTON: I want to make quite clear what the statement was. He gave the Premier to understand at that time that if it was proposed to spend any money in sending 250 troops to the Transvaal when such a thing was proposed in this House, it would be resolutely opposed by members sitting on this side of the House, so that when the hon. gentleman gave notice of motion yesterday he must have known quite well that the leader of the Opposition would directly oppose that motion. So the hon. member for Herbert was not justified in saying that the leader of the Opposition had missed his opportunity or had sprung a surprise on the House. Indeed the Premier understood the motion quite well to this extent. When the motion was moved this afternoon he got up and said that if it was carried the Government would drop the whole proposal. Did he understand that the Government could drop a proposal of this sort at this stage of the proceedings without it being equivalent to a vote of want of confidence? Would not the Government—

The SPEAKER: I think the hon. member is now departing from the question before the House.

Mr. KIDSTON: I have no objection to the adjournment. I understand that the Government require the adjournment to get their forces together.

The PREMIER: Try us now.

Mr. KIDSTON: Being British, I am quite prepared to allow them to gather up their forces and do the best they can to defend their position. It is a very bad position; it will take them all their time to defend it, and so I offer no objection to the adjournment, because it is evident that the Government are in a hole, and that is why they want the debate adjourned.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (*Hon. D. H. Dalrymple, Mackay*): I think the motion for the adjournment of the debate is a reasonable thing, seeing that this motion is equivalent to a vote of want of confidence. The Premier has been blamed for not discovering before that this was a motion of want of confidence, but I assert—not without fear of contradiction, because there are some hon. members that would contradict anything—that the persons who conducted the business and treated this vote as though it were a vote of want of confidence, if the Premier, having no written notice did not detect it, it was their business to stop all other business going on; and if anybody is to blame it is the leader of the Opposition, and the party which sanctioned this apparent departure from the rules of debate in allowing the hon. member for Croydon to continue the debate when he had no earthly right to do so.

Mr. TURLEY (*Brisbane South*): I do not think the statement of the hon. member should be allowed to go unchallenged. I do not think the leader of the Opposition is responsible because the leader of the Government did not accept the motion as a vote of want of confidence in the Government. How could the leader of the Opposition be responsible for that? There have often been votes moved in this House with the intention of being accepted as motions of want of confidence, and as a matter of fact they have been passed over because the Government had not been able to defend their position unless they had time to whip up their followers. How can it be the fault of the leader of the Opposition when he moved a motion which any reasonable man, any sensible man, would take up immediately as a vote of want of confidence?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You only just discovered it yourselves.

Mr. TURLEY : The hon. gentleman states that it is the fault of the party on this side, because the hon. member for Croydon happened to get up and continue the debate.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS : It had not been discovered that he had no right.

Mr. TURLEY : It was moved in this House about half-past 4, and yet the hon. gentleman says it was only discovered about 9 o'clock that it was a vote of want of confidence in the Government. Everyone knows that according to the conduct of business in this House, when a motion of that sort is moved, it is for the head of the Government to accept it as he thinks fit. If he accepts it as a motion of want of confidence he immediately moves the adjournment ; if not he declares, as he did this afternoon, that if the vote is carried against him he will go no further with the motion.

Mr. GIVENS (*Cairns*) : I only rose to make clear one statement that has hitherto remained unchallenged. The hon. member for Herbert, Mr. Cowley, in speaking on the question of the adjournment of the debate, stated that the Premier told him at tea time that he discovered that the motion was equivalent to a motion of want of confidence, and that if he had discovered it sooner he would have treated it as such, and moved the adjournment. After tea, when the hon. member for Lockyer was speaking, I distinctly heard the Premier and other Ministers, by interjection, encouraging the hon. member for Lockyer to continue, though the hon. member had expressed his intention of not speaking at very great length.

MEMBERS on the Opposition side : Hear, hear !

Mr. GIVENS : That showed a distinct desire on the part of the Premier and the other members of the Government to get a one-sided statement into *Hansard*, and then close the debate, and that is the reason that I protest against the adjournment.

Question—That the debate be now adjourned—put and passed.

The PREMIER : I move that the resumption of the debate stand an Order of the Day for to-morrow, and that it take precedence of all other business.

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at twenty-three minutes past 9 o'clock.