

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**THURSDAY, 12 OCTOBER 1899**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

2. The earnings per train mile on the sections Gowrie Junction to Roma and Gowrie Junction to Warwick, for the twelve months ended June, 1899.

#### INFORMAL NOTICE OF MOTION.

Mr. KERR (*Barcoo*) gave notice that on the 2nd November he would move—That there be laid on the table of the House copies of all correspondence and also instructions issued to the lands commissioners, Blackall and Tambo, re the valuation and fixing of rents in their districts for the second period of all grazing farms in the above districts.

The SPEAKER: I would draw the attention of the hon. member for Barcoo to the fact that he has just given fresh notice of a motion which already appears on the business-paper, and that the day for which he has given notice of his intention to move it later is in contravention of Standing Order No. 35, which says:—

A notice of motion may not be given for the same day on which it is given, nor for a day later than the eighth next sitting day of the House.

Mr. FISHER: He intended it for the 26th of October.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member, of course, must comply with the Standing Order in that respect.

Mr. KERR (*Barcoo*): I made an error. The date I intended to give notice for was the 26th October. I wish to correct the notice of motion accordingly.

#### THE TRANSSVAAL CONTINGENT.

##### RESUMPTION OF DEBATE—WANT OF CONFIDENCE MOTION.

On the Order of the Day being read for the resumption of adjourned debate on Mr. Dickson's motion—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—on which Mr. Dawson had moved that the question be amended by the insertion, after the word "Queen," of the words "but disapproves of the action of the Government in making an offer of troops to serve with Her Majesty's army in South Africa, thus committing the colony to an indefinite and practically unlimited expenditure without the sanction of Parliament"—

Mr. DRAKE (*Enoggera*) said: The amendment which has been moved has now made a clearly defined issue for the House to decide—that is, whether the Premier of the colony is justified in making an offer of troops without the sanction of Parliament.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That is not the issue at all.

Mr. TURLEY: That is the issue.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: No, it is not, unless you have a new amendment.

Mr. DRAKE: I will read the amendment—

But disapproves of the action of the Government in making an offer of troops to serve with Her Majesty's

THURSDAY, 12 OCTOBER, 1899.

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

#### CASE OF THOMAS HUNTER.

##### APPOINTMENT OF SELECT COMMITTEE.

On the motion of Mr. MOORE (*Murilla*), it was resolved—

1. That a select committee be appointed to inquire into the alleged grievances of Thomas Hunter, of Goondiwindi, as set forth in the petition presented to this House on the 7th June last.

2. That such committee consist of Messrs. O'Connell, Newell, Bell, Curtis, Browne, Fitzgerald, and the mover.

3. That such committee have power to send for persons and papers, and leave to sit during any adjournment of the House.

#### RAILWAY REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE.

##### GOWRIE JUNCTION TO ROMA AND WARWICK.

On the motion of Mr. BELL (*Dalby*), it was resolved—

That there be laid upon the table of the House returns showing—

1. The revenue, expenditure, net revenue, capital expended, percentage of net revenue to capital, and percentage of expenses to earnings for the twelve months ended June, 1899, on the section of railway Gowrie Junction to Roma.

army in South Africa, thus committing the colony to an indefinite and practically unlimited expenditure without the sanction of Parliament.

The question is whether those words are to be inserted; therefore, as I said at the commencement of my remarks, the issue is whether the Premier is justified in offering the services of our troops in Africa without first obtaining the sanction of Parliament. Now I do not want, in the course of my remarks, to introduce any irrelevant matter, nor to trench upon any matters that are not necessary for the purposes of the argument. I noticed last night that a great number of statements were made—statements that have appeared in the papers, and were repeated here—of a distinctly inflammatory character. The only object I think that could be had in view in the circulation of those statements, and the repetition of them here, is to cloud the issue.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. DRAKE: We have seen already plenty of evidence that a great number of those statements are, at all events, unreliable—particularly the statements that have been made with regard to the treatment of refugees. They may be true, but, on the other hand, it is equally likely that they are not true. But the particular object in sending them is clearly in order to inflame the public mind. Now, I have two reasons for believing that those statements are not true—or rather, perhaps, I might say, one reason why I think they are untrustworthy, and another reason why I think it is likely that they are either untrue or grossly exaggerated. One reason is this: that about the same time that the cablegrams appeared stating that these outrages had been committed, a cablegram also appeared saying that large orders for tinned meat had been placed in America, and it went into particulars, and actually named one firm with whom some of these orders had been placed. About two days after that, a cablegram appeared stating that the first cablegram was absolutely untrue. Now, what was the meaning of that? It was clearly this—that the first cablegram was sent in order to convey the idea of the extensiveness and completeness of the preparations for war, so as to persuade people that war was absolutely inevitable. Then there was dissatisfaction on the part of some countries who did not receive orders for this meat—probably Australia—and consequently a cablegram was sent out saying the first cablegram was entirely unfounded. One cablegram was to flog up the war spirit, and the other was to allay any jealousy on the part of any country which has not been dealt with by the War Department. I do not say which of those cablegrams is untrue, but it is perfectly clear one or the other is untrue; and, if those cablegrams are untrue, we may also come to the conclusion that the others sent at the same time are unreliable. Then we have this fact, which seems to rebut the idea that there can be any truth in the statements about these outrages inflicted upon refugees, and it is this—that taking a broad view of all the accounts, we can only come to the conclusion that up to the present time—possibly it is for tactical purposes—but that up to the present time the inhabitants of the Transvaal Republic and their Government have been most scrupulously anxious not to let themselves be placed in the position of aggressors. We had only the other day a cablegram saying that the death penalty had been threatened against any Boer who crossed the frontier, showing the effort upon their part to prevent themselves from being placed in the position of aggressors. I think, therefore, it is extremely unlikely that they would act as they are described as acting in this cablegram.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Why do you believe that cablegram if you do not believe the others?

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You believe only what suits you, as a Boer.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DRAKE: Then we have this cablegram in this afternoon's paper:—"It is announced from Capetown that Hon. W. P. Schreiner"—

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: He is another Boer.

Mr. DRAKE:

It is announced from Capetown that the Hon. W. P. Schreiner, speaking in the Legislative Assembly last evening, declared that the reports that the Boers had ill-treated the Uitlander fugitives at Johannesburg had not been confirmed, and he challenged the Archbishop of Capetown (Most Rev. W. W. Jones, D.D.) to substantiate the statements in relation thereto, which he had made in a letter to a newspaper.

That is a cablegram which we might almost have expected to come to hand. At all events, it throws a considerable amount of doubt on the last statement. I repeat that these statements may possibly be true. I have no doubt these Boers are rough and rude, and possibly they may be of a brutal disposition.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER of the Opposition: Question!

Mr. DRAKE: An hon. member says "Question." We have to remember that these men—and also the women—have been engaged in quite recent years in a life and death struggle with a whole lot of savages.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: From whom Great Britain delivered them.

Mr. DRAKE: Such a state of things as that has a natural tendency to brutalise the people who are engaged in that warfare. And that is the reason why I should not be at all surprised if some of the statements we have heard with regard to the roughness and rudeness of these people are true. But whether those statements are true or not, I say they should not influence our judgment at all, and they certainly should not influence our judgment in the slightest degree in deciding the point now at issue in the House—for this reason, that if the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government has the power to send troops away from Queensland for service in foreign wars, he has the right to do it equally whether the cause is a just one or an unjust one.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. DRAKE: That is a very important thing to be borne in mind by hon. members when they are justifying the action of the Queensland Government in offering these troops on the ground that Britishers have been ill-treated. In using that argument they are unduly losing sight of the fact that if they now establish by the vote of the House the right of the Government to send troops in this case, they establish the right of the Government to send them in any case, whether the war is a just or an unjust one.

The PREMIER: It is a volunteer service. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. DRAKE: The hon. gentleman says it is a volunteer service. I think that statement ought to be settled once and for all by the hon. gentleman's communication to His Excellency the Governor. It is contained in the return headed "Queensland Troops for the Transvaal." The letter, which is from the Chief Secretary to His Excellency the Governor, and dated the 10th July, 1899, is as follows:—

My LORD.—I have the honour to inform your Excellency that, in the event of hostilities breaking out between Great Britain and the Transvaal, the Government of this colony are prepared to offer the services of a contingent of troops, consisting of 250 officers, non-commissioned officers, and men of the Queensland

Mounted Infantry, with a machine-gun section, for field duty with the Imperial troops employed in South Africa, and I have to request that Your Excellency will be good enough to communicate this offer to the Imperial Government by telegraph.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. DRAKE: I do not know how the hon. gentleman could possibly have used language which would more clearly show that it is an offer of a portion of the Queensland Defence Force for service in South Africa than the words he has used in that communication. Whether the hon. gentleman has reconsidered the matter since I am not aware, but the fact that he has used different wording in the resolution which he has submitted to the House shows to my mind most conclusively that at the time he made the offer he understood that he was making an offer of a portion of the Queensland Defence Force.

The PREMIER: The hon. member should understand the statutes of Queensland.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You know he could not do it under the Defence Act.

Mr. DRAKE: We claim now that the hon. gentleman has presumed to do something that he could not legally do.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Hear, hear! Everybody knows that.

Mr. DRAKE: That is the whole question. We say the hon. gentleman has offered to do what he could not legally do. If the hon. gentleman's contention is right, that that communication to His Excellency simply meant an offer of a certain number of volunteers, why does he not adhere to the same form of words in the resolution before the House? He has changed his mind since then. He made an offer on the 10th of July of a portion of our Defence Force, and now what the hon. gentleman is endeavouring to do is to obtain volunteers in such a way as will enable him to carry out his promise.

The PREMIER: That is not so.

Mr. DRAKE: I am reminded by the statutes, which I, of course, knew perfectly well before—and this is really the gravamen of my charge against the Government—that the Government have not the power to send a single man of the Defence Force outside the limits of Australasia. Then, is not the impropriety of this offer most manifest? Is it not an impropriety for the hon. gentleman to offer to do a thing which he has no power to do? He himself afterwards asks persons to volunteer. I have no doubt whatever that a sufficient number of volunteers will be forthcoming, but it is quite legitimate to contemplate the possibility of the whole of the members of the Defence Force declining to go.

The PREMIER: That is what your leader says.

Mr. DRAKE: No.

The PREMIER: He doubts the number of volunteers.

Mr. DRAKE: No.

The PREMIER: Your leader doubts the number of volunteers. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. DRAKE: I said nothing of the kind. But let me first of all say that the leader of the Labour party is not my leader. (Continued laughter.)

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: He is no longer leader of a faction, but leader of the Opposition.

Mr. DRAKE: I am speaking here as an individual member, and as the leader of the Independent Opposition, who have honoured me with that position. Perhaps the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government did not hear me, but I say again, I have no doubt but that there will be a sufficient number of volunteers to make up this contingent. But I

say that, in considering the impropriety of the hon. gentleman's offer, we are quite justified in contemplating what would be the result if every member of the Queensland Defence Force refused to go to South Africa. How could the hon. gentleman then carry out his promise of a contingent of our troops for service in South Africa?

The PREMIER: You have expressed no doubt as to volunteers coming forward, but your leader stated differently.

Mr. DRAKE: I say it is perfectly clear that it was an impropriety on the part of the head of the Government in offering to do a certain thing which he had no legal power to effect. He makes an offer here of a contingent of troops "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 the Royal Australian Artillery." And he knew at the time that he had no power to give effect to that promise.

The PREMIER: Not at all—an offer of volunteers.

Mr. DRAKE: They were to be men of the Mounted Infantry.

The PREMIER: Volunteers from the service.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: A mere quibble.

Mr. DRAKE: I say the hon. gentleman has no power to compel one single member of the Queensland Mounted Infantry, or other branch of the Defence Force, to go to South Africa.

MEMBERS of the Government: He never asserted that he could.

Mr. DRAKE: Therefore, if they do not volunteer for that service he cannot carry out his promise. That is a very conclusive proof of the impropriety of the action the Premier took. He distinctly made an offer of troops which he had no authority to make.

The PREMIER: Volunteers.

Mr. GIVENS: And before a single volunteer was got.

Mr. DRAKE: Now, the hon. gentleman says he knew perfectly well at the time he made this offer that he had no authority to offer any portion of the Queensland Defence Force for service outside Australasia. I accept the statement of the hon. gentleman, when he says he knew at the time he had no power to do that. But I want to point out now to the House what took place in 1891, when it was most distinctly affirmed by Parliament that the Defence Force should not be used outside of Australasia. Up to that time there had been some doubt on the subject. It was contended in some quarters that under the wording of the Defence Act the Defence Force might be used outside the colony; but others thought differently. In 1891 the then head of the Government brought in a Bill amending the Defence Act. He proposed that the Defence Force might be used "within or without the colony." When the Bill was being discussed in committee I pointed out that if that amendment were made in the Defence Act, and it was provided that the force might be used "within or without the colony" it would be possible for the Government to order the Defence Force outside of Queensland or outside of Australasia. I pointed out then in

4 p.m. committee that that amendment of the Defence Act was in my opinion very objectionable. I have always, I may mention, held very strongly to the opinion that the military force raised and maintained in Queensland should be maintained for the defence of Queensland or at any rate of Australia solely.

The PREMIER: That is the principle of the Defence Act.

Mr. DRAKE: That is the principle of the Defence Act; but I tell the hon. gentleman that

in 1891 a Bill was brought down to amend the Defence Act, under which it would have been competent for the Governor to employ the Defence Force outside the colony of Queensland and outside Australasia. The motion I moved then was that the words "in any part of Australasia" should be substituted for the words "either within or without the colony." On page 1364 of *Hansard* for 1891, I am reported as follows on the subject:—

His object in moving the amendment was that he had found that in the opinion of a great number of persons—and he had no doubt they were correct—it was, under the Defence Act of 1884, within the power of the Governor, acting as Commander-in-Chief of Her Majesty's forces in Queensland, to take their Defence Force away, not only out of Queensland, but also outside of Australasia. It was claimed that that power rested in the Governor in consequence of the wording of the 57th section, as it gave him the power to call out the Defence Force for active service, "either within or without the colony." With regard to the particular expression, "either within or without the colony," he might say that he could not understand the sense of it, because it must be clear to any person that any particular plot of ground on this planet that was not in Queensland must be outside of Queensland. He could not understand what purpose could be served by the use of the words "either within or without the colony," and the draftsman might just as well have used the word "anywhere." It was claimed that under that section the Governor had the power to call the Defence Force altogether away from Queensland and from Australasia. He thought it undesirable that the Governor in his position of Commander-in-Chief should have that power; he would therefore move the insertion of the following new clause:—

In the fifty-seventh section of the principal Act the words "in any part of the Australasian colonies," shall be substituted for the words "either within or without the colony."

I would like to say here that I think I have said that the amending Bill then introduced contained the words "either within or without the colony," to which I objected, but I was in error in saying that as those words are in the 57th section of the principal Act, and I proposed to deal with them by a new clause in the amending Bill proposed. After some remarks about my amendment not having been circulated, the then Chief Secretary, Sir Samuel Griffith, is reported to have said—

He had never heard of the claim which the hon. member said he had heard set up—that under that section the Governor had the power to send Queensland troops to any part of the world. He had never heard anybody assert that, and he thought the hon. member was fighting a shadow. If the hon. member had heard such a claim made, it must have been by irresponsible persons. Of course, it had never been intended that their troops should be called out beyond the Australasian colonies. He had no objection to accept the amendment to make that more clear.

So that an amendment was then put into the Defence Act which made it perfectly clear that the members of the Defence Force could not be called upon to serve anywhere outside of Australasia.

The PREMIER: Nobody doubts it.

Mr. DRAKE: An amendment I considered very right and salutary. The essence of that amendment clearly is, and I think every hon. member will admit it, that the Defence Force should be regarded as a "Defence" Force simply, and should not be used outside the colony.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. DRAKE: I say again, quoting the terms of that offer made by the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government, that he did on the 10th July offer "a contingent of troops," consisting of men "of the Queensland Mounted Infantry"—

The PREMIER: That is a narrow-minded view of the question.

Mr. DRAKE: And also a machine-gun section from the Queensland Regiment of the Royal Australian Artillery. I think it right that I should feel and speak warmly on this question, because

I have always been a very strong supporter of the Queensland Defence Force, and at a time when it had a very great number of opponents in this Chamber.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: Do you speak for the Defence Force? Are you authorised to speak for the Defence Force?

Mr. McDONALD: Are you?

Mr. DRAKE: I am not authorised to speak on behalf of the Defence Force. I am speaking as a member of Parliament.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. DRAKE: And I do not intend to be deterred from doing my duty by any covert threats from the hon. gentleman.

The PREMIER: Well, do not misrepresent yourself.

Mr. McDONALD: Oh, keep your hair on. (Laughter.)

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That is a very venerable joke.

Mr. DRAKE: During the time here when the Defence Force had a great deal of opposition, and when the Government found it very difficult indeed to get their Defence Estimates through, and at a time also when it was not a popular thing to vote in favour of the Defence Estimates, the Government always had my support on those Estimates.

The PREMIER: A very small support.

Mr. DRAKE: "A very small support!"

The PREMIER: Very little was ever done for the Defence Force by you.

Mr. McDONALD: You've got them bad.

Mr. DRAKE: I did not want particularly to refer to this, but as the hon. gentleman has said that the Defence Force had very small support from me, I quote one particular instance, two years after the time I have been speaking of, when this House affirmed that the Defence Force should not be employed outside of Australasia, and the Defence Force Estimates of the Government were carried then by one vote—and that vote was mine.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and laughter.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: And mine, too.

Mr. DRAKE: I have some justification for saying that, because it was a very tight squeeze on that occasion. An amendment—generally regarded as a very popular one—had been made, that the amount of the vote should be reduced by £5,000.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Who moved it?

Mr. DRAKE: It was moved by the Hon. G. Thorn, who was then sitting as a Government supporter. A division was taken on the amendment, and the voting was 29 to 30; and when I say it was my vote carried the Estimates, I say it on this ground—that the whole of the members of the Opposition, with the exception of myself, voted for the proposed reduction.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. DRAKE: I have no hesitation in saying this now as the gentleman who was then my leader would not object to my doing so. My leader then was the Hon. Charles Powers, and I said to him beforehand that I could not follow his lead in that matter. I had always supported the Defence Force Estimates, and would continue to do so, and if the reduction was moved I should certainly vote against it. I did, and my leader, and every member on the Opposition side voted for the reduction. I voted with the Government, and the Estimate was carried by one vote.

The PREMIER: This only shows that you were in your sound mind on that occasion. (Laughter.)

Mr. DRAKE: I only refer slightly to these particulars in order to justify what might appear a somewhat unjustifiable expression—that it was

my vote that saved the Estimates. In the ordinary sense it was so. I say now that that vote was given on the honour of the Government, and Parliament pledged that the Defence Force should not be sent outside Australasia. This is the important thing, and it is why I consider this a very grave matter. I am looking at the effect it is going to have upon our Defence Force afterwards. There have been times in the past—hon. members know that very well—when the Defence Force has been unpopular. It may be so again; when it would be the duty, in my opinion, of every patriotic citizen to endeavour to help to maintain the Defence Force for the defence of Australasia. A distinct injury, I think, will have been done to the Defence Force, and a permanent injury, if you allow it to go forth from this time that that force, which is being enrolled, I maintain, for the defence of Queensland and of Australasia, may be sent away in order to take part in a war which may be just, but, on the other hand, may be unjust. Because, as I pointed out before, in considering this question, the matter of just or unjust war does not come in at all. The question is whether the military force maintained here is to be exclusively a force for our own defence or whether it is to be regarded simply as a part of the British army to do duty in any part of the world.

The PREMIER: Has the Defence Force requested you to represent this to Parliament?

Mr. DRAKE: I have had no communication whatever with any member of the Defence Force. I have spoken as I have always spoken in Parliament, within my rights as a member of Parliament. I have supported the Defence Force because I consider it is a proper thing that such a force should be maintained for the defence of the colony. That is the position I hold now. I consider it is good, not only for the Defence Force as a force, but also good for the country, that that force should be kept exclusively for the defence of Australasia.

The PREMIER: You are against your leader.

Mr. DRAKE: And I am bound to say this before I sit down, because it is justifiable that I should say it in consequence of some words that have been uttered in the course of the debate; and that is that I do not hold in the slightest degree with any of those who would minimise the personal courage or the qualities of the individual members of our Defence Force.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. DRAKE: I have not the slightest doubt that if members of the Defence Force volunteer for service in South Africa, or anywhere else, they will give a good account of themselves. As material for the making of soldiers they are quite equal to the rank and file of any army in the world, and I have not the slightest doubt that these men, if they go, will not show to any disadvantage as compared with troops from any other parts of the world. And, to my mind, there is only this one bright spot in connection with it, and that is that some of our men will get some military training which, as soldiers, will be a great advantage to them. And if this proposal were, as is pretended, that these men were simply volunteering to go and serve in the Imperial army—

The PREMIER: Why do you doubt it?

Mr. McDONALD: Oh! Get out!

Mr. DRAKE: I have quoted already the terms of the hon. gentleman's offer. I leave it to the Assembly, and to the country, to say whether it is an offer of volunteers or not. I was saying there will be that advantage, that the men will get a military training. I say, also, that if any man in this community, whether he be a member of the Defence Force or not, likes to go in for the profession of a soldier, I do not

blame him for going where fighting is going on; because his business as a professional man being to fight, and seeing that he can only learn the art of fighting by being amidst fighting, I could not blame a man for becoming a professional soldier. But let it be distinctly understood that he is doing that. And I am not prepared to admit that a man who gives up his position as a citizen soldier entirely for the defence of his country, and enrolls himself in an army of professional soldiers, to go anywhere he is sent to—I am not prepared to admit that he takes a higher position than the one he is at present occupying.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That is not a correct representation of the position.

Mr. DRAKE: In fact I am inclined to think that in giving up the position of citizen soldier and taking up that of a professional soldier, he declines from the higher position to a lower. There may come a time—the millennium—when we shall not require any army. At present, while we do, and must have soldiers, I have not a word to say against the military profession as a profession. But I do protest—and that is the reason why I have risen now—and shall continue to protest against our Defence Force being used for any other purpose except for the defence of Australasia.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That is not the federal view at any rate—the view taken in Canada, Victoria, and New South Wales.

Mr. DAWSON: But you do not believe in federation?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Yes, I do.

Mr. DRAKE: Since I have been speaking the Minister for Lands has been keeping up a continual series of disorderly interjections, his object, no doubt, being—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: To check your fallacies.

Mr. DRAKE: To disconcert me and perhaps spoil the effect of anything I may say. I hope the fair-minded members of the Chamber will take into account that I have had to speak under that running fire of interjections. I think I have made the position I take up perfectly clear.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: To yourself.

Mr. DRAKE: I say that, according to my reading of the offer made by the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government, he made an offer of a portion of our Defence Force. I say that he had no power to do that, and that in doing that he did something which was illegal, and which, according to his admission to the House this afternoon, he knew at the time was illegal. Therefore, the question before the House being whether the Premier of the colony—not particularly the hon. gentleman at the head of the present Government, because we are asked to lay down a principle to be applied not only at the present time but at any future time—shall have the power, without consulting Parliament, to send our home defence away for service abroad. I, having considered the matter over very carefully, and I hope dispassionately, must say "No," and therefore I cannot vote for the motion.

The PREMIER: A very good speech, if the facts were true.

Mr. BROWNE: They seem to hurt you, anyway.

Mr. JENKINSON: They sting.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. F. G. Foxton, *Carnarvon*): Dealing with the last statement of the hon. member for Enoggera first, he has laid it down as a principle that it is not competent for the Premier of this colony to offer the services of any portion of the Defence Force to the mother country in case of need. The hon. member and I certainly do not agree on that

matter. Everybody who knows the Defence Act—and I ought to know it, having had to pass an examination in it—knows that there is no power given to the Executive to send a single member of the Defence Force out of the colony for purposes such as are intended on the present occasion with regard to the Transvaal. That goes without saying; everyone knows that that is so. We also know that there is no power given to the Executive to make any offer which shall be absolutely binding upon this Parliament, and which shall commit this Parliament to any expenditure in carrying out any such offer that may be made—as this has been made on the present occasion. The only justification for any such offer is the fact that it is backed up by this Parliament, and if any Government so far exceeds its duty at a period of crisis or emergency, or at what the hon. member for Charters Towers would call “the psychological moment,” as to make such an offer as this without consulting Parliament, and if this House does not endorse its action, there is only one course open for that Government.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY: And that is what we have come here to settle. Now it has been said that revolutions are only justified by success. The same thing may practically be said of any such offer as has been made by the Premier of this colony to send troops to the Transvaal for the purpose of assisting the Imperial Forces there. The question is whether the Premier has correctly gauged the feeling of this colony, and if this Parliament refuses to endorse what he has done, there is only one course open to him, and that is to let someone else take his place.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY: Someone who will not send troops to the Transvaal.

Mr. HARDACRE: We will ask Parliament first.

The HOME SECRETARY: No; we will ask Parliament now, and if it votes the money then it endorses the action of the Premier, and justifies it. It was admitted by the leader of the hon. gentleman who interjects that there are certain periods when it is necessary for a Government to step in and show a strong hand, and not wait for the authority of Parliament.

Mr. HARDACRE: This is not one of them.

Mr. W. THORN: It certainly is not.

The HOME SECRETARY: I say it is one of them.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: No, no!

The HOME SECRETARY: That is where hon. members opposite and myself differ. I say that it was for reasons which will commend themselves to hon. members on the other side, who speak of our Defence Force as curs and cowards and swashbucklers, and which will, I trust, commend themselves to other people in this House and outside of it, who do not descend to epithets of that sort—

The PREMIER: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY: I say that it was desirable that the offer should be made at that particular moment, and it has been pointed out that it was impossible to consult Parliament earlier.

Mr. MAXWELL: The offer was made so as to get first in the market.

The HOME SECRETARY: It is quite immaterial what it was done for, and I will show why it was a good thing. I interjected when the senior member for Charters Towers was speaking—

Mr. KERR: The leader of the Opposition.

The HOME SECRETARY: No, I am told that he is not the leader of the Opposition. I do not know what to call him. I do know that he is the senior member for Charters Towers. No one can dispute that; but when I call him the leader of the Opposition I am taken to task by some of his friends, and when I do not call him that I am taken to task by others. I would like to know where is the cohesion amongst hon. members opposite? Well, when the senior member for Charters Towers, *alias* the leader of the Opposition, *alias* the leader of the Labour Opposition—he can take which title he likes—was speaking—

Mr. McDONALD: You can laugh now. That is where the joke comes in.

The HOME SECRETARY: There is no joke on my part. When the hon. member said it might be necessary for us to ask for some English swashbucklers to assist us at some future time, I interjected “And they will come.”

Mr. DAWSON: That is the paid professional man.

The HOME SECRETARY: I am quite sure that it would be something more than the paid professional man if he was needed.

Mr. DAWSON: That is quite a different thing.

Mr. JENKINSON: This is a British dependency, and we can expect it.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member for Wide Bay is anticipating my argument by his interjection. I was going to say that if this colony—if Australia, if the colonies generally of this great Empire to which we belong—ever desire to become more than dependencies, it is necessary that we should display, not by mere lip service, not by mere words and professions, but by our actions, that we are willing to accept our responsibilities as a portion of the Empire by taking part in its defence.

Mr. JENKINSON: Not until the time arises.

The HOME SECRETARY: The time has arisen.

Mr. JENKINSON: That is a question.

Mr. W. THORN: There is no necessity for it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The HOME SECRETARY: If one member interjects at a time I may be able to answer him, but when the member for Aubigny and the member for Wide Bay talk together and point their fingers at me it is quite impossible to hear either of them. I say the moment for action has arisen. I will not go into the whole of the details in regard to the Uitlanders in the Transvaal, but it must be apparent to any man who listened to such a speech as that delivered by the hon. member for Lockyer last night that at this moment it is a question whether Great Britain should be paramount in South Africa or not.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY: Unquestionably that is the point.

Mr. FISHER: That is not the point.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: What has that to do with Australia?

Mr. W. THORN: There is no analogy.

The HOME SECRETARY: I desire to see in South Africa a free people—a federation—it may not be to-day, it may not be to-morrow, it may not be next year—but I hope to live to see such a federation as we hope to establish on this continent of Australia within the next eighteen months. I desire to see a free people living under the British Crown with a Constitution such as we have, than which none could be freer or more desirable to live under. Here, in Australia, I can thoroughly appreciate the privilege of living under what I say unhesitatingly is the freest Constitution in the whole world—the most

democratic, as well as the freest, and where the will of the people can find the readiest expression—

Mr. HARDACRE : You will not let it.

The HOME SECRETARY : Both in administration and in legislation.

Mr. McDONALD : You don't believe that.

The HOME SECRETARY : If one member would interject at a time he might be able to get his interjection into *Hansard*, but as it is he will not. That is the reason why I think it is desirable, to say the least of it, that an offer of this kind should be made at the moment it was made. It was only by such an offer that it could be made manifest to the world, not only to the British people and our fellow-subjects in the rest of Australia, but also to the world outside the Empire, that Australia, and let us hope that Queensland, as the leader of national feeling in this matter, is willing to throw in her lot with Imperial interests.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY : It is useless for us to say in this House, or our leader-writers in the Press to say, that we are one with the Imperial authorities, that our feelings and our sympathies are the same. That may be reiterated for years, for centuries in fact, and it would convey nothing, but when we come forward as a community and say that we are so deeply interested in anything that affects the Empire that we are prepared to give money, aye, and if necessary to send volunteers—because they must be volunteers—to assist the Imperial troops in maintaining the prestige and authority of the Empire, that, and that alone, is an advertisement to the rest of the world that we are prepared to do these things.

Mr. W. THORN : What is the pay attached to these people?

The HOME SECRETARY : I cannot come down to the hon. member's level at [4.30 p.m.] the present moment.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear! and laughter.

Mr. W. THORN : You say they are volunteers. What is their pay?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS : What about bicycles?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE : What is the price of butter?

The HOME SECRETARY : Will that hon. member tell me the price of butter in Aubigny at the present moment? It is just about as important at this moment.

Hon. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON : Please address the Chair.

The HOME SECRETARY : I am addressing the Chair. I deeply regret the hon. member for Charters Towers, *alias* the leader of the Labour Opposition, should have found it necessary to descend to such—may I say. No, I will not say—

Mr. DAWSON : Say what you like.

Mr. GIVENS : Say on!

The HOME SECRETARY : Such abuse as he descended to yesterday in this debate. The hon. member spoke, and I tell the hon. member it will be years before those words are forgotten—

The PREMIER : Hear, hear! and Opposition laughter.

The HOME SECRETARY : It will be years before they are forgotten by the Defence Force of Queensland, or by the loyal people of Queensland.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY : The members of the Defence Force were abused by the hon. member as being cowards, curs, and swash-

bucklers. I told him then, by an interjection, that he ought to be ashamed of himself, but, to my regret, he appeared to pride himself upon it even after consideration in his cooler moments.

Mr. DAWSON : Do you think you could tell the truth for once?

The HOME SECRETARY : I am surprised that the hon. member could call any member of the Defence Force who desires to go to South Africa at this time as nothing better than a coward; and, in order to give it greater force, called him not only a coward, but a cur.

Mr. DAWSON : No. I said he had more dog nature than human nature.

The HOME SECRETARY : No. These are the words the hon. gentleman used, and I shall not forget them for many a day. And I am sure that those who have enrolled themselves as the defenders of this colony—and some of whom are now prepared to go to South Africa to fight for the freedom of the Uitlanders—will not soon forget them. I am quite sure his words, wherever they may be read—and I hope, for Queensland's sake, that they will not go outside Queensland—

Mr. DAWSON : I hope they will.

The HOME SECRETARY : Will not be forgotten readily. I tell the hon. member that they will be resented. I resent them.

Mr. GIVENS : You won't go.

The HOME SECRETARY : I think I know what the feeling of the members of the Defence Force is in this colony. I know the hon. member, and I know that the epithets he has been ready to apply to those men, though some of them may apply to himself, nobody will ever accuse him of being a swashbuckler. I am certain of that. The hon. member is not built that way, and nobody need ever expect to have the satisfaction of calling him anything of that sort.

Mr. DAWSON : There is nothing of the swab about me.

Mr. KIDSTON : What about the question before the House?

The HOME SECRETARY : It seems to me that, according to the hon. member for Rockhampton, when his leader speaks in this way, he is not transgressing, but I am. I have very little more to say. I think I have said enough to put the position before the House. I sincerely trust that, for the honour of Queensland and for the honour of Australia, no action will be taken by this House which will tend or have the effect of repudiating the action which has been taken by Queensland—action which has been endorsed since by every other colony on the continent.

Mr. W. THORN : By the casting vote of the Speaker.

The HOME SECRETARY : The hon. member is talking about the Council in South Australia, and we do not care that [snapping his finger] for Legislative Councils.

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

The HOME SECRETARY : I do not see why hon. members should display this risibility.

Mr. GIVENS : I wonder when that will be forgotten?

Mr. DUNSFORD : Never.

The HOME SECRETARY : Hon. members have evidently misunderstood me when I said that. I was alluding more to themselves than to those who sit with me. (Opposition laughter.) The laughter of hon. members only justifies this fact—either that my sarcasm was altogether misplaced, or hon. members do not possess the perceptive faculties which I gave them credit for. I say that what Queensland did has been since deliberately endorsed, each within its own jurisdiction and territory, by every other colony on this continent. And is it going to be now that



the colony which was the first to step into the breach—the first to advertise to the world at large that the British Empire, so far as Australia's connection with it is concerned, is one—is now going to be the only one which is going to back down? If so, then I say I do not want to remain a member of the Ministry which governs that colony.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. FITZGERALD (*Mitchell*): I do not intend to delay the House long in speaking to the amendment, but later on I may have something to say on the question. I must express my surprise at the want of ignorance—

The HOME SECRETARY: Want of ignorance! (Loud laughter on the Ministerial side.)

Mr. FITZGERALD: I was going to say on this side of the House. Now we come to the ignorance on the other side of the House.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Very sad!

Mr. FITZGERALD: The Hon. the Secretary for Public Lands has been interrupting all the afternoon. I hope he will keep himself quiet. If he likes to interrupt I will reply as long as he likes.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Do not get personal.

Mr. FITZGERALD: I have just listened to the Hon. the Home Secretary, who is a leader of the legal profession in Brisbane. We all recognise his ability in the profession. But it is a most peculiar thing that, among all these lawyers on the Ministerial side, they did not see the right way to go about this matter. They did not even know the law on the question, and they come before us with a motion which is really no good at all. They never even took the trouble to read their own Army Act of 1881. They never took the trouble to read the Defence Force Act of 1884, and the Amendment Act of 1897. My hon. friend, the leader of the Independent Opposition, has been the first one to mention the law of the question. Here is the position: Two hundred and fifty of our men leave Queensland to-morrow, and the moment they get three miles off the coast, they are no longer bound by our laws.

MEMBERS on the Opposition side: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY: We all know that.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: We will send you to school.

Mr. FITZGERALD: I will teach the hon. member for Mackay some schooling before I have done with him. From the time that they get three miles off the Queensland coast until they arrive in Capetown they are not subject to Queensland military law.

Mr. DUNSFORD: Not even the major.

Mr. FITZGERALD: Not even the major, with his spurs, and his gold lace, and everything else. The day that he leaves our coast he can refuse to turn out to parade, and have a good long sleep in the morning, and not all the Colonel Gunters or all the lieutenant-generals in the whole ship can court-martial him.

The HOME SECRETARY: Do you suppose we don't all know that?

Mr. FITZGERALD: Will the hon. gentleman allow me to point out one thing Ministers ought to have known, and that is the Army Act of 1881. There is a clause there—clause 177; does the hon. member know it?

The HOME SECRETARY: I think so. I passed an examination on it. It's all right.

Mr. FITZGERALD: This is how the Government ought to have gone into the matter. Section 177 of the Army Act says—

Where any force of volunteers, or of militia, or any other force, is raised in India or in a colony, any law of India or the colony may extend to the officers, non-commissioned officers and men belonging to such force,

whether within or without the limits of India or the colony; and where any such force is serving with part of Her Majesty's regular forces, then, so far as the law of India or the colony has not provided for the government and discipline of such force, this Act and any other Act for the time being amending the same shall, subject to such exceptions and modifications as may be specified in the general orders of the general officer commanding Her Majesty's forces with which such force is serving, apply to the officers, non-commissioned officers and men of such force, in like manner as they apply to the officers, non-commissioned officers and men respectively mentioned in the two preceding sections of this Act.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Hear, hear! What is the matter?

Mr. FITZGERALD: The matter is that the Premier, instead of bringing forward a motion, which is purely a silly motion, should have brought in an Act to comply with section 177 of the Army Act.

The HOME SECRETARY: There is not the slightest necessity. That Act is in force already.

Mr. FITZGERALD: It is in force as soon as our men get under British orders at Capetown, but from the moment they get three miles from Queensland till they arrive at Capetown, all our money may be expended for absolutely nothing.

The HOME SECRETARY: They are not rebels; they are not mutineers.

Mr. FITZGERALD: Two hundred and fifty men leave our coast. The next morning they are called upon to parade and they refuse to go, and there is no power in the world to make them.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Do you think they are all like you?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. FITZGERALD: There is no power in the world to force them to go on parade the next morning.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: When will they be attached to the Imperial troops?

Mr. FITZGERALD: The moment they arrive at Capetown—four or five weeks after they leave here.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: How do you know?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. FITZGERALD: The hon. member asks me how I know. I am simply judging by papers that his boss, the Premier, has put into our hands, in which I find that the home Government only take possession of them when they arrive at Capetown. I am arguing about the time between the time they leave Brisbane and the time they arrive at Capetown. That means four weeks at least, and that will be a quick trip.

Mr. COWLEY: Sixteen days.

Mr. FITZGERALD: Sixteen days from Brisbane to the Cape?

Mr. COWLEY: From the port of departure.

Mr. FITZGERALD: We will say three weeks if the hon. member likes.

Mr. J. HAMILTON: Sixteen days is not three weeks.

Mr. FITZGERALD: The hon. member cannot say that we can get from Brisbane to the Cape in sixteen days. I am talking about the time when our soldiers—who are just as good as any other ones—will be three miles off our coast—that is, when they cease to be subject to Queensland law. From that time till they get to Capetown they are not liable to any military law at all.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: It is true of every passenger to Cooktown also. They are subject to no law according to you.

Mr. FITZGERALD: I wish to goodness the hon. member would keep quiet.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I dare say you do. You don't want to have a little common sense applied to your arguments.

Mr. FITZGERALD : I am arguing in favour of this amendment to show this—

The SPEAKER : Order !

Mr. FITZGERALD : If a sum of £30,000 or £40,000 is spent by the Government sending those troops to Capetown, the moment they arrive at Capetown every one of them may refuse to join the British army. If they like they can join the Transvaal army, and the Queensland Government will be at the loss of £30,000 or £40,000. The moment they arrive there they can say, "Thank you, Queensland Government, I am off to the mines or to join the Boer troops." There is the position.

The PREMIER : That is another insult to the fidelity of our volunteers.

Mr. FITZGERALD : I say that we are running the risk at the present time of losing £30,000 or £40,000, and we do not know whether when the troops arrive they will join the British troops or not. The Premier says I am insulting the Queensland volunteers. Let me tell him this—a little experience I had in the West in 1891, at the time of the strike. I was here, and I went afterwards out West—I was in the volunteers then—and I found that a great many of the volunteers who had been induced to leave Brisbane to go West in connection with the shearers' strike—and I can give the hon. member the names of men who will say the same thing—that if they had known the circumstances of the case before they left Brisbane as they did after their arrival in the West, they would never have gone. And the same thing may happen in connection with this very contingent. When they arrive at Capetown they will very likely hear something very different from what has appeared in the newspapers here, and they will say, "I am very sorry I left Queensland; I am very sorry indeed that I had anything to do with this jingoism." And there is nothing to force them to go and fight, and it will be simply this—the whole of our £30,000 or £40,000 will be spent on nothing. I mention this to show that the Premier in bringing forward this motion went the wrong way about it. In section 177 of the Army Act it says that our Queensland colony can pass an Act to extend the Army Act to the troops from the time they leave our coast to the time they arrive at Capetown. Why did not the hon. member go and do that? Simply because he did not know anything about it—the Ministry containing so many lawyers never knew anything about it, and the result is that we may spend £30,000 or £40,000, and those men when they get to Capetown may just refuse to join the British troops at all. That is the only question I intend to raise now. I contend that the hon. member for Enoggera was perfectly justified in bringing up this question that our Defence Force is a force to defend our own shores, and is not an aggressive force, as the hon. member for Lockyer would like it to be. That hon. member, judging by his speech, wants to declare war against the Transvaal himself. He mentioned the case of Stephanus Jones and some others. It is a most peculiar thing that Great Britain should know all about those things long before the hon. member knew anything about them and never declared war against the Transvaal, and the hon. member for Lockyer says we should go to war with the Boers on the question at the present time. It is a most peculiar thing that members of this House should want to declare war against the Boers on questions which Great Britain has thought over seriously and carefully months and months ago, and which has only just come before us now. I think we ought to stay where we are—I think our Defence Force ought to stay where it is. Our Defence Force has a right to defend

Queensland against invaders and not act on the aggressive, and I am going to vote in favour of this amendment and against the motion.

Mr. JACKSON (*Kennedy*): As most hon. members know, it was I who moved for the papers to be put on the table of the House—the papers relating to the Transvaal; but I do not want hon. members to think that because I moved for the production of those papers I claim to be an authority on the present dispute in the Transvaal. I merely take the same interest as I suppose every hon. member takes in the matter, therefore I do not want it to be thought that I am in any way posing as a special expert in this matter. I must say, that like a good many other hon. members, I was greatly disappointed when I read this correspondence and the copies of the documents referred to, because I expected to see there something that would give a clue as to how this proposal to send troops to assist the mother-country in this possible war originated; but there was nothing to show this in the correspondence. There was a letter there from Colonel Gunter, but there is nothing to show how he got the offer which he communicated to the Premier. The Premier has stated that verbal offers have been made, but they must have been very few, otherwise why has it been necessary for officers of the Defence Force to go round the country and endeavour to raise the requisite number of men.

The HOME SECRETARY : To enrol them.

Mr. JACKSON : We have only to read through the correspondence to see that an officer of the Naval Brigade asked men to volunteer for service in time of need.

The PREMIER : He was not instructed to do so.

Mr. JACKSON : It is rather remarkable that an officer of the Naval Brigade should have taken this action if he had not received instructions from the Chief Secretary.

The PREMIER : The Naval Brigade were very anxious to serve, but their services were not required.

The HOME SECRETARY : Hear, hear !

Mr. JACKSON : I expected to see that when the Premier made this offer there would have been any amount of evidence to show that men had volunteered, not in dozens or in scores, but in hundreds. We have heard a great deal about the atrocities committed by the Boers in South Africa, and we have heard the leader of the Opposition say that he did not believe the statements about these atrocities. He said that no true Britisher would stand quietly by and submit to these insults offered to himself, to his wife, or to his children. Even if these statements regarding these atrocities are true, have not far worse atrocities been practised by the people of this colony in connection with the aboriginals, especially in the outside districts. But we must remember that there is some excuse for the Boers not dealing with kid-gloved hands with this matter. Seeing that the British are massing their troops on the frontier of the Transvaal country, we cannot expect the Boers to be all milk and water—when their country is threatened with invasion. Yesterday afternoon we heard a considerable amount of recent history from the hon. member for Lockyer in regard to this dispute. I do not propose to go back to ancient history, but I intend to give a few extracts to show that there is another side to the question. The hon. member for Lockyer quoted from a blue-book, which very few hon. members have seen. It only came out a few days ago, and since its advent it has been in the possession of only one or two hon. members, the majority of hon. members have not had any opportunity of perusing it. It is an *ex parte* statement, but even admitting that all these grievances that the hon. member quoted are true, that does not justify British

or colonial interference. The argument of the Home Secretary was that British interests in South Africa were paramount. That was getting to the kernel of the matter. No hon. member would attempt to argue that the British had any right to interfere with the provisions of the Convention of 1884, or with the terms of the agreement the British made with the Boers after the war of 1880. Before dealing with any justification by the British at the present time in this matter, we should consider the position that the Transvaal occupied some twenty years ago. I have here a book—not a blue-book—but a book written by Lady Bellairs, the widow of General Bellairs, who was in charge of the British troops at Pretoria in the war of 1884. It is written in a very fair spirit, and we can take her testimony as being impartial with regard to the Boers.

Mr. GLASSEY: That is eighteen years ago. A great many things have happened since.

Mr. JACKSON: From this book hon. members will see the character of the Boers twenty years ago, and we will see if there is any justification for calling them cowards and brutal.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: They have been charged with being brutal, not cowardly.

Mr. JACKSON: They have been charged with being brutal, and to be brutal is to be cowardly. On page 4 the writer says—

The annexation of the Transvaal was carried out in the early part of 1877, when it seems to have been expected by the authors of that act that the people would quickly become reconciled to the high-handed change made to a Crown-colony form of government—a form from which our colonies in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and at the Cape had for some time past shaken themselves free. The declarations made at the time by Sir Theophilus Shepstone had led the people to suppose that the withdrawal of their liberties was intended to be merely temporary, and that self-government would, in due course, follow a short transition period. How delusive were the promises thus held out, time plainly showed. High Commissioners and Admirals were replaced by other men, and a Conservative gave way to a Liberal Government in England, but the promised free institutions were still kept back.

Now hon. members who read these words will see that the British Government promised the Boers that they should have representative institutions, and they did not get those institutions.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: How long ago was that?

Mr. JACKSON: From 1877 to 1880 or 1881.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That's only three years. The Boers want a person to live there for fourteen years before he can get any rights.

Mr. JACKSON: With regard to the character of the Boers, I will quote this—

The men who had by their courage and endurance gained possession of the territory and had spread homesteads, flocks, and herds over the land, who had, notwithstanding all that has been averred to the contrary, managed their affairs fairly well—sufficiently so for their wants, according to their lights—were now set aside and deemed unfitted to have a voice in their own Government.

Now, the immediate cause of the late war was unjust taxation. Unjust taxation was levied, and that led to the revolt. On page 47 the writer says—

From the fact of the Landdrost having finally revised his decision and given judgment for £14, it would seem that the Government had tardily recognised their error to that extent. But, not satisfied with having put Mr. Bezuidenhout to great unnecessary trouble, as well as expense in employing an attorney to resist a wrongful claim, he was mulcted in costs—for proving that he was right.

I may say that the claim of £28 was just double the amount they had a right to levy on this Boer farmer.

Mr. COWLEY: Their own laws were in force at that time.

Mr. JACKSON: It was a Crown colony.

Mr. COWLEY: Their own laws were retained, and their own men administered these laws.

Mr. JACKSON: Just another short extract to show the character of the Boers

[5 p.m.] as regards the conduct of the war of 1880—

Thus ended a successful revolt. Although a few Boers had been unscrupulous, and here and there, to gain their ends, had employed means which conflicted with the more civilised usages of modern war; and though cases of murder, or closely verging on murder occurred, yet it must be conceded that rarely has a general revolt of a people been carried to its end with so few instances of cruelty exhibiting the ordinary darker shades of insurrection. Their conduct, at least, will compare with that of any people during risings which have taken place elsewhere.

Hon. members are aware that after the war Sir Evelyn Wood, who was then in command of the British forces in South Africa, made an agreement with the Boers—

The Boer leaders having previously accepted telegrams of 8th and 12th, except in two parts since abandoned, and having been acknowledged as leaders by Sir Evelyn Wood, have accepted the principle of suzerainty as defined by him—viz., that the country has entire self-government as regards its own interior affairs, but that it cannot take action against, or with an outside power, without permission of the suzerain.

I ask the attention of hon. members now to this question of suzerainty, in order to show that the British have no right whatever to interfere with the internal affairs of the Transvaal.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Neither had they in Abyssinia, but they had a right to rescue their own subjects.

Mr. JACKSON: Those were the terms made by Sir Evelyn Wood at the time of the armistice, and in the convention of 1884 they were made more stringent than the British Government had no right to interfere in the internal affairs of the Boers. In order to justify British intervention—I say nothing about colonial intervention, because I expect hon. members on the other side will say that the British have a right to interfere before they attempt to argue at all as to the rights of the colonists to interfere. Let them show that the British have a right to interfere under the terms of the convention, because, if hon. members on the other side like to wipe out, with a wave of the hand, the convention of 1884 and the armistice made with Sir Evelyn Wood, and say that the British interests are paramount in South Africa—the same as the Home Secretary said—then it is all right. We shall then know where we are. But hon. members opposite have failed to show that under the convention of 1884 we have any right to interfere.

Mr. ANNEAR: We saved them from being wiped out on three occasions.

Mr. TURLEY: We did nothing of the sort.

Mr. JACKSON: Let us suppose that these grievances of the Uitlanders which the hon. member for Lockyer read out give them just cause for complaint. Let us suppose it is unfair to refuse the Uitlanders the franchise, and that the dynamite monopoly is unjust—which probably it is—and that the tariff of the country is unfair, as in my opinion a protective tariff always is—and I was rather surprised at the hon. member for Lockyer objecting to the protective tariff that the Boers have, seeing that the hon. member is a well-known protectionist. Let us admit that the railway rates are unfair, and the question of white labour or coloured labour, and the fact of the Government having made arrangements for not letting buildings to the miners. Let us suppose these are all genuine grievances. But are they not all internal affairs? How is any foreign country outside Africa

affected by anything that I have mentioned? We know, of course, that under one of the articles of the convention the Transvaal Government must not make any arrangements with any outside nation which would be likely to interfere with Britain's interests in South Africa; but will anyone contend that the franchise and the dynamite monopoly, or any of those things, affect any foreign power, or affects the interests of Great Britain?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Those are only a part of the grievances.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: They go to make up the whole.

Mr. JACKSON: Then, again, it is a rather singular thing that the British Government is not willing to submit any of these troubles or disputes to arbitration.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. JACKSON: We find the Transvaal Government even now—at the last moment—saying, "We are willing to submit our case to arbitration." The British Government appear to only recognise the principle of arbitration just when it suits themselves. Two years ago the Transvaal Government proposed to arbitrate in connection with the Aliens Exclusion Bill, but the British Government were not willing. Looking at what then transpired, it seems to me that when the Transvaal Government asked the suzerain power to arbitrate in connection with that matter, that they made a fair request. I will not occupy the time of the House by reading it, but I have here, in the "Politician's Notebook," a despatch from the Transvaal Government, in which, I contend, they make out a remarkably good case as to why they should be allowed to shut out aliens.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Why don't you go and help them?

Mr. JACKSON: I am not of the same military disposition, perhaps, as the hon. gentleman, but it is rather singular that those gentlemen who are so anxious to send troops are not going over themselves.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. JACKSON: We are not particularly anxious to go and fight. It is the hon. members on the other side. They want to fight by proxy, as some hon. member interjected the other night.

Mr. TRELLEY: The Secretary for Agriculture is an officer.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. JACKSON: I wish to point out—and it would have been a justification for my reading the despatch—the courteous language of the despatch. Reading the despatch of the South African Republic to the British Government and the despatch, in reply, of the British Government, while I do not profess to be much of a grammarian, I am struck with the correct and courteous language of the former. Some people represent the Boers as an ignorant race.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: So they are, as a race.

Mr. JACKSON: I venture to contradict the hon. member. As a race they are not ignorant. I was going to quote from Lady Bellairs' book on that very point. Leaving that on one side, however—I will not read the despatch now—but I want to show that they made out a good case in favour of interfering with the aliens, but the British Government refused to let them, just the same as we in Queensland attempted to interfere with alien labour. There was a big influx of criminals and paupers into the Transvaal during the gold rush, and the Transvaal Government claimed the right to shut out those aliens. The British Government said "No! You shall not do it. It is a breach of the convention." Under the law of nations the Transvaal Government claimed that, in spite of the convention, they had the right to shut out these

aliens. They claimed that they had the right—which every country has—to govern themselves, and they proposed to submit the question to arbitration. They proposed that the President of the Swiss Republic should appoint a juror to arbitrate in the matter, but the British Government—I may say in its usual high-handed style—refused to accept that offer of arbitration, in the same way as they now refuse to arbitrate.

Mr. J. HAMILTON: What is the date of the despatch you refer to?

Mr. JACKSON: The magazine only came to our library on the 7th October, 1899, so that it is up to date, but the despatch is two years old. It may sound presumptuous for me to express an opinion on the matter, seeing that we are so far away, but my opinion is that if the British Government had only kept their hands off the Boers these matters would easily have settled themselves within another generation, probably within less than another generation. Having regard to the fact that there will be intermarriages among the people in the Transvaal, and that the rising generation of Boers are bound to have different opinions from those entertained by the old stock, we may be sure that these matters would be decently settled within a very few years. But, in my opinion, the real object of the British Government is not so much to redress the grievances of the Uitlanders as to get possession of the Transvaal, in order to pave the way for a South African Confederation. That may be right enough if hon. members argue in that way, but why not admit that the British Government have no right to interfere with the Boers under the convention of 1884? I could understand hon. members contending that British interests are paramount in South Africa, that British subjects and British capital, particularly British capital, should be protected and encouraged, and that British subjects would make a better use of the Transvaal, both as regards farming and pastoral pursuits, and develop its resources better than the Boers, just as the Boers have made a better use of the resources of the country than the natives did. I could understand arguments of that character. But will hon. members opposite argue in that way? If that is what hon. members believe let them argue in that way, and we will answer them.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: It is entirely apart from the question, at any rate.

Mr. JACKSON: We have heard the Home Secretary argue in that way, that British interests are paramount, though I admit that he put forward the argument very quietly. And in reply to an interjection by the hon. member for Wide Bay the same hon. gentleman said we are a dependency of the mother country, and ought to take up some of the responsibilities of the Empire. What did the hon. gentleman mean? Was he referring to Imperial federation? Does the hon. gentleman say, "Let us have a great Imperial federation; we are members of one empire, and let us share in the responsibilities of the mother country?" If we were members of an Imperial federation I could understand the justification of our participating in the wars of the mother country, because then we should have a voice in the declaration of war. But we have no voice in this quarrel, and we are courting the interference of foreign powers by interfering with the Boers as the Government now propose. Professor Goldwin Smith, in his book on "Canada and the Canadian Question," ridicules the idea of Imperial federation, and shows how absurd it is.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: His ridicule does not settle the question.

Mr. JACKSON: His argument settles it. Has the hon. gentleman read the book? I think that anyone reading the chapter on Imperial federation will give up the dream of Imperial federation, not only in our time, but in anybody else's time. Goldwin Smith mentions in that book that a treaty of neutrality was proposed between Louis XIV. and James II., under which, in the event of the mother country going to war, the colonies were to stand out of it; they were to be considered neutrals. Goldwin Smith remarks that the treaty pointed true, and that is the position we ought to take up as long as we are, as self-governing colonies, dependencies of the Crown, and have no voice in Imperial matters.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Let the Empire be humiliated, and where shall we be?

Mr. JACKSON: In reply to the hon. gentleman, I say if we keep our troops here, and do not go interfering in outside quarrels, we shall not be interfered with. I was rather astonished at the suggestion made yesterday afternoon by the hon. member for Croydon—that instead of sending troops we ought to vote a sum of money to assist the old country in the Transvaal. I take exception to such a suggestion.

Mr. BROWNE: I said it would be a more sensible thing.

Mr. JACKSON: The hon. member said it would be a more sensible proposal. I should certainly object to a proposal of that sort. Supposing the old country were at war with Germany, would the hon. member for Lockyer, in whose constituency there are a great number of Germans, support a vote of £30,000 or £50,000 to assist the old country against Germany? I do not think so. If he did his constituents would have something to say to him at the next election. I take exception to our interference in this Transvaal matter in any shape or form, except as private individuals. As private individuals let us do what we can to assist the mother country if she is engaged in a righteous dispute and requires our assistance. In that case it would be our duty, as members of the same race, or, if you like, as members of the same grand Empire—because I believe it is a grand Empire—I believe it is one of the greatest Empires that has ever existed—

MEMBERS on the Government side: Let us show it.

Mr. JACKSON: It is because I believe in the greatness of this Empire that I would not like to do anything that would tend to sully or tarnish its name.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

HON. E. B. FORREST: I wish to say a few words before this amendment is disposed of, and I shall not detain the House long. I do not think the House is disposed to listen to speeches of two or three hours' duration, more particularly as they consist of facts obtained from blue-books, most of them mouldy.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Not one single fact that I gave was mouldy.

HON. E. B. FORREST: A good many that I listened to last night bore the stamp of being of a very old character, but I shall not discuss that point now; it is not good enough. I think the time is past when the question of our sending troops to the Transvaal can be considered on its merits.

Mr. DAWSON: Whose fault is that?

HON. E. B. FORREST: I am not going to discuss that just now, but I say that, whether rightly or wrongly, the country is committed to the troops going to the Transvaal, and the House is called upon now either to ratify or repudiate the action of the Government in the matter.

That is really the position, and nobody knows that better than my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. DAWSON: No, that is not so; what we are called upon to do is to resent the action of the Government.

HON. E. B. FORREST: The question is how that should be done, but I say the most important question before the House now is the question of ratifying or repudiating the action of the Premier. Much as I disapprove of that action, no vote of mine shall be given to repudiate it. I am here to ratify it, as the country is pledged to the sending of these troops to South Africa. The last thing we should think of is repudiation, and there is no getting away from the fact that, rightly or wrongly, the country is pledged to the sending of these troops to the Transvaal, and so far as members of this House are concerned it is their duty to ratify the action of the Premier, even if they do not believe in it.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: No, no!

HON. E. B. FORREST: There is no doubt whatever that the country is pledged to it by the action of the Premier. At the same time I say that the action of the Government is one that should be considered by the House. That is to say, as to whether they should have made the offer at the time they did. I think this: That the offer, whenever it was made, should have been accompanied by the customary saving clause—that it was subject to ratification by Parliament.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. E. B. FORREST: The introduction of those three or four words would have saved all the trouble we have had for the last three or four days. I cannot see why they should not have gone in—not necessarily to Mr. Chamberlain, though there would be no harm in sending the offer in that form to him—and if the offer had been framed in that particular way all the bother we have had for the last few days would have been at an end.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. E. B. FORREST: We have heard a good deal from the Premier as to the question of emergency. In my judgment the emergency has never arisen, and it has not arisen yet. It has not. It is all nonsense to say that any emergency had arisen, and that it was necessary to send this offer on the 10th of July last. It did not exist. The other colonies did not make the offer. They are only making it now, and that is any amount of time for the purposes connected with the offer on the score of emergency, and it was a distinct blunder for the Government to have made it at the time they did. I am not discussing the question now as to whether the troops should be sent to the Transvaal or not, but as to whether the offer should have been made to the Imperial Government to send them at the time it was made by the Premier. I say it was not necessary that it should be made then at all; and when Parliament met in September it could have been made then, and it would have been in ample time.

Mr. STEWART: And you are going to back up the Premier?

HON. E. B. FORREST: Since I have been in this House I have heard, day after day, no end of discussion as to the privileges of Parliament. What are the privileges of Parliament if the Premier can give Parliament away in one act without any reference to Parliament at all?

Mr. STEWART: And yet you support him!

HON. E. B. FORREST: The privileges of Parliament have been invaded by the Premier's action. I say so deliberately. I have heard one time after another of the privileges of Parliament, and if there is anything that Parliament should control it is big questions of this kind.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. E. B. FORREST: I do not approve in any sense of the action of the Premier in offering to send troops to the Transvaal at the time he did—assuming that it is the proper thing to send them at any time. I am not discussing that now, but confining myself to the question whether he should or should not have offered to send troops to the Transvaal at the particular time he did. Coming to the amendment of the leader of the Opposition, I do not hesitate to say that in its present form I will not support it.

MR. DAWSON: Why?

HON. E. B. FORREST: Because, to tell you the honest truth, I consider it is practically a contradiction of terms. You see by the amendment you disapprove of troops being sent to the Transvaal. Practically, in so many words, that is what it is boiled down.

MR. DAWSON: No, it does not say that.

HON. E. B. FORREST: Then in the same resolution moved by the Premier as it stands it really says that troops should be sent. In the one resolution, if it is amended as proposed, you will say in the first part that the troops should not go, it is a most improper thing, and so forth, and in the next part it is said that they should go.

MR. GIVENS: We can amend the resolution further on.

HON. E. B. FORREST: I have looked it from end to end, and I see no further on in it. There is not the slightest doubt that with this amendment you will have the two cases presented—the suggestion that it is the proper thing to send troops to the Transvaal, and also the suggestion that it is an improper thing to send them. Who is to decide? It will lead to no end of difficulties should anything arise out of it, and I do not hesitate to say I am not willing to support the amendment for those reasons.

MR. HIGGS: Would you support it in any form?

THE HOME SECRETARY: Fishing for votes.

HON. E. B. FORREST: Yes, you are in a hurry to know what I would do. I have not got up here to object to everything or to say anything about what I would do. Do you suppose that I am afraid to say what I would do? I will tell you what I would do. It is this: Had the amendment been moved in another form such as this, by the leader of the Opposition, I should have felt called upon to support it.

MR. KIDSTON: An honest confession.

HON. E. B. FORREST: I would propose to allow the resolution to stand as it is, but I would be inclined to add these words: "The House regrets that the constitutional method of making the offer, subject to ratification by Parliament, was not adopted." I should have been prepared to support that.

MEMBERS on the Opposition side: Move it.

HON. E. B. FORREST: It is not my business to move it now. I do not want to take the business out of the hands of the leader of the Opposition. He is in charge of the amendment at present, and I have not the slightest desire to jump his claim. I was not consulted about the present amendment. The first I heard of it was when it was moved, and I confess I fell into the same mistake with respect to it as the Premier did. The Premier said he did not gather the exact extent and meaning of it until after tea, and I confess that until Mr. Bell brought over a copy of it about 8 o'clock I did not catch the whole of it, but then I saw what it was.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWSON: Oh, oh!

HON. E. B. FORREST: I say I do think it would be correct to say that the House regrets that the constitutional method of making the

offer subject to the ratification of Parliament was not adopted. With that addition, the resolution is one which—I will not say many, but which some members on this side would be prepared to agree to, because they do not believe any more than I do that the action of the Premier was on strictly constitutional grounds. I have told him so over and over again, privately and publicly, and I tell him here now that I consider there was no necessity for the offer to be made to the Imperial Government at the time it was made.

MR. DAWSON: The Premier's motion embodies two questions.

HON. E. B. FORREST: Unfortunately your amendment does, too.

MR. DAWSON: No; my amendment confines it to one—the constitutional question.

HON. E. B. FORREST: The amendment practically introduces two questions into the Premier's resolution, one stating that it is an improper thing that the troops should go, and the other that it is a proper thing. There is no doubt about that, and the hon. gentleman in calmer moments would see that I am correct. I am not grumbling at the right of the leader of the Opposition to put the amendment in any form he likes, but if I had framed the amendment it would have been in the form which I have indicated, and in that form it would have got some support on this side from members who take the same objection to the action of the Premier that I do, and the same objection that members on the other side take. I have not got up here for the purpose of harassing the Government in any form. There is no desire on my part to do it. I do not think there should be a desire on anybody else's part to do it. After all it is not to my mind a question of the life or death of the Ministry. There are many other questions to come on which might involve their life or death with very much more force than this. That is my opinion, though many members on the other side, I know, do not take that view.

MR. DAWSON: We don't want to kill them.

HON. E. B. FORREST: That is your own business, but I say deliberately I do not want to harass them. They have accepted the amendment before the House as a want of confidence motion, and it is a matter for themselves whether they would accept the amendment I have suggested as a want of confidence motion or not. I do not know. I never asked about it or consulted anyone about it, and I have never asked anyone to vote for it or against it. So far as I am concerned I think the time has passed for us to consider the question of sending troops to the Transvaal on its merits, because the Premier has committed the country to it. I am prepared to say that he improperly committed the country to it, but I say that notwithstanding that fact the duty of this House is to confirm that action and save repudiation.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GROOM: When I came into this Chamber yesterday afternoon I came prepared to vote for sending a contingent of troops to the Transvaal. Therefore the course of action I am going to take on this amendment is perfectly disinterested, and it has been arrived at after very careful consideration of the whole facts of the case. I carry my mind back to the year 1887, when Sir Samuel Griffith was Premier of Queensland, and the Hon. B. D. Morehead leader of the Opposition. I remind the House that there were papers then laid on the table which committed the colony for ten years to pay a subsidy of from £13,000 to £15,000 for the Australasian Auxiliary Squadron. I remember the outcry which was raised not only in this Chamber but throughout Queensland at the Premier going to London to attend the Colonial Conference, and

there committing this colony to such an expenditure without the consent or the knowledge of Parliament. Those are facts which are well known to

hon. members, and the consequences 5.30 p.m. which followed are perfectly well known. So strong was the feeling in the Chamber that no one could say at the time what the consequences would be. It is perfectly certain that it formed the groundwork of the policy of the National party that came into being in the following year, 1888. As the leader of that party, Sir T. Mcllwraith asked the electors not to support a Government which had committed such an act in London without asking the advice of Parliament and without consulting the people; and the result was that he was returned with a large majority against the Government which had committed that act in London.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Not on that ground.

Mr. GROOM: Do not let there be any misunderstanding about it. There are members now sitting on the other side of the House who went to the country in 1888, and denounced Sir Samuel Griffith for having made that compact in London over the heads of the Parliament and the people of the colony.

Mr. J. HAMILTON: That was only one complaint out of fifty.

Mr. GROOM: I am only mentioning this to show that what we are asked to do now is no new thing. Of course, if hon. members on either side of the House object to such a course of action, they have a perfect right to do so. I only ask them to look at all the circumstances of the case, and find out whether this Parliament has on any previous occasion been committed in any similar way. The first thing the House did on its assembling was to criticise the action of Sir Samuel Griffith.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Not the first thing.

Mr. GROOM: I would remind the hon. gentleman that the hon. member, Mr. Annear, in moving the adoption of the Address in Reply, in one of the characteristic speeches for which he is noted, while endorsing the general policy of the Government, was constrained to admit that that particular action of Sir Samuel Griffith was one which he could not endorse. I give the hon. member credit for sincerity of conviction on that occasion, and there were other members sitting behind the Government who said they could not endorse it, although when it came to a fight they were quite prepared to support the Government.

The TREASURER: They accepted it afterwards.

Mr. GROOM: Because they were convinced that the honour of the colony had been committed to the Imperial Government. I take the view of the hon. member for North Brisbane, that the Premier, having committed the honour of the colony in making the offer, I, as a representative of the people, would not go back on the Premier's word.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The members who opposed it did so on the grounds of those who are opposing now. They believed it would humiliate the Government.

Mr. DAWSON: You are entirely wrong there.

Mr. GROOM: The Attorney-General was in the House at the time, and is quite competent to give what he considers his verdict of the affair. What I am pointing out is that Sir Samuel Griffith's action in London was the root and origin of the National party. The hon. gentleman must know perfectly well that it was what was called Sir Samuel Griffith's imperialism which led to the establishment of that party. There were pamphlets issued galore at the time calling attention to that gentleman's imperialism. This very act of his in connection with the Australian Auxiliary Squadron—which we now consider the right thing to have done under the circum-

stances—was put prominently before the electors in Sir T. Mcllwraith's appeal to the electors. As we all know, that appeal was successful, and there are members now sitting on the other side of the House who obtained their seats on that occasion by endorsing Sir T. Mcllwraith's policy.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Were you not a follower of Sir T. Mcllwraith a short time before?

Mr. GROOM: That has nothing to do with this particular question. If the hon. gentleman wants any information on the subject, I will give it to him at the proper time. I say that history repeats itself. On that occasion the House expressed its disapprobation, and the people spoke with no uncertain voice about it. As far as the present movement is concerned, I think, with other hon. members, that the right course would have been for the Premier to have made the offer, subject to the approval of Parliament.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: That was understood all along. It could not be carried out without the sanction of Parliament.

Mr. GROOM: I have read the correspondence carefully from beginning to end, and the conclusion I came to is that immediately on the receipt of the letter from the Commandant in July last, the hon. gentleman made an offer of troops to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, but nothing was said in that message to Mr. Chamberlain that the offer was made subject to the approval of Parliament. Is the Premier aware that when that offer was made the Agent-General in London, Sir Horace Tozer, was interviewed on the subject, and that reports of the interview appeared in certain of the London newspapers? Does he know further that Sir Horace Tozer subsequently asserted that he had been misrepresented by the interviewers, that words had been put into his mouth which he had never uttered? Sir Horace Tozer felt impelled to reply to those misrepresentations, and here is the correction which he sent to the *Times* newspaper, and which I will read to the House. He says:—

1. Concerning the cost of contingent, I merely remarked that if the Imperial Government desired a larger number of mounted infantry from the Queensland Defence Force than those now offered to be sent and paid for by the colony, they could doubtless obtain them on consenting to pay the expense.

2. The description of the *personnel* of the men related more closely to the selected number than to every soldier in this branch of the service.

3. Till recently I had two sons in the mounted infantry. My observations as to probable service now only applied to the survivor.

4. To the question of policy I stated that the offer would be loyally and patriotically endorsed by the majority of the people.

The HOME SECRETARY: And so it has been.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That is a fact, at any rate.

Mr. GROOM: He goes on to say—

But that if there was any criticism such would only emanate (1) from a section who would probably object to Australasia's interference in any Imperial disputes outside their own territory, and (2) from our Irish colonists, who, numbering about 23 per cent. of the total population, may follow the lead given here and contend that the redress of Irish "grievances" should precede the enforcement of the claims of the Uitlanders.

The PREMIER: That is Sir Horace Tozer's own view.

Mr. McDONALD: He is your own officer.

Mr. GROOM: Well, let me finish my quotation:—

Beyond the mere narrative I did not desire to offer any comments upon the wisdom of either policy.

That is the opinion of the Agent-General in London. And really as I read it I can hardly conceive that an officer of the Government of



Queensland should even dabble in affairs of that kind at all, because he is there 16,000 miles away from this Chamber, and it is remarkable how very soon a man in England gets out of touch with the opinions of the colony and how difficult it is for him to express opinions upon contemporaneous events because he does not know what is happening here, and does not really know the opinions of those who have to deal with the affairs of government. Therefore I say the opinion of the Agent-General on questions of policy as affecting this colony are of little value, and that he would have shown a wiser discretion in informing his interviewer that he preferred to await instructions from his Government before he consented to speak. I do not hesitate to tell the House that last night I went carefully over the debate which took place in 1887.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: What about this debate?

Mr. BROWNE: Why do you not listen to this debate?

Mr. GROOM: I am coming to that. I want hon. gentlemen to observe the lesson of 1887, with regard to the Premier in England overriding Parliament, committing the colony to an enormous expenditure, and then coming out and asking Parliament to consent to it. I say that the arguments advanced then are equally as strong and equally as powerful to-day, and one would have thought that that lesson taught in 1887 would have had some effect in influencing subsequent Premiers in taking such important action without the consent of Parliament.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Was he not justified by events?

Mr. GROOM: What is the use of Parliament, if we are not to be consulted? It was said last night that occasions might arise when the Executive, represented by the Premier—and Sir Samuel Griffith contended that the Premier was virtually the Executive of the Cabinet—might find it necessary to bind the colony to a particular bargain.

Hon. E. B. FORREST: Do you believe that?

Mr. GROOM: No, I do not; but I say that there may be matters of more domestic concern, involving no great principle, where it is necessary for the Premier to act on the spur of the moment, and enter into transactions that may be absolutely necessary. There is an instance of that reported in the paper to-night, in which the Secretary for Agriculture has entered into a bargain with the steamship company, and undertaken to pay £2,500 a year for the first year, and £1,000 a year for two subsequent years, for the carriage of certain produce. He has not obtained the consent of Parliament; but I have no doubt that when the matter comes before Parliament we will endorse the action that has been taken. But that is a matter of domestic policy as affecting the internal affairs of the colony, while in this case what are we asked to do? We are positively asked, in spite of the Act passed in 1891, which had in view a contingency such as this, and specially guarded against sending troops out of the colony without the consent of Parliament, to consent to an offer which the Premier has made to send troops beyond the borders of the colony. The Premier has committed the colony to an expenditure of £32,000 for the purpose of entering into a quarrel with a people in whom we have not the slightest interest whatever. I have as much sympathy with the Uitlanders and their grievances as any other member here present.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Their case may be ours to-morrow.

Mr. GROOM: No, I think the circumstances are entirely different. There is not the slightest comparison whatever between the difficulties

occurring in these colonies of Australia and the difficulties in the Transvaal Republic. I read the monthly letters appearing in the newspapers which give details of what is going on in the Transvaal, and, like the hon. member for Lockyer, we have access to the English blue-books and papers like the *London Times*, which has able correspondents in Natal, Durban, Johannesburg, Pretoria, Capetown, and other places, and which supply the latest information in regard to Transvaal affairs. From these reports any man can gather together a fair idea of what is going on.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: All these telegrams, according to the leader of the Opposition, are concoctions.

Mr. DAWSON: No, I did not say so.

Mr. GROOM: May I inform the Secretary for Lands that I am talking of the ordinary letters headed "from our own correspondent," which appear in the *Times* newspaper, and I think it will be admitted, however much we may throw doubt—and at times there is good reason for doubt—upon the cablegrams which appear in the daily papers, yet that is not altogether the fault of those who conduct newspapers. I have had cablegrams delivered to me in such a mutilated condition that it would be utterly impossible to make anything like intelligible English out of them, and sometimes the newspaper man in charge of that particular department of the paper has to exercise a very considerable amount of ingenuity and skill, and must have a very intimate knowledge of the country from which the cablegram comes, and of the events transpiring there, in order to give to the public anything like a correct account of the cablegrams which are received, and it is quite possible that he may often make mistakes. But in the case I speak of no such difficulty can arise, because what I refer to are the deliberate writings of the able men whom the *Times* is known to employ. I say then that any reader of the *Times* can find out the general condition of the Uitlanders of the Transvaal. While I am, as I say, in full sympathy with them, one cannot but acknowledge that the Boers have their rights as well. The Transvaal is a very rich country. It has been estimated since the present trouble began, that the amount of gold taken out of the Transvaal during 1899 came to 5,000,000 oz. Let us contemplate for a moment the amount of wealth in the country! A writer in the *Times* absolutely states that in the Transvaal mines there is stone in view which is calculated to produce 70,000,000 oz. That will give us some idea of the richness of the country. Therefore, if a man like President Kruger informs the Americans that the reason why the British want to fight is, that they want to take possession of the goldfields of the country, he is entitled to his opinion.

The PREMIER: Then you think that volunteers should not be sent?

Mr. GROOM: The hon. gentleman knows exactly what I said. I have already intimated in the earlier part of my remarks the course I intend to take, and what I came yesterday expressly to vote for. I am going to vote for what the hon. gentleman has done, but like the hon. member for Brisbane North, Mr. Forrest, I do not think he went the right way about it. I shall express the views I hold by voting for the amendment of the leader of the Opposition, and if the hon. gentleman's motion comes to a vote I shall vote for it simply because I think he has committed Queensland just in the same way that Sir Samuel Griffith did in 1887. That was done in my opinion unconstitutionally. I believe the Premier has acted now unconstitutionally, but, rather than see the colony suffer by the



unconstitutional act of its Premier, I shall vote for the motion proposed by the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government.

Mr. ANNEAR: I do not rise to reply to the hon. member for Toowoomba. I think that this is the time when we should discuss, not only the amendment, but the general question. I thoroughly agree with the hon. member for North Brisbane, Mr. Forrest, that it is no use making speeches of two or three hours' duration discussing the amendment. The question now before the House is—Shall we ratify the offer made by the Government to send the contingent to the Transvaal, or shall we reject it?

Mr. DAWSON: Without the consent of Parliament.

Mr. ANNEAR: If the hon. the leader of the Labour Opposition will only wait a little while, I shall have the pleasure of answering him. Before doing so I wish to say a few words with regard to the remarks made by the hon. member for Kennedy. The hon. member was very brave this afternoon. He talked about the great Empire of which he is a member. I come to this House and speak about the great Empire of which I am a very humble member, and I give place to no man in the pride I feel at being a member of that Empire.

Mr. DAWSON: Don't monopolise all the pride.

Mr. ANNEAR: But the hon. member, like other hon. members we heard yesterday, if we are to judge by their conduct, would like to see that Empire crumble to pieces.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. ANNEAR: They want a republic, where they murder a President about every six months. (Loud Opposition laughter.) We have seen, from the conduct of hon. members opposite lately, that their sympathies go with men who carry out deeds of that nature.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: No, no!

Mr. ANNEAR: I trust I can discuss this question dispassionately. (Loud Opposition laughter.)

Mr. ANNEAR: I wish now to reply to the leader of the Labour Opposition. I will give him a little information. I am confident that 90 per cent. of the people of this colony, if put to the vote to-morrow, would ratify the passing of the resolution as proposed by the Premier. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. DAWSON: Be merciful.

Mr. ANNEAR: And not 150 miles from this House this afternoon the citizens of a constituency not represented by members on this side of the House, but by members on the other side of the House, have put down in hard cash £150 to insure the lives of the volunteers who are to go to South Africa.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. ANNEAR: And I am confident that the electors of Charters Towers would contribute ten times that amount, if required, to insure the lives of the loyal men who will leave that town to redress the wrongs of their fellow-countrymen in that distant country.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. ANNEAR: I must congratulate the hon. member for Lockyer on the able and most telling speech he delivered in this House last evening.

Mr. LESINA: All blue-book.

Mr. ANNEAR: It was a speech that was required to let the people of this colony see how those of our own blood and of our own race are treated by the Government of which Oom Kruger is the President. The hon. the leader of the Labour Opposition—

Mr. DAWSON: Be merciful.

Mr. LESINA: Deal tenderly with him.

Mr. ANNEAR: The hon. member has not a high opinion of the Press; but the metropolitan Press has been very kind to him. But the metropolitan press, and one paper in particular, to which I shall refer, has not, at any time, been very kind to the rank-and-file that sit on these benches and support the Government. Take the *Brisbane Courier* of to-day. What do we see? We see a paragraph under the heading of "Gallery Notes," saying that the telephone was going last night, that noses or heads were being counted, and that the hon. member for Lockyer was put up to waste the time of the House.

Mr. DAWSON: Hear, hear!

Mr. ANNEAR: I say there is not one atom of truth in it.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. ANNEAR: Neither the Ministry nor a member sitting on this side of the House knew that the hon. member for Lockyer intended to speak last evening.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Hear, hear!

Mr. ANNEAR: But the writer of "Gallery Notes" is in sympathy with hon. gentlemen sitting on the other side of the House. I believe that his sympathy went to the extent that when Mr. Higgs was elected member for the Valley—

Mr. FISHER: Shame!

Mr. ANNEAR: And he ceased to be—

Mr. LESINA: You ought to be ashamed of yourself.

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

Mr. LESINA: Sheltering himself behind the hedge.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DAWSON: I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. member in order in attacking a man who is not a member of this House on his opinions?

MEMBERS on the Government side: Oh, oh!

The SPEAKER: So far as I have been able to discover, the hon. member for Maryborough is strictly in order.

Mr. DAWSON: His remarks are not very decent, at any rate.

Mr. ANNEAR: I want to show—

Mr. DAWSON: Look here, Annear, you tried to get him the sack.

Mr. ANNEAR: I tried to get no man the sack.

Mr. DAWSON: You tried.

Mr. ANNEAR: I give it an absolute denial. I never tried to get any man the sack.

Mr. McDONNELL: Coward!

The SPEAKER: If the hon. gentleman called an hon. member a coward he is guilty of having used unparliamentary language.

Mr. DUNSFORD: It is a cowardly statement.

The SPEAKER: If he made use of that statement to any hon. member he made use of unparliamentary language, and I ask him to withdraw the word.

Mr. McDONNELL: All right, I withdraw the word.

Mr. ANNEAR: I say that this man's sympathies—

Mr. DAWSON: You know he can't reply to you.

Mr. ANNEAR: I say his sympathies are with hon. members opposite, because he was an applicant for the editorship of the communistic journal after the hon. member for Fortitude Valley ceased to be the editor.

Mr. DAWSON: That is not true.

Mr. ANNEAR: All we ask for is fair play in the Press. But it has not been extended to us except by one gentleman, who was not in the House last session, but who is here this session. He writes under the name of "Scriblerus" in

the *Telegraph*. He metes out justice to all of us. By the other gentleman no justice has been extended to us in the "Gallery Notes."

Mr. DUNSFORD: It is a cowardly attack.

Mr. ANNEAR: The hon. the leader of the Labour Opposition says he does not believe that the cruelties referred to exist in the Transvaal, and he referred to the cruelties that exist in this colony. He referred to the question of flogging.

Mr. DAWSON: Yes.

Mr. ANNEAR: Flogging in this colony is only applied to criminals of the deepest dye. But what about the flogging in South Africa?

Mr. McDONNELL: What about Ireland?

Mr. ANNEAR: I hold here in my hand a paper—the *St. James's Budget*.

Mr. DAWSON: There is no such paper published.

Mr. ANNEAR: It is a reliable paper, and I will ask the hon. gentleman to read of the flogging of four African girls of from twelve to fourteen years of age by the Boers in South Africa. They were not satisfied with flogging them to death, but, to make sure that two of them were dead, they brought them on to the hearth, in front of the fireplace, and the wife of the Boer poured boiling water over them. Before the adjournment for tea I made a statement on information given to me

[7 p.m.] that the gentleman who writes the "Gallery Notes" for the *Courier* was an applicant for the position vacated by the hon. member for Fortitude Valley, Mr. Higgs. Since that time I have received a note from Mr. Hinchcliffe informing me that my statement was incorrect.

Mr. DAWSON: I told you so at the time.

Mr. ANNEAR: I regret that the information I received was incorrect, and I take this the first opportunity of expressing my regret for having made an incorrect statement.

Mr. KIDSTON: Why bring private affairs before the House?

Mr. ANNEAR: I believe I also saw it in the *Brisbane Observer*.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: It was in the paper.

Mr. ANNEAR: Referring to what the leader of the Labour Opposition said as regards the cruelties practised in this colony upon men who are criminals, and his attempt to lead this House to believe that no such cruelties were practised in South Africa, I referred to a certain case, and I will thank hon. members to read the whole case and see if the Boers are that class of humane people the hon. gentleman would like us to believe they are. I had the pleasure in 1889 to be a fellow-passenger for one week with Mr. Fred. Villiers, the noted war correspondent. Mr. Villiers was interviewed in Sydney, and the report of the interview can be seen in the *Sydney Daily Telegraph*. He said that a more cruel and brutal race does not live on the face of the earth. This case will fully show that—

But to see the Boer at his worst in his treatment of the native it is necessary to go to the outlying districts. One of the most shocking instances of diabolical cruelty is that which has become known as the Wakkerstroom scandal. In this case a Boer farmer, named Uys, is charged with having on 13th May last, tied down four Kaffir girls with ropes, and lashed them so severely that two of the girls subsequently died. The evidence adduced at the preliminary examination held on 10th June went to show that Uys had, for some time past, subjected the Kaffir girls to the most shameful treatment, as a result of which two, Emma and Mangies, died. It was shown that the defendant beat the girls with a large strap with a knot at the end, and in order to perform his work more easily he strapped them by their neck to the floor. We reprint some of the evidence given as reported in the *Johannesburg Star*.

Mr. DAWSON: You believe in the lash yourself.

Mr. ANNEAR: I believe in the lash for the class of men I referred to the other evening, whom the hon. member considers should not be lashed. I gave a case where Sir Charles Lilley sentenced three men to two years' imprisonment with two lashings for putting a trace chain round the neck of one of their fellow-countrymen, dragging him from the Longreach Hotel to the lantana scrub, robbing him, and leaving him for dead.

Mr. DAWSON: That is what they did to the unionists in 1891.

Mr. ANNEAR: If the leader of the Labour Opposition will listen to me I will give him facts in regard to his new found friends—the Boers. They were not satisfied with the death of two of those girls, from twelve to fourteen years of age, but they stripped them, laid them on the hearth in front of the fireplace, and the wife of the Boer poured hot water on them.

Mr. W. HAMILTON (*Gregory*): How about the station-owners in Western Australia beating them to death with sticks?

Mr. ANNEAR: I am sure hon. members do not want me to tell them—it is a matter of history which cannot be denied—that the Government of Britain and the British people saved the Boers on three occasions from being wiped out of South Africa.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Now they want to wipe out the Boers themselves.

Mr. ANNEAR: When Cetewayo was ready to attack them, had it not been for Sir Theophilus Shepstone stepping in, there would have been no Boer Government in the Transvaal to-day. The hon. member told us last night about the liberal Press in England, and he gave the name of one paper, and I ask him does that paper represent the liberals of Great Britain? I say it does not. What do we see at the present time? Sir William Harcourt, John Morley, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, Bryce, and the leaders of the Labour party back up the British Government.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: No, no!

Mr. ANNEAR: Yes, they do. Read their late speeches. They will support the Government in redressing the grievances and the wrongs of the Uitlanders in South Africa. Now, there was one gentleman who was at one time an idol of the Liberals in England. I believe there is no abler statesman in England to-day; there is no more faithful servant than the hon. gentleman to whom I refer—that is, the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Oh, oh! Judas! (Laughter.)

Mr. ANNEAR: I hope the natives, not only of Queensland, but the natives of all Australia, will read the speech delivered by him, and then they will see that they have every reason to be proud of the right hon. gentleman. (Opposition laughter.) This is what Mr. Chamberlain said, not many days ago—

He warned the Transvaal that the sands in the glass were rapidly running out. The situation is too fraught with danger, it is too strained for any indefinite postponement. The knot must be loosened, to use Mr. Balfour's words, or else we shall have to find other ways of untying it, and, if we do that, if we are forced to that, then I would repeat now the warning that was given by Lord Salisbury in the House of Lords, and I would say if we are forced to make further preparations, and if this delay continues much longer, we shall not hold ourselves limited by what we have already offered, but, having taken this matter in hand, we will not let go until we have secured conditions which, once for all, shall establish us the paramount Power in South Africa, and shall secure for our fellow-subjects there, at all events, those equal rights and equal privileges which were promised them by President Kruger when the independence of the Transvaal was granted by the Queen, and which is the least really that in justice ought to be accorded to them. If it should come to this, if a rupture—which

we have done everything in our power to avoid—should be forced upon us. I am confident that we shall have the support of the vast majority of the people of the United Kingdom, and I will go further and say the vast majority of the British Empire. For there is in all this bad business one thing, at any rate, upon which we can congratulate ourselves, and that is upon the proof which it has afforded us of the unity of the British Empire. We know now no British subject anywhere can suffer from injustice without a responsive chord being struck which will be heard in the most distant parts of the Empire, and we know that our colonies and our dependencies, in any difficulty, will stand side by side and shoulder to shoulder with us in maintaining the honour and interests of the Empire.

Now, these are the remarks of a liberal man; and similar remarks were made by another gentleman, who is a patriot to his country, and who is well known to the hon. member for Bundaberg. I refer to Mr. Joseph Cowen; but because he would not bow the knee to the advocates of "Socialism in our time"—

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

Mr. ANNEAR: He was a liberal of liberals; but because he would not bow the knee to the shibboleth of labour socialists, such as we have in this House, he was hounded out of Parliament—from his seat as the representative for Newcastle-on-Tyne.

Mr. DAWSON: That's not true.

Mr. ANNEAR: I am proud to know that we have men who have volunteered in this colony for service in South Africa, to assist the mother country in redressing the wrongs perpetrated against men of their own flesh and blood. I am proud of these Queensland volunteers. For many years I was a volunteer myself, and these remarks of mine are no lip service; and I say that the men of Queensland who have volunteered will go forth and do their duty as soldiers of the Queen. I say this because I know what I am talking about, and because I represent, with my hon. colleague, one of the most important electorates in the colony, where the naval and military forces are equal to those in any other town in Australia. And I would be a coward if I did not stand up in my place in this House and resent the words of the leader of the Labour Opposition when he called these men "swash-bucklers." But that was not enough, he also called them cowards and curs. I say that they are no more cowards or curs than the hon. member himself is. The hon. member made those statements under privilege of Parliament, but he would not dare to make such statements in Queen street or in any other town in Queensland.

Mr. JENKINSON: Your attack on a pressman was just as bad.

Mr. DAWSON: I will call you a cur outside when the House adjourns, if you wish it.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh! Order!

Mr. ANNEAR: I do not profess to have any greater courage than other hon. members, but let him do what he threatens.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ANNEAR: And he will find that a Cornishman never disgraced himself yet.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and laughter.

Mr. ANNEAR: In this connection I wish to reply to the remarks of the hon. member when he referred in a pointed way to Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo.

Mr. DAWSON: He has the gout.

Mr. ANNEAR: I trust that what we have seen in the public Press about this officer is correct. He is an efficient soldier, and a man well worthy to command the contingent that will go from this colony, if required.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and applause in the gallery.

The SPEAKER: I think I heard sounds of applause from one of the galleries. If this is continued, I shall order the galleries to be cleared.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ANNEAR: As a Queenslander, I say that we have every reason to be proud of such a worthy officer as Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo.

Mr. W. THORN: Nobody said he was going.

Mr. ANNEAR: The hon. member for Aubigny is a volunteer also; I know that he did good service for the colony in 1891; we give him credit for that—(laughter)—and I feel sure that he will be true to his country on this occasion. Now, what do the Uitlanders in the Transvaal demand? I think their demands are very reasonable, and I feel sure that every hon. member who acts up to his principles will do everything in his power to try and get these demands carried into effect. At the present time the Uitlanders number 77 per cent. of the white population in the Transvaal, and yet they have no voice in the affairs of the country.

Mr. DAWSON: Why don't they swear allegiance?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: They are quite willing to do so.

Mr. LESINA: What about the British subjects in India?

Mr. ANNEAR: This is the platform of the Uitlanders—

On July 4 the Uitlanders' council at Johannesburg in declaring their policy, agreed that the understanding between Great Britain and the Transvaal should be the inclusion among the permanent and fundamental laws of the Republic of a Reform Act, embracing, in addition to clauses providing for naturalisation and redistribution on the lines indicated, the following among other provisions:—

No differential privileges or immunities, and no religious disabilities.

Equal recognition of English and Dutch as official languages.

The independence of the High Court to be established as the only safeguard against the abolition of legislation by simple resolution of the Volksraad.

The free right of public meeting, the formation of electoral committees, and freedom of speech and of the Press to be assured.

All persons to be secured in their houses, persons, papers, and effects, against violation and illegal seizure.

The existence of the forts and the adoption of other measures intended for the intimidation of the inhabitants of the country, being a menace to the exercise of the undoubted rights of free people, to be declared unconstitutional.

Existing monopolies to be cancelled or expropriated on equitable conditions.

Mr. JENKINSON: Repudiation.

Mr. ANNEAR:

Members of the Raad to be fully enfranchised burghers, over twenty-one, and candidates for the presidency over thirty, and thirty years resident.

Elections by ballot to be adequately safeguarded by stringent provisions against bribery and intimidation.

Mr. LESINA: We want that here.

Mr. ANNEAR:

Towns with a population of 1,000 and upwards to have the right to manage their local affairs under the General Municipal Act.

The registration of voters and the conduct of elections to be regulated by local bodies.

Mr. LESINA: We have not got that here.

Mr. ANNEAR:

A full and comprehensive system of State education, under the control of local boards.

Complete reorganisation of the Civil service, and dismissal of corrupt officials, who shall be ineligible for office.

Mr. LESINA: We have not got that either. We want that.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. ANNEAR:

Payments out of the public Treasury to be made only in accordance with the budget proposals and to be proved by the Raad.

Full and open publication of the accounts periodically. No person to be created a burgher and no fresh constituency to be created except in accordance with the lines laid down.

Officials to have no discretionary power in this or any other matter affecting the civil rights of the inhabitants of the country.

Mr. McDONALD: What are you doing now?

Mr. DAWSON: What are the civil rights?

Mr. JENKINSON: In short—give up the country and we will be satisfied.

Mr. ANNEAR: What do we find in Cape Colony and Natal? Cape Colony and Natal, as hon. members know, are under British rule, and the franchise in each of those colonies is as liberal as in the colony of Queensland.

Mr. LESINA: That is not saying much for it.

Mr. ANNEAR: The franchise is so liberal that at the present time the government of Cape Colony is in the hands of the Afrikaners.

Mr. DAWSON: Who have sworn allegiance.

Mr. ANNEAR: The franchise under British rule gives equal justice to all. Now, how do the Transvaal Government treat foreigners? They are the majority of the white people. The Uitlanders in the Transvaal pay six times the amount of taxation that the Boers do.

Mr. STEWART: They have six times the wealth.

Mr. ANNEAR: When they form 77 per cent. of the white population they certainly should have some voice in the management of the affairs of the country. They should have the right to vote; they should have representation in the Houses of Legislature; but that is denied to them at the present moment. I am well aware that Great Britain does not require our help to put down the trouble in the Transvaal. But the motion moved by the Premier, and the similar motions moved by all the Premiers of Australia—and which have been carried with the exception of this Parliament, which I am sure will carry it—(laughter and "Hear, hear!")—the motion, I say, is to show sympathy with our fellow-Britons in the Transvaal, because I maintain that though resident here we are Britons still, and wherever there is a Briton in trouble a true Briton will always come to the rescue.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. ANNEAR: And especially Australians. We have a leader in this House—the leader of the Labour Opposition—who is willing, to judge by his speech in this House last night, to allow those of our own blood and race to suffer the wrongs under which they are at present labouring in South Africa. I want to know what are the wrongs.

Mr. DAWSON: If they swear allegiance to South Africa, how can they be Britons or Australians?

Mr. LESINA:

I du believe in freedom's cause  
Es fur away es Paris is.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. ANNEAR: This motion has my most hearty approval. It has the approval, I am sure, of the loyal men of Queensland.

Mr. DAWSON: I am very glad to hear it.

Mr. ANNEAR: The hon. member says he is very glad to hear it. I have yet to learn that my rights are not on a par with those of any hon. member in this Chamber. I am one of the representatives of an important constituency, and on a question of this kind I claim my right. My position shall be defined in no uncertain sound, and I am confident that the men who leave these shores to fight the battles of the Britons in South Africa—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Our battles?

Mr. ANNEAR: Yes, our battles, will give a good account of themselves. I say, God speed them! Loyal and faithful will be the account they will give of themselves while they are away from Queensland, and when they return Queenslanders will, as loyal people—including the majority of the electors of Charters Towers, whom the hon. member represents—will be here to meet them.

Mr. DAWSON: Amen!

Mr. ANNEAR: The speech of the hon. member last night was but a perpetuation of his own conduct, and that of many of his friends, in the year 1891.

Mr. DAWSON: Hear, hear!

Mr. TURLEY (*Brisbane South*): The hon. member, as usual, has afforded a considerable amount of amusement to members on this side. We know his loyalty, especially to the Government that he sits behind at any particular time so long as he is going to vote to keep that Government in power, otherwise I do not know that the hon. member would be so full of loyalty as he appears to be. He evidently has not made any special study of the South African question, as far as we have been able to judge. He simply makes a number of assertions, and talks about his loyalty, and about Britons always doing so—and so when they are called upon. Well, I am a Briton, and I am just as proud of it as the hon. member.

Mr. ANNEAR: You ought to—you are a west of England man.

Mr. TURLEY: It does not matter a toss of a button whether I am a west of England man or a north-countryman, I should be just as proud of the country I came from. But at the same time I do not believe, because they happen to go from that country and settle in another country, in their jumping into any trouble that the people in that country may get into, whether they are in the right or whether they are in the wrong. The hon. member is evidently prepared to fall in whether his countrymen, as he calls them, are in the right or in the wrong.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: He did not say so.

Mr. TURLEY: He quotes a number of members of the House of Commons who are supposed to be in favour of this, and, among others, he quotes Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman. Now, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman has been a decided opponent of this ever since the question was raised. He is the one man in the House of Commons who has stood up and denounced Mr. Chamberlain and the Government which he follows, because he states there is no need of war in South Africa.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: He is not the only man in the House of Commons who has done that.

Mr. TURLEY: He is the only man in the House of Commons who was mentioned by the hon. member in particular. He quoted Mr. Chamberlain and his opinions at the present time. Well, I will give the hon. member a quotation of Mr. Chamberlain's before this trouble.

Mr. ANNEAR: How long back?

Mr. TURLEY: Some few years before he became connected with the party at present in power.

Mr. BELL: What is the date?

Mr. TURLEY: At a meeting in Birmingham in 1881, when exactly the same thing was going on—according Mr. Cecil Rhodes—as is going on to-day—and I am taking the expressions of Mr. Cecil Rhodes before the inquiry in London after the Jamieson raid.

Mr. BELL: What month?

Mr. TURLEY: On 7th June, 1881. Mr. Chamberlain said then—

I say under those circumstances is it possible we could maintain a forcible annexation of that country without incurring the accusation of having been guilty—I will not say a national folly—but I say of a national crime?

And the hon. member for Maryborough now stands up and says that Mr. Chamberlain has altered his opinion. Certainly he has. That is the opinion of Mr. Joseph Chamberlain.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: No one has ever advocated it yet.

Mr. TURLEY: Every word that has fallen from hon. members on the other [7-30 p.m.] side has been in advocacy of that;

they will not say that that is the object at the present time, but practically that is the object, as everyone knows, whether it is to be brought about by war or in some other way. At any rate, that is the principal object which those who are at the head of this agitation have in view.

The PREMIER: What is your object in delaying the motion?

Mr. TURLEY: I will tell the hon. gentleman what my object in delaying the motion is. I am sent here by a number of people in South Brisbane to take my part in the deliberations of the House, and I believe I am voicing the opinions of the majority of those people when I say they are decidedly against the method in which the Government offered the service of troops to the British Government for South Africa. The hon. member also told us that the natives have been badly treated by the Boers. That is admitted; no one attempts for a moment to defend the Boers for their treatment of the natives in South Africa. But the hon. member did not tell us that in the neighbouring country of Rhodesia the natives are flogged by the Chartered Company just as much as ever the natives were flogged by the Boers in the Transvaal, and he does not condemn what is done in Rhodesia. We condemn those people in both instances. We condemn either Boer or Briton who treats the natives in that way; but the hon. member and his colleagues are only prepared to condemn such conduct in those to whom they are opposed. The hon. member did not give us any idea of the atrocities committed by pearlshellers on the blacks not very long ago in Western Australia. Those pearlshellers treated the blacks in as bad a manner as the hon. member has represented the natives have been treated by the Boers in South Africa. Neither did the hon. member tell us of the treatment meted out to the natives of this colony on the mainland in North Queensland. Let him take up the report of the Government Resident at Thursday Island of two or three years ago, and see how the white men in North Queensland treated the natives there.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The Government never approved of it.

Mr. TURLEY: The Government knew for years that those atrocities had been going on in Northern Queensland; but simply because attention had not been called to them, as it has been during the last few years by the hon. member for Croydon and others, they were prepared to sit down and say they knew nothing about the matter. I do not know that the hon. member has said a great deal that needs to be dealt with to any extent. I think we should continue this debate as it started, and I intend to do that, because I believe the whole thing has been misunderstood to some extent, especially by the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government.

Mr. DAWSON: Misrepresented, not misunderstood.

Mr. TURLEY: When the amendment was moved yesterday the hon. gentleman had accused

the leader of the Opposition of not being manly enough to move a direct vote of want of confidence, and later on he stated that he had not had an opportunity of considering what the amendment was. I wish to call the attention of hon. members to what actually took place. When the amendment was moved the hon. gentleman procured a copy from either the Clerk of the House or Mr. Speaker.

The PREMIER: I did not.

Mr. TURLEY: And—

The PREMIER: I did not. Why do you make the statement?

Mr. TURLEY: Because the hon. gentleman went over—

MEMBERS on the Government side: Oh, oh!

Mr. TURLEY: The hon. gentleman went over either to the Clerk or Mr. Speaker, and then went back to his place and stood up, and pointed out what the contents of the amendment were.

The PREMIER: I did not.

Mr. TURLEY: The hon. gentleman pointed out that if the words in which the amendment was proposed were inserted in a certain place in the motion, they would render nugatory some provisions that afterwards appeared in the motion.

The PREMIER: That is a misstatement.

Mr. TURLEY: That is the position the hon. gentleman took up.

The PREMIER: That is a deliberate misstatement.

Mr. McDONALD: I rise to a point of order. Is the Premier in order in stating that what the hon. member says is a deliberate misstatement?

The PREMIER: I rise to a point of order—

Mr. McDONALD: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! When an hon. member raises a point of order it is quite in order for any hon. member to speak to that point of order, but not to raise another point of order.

The PREMIER: I rise to the point of order—

Mr. McDONALD: I rise to a point of order, too.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. McDONALD: I want to know what position I am in.

The SPEAKER: The point of order raised by the hon. member for Flinders, as I understood it, is whether an hon. member is in order in saying that a statement made by another hon. member is—

Mr. McDONALD: A deliberate misstatement.

The SPEAKER: Will the hon. member permit me?

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: Is a deliberate misstatement. That is the point.

The PREMIER: I rise to ask your ruling as to whether an hon. member is justified in persisting in a misstatement—

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Chair, chair!

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

The SPEAKER: Will hon. members be seated? The Premier is in order in speaking to the point of order.

The PREMIER: I rise to speak to the point of order.

Mr. McDONALD: I am going to rise to another point of order on that.

The PREMIER: I ask whether an hon. member is justified in persisting in making the statement that such and such a circumstance occurred when it is distinctly denied? That is the point of order.

The SPEAKER: With regard to the point of order raised by the hon. member for Flinders, that a statement made by an hon. member such

as that to which exception is taken—that a statement made by one member is a deliberate misstatement—I should say that it is not in order. I should also say with regard to the question raised by the Premier that an hon. member should accept another hon. member's denial.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Withdraw, withdraw!

MR. TURLEY: I made the statement once, and when it was contradicted I did not repeat it.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Oh, yes, you did.

THE TREASURER: You spoke on it.

MR. TURLEY: I did not repeat the statement, and as long as I keep within the Standing Orders—

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You repeated the statement three times.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Oh, shut up.

THE TREASURER: I rise to a point of order. An hon. member on the other side interjected "Shut up." I think that hon. member should be made to withdraw his words. An hon. member who says that does not know how to behave himself decently in this House.

MR. McDONALD: I desire to speak to this point of order. The hon. member has got up to state—

MR. BELL: I rise to a point of order.

THE SPEAKER: Order, order!

MR. BELL: I rise to a point of order on the observation the hon. member has just made. Can any hon. member in this House speak to a point of order without a direct invitation from the Chair?

THE SPEAKER: The point of order raised by the Treasurer was really drawing my attention to an expression or interjection which emanated from an hon. member in this House. The words, if I rightly understood the Treasurer and understood the interjection, were "Shut up." Those words are distinctly unparliamentary and disorderly, and ought not to be persisted in. I sincerely trust that hon. members will refrain from persistent interjections, and still more that they will refrain the use of language which is disorderly in itself, and which is calculated to produce disorder.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McDONALD: I rise to a point of order, and ask now whether the Treasurer was in order in stating that the hon. member who said "Shut up" did not know how to behave himself decently in this House. Those were the Treasurer's concluding remarks.

THE SPEAKER: I did not understand the hon. member.

THE TREASURER: I did say that.

THE SPEAKER: I did not catch the terms in which the words complained of now were stated, and I am not now in a position to say whether they were used in a disorderly sense or not. They might or might not have been so used.

MR. DAWSON: Are those words disorderly?

THE SPEAKER: It all depends on the circumstances and connection in which they were used. I appeal again to hon. members to refrain from interjections, which are in themselves disorderly, and are calculated to produce disorder. I hope hon. members will conduct the debate in an orderly manner. The hon. member for Brisbane South is orderly debating the question, and is entitled to be heard in silence.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TURLEY: I have said that I did not repeat the statement about the hon. gentleman procuring a copy of the amendment, but I said one would be led to believe that was so by the fact that the hon. gentleman was able to say that if the words proposed by the leader of the

Opposition were inserted it would have a certain effect. Now I find I am borne out by the Press, which points out that the hon. gentleman complained that the words proposed to be inserted would not be in symmetry with the rest of the motion, and he contended that the leader of the Opposition had not the courage of his convictions. Now I want to know if it is not rather a strange coincidence that the hon. gentleman simply having heard the amendment read once was able to get up and say that it would destroy the symmetry of the motion, because the words in the amendment were, to some extent, contradictory of the motion? I say, the misunderstanding into which a number of the members of this House fell regarding the position of the hon. gentleman was one into which anyone was likely to fall; because, when a motion was moved like this, the hon. gentleman, knowing perfectly well that his action in connection with this matter was totally unconstitutional, and knowing well that he had himself been a member of this House when something similar had been done, and the House had declared against the member who did it—the hon. gentleman, knowing that, and knowing that amendment had been moved, knew that it was his place to see what were the exact terms of the amendment, so that he would know in what way to treat it. The hon. gentleman, as he states, had not obtained a copy, but, knowing perfectly well what the contents of the amendment were, does it not seem strange that the hon. gentleman should have to wait until after the intermission for tea, and until he was moved up by those behind him pointing out to him that it was time he accepted the amendment as a vote of want of confidence? When the hon. gentleman first spoke upon the amendment, he said it would destroy the symmetry of the motion, and the troops would not be able to go; consequently if the House was prepared to carry it he could go no further, but "I am prepared to back down from the position I have taken up, and my Government are still prepared to remain in their positions."

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

MR. TURLEY: That was the kind of logical position the hon. gentleman was prepared to take up.

THE PREMIER: No.

MR. TURLEY: Afterwards when his followers got round him and pointed out what was meant he was squeezed into the position he took up after the hon. member for Lockyer had concluded his speech. As it presents itself to the average person in Australia and in Queensland to-day, this is simply another instance of the bauble-hunting proclivities of the average politician. (Laughter.) That seems to be the way so many of our politicians have gone in the past. We have had one instance pointed out this afternoon by the hon. member for Toowoomba—the instance in 1887: A gentleman goes home to the old country, and settles down with a number of people imbued with the idea of Imperialistic federation, and he commits the colony to considerable expenditure—it was a definite expenditure in this case—and after he had committed the colony he came out here and submitted the matter to the House in the following June. Let hon. members take up *Hansard* for 1887, and they will see what the opinion of many hon. members opposite was upon it. They held that it was absolutely unconstitutional, and they said it was. They said no man has the right to commit the colony to expenditure without the sanction of Parliament, and with this result: that Parliament refused to ratify the agreement which had been arrived at in London. This was in 1887, but afterwards we find it was part of the price that

Queensland had to pay for the coalition of 1890. It was after the coalition of 1890, when that same gentleman who made that agreement was prepared to swallow the principles of a lifetime at the instigation of another man whom he hated not only politically but personally at the time—when he was compelled to swallow the whole of the principles he had enunciated for a lifetime, then the other man in return was prepared to get his colleagues to back him up in carrying through that agreement. If hon. members turn up *Hansard* for 1891, they will find out what the cost was to the country, to some extent, of the coalition of 1890. They will find that as one of the conditions the Australasian Naval Force Act was brought down and passed to give effect to the agreement which a good many members on the other side took a good hand in preventing in 1887.

The PREMIER: What has all that got to do with the present position?

Mr. TURLEY: It has everything to do with it. If this House was composed of the same men now as in 1887 they would absolutely repudiate the action the hon. gentleman has now committed the colony to—indefinite expenditure without the sanction of Parliament.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. TURLEY: I have here the *Hansard* for 1887, and at page 10 of vol. lii. I find the hon. member for Maryborough, Mr. Annear, said—

Well, Sir, up to the present time we have no details of what this floating squadron is to be, or of what its cost is to be to the colonies. I am of opinion, Sir, that we may get a little bit too much of Imperialism altogether—

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

Mr. TURLEY:

and I think that hon. members should well consider this scheme before the Parliament of Queensland pledge themselves to an expenditure of that kind. What are the colonies doing for Great Britain? Last year we imported into the colonies of Australasia £17,000,000 of the products of Great Britain, and I hold, Sir, that it is their bounden duty to do something for the colonies. What are they doing for the colonies? What are they doing for the colonies, Sir, as illustrated by their action in regard to the occupation of the New Hebrides by the French? Why, they have cavilled at every representation made by the Governments of Australia. They have done nothing at all. Therefore I say that we should be extremely careful before we have any more of the Imperial yoke placed upon our shoulders.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear! and laughter.

Mr. TURLEY: If the hon. gentleman was only as outspoken to-day! The hon. member went on to say—

We, in these colonies, are building up a nation of our own—a great Australian nation—which, I dare say, will be as great in a few generations to come as the States of America or Canada are at the present time. And I am sure, Sir, that in time we shall be as able to resent such treatment as we have received from the Imperial Government as the Americans were to resent the occupation of Mexico by the French. The Americans told them, "This climate is not congenial to you; we would advise you to find some other climate"; and the French went, and have no authority in Mexico to this day. We are free Australians here, and in that spirit I hope we shall meet this question.

What a pity the hon. member is not prepared to stand to those sentiments to-day, and vote against the unconstitutional manner in which this thing has been done.

Mr. ANNEAR: How did I vote on that occasion?

Mr. TURLEY: The hon. member very probably voted directly opposite to what he said. I am quite prepared to understand he could do that.

Mr. ANNEAR: I did not. I went to my constituents on the question.

Mr. TURLEY: I was pointing out that this is another result of the bauble-hunting proclivities of the average politician. We know that the hon. gentleman who at that time started the Australian squadron had a few letters put at the back of his name, and we were under the impression that that was the only sentiment that was animating him; and I think the majority of the people of Queensland to-day are under the impression that that was the only sentiment that was animating the present Premier when he made this offer.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member is out of order in imputing improper motives, and I sincerely trust he will not continue in that strain.

Mr. TURLEY: I always thought that ambition was a proper motive. I am glad to be able to understand now that ambition is an improper motive. I did not know I was imputing anything improper to the hon. gentleman, but only that he was animated by a motive which, in the minds of numbers of people, is not conducive to the best interests of these colonies. We all remember the *furor* which went over New South Wales some few years ago when a contingent was sent from that colony to the Soudan. Everybody was up in arms about it and there was going to be no end of glory. I have spoken to people since who went with that contingent, and also to some of the politicians who were favourable to it at the time. Not twelve months afterwards there were very few indeed of those who had anything to do with it who were not absolutely and utterly ashamed of having ever taken any part in it. I say to-day that while this jingo spirit is rampant in Australia, while we have the hon. gentleman getting up with his enthusiastic loyalty and telling us what we should do because we happen to have been born in a certain part of the world—that jingo spirit may catch on for a time; but as sure as the sun will rise the day is not far distant when everyone of those who are prepared to stand forward here and echo those jingoistic opinions will be ashamed of the part they played. What will be the result of it? As has been pointed out, we are committing ourselves to something, and we have no idea how far it will extend. I know it is not very popular to stand up and say those things. I know people will say they are said in a small carping spirit. I deny that altogether. It is nothing of the sort. It is with the object of doing all we possibly can to see that these colonies shall not have such a spirit engendered in them as will induce them to take a part in anything which is not fair and just. There is no member of this Chamber, on whatsoever side he sits, who, if the country he came from, or the country his forefathers came from, was in actual need, would not be prepared to do everything that lay in his power to get her the assistance of all the Australian colonies. The hon. gentleman tells us he is animated by true loyalty. I say it is more lip-loyalty than anything else. If there was anything really required we should not have them coming forward with their offers so readily. It would be left for someone else, as is usually the case, to do the heavy work. Last night the hon. member for Lockyer gave us a long series of what are alleged to be the grievances under which those people suffer in the Transvaal. Such being the case, it seems to me to be necessary that a reply should go forth in the pages of *Hansard* to what the hon. member stated. He takes a blue-book which is published by the authority of the British Government, and reads long extracts from the despatches of the Commissioners in South Africa, and also a very large number of extracts from the Press. The hon. member for Maryborough pointed out that he quoted from the *Johannesburg Star*. It is

just as well to know the sort of paper he was quoting from; and it seems to me that in this particular matter we may take the opinion of a man who is, at any rate, independent on this question—Mr. Labouchere, the editor of the *London Truth*. (Ministerial laughter.) It cannot be denied that Mr. Labouchere is an independent man, a man who is really independent enough to speak out his own opinion, to say nothing about his having had the offer of Cabinet rank in England.

Mr. ANNEAR: No; not by Mr. Gladstone.

Mr. TURLEY: It was understood in Australia, at any rate, that he had been offered Cabinet rank in England. But whether he was offered Cabinet rank or not, there is no doubt he is a man who speaks out fearlessly what he has to say. I will give hon. members his opinion of the editor of the *Johannesburg Star*, which appeared in *Truth* of 17th August, 1899:—

The *Times* correspondent at Johannesburg may be a most estimable man, but it is a little too absurd that he should talk of President Kruger's gold having been devoted to securing support in the London Press. He is editor of the *Star* newspaper in Johannesburg. A friend of mine was approached and offered the editorship. If I remember rightly the salary was to be £3,000 per annum. Those who approached him were Rhodesians, and no secret was made that the newspaper was to be used to air the grievances of the Uitlanders. I have no objection to any London newspaper having a partisan as one of its foreign correspondents. But when this is the case I do not regard him as an impartial recorder of what is going on.

I should like to point out that a great deal that was quoted last night in connection with this was from that same paper.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I wish to set the hon. member right. The only newspaper quotation I made was from a speech of President Kruger, which had been sent to him for revision before it was printed in the *Star* newspaper.

Mr. TURLEY: In glancing over the report this morning I came across a number of quotations that were marked in pencil.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Not mine.

Mr. TURLEY: More particularly one in connection with the subject of education, which the hon. gentleman was speaking of, and those quotations will be found in *Hansard*. This is from the *Johannesburg Star* of 17th March, 1899:—

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. The hon. gentleman said he was not quoting from newspaper extracts.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Hear, hear! and that is included in a despatch later on.

Mr. TURLEY: Yes, I thoroughly understand that, and if the hon. gentlemen had gone through this carefully he would have found that the despatches are very often based on these reports from newspapers.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Utter nonsense.

Mr. TURLEY: The despatches take this form—"I enclose, in connection with this matter, extracts from a certain paper showing so-and-so," and the whole thing contains really what has appeared previously in the newspapers. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that that is the way in which despatches are dealt with in many instances, and he is prepared to take up these extracts and contend that they were not what could be contradicted. A great deal has been contradicted, not only here but in Cape Colony, the Transvaal, and in

the old country. But the hon. gentleman did not tell us that the High Commissioner of South Africa was shifted from there because of the despatches which he sent home to Great Britain which were altogether in favour of the position which the Boers had taken up, and which Mr. Chamberlain absolutely refused to have published. Afterwards he was recalled, and Sir Alfred Milner was sent out in his place.

Mr. BELL: To whom are you alluding?

Mr. TURLEY: To Sir William Butler, who was acting as High Commissioner. That gentleman was recalled.

Mr. LESINA: He resigned, and would not take it up.

Mr. TURLEY: He belonged to the army, and was practically recalled, the reason being that the despatches which he sent home showed that a great deal that had been done was practically done at the instance of the South African League. He pointed out clearly in his despatches that the South African League had been at the bottom of the whole thing ever since Cecil Rhodes was defeated.

Mr. BELL: Have you seen the despatches?

Mr. TURLEY: The only thing that one can go upon is what has been stated in the public Press.

Mr. BELL: How did you get your impression?

Mr. TURLEY: I took it from *Truth*, and the hon. gentleman can see it for himself in the library.

Mr. BELL: Do you take your politics from *London Truth*?

Mr. McDONALD: It is as good as the *Times*.

Mr. TURLEY: I do not, but I am prepared to place as much credence on the statements of that paper as in some of the hon. member's sources of information.

Mr. BELL: You come from England, and ought to know the status of *London Truth*.

Mr. TURLEY: The statements are freely and fearlessly made, and it cannot be denied that Sir William Butler was recalled.

Mr. BELL: I do deny it. He came back at his own request.

Mr. TURLEY: How many Civil servants has the hon. gentleman known who have resigned their positions because they were wanted to resign? And if they had not done so, was there not a strong probability of their being forced to resign?

Mr. BELL: You know perfectly well that he was connected with the army then, and not with the Colonial Office.

Mr. TURLEY: We know that, although he was a general, or something of that sort, in the army, he was the man who was High Commissioner at the Cape. He was the man through whom all the despatches had to go, and it was because he kept himself in touch, as far as he could, with the feeling that was abroad in the Transvaal—because he pointed out that the agitators who were behind the movement were practically the Rhodesian people, who were responsible for the Jameson raid, and because his despatches did not fit in exactly with the views and sentiments of the people who were at the head of the Colonial Office in London, and who, to a great extent, have been endeavouring to shield the people connected with the Jameson raid in South Africa—that he was recalled.

Mr. BELL: That is an absolutely irresponsible statement.

Mr. TURLEY: Not as irresponsible as some of the hon. gentleman's statements. He knows perfectly well that Sir William Butler was recalled, and Sir Alfred Milner was sent out to take his place. There is some evidence of that.

Mr. BELL: You are utterly wrong in making that statement.

Mr. McDONALD: You get up and make a speech after.



Mr. BELL: I make no more interjections than you do.

Mr. McDONALD: I am not interjecting at all.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. TURLEY: I suppose the position of the gentleman who edits this paper is such as to enable him to make a quotation from the despatches of Sir William Butler. Here is an extract from the paper of 29th June, 1899—

As to this league, that level-headed man, General Sir William Butler, when acting a few months ago as High Commissioner, informed Mr. Chamberlain that much of the ill-feeling between Boers and Uitlanders was due to his action, and he warned him to receive "with caution and a larger measure of suspicion" statements emanating from the officers of that organisation.

Surely to goodness, there is something in that? That is put in as a quotation from some of the despatches sent by Sir William Butler. The hon. gentleman does not wish to believe that, because, I suppose, it does not altogether fit in with some of his opinions. The hon. member for Lockyer last night quoted from the blue-book, to show some of the grievances of the Uitlanders; to prove that the Boers did not treat them fairly. I admit that straight away. At the same time I contend that the people who are in the Transvaal went there knowing the laws of the country. They must have known the style and manners of the people who have control of the affairs of that country. Those people had made their own laws. They had made laws regarding the franchise and other grievances, of which the hon. gentleman spoke.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: The franchise has been continually changed.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Have you not come here to get one man one vote?

Mr. TURLEY: Certainly; and it is ten years since the agitation was started in Queensland for one man one vote, and we have not got it yet, although there have been thousands of people outside who have been demanding that this reform should be granted. Yet the hon. gentlemen who are sitting on the Treasury benches to-day have been doing all they possibly could by all manner of devices to see that the reform was kept back.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Your argument is that the Uitlanders must not agitate.

Mr. TURLEY: No. I am not saying anything of the sort. I do not blame the Uitlanders for agitating at all, and I do not blame the English Government for carrying any measures they wish in connection with their people there. But I blame the Government here for forcing themselves into a quarrel with which they have absolutely nothing whatever to do. That is the position we take up—that we should not be compelled to go into a quarrel which is not ours, which we had nothing whatever to do in bringing about, and with which we should have nothing whatever to do in settling. A number of the difficulties, as pointed out by the hon. gentleman, is in connection with the liquor law. We know perfectly well that that is bad, but it is bad in more places than the Transvaal. But it has been bad there. Why? Simply at the instigation of a number of people who are themselves termed Uitlanders. There are a number of them there. They have gone there with the object of exploitation, and they have succeeded in not only getting more licenses, but the illicit sale of liquors in the Transvaal, I believe, exceeds the illicit sale of it in any other place. Has it not been so in other places? Has it not been the illicit sale of liquor that has caused commotion in other places? Has it not been the same in almost any country the hon. gentleman can name?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: And the Uitlanders merely ask that they should be prevented.

Mr. TURLEY: I am not against the people who are there asking that it should be prevented. I want to know why we should force ourselves into these quarrels, which are of a domestic nature as far as the Transvaal is concerned. That is one of the particular questions that the hon. gentleman took up. He dealt with it, not from the point of view of the illicit sale of liquor, which is practically a local question, but from the fact that licenses were granted wholesale.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: The maladministration of the liquor law.

Mr. TURLEY: Because licenses were being granted in excess of what was considered to be reasonable.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Maladministration.

Mr. TURLEY: Out of this arises one of the grievances that the hon. gentleman was talking about as one of the atrocities—the atrocity of a white woman—Mrs. Applebee, being killed.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I did not touch that case, I dealt with the Edgar case only.

Mr. TURLEY: We will deal with the Edgar case if it suits the hon. gentleman, and see exactly what it was.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I told the House last night what it was.

Mr. TURLEY: The Edgar case was this: It is pointed out in these very despatches that a great deal was made of it which should not have been made of it in any other country or under other circumstances.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: The circumstances in every country are not the same.

Mr. TURLEY: This is—

Mr. ARMSTRONG: That is a Press report.

Mr. TURLEY: A wire from Sir Alfred Milner to Mr. Chamberlain, received at 1 a.m. on the 5th of May, 1899—

The present crisis undoubtedly arises out of the Edgar incident. But that incident merely precipitated a struggle which was certain to come. It is possible to make too much of the killing of Edgar. It was a shocking, and in my judgment, a criminal blunder, such as would have excited a popular outcry anywhere. It was made much worse by the light way in which it was first dealt with by the public prosecutor, and by the attitude of the judge at the trial. By itself, however, it would not have justified, nor, in fact, provoked, the present storm. But it happened to touch a particularly sore place.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. TURLEY: This was the opinion of people there. What was this great outrage? There were three men standing talking on the side of a street. Another man comes along, who is the worse for liquor, as is clearly stated in the evidence.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Of the Dutch doctor.

Mr. TURLEY: Two doctors—by the Dutch doctor and another as well.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Only one doctor—only the Dutch doctor.

Mr. TURLEY: There are three men on the other side, and one of them had a dog. He is under the influence of drink.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: No.

Mr. TURLEY: The man who owned the dog kicks out with his boot and gives it a kick, and, in Dutch, says "Get out." The other man—Edgar, who was going in at his door—walked across the road, because his wife, in her evidence, stated she heard him speaking to people, and says to this man, "Who are you telling to get out?" A man by the name of Shepperd said, "Oh, do not take any notice of him; he is very drunk." This man immediately, without any further consideration, hits at this man named Foster, and stretches him out on the footpath.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Edgar did?

Mr. TURLEY: Edgar did. Shepperd says he was under the impression that the man was dead, and he went to call the police. The police came up; but, during the interval, Edgar had gone into his house. The police went to his door; and there, I think, they were wrong, because they broke the door open.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: They went to the window first.

Mr. TURLEY: They went to the window first, and then went to the door, after telling him they wanted him to come out, under the impression that a murder had been committed. He did not come out, and one of them threw the door open. As soon as he stepped inside, the man inside went for him with a stick, on the end of which there was an iron screw. That was the evidence.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: The stick was never known to be in the house before.

Mr. TURLEY: The man who was attacked bore evidence of the attack, whether the stick was known to be there or not. This policeman then fired at the man who was in the house, and shot him. I do not justify the action of the police or anyone going into a man's house; but I understand that here in Queensland, if I were to commit murder, and shelter myself in my own house, the police could come and take me. I understand that for crime the police are allowed in any country to go and arrest a criminal. What I contend is that there is a great deal made out of this incident by hon. members not giving us the true facts of the case, and simply pointing out that this man had been shot, without giving the reasons why, or the circumstances which led up to it. We should have full information when we are considering these matters. It is no use giving—

Mr. ARMSTRONG: You do not tell the Chamber you are giving the Dutch version of the incident.

Mr. TURLEY: I am giving the version of others who were there besides the Dutch. When the case came before the court there were other people besides Dutch who stated these facts—men who were not interested in the case at all. What was the result? Was not there nearly an embroil in other matters over this from the very fact that the South African League was behind, egging on the people who were going round getting affidavits? The South African League then went and published these affidavits in the Press even before the case came before the courts. It is no wonder that the question of contempt of court was raised, when it is shown that the people who have been at the bottom of the whole of this agitation have been trying to use the Edgar case with the object of furthering their own nefarious business. That was the whole position. It is better that the hon. gentleman should give the House the whole of the information in connection with this case, instead of simply saying a man was brutally murdered by the Boer authorities. I hardly understand what the hon. member means. I understood that he was giving the true position of affairs as far as possible. That, at least, is what I am endeavouring to do. I have read the whole of the evidence given in the lower court, and also the whole of the evidence given in the higher court—from those called in connection with the Boers as well as those called on the other side; and the evidence clearly points to that.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I took the affidavit of Mrs. Edgar herself, and I consider her oath as good as anyone in the crowd, and I stand by it still.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TURLEY: I am taking her oath as well, only she stated that she did not see her husband with a stick in his hand, while other people were

prepared to say that they did, and the man who was struck was struck twice and bore evidence of the wounds inflicted on him.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: So the Dutch doctor said when he examined him ten days afterwards.

Mr. TURLEY: The hon. gentleman struck one of the great reasons of this when he mentioned the tax upon gold. That has been, to a great extent, one of the principal reasons why this agitation has gone on. The agitation has gone on more pronouncedly since the tax was put on gold—a tax of 5 per cent. on the net profit—because there has been a large amount of gold won in that country, and large fortunes have been made in connection with it, and those who have been exploiting the country for years do not wish to be subject to taxation. Therefore, one of the principal grievances has been in connection with this gold tax. It has not been the miners who have been agitating on that account.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I said it affected the miners.

Mr. TURLEY: Does it affect the miner to any considerable extent in Queensland, which does not turn out anything like the same amount of gold?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: By itself probably not, but I pointed this out as one of the reasons.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TURLEY: It is the shareholders in the large companies there who have been endeavouring to use the majority of the population to secure their own ends as has been pointed out time and again. Now, I will give the opinions of a man as expressed even before the Jamieson raid. This is from a newspaper, which again is subsidised by the South African Company, that, is the *Cape Times*.

Mr. BELL: Why do you say that?

Mr. TURLEY: Because it has been admitted, as the hon. member will see if he will go to the blue-book. This is an American citizen, and it is nearly three years ago since he pointed out what in his opinion was the position they would occupy. In the first place he pointed out that he had no sympathy with the Government of the Transvaal; he did not believe they treated the people as liberally as they should; he believed they departed from what he understood to be republicanism. He says—

Now, I wish to point out very clearly to you, gentlemen, that it is you, the thousand men here to-night, who represent the true spirit of the population. (Applause.) You are the bone and sinew of the country, governing the industry. You are the bone and sinew of its wealth and its prosperity. When you make a move, we shall all make a move—Americans, Britons, Irishmen, Dutchmen, Frenchmen, Germans, Cornishmen—even Scotchmen. (Laughter.) But we must not make this move, gentlemen, at the behest of those who now suggest it. We must watch what we do very warily; we must, for our self-preservation, very carefully note how we are made the humble tools and mean instruments of the means to an end of the clique of capitalists, of the monopolists, and the combination of monopolists that have alone their personal aggrandisement and their personal further enrichment before them, and nothing else. They would profit by our united action. They will try to move forward at our expense. You must not expect, gentlemen, you dare not hope that your conditions will be bettered by an overthrow of the Government—by the united action that the capitalists mysteriously hint at. The men who now possess millions will make more millions by the subjugation of the working men of the Rand to their whims and desires. We have the example of the Cape Colony, of Kimberley, before us, where no man can make a living. I maintain that you men cannot make the money and earn the wages at Kimberley that you can here. Gentlemen, we must not tolerate any monopoly or combinations of monopolies. We must vigilantly watch any attempt made to seduce our affections from ourselves, and from our well-being. There are companies and corporations and groups of capitalists who will profit exceedingly by an overthrow of the Government, and these conspirators are endeavouring to make you their tools—their instruments. If you men don't want a repetition of the Kimberley episode, if you do

not want to see a De Beers syndicate owned by a few rich men established here as the controlling and governing influence paramount, you will watch this intrigue with very wholesome suspicion, as it is laid here before you to-night in its true light and true colours.

There is the position clearly laid down by a man who was speaking in the town of Johannesburg, and it seems to me that when men on the spot are able to see exactly what the object of the agitation is we ought to benefit at least by their knowledge and their experience. The dynamite monopoly is undoubtedly recognised as something which weighs heavily on the mining industry, but I believe the price of the same commodity is about the same in Queensland as it is in the Transvaal.

Mr. ARMSTRONG : No.

Mr. TURLEY : I asked the hon. member for Croydon what was the price and he told me it was about 100s. a case in Queensland. The highest it has been there is 107s. a case, and the last offer made was contained in the despatches the hon. gentleman read last night, where the President stated that he had made arrangements for it to be sold at 70s. a case.

Mr. ARMSTRONG : He said he thought he could do so.

Mr. TURLEY : He stated that he had made arrangements, which he believed would be verified, that the price should be 70s. a case, or something like 30s. a case less than the price to-day in Queensland. The hon. gentleman said the dynamite monopoly was one of the reasons why Queensland troops should be sent to South Africa with the object of rectifying grievances.

Mr. ARMSTRONG : I never said anything of the sort, and no one knows it better than the hon. member.

Mr. TURLEY : The hon. member included it in the reasons why troops should be sent. Did the hon. gentleman kick up such a row when the cyanide people were allowed to come here and charge our miners 20 per cent.? Not a word from the hon. gentleman. They were allowed to have practically a monopoly in Queensland with the connivance and assistance of the Government, and not a word was uttered against them as monopolists or against the industry being heavily taxed. It was only when the question was agitated from one end of Queensland to the other that the Government were prepared to step in and do anything at all.

Mr. LESINA : They believe in reform 10,000 miles away.

Mr. TURLEY : I do not know that there is any use in traversing the whole of the statements made by the hon. member for Lockyer, because there are other hon. members who desire to speak on the question ; but I think when we boil down some of these grievances, and when we find out the opinions expressed by people living there, and the letters sent to the Press, it seems to me that we can take the opinions of men living there to be at least worth something. This is a cable that went from Capetown this year

[8.30 p.m.] to London, dated 14th July. It reads :—

Capetown, 14th July.

The Rev. Dr. Kolbe, the virtual head of the Catholic Church at the Cape, writes impeaching Mr. Chamberlain as directly aiming at war. As a traitor to his own party Mr. Chamberlain seeks to

JUSTIFY HIMSELF TO THE CONSERVATIVES

by winning the wealth of the Transvaal. They all knew at the time of the raid that Mr. Chamberlain knew how to give a wink meaning everything to one side and nothing to the other, and that he was far too clever to tell a vulgar untruth. Foiled in that attack, after a decent interval, he instructed Sir Alfred Milner to put on the screw. Sir Alfred Milner's amazing despatch set that beyond doubt, and showed that the Bloemfontein conference was a prearranged farce, not on the side of the Transvaal, but on the British side.

#### PLOT TO FOMENT WAR.

There was a deliberate intention to make demands carefully calculated up to war point and, even had President Kruger accepted Sir Alfred Milner's minimum, it would have availed him nothing.

#### ENGLAND STOLE THE DIAMONDS.

England stole the diamonds from the Orange Free State, and now wanted to steal the gold from the Transvaal. This was not the first time England had raised a lofty moral cry against the perpetration of a monstrous injustice. The doctor says that if war is actually entered upon he could not wish God-speed to his country in an unjust cause. He strongly defends General Sir William Butler against the newspaper attack. War, he concludes, will create many more abuses than it heals, especially when it is a war of hypocrisy and greed. Dr. Kolbe is a man universally respected, and in politics his opinion carries great weight.

These expressions of opinion were not given from personal motives, but they were given by men who recognised the facts of the case, and they are entitled to just as much consideration as the things quoted from the blue-book sent from the Commissioner to the Government in the old country. It seems to me that we may be able to arrive at a better conclusion in this matter by taking the evidence of these persons rather than *ex parte* statements from the blue-book. To come to the particular question now before the House, I would like to point out that we hardly know where we are. The hon. member who introduced the motion has said that a large number of men have volunteered their services. We have had the Canadian offer that has been supposed to have been made contradicted, and then we are told that there has been great agitation there—that men are coming forward and volunteering for service anywhere. Let us see how much of these statements are true. In the correspondence laid on the table of the House, we are informed that certain persons are prepared to go away from the colony on service. Letter No. 13 says :—

THE OFFICER COMMANDING QUEENSLAND MOUNTED INFANTRY TO THE COMMANDANT, Q.D.F.

SIR,—In accordance with your instructions, I have the honour to submit the names of the following officers to proceed to South Africa, in the event of the Queensland Government sending a contingent there :—

Lieut.-Colonel P. Ricardo, in command.  
Captain H. G. Chauvel, Adjutant and Quartermaster.

*Captains Commanding Companies.*

Captain P. W. G. Pincock      Captain D. E. Reid  
Captain L. E. D. Evans      Captain H. Bailey.

*Lieutenants.—Division Leaders.*

Lieutenant F. J. D. Darvall      Lieutenant H. J. I. Harris  
Lieutenant R. M. Stodart      Lieutenant E. U. Roberts  
Lieutenant H. J. Harris      Lieutenant A. G. Adie  
Lieutenant T. W. Glasgow      Lieutenant H. Hanley.

Then we get this in the Press—in the *Courier* of the 7th October :—

So far there has been no actual enrolment of men, but as soon as possible that will be entered upon. The rate of pay and other details will have to be fixed first, and that will have to stand over until the Commandant has had an interview with the Chief Secretary. No selection of officers has yet been made, and some annoyance has been caused by the publication of names of officers recommended for service without their being consulted in the matter. These officers state that it is impossible for them to leave Queensland at present, and they have not volunteered for South Africa.

The names of the men who are prepared to go into active service are here mentioned. The first thing we glean from this is that annoyance has been caused to these men, because they had not been asked to offer their services, and were not prepared to go if they were required. Does that tend to show that the statements made by hon. members on the other side about men volunteering for service are true? It seems to me that the question is this: Are we prepared, as a body, to support a wrong action or not? We have been told that it is a matter of repudiation. Repudiate what?

Repudiate the action of the hon. gentleman at head of the Government! Or are we prepared to condone a wrong and establish a precedent that other men will be entitled to follow afterwards? It is not a question of whether troops are to be sent to South Africa or not, but that hon. members opposite are endeavouring to establish a precedent which will recognise the right of the Government or a Minister at the head of the Government to commit this colony to an indefinite expense without consent of Parliament. It is not a matter of sending troops to the Transvaal or not, but of the Government taking up any other wild-cat scheme, committing the country to enormous expense, and then asking Parliament to condone it. We should endeavour to maintain, as well as we can, the cleanliness, the morality, of the Government of the day, whoever they may be. Fancy the hon. member who leads the Opposition occupying the Treasury benches committing the colony to an expense of £50,000, and then asking that his action should be condoned! Would hon. members opposite, sitting on these benches, consider that a matter that would be to the credit of the colony? They would think nothing of the sort. Hon. members on the other side preach about repudiation, but they have no hesitation in repudiating when it suits them. That is the position, and there is no use hon. members trying to draw a red herring across the track. The position is this—whether we are prepared to condone a wrong action done by the Government, which will run the colony into a large expense, without the authority of Parliament, and thus establish a precedent which may act most injuriously. I agree with the hon. member for Dalby that the power of the Cabinet is usurping the powers of Parliament beyond all reasonable bounds, and I say it is necessary to put a curb on the powers of the hon. members on the front Ministerial benches; but I am prepared to do more than the hon. member. I am prepared not only to stand up and say what my sentiments and my opinions are, but I am prepared to follow it up by action, and I believe this House will be doing the right thing if it simply votes for the amendment. Whether it means that the troops go or whether it means that the troops do not go, it is better to show that Parliament wishes to hold the Cabinet in hand, and not allow them or any other number of men who may occupy the front Treasury bench to run this country into an indefinite expenditure without their having been consulted.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

\* The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. A. Rutledge, *Maranoo*): I am not going to take up about an hour and a quarter with the observations which I have to address to the House. It is very undesirable on an occasion like the present, when most hon. members probably desire to give expression to their opinions, that anyone should monopolise too large a proportion of the time. I take exception to the manner in which hon. members seem disposed to discuss this question. The drift of the debate this afternoon has largely taken the shape of referring to the present House as a jury, to be addressed by advocates on one side or the other in order to prove whether the grievances which are alleged to exist in the Transvaal are genuine grievances or not. Now I take it that we are really not acting wisely in entering too minutely into a discussion of the various matters that have occupied the attention of Great Britain—of the whole world, for the matter of that—for the last six months, in order to arrive at a conclusion of our own as to whether the British Government is justified in the attitude which it has assumed towards the Transvaal.

Mr. DAWSON: The question now is, Is the action of the Government justified?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I am coming to that. I say we have had a lot of time taken up in the endeavour to prove that the evidence given by A, B, and C is not as reliable as the evidence given by D, E, and F. I do not blame the hon. member for Lockyer when introducing the matter last night, in referring largely as he did to facts, because he simply confined himself to quotations from the blue-book published under authority in Great Britain, and as indicating in some measure the drift and general nature of the grievances which oppress our fellow-subjects in the Transvaal; but I do not see why we should all of us go into minute details in the discussion of the question as to whether there is a just grievance in respect of the price of dynamite or in respect to some other kind of monopoly alleged to prevail there. One thing is quite certain—that the British Government—which is a Government notoriously slow to take decisive action—is fully satisfied that there are grievances there which are absolutely intolerable, and which ought not to be countenanced by any Government having the welfare of the subjects of Great Britain at heart. And depend upon it, if there was nothing whatever in these grievances that deserves redress by the intervention of a strong hand, it is remarkable how great is the unanimity existing among the great powers of Europe upon the subject. We know very well that some of the continental powers are only too eager to discover and to pronounce Great Britain in the wrong in order to humiliate her if the opportunity presents itself. And yet we find the Press of Germany, and the Press of France, and even the Press of Russia, all taking the side of Great Britain in the matter.

Mr. DAWSON: What! all?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: And they are urging President Kruger to yield to the reasonable demands that are now being made on the part of Great Britain.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. DAWSON: Where do you get that?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: It is in every newspaper, as the hon. member will find if he takes the trouble to look. I have seen it stated, not once, but many times, that the continental Press has expressed the opinion I have just stated. And when we know there is such unity of sentiment, I think we are a little behind the times when we, here at this end of the world, with but limited means of information, attempt to discuss the value of this or that evidence upon which the claims to redress on the part of the residents of the Transvaal are based. The question really is for this House to decide whether the Government, in the step it has taken, has acted in a way that renders it liable to condemnation. It must be borne in mind that at the time when the offer of troops was made to Great Britain by the Premier of this colony Parliament was not only not in session, but it was known that it would not immediately be in session.

Mr. GLASSEY: And no offer should have been made until Parliament was in session.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The date for the opening of Parliament was fixed for 12th September, and we knew Parliament could not meet before that time, and in the meanwhile the condition of things was becoming more serious, and the strained relations between President Kruger and Great Britain—the suzerain of that country—were becoming more acute, and it was believed by most people who were trying to inform themselves as to the real state of affairs that war would really be precipitated within a few weeks at the outside, when the offer of troops was made.

Mr. DAWSON: What do you understand to be the meaning of the word "suz-rain"?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Look it up in the dictionary.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Hon. members seem to think that the Government acted unconstitutionally in this matter.

Mr. DAWSON: Hear, hear!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Well, I take it that we have the finest example of a Constitution in the mother country, from which we have all sprung.

Mr. DAWSON: They have got no Constitution.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: In copying the action of the Executive of Great Britain I do not think that the Government of any dependency of the Empire goes very far astray. Now, it is a very well-known fact that when Parliament is not in session in Great Britain it is competent for the Queen's advisers to declare war without the authority of Parliament.

Mr. McDONALD: What do they do afterwards?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: If they make a mistake in declaring war on their own responsibility, Parliament afterwards deals with the Government that has made the mistake.

Mr. McDONALD: They have to deal with them in any case.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: They have to deal with them in this way—that they have to vote the supplies for carrying on the war, and if Parliament disagrees with the action of the Executive then there is one course, and one course only, open to them. That is the course which has been taken here. The Government always takes the risk of rightly interpreting public opinion, and apprehending what the consequences of its own actions in such a grave matter will be. That is what has been done in this case.

Mr. GLASSEY: It is not the colony's quarrel.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I am coming to that. I am only pointing out as to the constitutional or unconstitutional aspect of the question at present, and I say there is nothing unheard-of in the course which has been pursued by the Government in this matter. The Premier believed, when he made the offer of the troops, that he was acting in accordance with the great bulk of public opinion, and I venture to say that, if the House were sent to the country to-morrow upon this question, then those who favour the action of the Premier would be returned in an overwhelming majority.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Question! Try it!

Mr. McDONALD: You are not game to try it.

The TREASURER: Yes, we are.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: With the means I have at my disposal of correctly interpreting public opinion, I believe that is what the result would be if the constituencies had an opportunity of registering their decision upon the question. It has been said that the difference between the powers possessed by the Executive of Great Britain and the powers possessed by the Executive of Queensland is this: That while the Executive of Great Britain has power to declare war, if necessary, without the authority of Parliament first obtained, we here are not justified in taking any steps such as have been taken in this case, because it is said it is not our quarrel. Now I take a different stand from that. I am not an Englishman. I have the happiness, like my hon. friend over there, of being born in Australia. I never was in England. I hope to complete my education before I die, and I shall never complete it until I have the opportunity of going to Great Britain to study all that is to be learnt by actual contact with the

men and the opportunities of information that are available there. But still I am no Englishman, nor am I the son of an Englishman. Yet, at the same time, I glory in the fact that the flag that waves above me is the grand old flag that for a thousand years "has braved the battle and the breeze."

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: What country in the world is there, save the British Empire, or some part of the British Empire, in which men are free to express their opinions and go to the length they are permitted to go there in opposition to the will of the Government of the country? Look at South Africa, where we have an example in that traitor who occupies the position of Premier in Cape Colony.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Oh, oh! Withdraw! Shame!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I say a traitor, who in former times would have had summary punishment dealt out to him, who would have been taken out and given a very short shrift.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Shame, shame!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I say that in no country of the world would such action as he has taken be possible, except in Great Britain itself or in some dependency of the Empire. We have this fact—that while Portugal, a friendly ally of Great Britain, prevented a ship in Delagoa Bay from landing a cargo of ammunition, yet this man, who is at the present time the unworthy occupant of the position of Premier of Cape Colony, allowed to go into the Transvaal, by train-loads, a lot of ammunition which he knew was intended to be used for the purpose of shooting down Englishmen if they should come to close quarters with the Boers.

Mr. FISHER: Do you allow a prisoner to defend himself?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I say not only am I not an Englishman, but I am no jingo.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Oh!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I am not a jingo. I am not a man in favour of war. I neither believe in going to war myself nor in sending my brothers, or my cousins, or any other relatives to fight. I am not one of that sort. But I say this is not a question as to whether we should rush into a quarrel that is none of ours; the question is whether when Great Britain is committed to a great struggle—

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Struggle!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Yes, struggle; the principle is a great one. I say the question is whether when Great Britain is committed to a struggle like this, we are or are not to avail ourselves of the opportunity presented of exhibiting in a way that will impress the imagination of the world as nothing else can the solidarity of the British Empire.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: We do not suppose, there is no man so infatuated as to suppose, that 250 men going from Queensland can make any very great difference in the result one way or the other. No man flatters himself about that. But the question is whether this is an opportunity that is presented of showing to the world that the people who speak the British language, and who own the British flag in all quarters of the globe, are one people or are a divided people.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Jingoism.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: It is not jingoism. Depend upon it there never was a time when the outlook was more serious than it

is now. We may laugh and make merry over the condition of things, but we do not know when our turn is to come. There has grown up here recently, within the last few years, a power which has asserted itself in a way that has excited the astonishment of the world. I refer to Japan. I dare say most persons, like myself, when they heard of little Japan having the temerity to go to war with the great giant China, as I thought she was to be regarded at that time, thought that little Japan had gone off its head. It was like a mouse attacking a lion. But there was a development of power exhibited on that occasion that I think took every thinking man by surprise, and the result of that contest with China has been to make Japan one of the great naval powers of the earth. I think if Great Britain is once involved in a serious struggle, and if in that struggle she excites the opposition of other nations of the earth, who may be only too ready to seize the opportunity, as was nearly being the case only a year or two ago, that would furnish the opportunity for a nation like Japan to swoop down upon a valuable place like Australia. They would very likely make war upon us, and if we by our, as I regard it, patriotic action in this matter show our sympathy with our fellow-subjects in South Africa, then if we should be in trouble from any cause we may expect a similar exhibition of patriotic sympathy and fellow-feeling towards us as British subjects.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba, Mr. Groom, referred to the action that was taken by the then Premier in 1887, in agreeing to an arrangement that was entered into between the Secretary of State and the several colonies with respect to the maintenance of a naval auxiliary in Australian waters. It appears that there was no opportunity on that occasion of consulting Parliament. The other members of the Conference were willing to pledge their own colonies in this respect, but it remained for the Queensland Premier to be the man to be humiliated, and the opportunity was only too eagerly caught at. It was regarded as too precious to be allowed to go by the opponents of the then Premier, and though believing as firmly as the Premier himself believed in the propriety of the arrangement made, yet for the purpose of snatching a party victory they humiliated the Premier; and I venture to say that there are some hon. members sitting over there to-night who, in their heart of hearts—

Mr. DAWSON: I was secretary to your election committee, and we all disapproved of that action on the part of the Premier.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The hon. member was a faithful supporter of mine when I represented Charters Towers, and I have a very kindly sentiment towards him on that account. He did me the honour to assist me into this House many years ago, though not for the first time. I say there are hon. members sitting over there who in their heart of hearts are as much in sympathy with this movement that has been inaugurated by the Premier as any hon. member sitting on this side of the House, but party loyalty very often goes a good deal further than some other kind of loyalty, and I have no doubt some hon. members are willing to sink their individual preferences and opinions for the sake of securing a victory and humiliating the Government. If hon. members sitting opposite succeed in carrying this amendment and humiliating the Government, is that all they will accomplish? I say no, Sir. That humiliation will be equally their own humiliation. It will be the humiliation of the colony of Queensland.

We are proud of our colony, and are apt to boast of Queensland as being the first colony of Australia. Still hon. members endeavour to hold up Queensland to the derision of the civilised world as being the one colony in Australia that is willing to repudiate the action of its Government, which action was dictated by patriotic motives. We cannot escape humiliation and degradation if the amendment is carried. But I do not believe it will be carried. I was referring to what was said by the hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba, Mr. Groom. I disagree with him when he says that the action of the Government on the occasion to which he alluded was the battle-ground on which the election of 1888 was fought. Of course, it may have been from his point of view.

Mr. GLASSEY: It was an important factor at any rate.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Of course we know it was dragged in, it was one [9 p.m.] of the side issues, but it was by no means the principal weapon used for the purpose of defeating the Government party.

Mr. McDONALD: What made McIlwraith form the National party.

Mr. GROOM: It was the main issue.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The hon. member may have used it himself. It was one of the weapons, but it was by no means the principal weapon.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: What do you know about it? You got defeated that time.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I know all about it. We were defeated at that time, still the fact that a man is defeated does not at all prove that he does not know with what weapon he was hit. (Laughter.)

Mr. FITZGERALD: You were a Liberal in 1888, and you are a Conservative in 1890.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The hon. member for Brisbane South said he is proud of being an Englishman, and I have not the slightest doubt he is proud of the fact that he is an Englishman; but at the same time he limits his pride in his country to this: As regards the use of actual support, he said that if the mother country was in danger then he would be one to render practical assistance; but I say Great Britain can be attacked in her dependencies, just as a father or a mother can be attacked in the persons of their children.

Mr. DAWSON: By a small boy two years of age!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: When the colonies of Great Britain are attacked it is an attack on Great Britain. Hon. members over there are never tired of proclaiming the necessity for an alteration or improvement in the laws which will give men just and equal representation.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: While the hon. member for Brisbane South was speaking, when he was condemning the agitation in the Transvaal by the overwhelming numbers of Britishers there, when he said that if they were not satisfied with the conditions they found in that country, and insinuated that if they did not like the conditions of the franchise, and did not like the other conditions under which they were called upon to live, they could go elsewhere, I interjected, and I ask now why hon. members do not use that kind of argument to apply to themselves? Many hon. members when they came to this colony found a condition of things in regard to the franchise of which they could not approve, and which they felt to be a grievance. To a certain extent I am disposed to agree that there were some conditions which they may have been justified in regarding as

grievances in connection with the government of the country in which they came to live. But I do not argue that when they found a condition of things prevailing of which they could not approve, when they found there was not manhood suffrage in Australia, and that the country was governed by a sort of oligarchy and they were deprived of what they consider their rights, they should not be permitted lawful agitation for remedying that state of things.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Not going to war.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Who would blame them for that? Why, in the Transvaal there is no other way to achieve their object.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear! No, no!

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The meetings of the people are suppressed by the strong arm of the law.

MR. LESINA: They are not suppressed.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Representations made through resolutions passed by large public meetings attended by orderly, intelligent Englishmen, when sent on to the authorities, are derided, and those who passed them are told in effect, not only that they must not send any more such resolutions, but they are not even to hold public meetings for the purpose of passing such resolutions.

MR. DAWSON: As a matter of fact, our people in 1891 threatened to go to war, and they got three years in St. Helena for it.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Does the hon. member compare the two sets of circumstances?

MR. DAWSON: I do, yes.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Oh, oh!

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: There were a number of men there, but they had no fault to find with the institutions of the country.

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, they had.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: No, the men who went out on strike had no fault to find with the institutions of the country. The only fault they had to find was with the employers under whom they served.

MR. LESINA: And with the Government, too.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: There is no comparison whatever.

MR. DAWSON: They got three years, anyhow.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: They did not all get three years. I do not condemn any just and lawful agitation, and I never did.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: They were only punished for crime.

MR. DAWSON: No doubt the Secretary for Lands would like them to have got seven years.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I do not object to just and lawful agitation, but the state of things in the Transvaal, where men are not permitted to use even the mildest forms of agitation, is a condition of things which is intolerable to any man who bears the name of Briton, and if grievances cannot be redressed in one way they must be in another.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: What about the Coercion Acts in Ireland?

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You are sympathising with the Coercion Acts of the Transvaal.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The hon. member for Maryborough in the able speech he delivered to-night.

MR. DAWSON: In what?

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: In the very able speech the hon. member delivered to-night, he pointed out that about 75 per cent. of the adult white population of the Transvaal were Uitlanders. I ask, is it not an intolerable thing that 75 per cent. of the white population, the men who find the money, who find the brains,

and who find all the other appliances by which the resources of the Transvaal are developed should be oppressed by a small handful of those who speaking a different language—

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: It is their own country.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: And, animated by a hatred of the British, take every opportunity of robbing them of the ordinary rights of citizens; and when we find such a condition of things as that, is it not time for Great Britain to step in and say, "We have something to say on this subject"?

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

MEMBERS of the Opposition: They do not molest us. What about India?

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: We are not talking about India. Will any man say that the ryots and the rural populations of India are to be compared to the representatives of the British race who are to be found in South Africa?

MR. McDONALD: Oh, is that the ground you go on?

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: They are a subject race, and their intelligence is so low that the authorities in Bombay and other large centres of population in India have been obliged to use coercion in order to compel those people who swarm in various districts to use the commonest means for keeping their streets and houses clean in order to prevent the spreading of the bubonic and other plagues. Are you going to compare that kind of people with the men in the Transvaal?

MR. FITZGERALD: Of course we are.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Then I have no arguments to address to you.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I address my arguments to those who take a more intelligent view of public questions. (Laughter.)

MR. McDONNELL: What about the suppression of public meetings in Ireland, and the suppression of the Press there by the English Government?

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: We need not confuse the two things. We know that a very large amount of indignation was raised in regard to the people of Ireland, and there was a party formed in Ireland for the purpose of representing their grievances to the people of England.

MR. FITZGERALD: What about King Billy?

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The observation is unworthy of the hon. gentleman. If hon. members will persist in introducing irrelevant subjects I cannot stop to deal with them. The legislation of the British Parliament shows that there was a disposition on the part of a large and of an influential section of the British public to do justice to Ireland.

MR. McDONNELL: Coercion Acts.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: We know that these attempts to drag in subjects which are not relevant to the question under discussion are only attempts to draw a red herring across the trail.

MR. KEOGH: They might have got liberty under Mr. Gladstone, but not under the present men.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: We are not discussing that here. We are dealing with a people who have no right to say how they shall be governed, or how the money they contribute to the Government shall be disposed of by that Government. I prefer to base my belief as to the actual condition of things that prevail in the Transvaal upon the testimony of intelligent persons who have lived many years among them



I have spoken with men who have resided in the Transvaal, and who have recently come from there, and I read a series of very informing articles in a Sydney paper when I was down there a week or two ago bearing on this question. And there is perfect unanimity on the part of those who bear testimony as to the condition of things there. They say the Boers are animated first and foremost with an intense antipathy not only to British rule, but to everything that is British. This is the kind of language they indulge in in their cups. When they talk about flags they say to the Englishman, "The only flag that we know anything of in connection with England is a white flag." They hold Great Britain in supreme contempt because, owing to the incompetency of the general who had charge of military affairs at the time of Majuba Hill, they were victorious. We know very well that at that very time, but for the pusillanimity of the then Premier of Great Britain, we should never have had these troubles in the Transvaal. The testimony of those who have resided in the Transvaal is that the Boers are tyrannical, bigoted, and ignorant; and because Great Britain stepped in and prevented the Boers from treating the natives of the surrounding nations as slaves who were to be flogged to death, or treated in any opprobrious manner that pleased them, they came to the conclusion that Great Britain was their natural enemy.

Mr. MAXWELL: Was that in Rhodesia?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: No doubt abuses were perpetrated in Rhodesia. You will always find some lawless Englishmen in a new country, where the strong arm of the Government cannot reach them, acting in a tyrannical manner. But in Rhodesia their reign was soon over, and the state of that country is now such as no reasonable man can find fault with, as far as the humane treatment of the natives is concerned. I have not very much more to say. This is a matter that should be discussed calmly, and without importing any personal feeling into it. I have not attributed any wrong motives to any hon. member. I have endeavoured, from my point of view, to establish that the position the Government have taken up is a perfectly defensible position; and in doing so I have tried to use as temperate language as I could command. That is what I think we are all disposed to do, except when an hon. member forgets himself a little, as I am sorry the leader of the Labour Opposition did yesterday afternoon. I was very sorry indeed to hear that hon. member, for whom I have a very high respect, so far forget himself as to designate those who are to go from Queensland to the Transvaal as being—he withdrew the word "cowards," but substituted something that was really scarcely less unworthy of him. He said they were curs because there was more of the element of the dog in them than of the human element. I was hoping that the hon. member, when he saw those words in cold print, would have taken the earliest opportunity to express his regret for having used them. I hope he will do so before this debate closes, because I regard it as a slur upon himself to have used language of that sort with regard to men who, after all, have not the opportunity of saying anything on their own behalf, and who are ready, when there is an appeal made to their patriotism, to respond, even though that may involve the sacrifice of their lives.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: That was not said in 1891.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I do not know what is the matter with the hon. member for Mitchell. He seems to be very uncomfortable to-night, and has been interjecting in a remarkably active way for him. I do not know that anything I have said can be interpreted as

a personal reflection upon him, and I hope he will not attach to any observation I have made the idea that I am imputing anything to him.

Mr. FITZGERALD: When did I interrupt you?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: He will have an opportunity of delivering a speech, and combating my statements if he likes.

Mr. FITZGERALD: Tell me one instance when I interrupted you.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: It is a course of action I never follow, and which I deprecate. We are here as an assembly of British gentlemen, and I am sure hon. members will feel it incumbent upon them to act as such.

Mr. FITZGERALD: Why do you attack me? I never said a word against you.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: As I said at the outset, I am no advocate for war, but the forbearance of the British Government has been stretched to such an extent during the present strained condition of things in South Africa, that it has caused resentment among a large number of British subjects in all parts of the world. I do hope that hon. members, on the present occasion, will concede to the Government that in acting as they have done they have acted honestly in trying to meet what they believed to be the wish of the majority of the people of Queensland, and anticipating a favourable verdict from Parliament when it met. The hon. member for Brisbane North, Mr. Forrest, who spoke this afternoon, referred to what he called a defect in the message sent to Mr. Chamberlain, because it did not state in so many words that the troops would be sent from Queensland subject to the approval of Parliament. Of what use, I should like to know, would have been the addition of those words? Does not Mr. Chamberlain know, as well as any member of this House knows, that the thing must be subject to the approval of Parliament before effect can be given to it? He would not suppose we were a lot of fools who believed this could be done without the sanction of Parliament. There are many things in communications that pass between man and man that are left unsaid, because both parties understand that what is not stated is understood; and in this case Mr. Chamberlain knows that this is an offer made by the Government of Queensland, in the name of the people of Queensland, to be ratified when Parliament should meet, by a majority of the votes of the Parliament.

\* Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*): I may say that the address to which we have just had the pleasure of listening has given me a mild surprise. I recollect that at one time the Attorney-General was a gentleman who went around preaching Christ's gospel of "Peace on earth, goodwill towards men," but to-night he has come out in an entirely new character.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: You are always true to the type of a Sydney larrikin.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Oh, oh! Shame, shame!

Mr. McDONNELL: Is the Attorney-General in order in using those words?

The SPEAKER: I think the words are distinctly out of order, and must be withdrawn.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I am always willing to set an example, and I withdraw the words I used. I hope the hon. member will confine himself to argument.

Mr. LESINA: I was saying that the Attorney-General has appeared to-night in an entirely new character.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Order, order!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. member in order in referring to my character.



Mr. ANNEAR: The Attorney-General's character is a good one at all events.

The SPEAKER: I did not understand the hon. gentleman to use language that could be held as unparliamentary within the strict meaning of the word; but if the language is objectionable to the Attorney-General, who regards it as of a personal nature, the hon. member for Clermont certainly should not persist in it.

Mr. LESINA: I did not intend to in any way reflect personally on the character of the estimable gentleman who holds the portfolio of Attorney-General. I desire to point out that he, in common with others who have spoken, has assumed the role of jingoes—understanding by that persons who at all times and on every conceivable opportunity, and in all places, are eternally and blataantly declaring and gloating over the fact that they belong to a particular nation and own allegiance to a particular flag. Generally speaking, I find that the man who prides himself eternally on his nationality is the man who has nothing else to pride himself upon. No man, in my opinion, can claim any particular credit because of the place in which he was born. A man's nationality is nothing more or less than an accident. Why should he pride himself on the fact that he is an Australian, or an Englishman any more than that he is a Russian or a Turk? It is purely a geographical accident.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You are an accident.

Mr. LESINA: I am not more of an accident than the political combination that has for so long sat on the other side of the House. I see nothing in the fact to call forth an immense amount of glorification that a man has been born in Australia, or England, or Turkey, because he can have no possible control over the circumstances of his birth, he deserves no credit for it. And as for the fact that a man is a born Englishman, living under a particular flag—which, by the way, can be bought at Finney's at 4½d. a yard—I see nothing particular in that circumstance, and consider reference to it a pure waste of public time and attention. The hon. gentleman said, in the course of his jingoistic speech, that we did not know when our turn might come when we may have to defend ourselves; but I do not know that we will have to wait long if many such inflammatory speeches are delivered in this House. If we crow to such an extent about our 250 drapers' clerks who are going forth to take Paul Kruger by the beard—if we let the whole world know what we are going to do, and draw attention to our defenceless state during the absence of our defenders—the result will be that we shall very soon invite invaders to come down upon us.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: "Tread on the tail of me coat."

Mr. LESINA: Yes, it is very reminiscent of the Irishman at the fair who was never tired of trailing his coat about the market-place, inviting all and sundry to take up his challenge, and who when anyone responded promptly knocked him down. In that case the challenger was perfectly aware of his ability to defend himself against any insult, but in this case it is an entirely different matter, because we are not able to defend ourselves; and if the Attorney-General and others make speeches of the inflammatory character which we have heard, the result will be that we will call the attention of some European power to our defenceless condition, and thus bring about the very evil which the Attorney-General is so anxious to guard against. I say therefore that such speeches are ill-advised; that they inflame the public mind, and there are times in history when the public mind goes off the balance, and the people are not responsible for what they do. And when level-headed gentlemen

like the Attorney-General make such speeches, you cannot be surprised at the men in the street adopting the same bloodthirsty style, and being eager to rush to the front and cut the throat of somebody. I am surprised that a gentleman whose teaching has been so peaceful and good in the past, should launch out in the direction he has taken, and thirst to pick a sanguinary quarrel and indulge in unlimited blood-letting. But let hon. members opposite understand that there is a large section of people in the old country who have determined that there is no necessity for war with the Boers—that there is every justification, rather, for appealing to arbitration. But, while some ask for arbitration, we have the bloodthirsty section screeching out for war, and nothing but the most sanguinary set of circumstances will by any possibility satisfy them. As I interjected last night, hon. members opposite always fight by proxy. The man who makes the most warlike speech, I have noticed, prefers to sit at home and let some other fellow do all the hard work of fighting for him. Here is a case in point. There are hon. gentlemen on the other side who are leaders in our Defence Force. There is the Home Secretary and the member for Lockyer, who delivered such a long and eloquent speech last night. They are eager and anxious to wipe out the Boer, but they prefer to do it by paying some other fellow 4s. 6d. a day out of the public Treasury to do it for them. I maintain that it is not the workers who have any sympathy with these warlike demonstrations. The workers of the world have got all things in common, but it is the politicians who foment the quarrels, and it is they who should be compelled to fight them out. Indeed I would cheerfully vote for this motion if the whole of the Ministry will lead the contingent into battle. (Laughter.) The Attorney-General seems to have a most fearful appetite for gore, and I should advise him to wear a plaid waistcoat in order to check his appetite for gore and glory. I have noticed that many of the men who are most anxious to reform the world have a gate that hangs by one hinge. Is not the whole of this country reeking with corruption? What are we doing to sweep our own doorstep? What are we doing to set our own house in order? What are we doing to give our own people the franchise? Nothing! And yet, while we will not give our own people a vote, there are those who are willing to go 10,000 miles away to fight the battles of other people and obtain the franchise for them. You grant large concessions on this continent to mining and railway syndicates and for various other purposes, to which I have before alluded, but when reform is mentioned at home those gentlemen opposite will not take one step in that direction. They are willing enough to sympathise with the Uitlander, the hook-nosed Jew who is running an agency in Johannesburg, but they have no sympathy for their own people, and let them cry out in vain for the pressing reforms which are needed. What does the member for Lockyer know about the Transvaal? We have a man in this Chamber to-night who is just from the Transvaal, and who has taken an active part in organising the Labour party there. He was interviewed by the *Worker* this week, and in the course of the interview he says, speaking of the demands of the Uitlanders—

One by one the Boer Government conceded the points demanded. It reduced the railway rates for coal to below the actual cost of carriage. It abolished machinery duties, it reduced the duties on necessities, but increased the duties on champagne, cigars, wines, and mineral waters. The capitalists complained that the Kaffirs were unreliable as miners, owing to the Boer law permitting them to purchase grog. On this point their demands were conceded also. Having exhausted every plausible pretext, the capitalist organisation then attacked the franchise, and blamed it for the depression. Kruger conceded point after point on this matter,

until it became a question of constitutional suicide. When the crisis was reached, Kruger demanded arbitration; Chamberlain refused, hence the war. It is all rubbish this pretence of fighting for the political enfranchisement of the Uitlanders. I heard a millionaire boasting the other week in Johannesburg that they did not care a fig about the franchise.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Oh, oh!

Mr. LESINA: It is seldom that the Labour party are in favour of the Government; but they are strongly in favour of the Transvaal Government because they are well treated.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You all approve of the franchise.

Mr. LESINA: That I will give evidence of before I close.

Mr. DUNSFORD: They would rather have the devil they know than the devil they don't know.

Mr. LESINA: Reference was made by the Hon. the Attorney-General to the defeat at Majuba Hill and one or two other defeats, administered to our troops by a paltry Boer force in that small republic. They defeated the flower of the English Army in three battles. He said it was due to the blunder of the general in command of the force—that it was due to the incompetence of Sir Pomeroy Colley. In *Blackwood's Magazine* for March, 1899, there is an article by Henry Brackenbury—a review of the life of Sir George Colley by General Butler, who has recently sent in his resignation as commander of the South African forces. He publishes, amongst other things, an extract from a letter from Sir Garnet Wolseley. Here it is—

My heart is sick. I am low in spirit. I will never see Colley's like again.

There is the testimony of Sir Garnet Wolseley of Colley as a commander and a capable gentleman. On the other side, we have the Attorney-General, who says he was incompetent.

The PREMIER: Read the context.

Mr. LESINA: I am quoting a letter written by Sir Garnet Wolseley. I went to the library to see if I could obtain another work by Sir William Butler, dealing with the life of Colley; but I found a member of the Upper House had taken it, and I could not get it. But I have another extract which will do just as well.

Mr. BROWNE: Sir Garnet Wolseley is not as good an authority on military matters as the Attorney-General.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I passed no comment on his management at Majuba Hill.

Mr. LESINA: It strikes me as a peculiar thing that the Government of Queensland has suddenly taken on itself to act the part of redresser of wrongs in other parts of the world. They seem to have been suddenly smitten with the idea that it is their proper place and duty to seek out in the world where there are wrongs and redress them. They remind me very much of that Spanish knight errant, Don Quixote, who went out, accompanied by his lieutenant, Sancho Panza, to redress grievances, more or less imaginary, and got himself into all sorts of ridiculous scrapes. We have Don Quixote Dickson, and his lieutenant Sancho Panza, the Attorney-General. (Loud laughter from the Opposition side.) They are off to South Africa, and they are determined—with the assistance of some 250 drapers' clerks and other fierce persons they are going to take over at the public expense—to pull Paul Kruger's beard, and generally to instruct him in the art of governing the people living in his little dependency and within his little dominion. These people, who have made such a bungle of affairs in Queensland, are going to redress the grievances and wrongs of the Uitlanders, instruct Kruger as to how to manage the country he has ruled very faithfully for so many years without any outside assistance, and instruct him also in the first principles of statesmanship. They should

look at home before they look abroad. If they had paid the money themselves—if they had signed cheques themselves—it would be different; but they are calling on the long-suffering taxpayers of Queensland to carry out this Don Quixotean scheme 10,000 miles away.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: How much taxes have you paid in Queensland?

Mr. LESINA: I pay as little as I can to this Government. (Laughter.) It has been stated by one hon. member on the other side—Mr. Annear—that one reason why we should send these 250 swashbucklers, as they have been called by some hon. member—

Mr. ANNear: Not on this side of the House.

Mr. LESINA: Is to ensure reforms in the Transvaal Government. And one of the things that appealed to him more than anything else in the unfortunate condition of the Uitlanders is the tale of the little nigger girls—Kaffir gins—having been flogged. No doubt, the flogging of Kaffir gins appeals to the highest feelings in the hon. gentleman's expansive breast. It appeals to his finest feelings that these gins, 10,000 miles away, should be flogged. His gorge rises. I will quote from a very respectable journal to show what the good old Britisher does when he gets abroad. I will quote from an organ with which the Honourable the Attorney-General is, no doubt, very conversant. It is called the *Independent and Nonconformist*. It is a church journal. It contains a letter sent by a young Englishman who lives in the Transvaal. This is an extract from his letter:—

The PREMIER: Date.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: An anonymous letter, I suppose.

Mr. LESINA: It is not an anonymous letter. I will hunt up the date. I have it in my notes.

The PREMIER: I want the date.

Mr. ANNear: Years ago?

Mr. LESINA: It is not twelve months ago, because I only cut it out three months ago. At any rate, I am quoting it. If we keep the paper in the library, I will conduct the hon. gentleman to it.

The PREMIER: I want the date.

Mr. GIVENS: Is there anything else you want?

Mr. LESINA: If the hon. member would climb a palm-tree he would be up to date. The writer says—

It is grand fun potting the niggers off and seeing them fall like nincomps. There have been two or three caught in the town (Buluwayo) lately and shot as spies. Crowds go to see it. They are stood ten yards off the firing party, who all blaze at them at once. It is quite a nice sight. One gets callous and hardened, and does not object to seeing it. . . . Yesterday three natives were hung as spies. They were marched out of town about half a mile, ropes were tied to branches of a tree, they were made to climb up, the rope was tied to their necks, and they were made to jump off the tree and drop. One would not for some time; he would talk to Mr. Colenbrander.

Who is a British official.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: He is a Hollander.

Mr. LESINA:

The check of the sweep amused me. They are still hanging as a warning to spies and natives.

Here is another young fellow—a business man—writing in much the same strain.

The PREMIER: What is the date?

Mr. LESINA: He writes in the *Daily Graphic*, and you may find it by going to the library. He says—

The natives will have a warm time of it. They will nearly all get wiped out. That is the only way to settle it now. Surrender is useless. The idea is to kill the greater portion of every impi, and thus teach them a very bitter lesson. . . . Several patrols have been out for a few hours, and come back having killed a hundred or two natives. Yesterday morning was the best. Two hundred and fifty of our people went out. They killed over 200 in two hours' fighting. This is a young business man. Another young tradesman says—

The PREMIER: Writer?

Mr. McDONALD: Oh! Hold your tongue. (Laughter.)

Mr. LESINA:

My stand has one big tree on it, and it is often used as a gallows. Yesterday there was a goodly crop of Matabels hanging there. To-day there are eight.

This is a young business man who, when he is in London, will probably be found at a meeting of some missionary society singing hymns, but when he is in Africa he hunts big game and pots niggers on his Sunday afternoons off.

The PREMIER: Give us the date.

Mr. LESINA: I will give one a little more recent than that. If you hunt up the files of the daily papers of the 25th August last you will read the following cablegram:—

News from the Transvaal states that the natives employed in the mines are at present very restless. In the eastern part of the Rand several natives have been fined, and have also been sentenced to be flogged, for refusing to work.

The British Government are flogging them because they feel inclined to clear out.

Mr. COWLEY: It is not the British that is doing it. It is the Boers.

Mr. LESINA: The tone assumed by hon. members on the other side reminds me of the famous message from the West Indian colony Barbados, in the reign of one of the Georges, when some international war was on. The Premier's message is reminiscent of that famous message, which was to King George III., and was in this strain: "Tell King George not to be afraid; Barbados is firm." We have an historical parallel to that in the Premier's message to Chamberlain: "Tell Her Majesty not to be afraid; Queensland stands firm; 250 drapers' and grocers' clerks will shoulder arms and take the field."

Mr. ANNEAR: Every one of those is your equal.

Mr. LESINA: That may be; but I do not know, if they were submitted to medical examination, that they would be. I would like to know whether the Commandant is going away, and why the gentleman in command should not be submitted to a medical examination.

The PREMIER: So they will. They are all to be examined.

Mr. LESINA: I am glad of that, because it is well known that Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo suffers from weakness of the heart and also from gout.

The PREMIER: You have no authority for stating so.

Mr. LESINA: Fancy a warrior suffering from gout and a weak heart taking the field and leading our 250 noble—

The PREMIER: I rise to a point of order. I think it is exceedingly discreditable—

MEMBERS of the Opposition: No! What is the point of order?

The PREMIER: The point of order is this. The name of a gentleman should not be introduced in this Chamber and subjected to unmerited criticism when he has not the opportunity of reply.

Mr. GIVENS: He is a public official.

Mr. JENKINSON: What about the gallery reporter?

The PREMIER: I say it is a prostitution of parliamentary privilege by the hon. member for Clermont, and I ask if it is to be permitted?

Mr. McDONALD: You are not in order yourself.

The SPEAKER: I am not in a position to rule the hon. member out of order, but he is pursuing a course that is in itself most extraordinary—making statements calculated to injure an individual. I think the course pursued is a most unusual one, and I can only express my opinion that it ought not to be persisted in.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. LESINA: I am very glad attention has been drawn to this by the Premier, because it enables me to refer to a matter that merits the severest censure of this House, and that is the unworthy, cowardly attack made upon a newspaper reporter in the gallery by the hon. member for Maryborough, Mr. Annear.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. LESINA: That was worse than the attack I made, because what I said was in the interests of the general public, for the purpose of drawing attention to a certain deficiency in this military hero who will probably take our troops abroad. I would like them to make a presentable appearance in the field, because if they do not they will be placed in the reserves or the supports, and will never smell powder.

The PREMIER: A very much worthier man than his assailant.

Mr. JENKINSON: That applies to the *Courier* reporter, too.

Mr. LESINA: They are willing to condone any offence committed by some people, but in the matter I have referred to they get their gorge up immediately. I consider that they should not make fish of one and flesh of another. If attacks on gentlemen carrying on their duties as reporters are permitted to be made on the floor of this House, and with an object which was very ill concealed, I do not see why I should be prevented from drawing attention to a permanent official connected with the despatch of these troops to South Africa. Another officer connected with this force going away is Captain Pelham, who will probably go away also, and who, if subjected to medical examination, would not be permitted to serve in the British army at any rate. He is practically a cripple. It is a well-known fact that Captain Pelham is laid up from time to time, sometimes weeks, sometimes months, with a bad back, and that he has to wear steel corsets of the best pattern.

The PREMIER: Mr. Speaker,—I rise to a point of order. It is a most disgraceful—

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Order! What is the point of order?

Mr. McDONALD: I rise to a point of order. The Premier is making a speech.

The PREMIER: The point of order is this: That the names of gentlemen not in any way at the present time before the House should not be introduced, and physical or other infirmities attributed to them, and that they should not be held up to public obloquy. I say it is most unfair, and I ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether it should be tolerated.

The SPEAKER: I have already stated that I have no power to declare the conduct of the hon. member irregular or improper according to our rules. I can only repeat the opinion I previously expressed—that he is pursuing a most unusual course, and a course that I do not think he ought to persist in. I trust the hon. gentleman will not continue in the course he has been pursuing for some time past.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. LESINA: Leaving that part of the question and coming to the papers laid on the table of the House by the Premier, I find amongst the patriots mentioned there the names of Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo and others to whom it was my intention to refer.

The PREMIER: There is no word of Captain Pelham.

Mr. LESINA: That is information that came to my ears within the past few days.

The PREMIER: We don't want your information.

Mr. LESINA: My information is perhaps better than that of the Premier. He may not have made inquiries; if he had done so he might

take the view I take. Anyhow, it is public money that is sending these men abroad, and we want them to be as efficiently commanded as possible. Whatever may be the result of this business, publicly, or privately, or nationally, or Imperialistically, the responsibility must rest on the shoulders of the Premier, because it was he who initiated it in this House. According to the correspondence, he was first approached in the matter by Major-General Gunter—who approached Major-General Gunter, I don't know. The first item in the correspondence is a letter from Howel Gunter to the Chief Secretary, and the second is a reply by James R. Dickson; so it would appear that this matter which has originated outside was primarily started by the military party in Queensland. They have their mouthpieces and representatives in this Chamber, and they are beginning already to dominate our politics, as they have done in the old country.

Mr. STEWART: In France.

Mr. LESINA: Yes, in France, where they have long occupied a political standing in the country. This party which is beginning already to exercise an insidious influence in the counsels of the country, this military party has pulled the strings to induce the Chief Secretary to wire to Chamberlain, without consulting this Parliament, that he will send 250 paid soldiers to take part in the war that is about to be waged in the Transvaal. I would like to point out another matter that has occurred to me in this connection. Many references have been made by the Press in the old country to the trouble in the Transvaal and to the attitude that the British Government have assumed on the matter; but I find that recently a huge demonstration was held in London to protest against the war with the Transvaal. That meeting was addressed by many eminent politicians. The resolution, which I will read, was moved by Mr. Jas. Macdonald, of the London Trades Council, representing millions of organised workers, and it was seconded by Mr. Michael Davitt, and supported by Mr. Steadman, Dr. G. B. Clark, and others, and carried unanimously, and its terms were wired to President Kruger. It reads—

That this meeting of the citizens of London protests against the overwhelming force of the British Empire being used to coerce a small and non-aggressive population of nearly 130,000 Boers on behalf of the motley inhabitants of Johannesburg, who, though suffering under certain disabilities, are assuredly no worse off, either in respect of political grievances or personal rights, than millions of Englishmen at home, whose grievances are entirely disregarded; and assures the Boers of its sympathy in any course they may take to prevent their country from being voted away from them by a number of unscrupulous interlopers, whose sole object in settling in the Transvaal is to extract huge fortunes from the gold-mines of the Rand. (Cheers.)

Mr. Michael Davitt, who seconded the resolution, used these words—

It would soon be discovered that President Kruger was not such a bad man after all. (Cheers.) All the talk about wrongs inflicted upon British subjects was humbug. Mr. Chamberlain was a dexterous politician, but how could he fight for Home Rule in the Transvaal and refuse it in Ireland? How could he support extension of the franchise there and refuse it to thousands of men and women in the United Kingdom and millions of their fellow-subjects in India?

The question was never attempted to be answered, and it will never be answered in this Chamber. I will quote from another journal, which is considered a very respectable paper, and which is held in high estimation by hon. members on the other side—the *London Investors' Review*—a paper which deals with financial questions, with dividends, bonds debentures, stocks, and all things of that sort. It is stated there—

The misdeeds of the Boers are merely a pretext. We covet their territory and mean to have it, by foul means if fair serve us not. Possibly enough, Mr. Chamberlain does not even now realise that this policy of coercion is leading straight to war. Not all the indiscriminate eulogy of his friends can disguise the fact that he is a man of the densest, most lamentably prejudiced ignorance in all that relates to the essentials of statesmanship. To one of such limited knowledge and narrow views, nothing may appear simpler and more logical than the course he is following. The Boers are a feeble folk, he thinks; bully them enough and they are sure to give way. If not, at the worst a brief campaign—a large display of force—will sweep them away, and their vexatious little Republic with them. Then we can divide the spoil in peace and have rampant times on the Stock Exchange.

Surely if history teaches us anything at all about these Dutch-Huguenot-Afrikaners, it is that they may be led far, but cannot be driven an inch; that they are the true descendants of the men who withstood Philip of Spain and the last of the Valois—with their Alvas, their inquisitors, their Alexanders of Parma, their Catherine de Medici, and their Guises; that Louis le Roi Soleil himself found them unchanged, men counting death the smallest of the evils their obstinacy in clinging to freedom brought down upon their heads. Again and again in South Africa they have displayed the same heroic constancy and independence of spirit, and it is against a people of such mettle, with such traditions behind them, that we are now about to make war at the bidding of gold-mine "bosses," mostly strangers to our race and nation. Ah, the pity of it and the shame!

It has been said that public meetings cannot be held in the Rand; that property is unsafe; that British subjects are driven from pillar to post—hunted like rats in a courtyard. Considering all this, it is surprising to me that any Britisher, with a drop of British blood in his veins, has lived in the Transvaal for twenty-four hours. Not only have meetings been held there, but the following resolution was passed at a meeting at Lydenburg:—

This meeting of Uitlanders assembled at Lydenburg wishes to assure His Honour the State President and Executive Council that they heartily approve of the principles contained in the draft Franchise Law, submitted at present to the Volksraad, and further this meeting binds itself to loyally support His Honour the President in his efforts for peace. We assure him also that we shall do all that lies in our power to ensure the independence of this State.

Then, again, at a meeting at Capetown—at Petrusville—this resolution was passed—

This meeting of Her Majesty's loyal subjects, persuaded of the ruinous and irreparably hurtful consequences for the whole of South Africa of a war between England and the Transvaal, declares itself decidedly in favour of a peaceful solution of the existing differences between England and the South African Republic, and expresses it as its respectful opinion that such a solution can be attained if both interested parties accept a compromise regarding the franchise in the South African Republic on the lines of the proposals recently made by the Executive Council to the "Volksraden" of the South African Republic.

These resolutions were passed by citizens there in public meeting assembled, when expressions of confidence were passed in President Kruger and his legislation, in his endeavours to lift the burden off the shoulders of the Uitlanders. This business means a scandalous waste of money, and I think it would be far better if we determined to sweep our own doorsteps before making remarks about our neighbours.

The PREMIER: What about the spirit of patriotism?

Mr. LESINA: I am just as patriotic as the hon. gentleman, but my idea of patriotism is quite different from his. He believes in a jingoistic display of narrow-chested drapers' assistants and others, while I believe in domestic legislation and internal reforms which will promote the peace and happiness of the people. He wants to break law and order, I want to preserve it. I want to see arbitration, but the hon. member wants to "let loose the dogs of war"—to set the huge British bull-dog on the little Dutch poodle, and sool him along.

Amongst other South African papers I read the *Standard and Diggers' News*, an organ representing a large section of Uitlanders, who are living peaceably and prosperously and are adding largely to their banking accounts, more largely than the people of this [10 p.m.] colony are doing. I find in this paper these remarks—

Owing to the settled conviction that Great Britain will not rest until she has taken possession of the Transvaal, the Boers are determined to fight rather than permit this matchless gem of earth to be taken from them. The Transvaal being the richest country for its size in the world, would form a bright gem in the British Crown, and it will answer the purpose of Great Britain to secure the whole country, even at the cost of the mining industry. In the event of war the Boers will deliberately lay the mines on the Rand in ruins. . . . One thing is certain. War means the absolute ruin of Johannesburg.

That is a very important point, and one well worth knowing. If the British, by a large display of force—assisted by the 250 gentlemen from Queensland—beat the Boers, it will result in the destruction of the mines on the Rand, the ruin of the town of Johannesburg, and the ruin of thousands and thousands of people who at present are drawing incomes by way of dividends from capital invested in the Johannesburg mines. If the Premier had any capital invested in those mines, he would have thought considerably before he made this proposition to the British Government to lend them 250 gentlemen from Queensland to become targets for Boer bullets at 4s. 6d. a day. It has also been said the Uitlander population has been ill-treated in a most cruel and ungenerous manner by the Boers. Now do the hon. members who make that assertion know that the Uitlanders in Johannesburg to-day are in receipt of higher wages than are paid in Queensland.

Mr. COWLEY: I should think so, when living costs double the price.

Mr. LESINA: Now, if there are so many thousands of white people living on mining in the Transvaal, and they are getting higher wages than are being paid at Broken Hill, Charters Towers, Gympie, Croydon, or even in Western Australia, or any other of the mining centres of Australia, and the cost of living is no higher, for you can get board and lodging for 25s. a week—

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: No. Yes.

Mr. LESINA: But you can. I am going to show by figures, taken from the *Johannesburg Witness*, August, 1899, that what I say is correct. You know that the Uitlanders have been called "political slaves." We have been told that these unfortunate men—these brothers in blood and race—are weltering under slavery that robs them, practically, of every political right which we freely enjoy here to-day—that these brothers who are calling to us for assistance have no political rights in the Transvaal. Here is what the *Johannesburg Witness* says—

Political slaves, indeed? Where on earth can the English miner do half as well as in the Transvaal? Look at Australia. In former years the Broken Hill mines paid decent wages, but latterly the pay has been reduced until to-day the best men cannot earn more than 6s. to 8s. a day. Look at Western Australia—pay from £2 to £3 10s. per week. Simply a living; and when one is married a hard struggle to make both ends meet. Take Canada. The highest wages paid are in Rossland, British Columbia—12s. per day; and men do well to save £7 10s. per month. Then look at the United States, where in the East miners work harder than they do anywhere else in the world for a mere pittance of from 4s. to 7s. 6d. per day. In the West the wages are better, but even there, in the best mining camps of the United States, the pay is not over £5 per week.

Then take the Rand and notice the difference. Men bossing boys, £4 10s. to £6 per week. Men developing on machines think their pay a poor one if under £30 per month, and no complaint is made if they earn £50. Here we find Englishmen sending home from £10 to

£20 per month to the old country, many buying houses, and not a few being enabled through strict economy here to buy a few acres in Cornwall, and settling down in independence. And then to find the President of the Wesleyan Methodists calling us slaves!

Far better were he to organise the poor miners of Cornwall, men who think themselves well off if they can take home a paltry sum of £4 after working hard all month. They are the slaves—men who, being in debt to the shopkeepers, dare not call their souls their own, but take whatever is given them, and rejoice when their sons can leave the old country and come to the Transvaal, and send the hard-working parents more than they could ever hope to earn at home.

Mr. ANNEAR: Cornishmen are your equal at any time.

Mr. LESINA: I suppose they are in heaven.

Mr. ANNEAR: They fill up old shafts in Cornwall with disloyalists.

Mr. LESINA: The hon. member admits that they are so bigoted in Cornwall that if a person expressed the views I am now giving utterance to they would fill up an old shaft with him. Well, seeing that they are willing to work for £1 a week and consider themselves well paid, that they will pull their forelock to the squire and bow to the parson, I am quite prepared to believe they would strangle anyone who expressed the free-born sentiments I have to-night. I am glad I do not live in Cornwall, and I am sure the hon. member for Maryborough is glad he does not live there, because, if he had been heard in Cornwall delivering that speech which was quoted by the hon. member for South Brisbane from the 1887 *Hansard*, the hon. member would have lined the bottom of a shaft. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. ANNEAR: What do they do in Italy, and what are the wages in Italy?

Mr. LESINA: In Italy they get about 10d. a day, and they are glad to get it; but in Italy the people are very meek and mild. They are as meek as dogs, and the Government treats them like dogs. Out here if we create a bit of a disturbance we get some consideration in consequence. Again, we have further evidence that the Uitlanders—these political slaves who get £30 a month—are not dissatisfied with their treatment in the Transvaal. We have further evidence in the letter of Mr. W. R. McNab, an auctioneer in Krugersdorp—he runs the Western Rand auction mart—

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: He is a Scotchman.

Mr. LESINA: He is a Scotchman, and Scotchmen are generally very careful of their political liberty. They have been remarkable on all occasions for standing up for their political rights wherever they go, for taking a prominent part in politics, and extending the boundaries of their political freedom wherever the opportunity offers. Now this hard-headed Scotchman writes to a jingo paper as follows:—

SIR,—Since I last addressed you the legislature of this country has, as you are doubtless fully aware, made it part of the Constitution that a seven years' retrospective and prospective—franchise shall supersede the old franchise laws. Further, the First Raad has sanctioned the addition of eight new members (that is, four in each House) for the Witwatersrand Goldfields, this latter innovation bringing up the number of members representing the goldfields interests and including Barberton to six in each House, a substantial concession to progress and one which satisfies all moderate and reasonable inhabitants of this State, which includes the vast majority of the British working men on the Rand.

The assertion of the emissary of the Rhodes-Jingo League, Mr. T. R. Dodd, in his public address at Sunderland, that the aim of the Boers "was dominion, not liberty," is absolutely without the slightest foundation. The mischief commenced by the granting of a British charter to Cecil John Rhodes, who whilst coquetting with the Afrikaner Bond and aiding by all his power the no-export-tax-on-diamonds—dear bread and cheap brandy legislation—was covertly raising a stone wall that stemmed the natural expansion of the Boer race and blocked the pioneers of Christianity in a corner.

I feel firmly convinced that the day will yet dawn when it will be universally admitted that the granting of a British charter to a band of unscrupulous and insatiable Kimberley company promoters was the biggest of all the great political blunders committed in connection with the South African dependencies of Great Britain.

I trust in all sincerity that the greatest act of justice the world has ever witnessed—and that was the retrocession of this country to its rightful owners—will not be undone by the false and misleading sentiment which is the direct outcome of the twin feelings of chagrin at Majuba and cupidity at the abnormal richness of the soil of the South African Republic, and that the ancient traditions of British honour and fair play will be maintained at all hazards against the aristocratic vultures.—Yours, &c.,

W. R. MACNAB.

West Rand Auction Mart, Krugersdorp.

That is the statement of a cool, calm, level-headed Scotchman, who is in business there, and is making an honest livelihood in the country, and he says the majority of British people there are in entire agreement with his views. What have we as a set-off against that! There is a gentleman who is in this Chamber, or who has been here nearly all night, Mr. J. A. Verhoef. He is one of the members of the Johannesburg Labour party. He takes an active interest in politics in the Transvaal, and has just arrived from Johannesburg. He is one of the organisers of the Labour party there, and he looks at this matter from the point of view of the working man, who wants not only good work and good wages, but also a certain measure of political freedom. Hon. members can read what he has to say on the subject in this week's *Worker*. Will any hon. member in this Chamber venture to tell me that Cecil Rhodes, or Dickson, or the big moneyed Jews in Johannesburg, or the Jews in London who own the London Press, and are forcing on this jingo agitation, care a tinker's curse about the extension of the franchise to the Uitlanders? They do not care a red cent. If the Uitlanders never get the franchise. The *Brisbane Telegraph* honestly admitted that the other day, and said that all the talk about the granting of the franchise to the Uitlanders was a mere pretext to carry on a war which had for its object the making of Great Britain the paramount power in South Africa. We want the golden rand, we want to get Johannesburg, and we want to secure the vast and rich territory possessed by the Boers in the Transvaal and the Orange Free State, so as to make them part of the British Empire, about which so much flapdoodle has been talked by hon. members on the other side of the House. What is the use of making all this noise about the Transvaal laws when we find that men who have been in the country for years and have lived under those laws do not create the stink about them that has been created by persons who have never been in the Transvaal? I have friends in the Transvaal, friends who have gone there from Charters Towers, from Gympie, and from Croydon—men who were always opposed to the Government here for a variety of good reasons—and who could not have good reason for opposing the present Government?—and they are satisfied with the condition of things there. It is not men like that, but it is the Jews in London, and the Jewish-owned Press, that are crying out for rapine and slaughter and territorial aggrandisement. I defy any hon. member on the other side to deny that statement. I say it is really the Jew-owned Press that is responsible for the present agitation, and in support of that statement I shall give a list of newspapers which are advocating the Chamberlain jingo policy for the acquisition of further territory in South Africa. The London Press are in favour of a second raid on the Transvaal, and they supported the raid of that travelling adventurer, Dr. Jamieson, who ought to have been hanged when he was in

the hands of the Transvaal Government, who treated him too leniently. Here is an interesting extract—

A large majority of the Uitlanders are Polish Jews, who start as pedlars or illicit liquor dealers, and sometimes blossom out into high finance, possibly to end as millionaires in Park lane.—*Mr. George in Colebrook's in the "Westminster Gazette."*

The majority of the London Press are in favour of the second raid into the Transvaal. They include Oppenheim's *Daily News* (Oppenheim is a Jew); the *St. James' Gazette* (Steinkoff, proprietor, is a Jewish financier); the *Daily Telegraph* (the Levis, proprietors, who have changed their name to Lawson, are Jews); the *Critic* (proprietor Mr. Hess, a Jew); the *Observer* (the Beers, proprietors, are Jews); the *Sunday Times* (the Beers, proprietors, are Jews); the *Sunday Special* (the proprietors are Jews); the *Sun* (Marks, M.P., proprietor, is a Jew); the *Saturday Review* (proprietors, Jews). These, not forgetting the *Pall Mall Gazette*, owned by the American millionaire, Astor, who was burned in effigy the other day in America for becoming a naturalised British subject.

There we have a number of hawk-beaked, vulturous Jews egging on a bloodthirsty war in the Transvaal for the purpose of depriving the people who live in that little peaceful country of their Government, their mines, and their territory; and here we have a Government which intends to introduce legislation of one kind and another, about which we shall certainly be divided for a session or two, provided they weather this particular storm, which I hope they will not. We find them cheek by jowl with the Jew-owned Press of London inflaming the public mind by highly-coloured statements about the disabilities, political and social, suffered by the Uitlanders of the Transvaal. We have got to depend on the Jew-owned daily Press of London for our facts, and the result is that they are highly coloured, and we are misled. I know there are some hon. members in this Chamber who are prepared to be misled at any time on any question in which the Government take an active part. Any statements may be put forth by the head of the Government, and they will fall into line like so many sheep going through a hole in a fence. They are satisfied so that the Government continues to act for them, and they troop backwards and forwards into this Chamber, and as the Premier nods his head they go to the right or to the left. What is the trouble in the Transvaal? It is simply this: These are the Boer proposals submitted to form the basis for a settlement of the dispute: (1) five years' franchise; (2) a share in the election of the President; (3) increased representation for the goldfields to the extent, probably, of eight new seats; (4) all other questions submitted to arbitration, but not to that of a foreign power; (5) Great Britain to agree not to use her present interference as a precedent; (6) Great Britain to relinquish her suzerainty rights. And now we are to have the huge force at the command of the United Kingdom, with the assistance rendered by the Australian colonies, simply to bump the poor little Dutchman into compliance with their wishes. Great Britain is able at any time to bump him alone, but now, with the assistance of Queensland, the matter is placed beyond doubt. There is no hope at all for the unfortunate Dutch Boer now, because Queensland is going to assist, and the Premier asks England to "Stand firm," because Queensland is behind her. The dispute must now be settled in favour of the English, because of the forces at her command. There is another matter I think a very vital one, and it completely traverses the arguments used by hon. members on the other side who justify the sending of a contingent to the Transvaal. There is a paper published here in Australia called the *Sydney Bulletin*, a paper which I venture to say is well and favourably

known throughout the colonies of Australia. That paper recently took a very active and prominent part in supporting the policy of federation, which was one of the leading planks in the platform of the party sitting on the benches opposite. That paper, which was then quoted by hon. members on the other side as an oracle which could not possibly err—

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: It was never once quoted.

Mr. LESINA: It was quoted repeatedly, and its literature was carried throughout this colony to assist in attaining a victory for federation. Well, this same paper has got something to say about the Transvaal. I will just give hon. members opposite an extract from the *Bulletin* to show them the opinion of that paper on the trouble in South Africa. The *Bulletin* says—

The Boer law of naturalisation is not so very remarkable after all. Any alien may be naturalised and get a vote for the Lower House after two years' residence and payment of £2. He may get a vote for the Upper House twelve years later—or, again, he may not. In Great Britain the alien gets a vote for the Lower House after five years' residence and payment of £5, and he never by any chance gets a vote for the Upper House—even 400 years' residence wouldn't bring that any nearer. If English law applied to the Transvaal there would probably be not many more voters in Johannesburg than there are now, for the hawks and hustlers of the Rand are a transitory crowd, and only a small proportion of them could qualify for naturalisation according to the hard British law.

Britain has about 40,000,000 people, and if Britain were rushed by 60,000,000 Germans whom it hadn't been strong enough to keep out in the first place, and these Germans demanded that the British law should be abrogated so as to give them the franchise—so as to enable them to take over the whole government of the country, and Britain was firmly convinced that they would use their power to enact that Britain be at once annexed and governed by Kaiser Bill and garrisoned by his spike-helmeted myrmidons—well, Britain would also die in the last ditch before it gave way: and it would also be nasty, and aggravated, and quarrelsome.

This is a point very well worthy of consideration in this matter. The Boer law permits an Uitlander, after he has lived in the Transvaal for two years, on payment of £2, to become a naturalised subject and obtain a vote. In England he must be a resident for five years before he can become naturalised and obtain a vote, and he must pay £5, and that in a country where it is almost impossible for the average working man to get £5. In a country like the Transvaal, where a man can get as high as £50 a month, he has only to be two years there and pay £2 to become naturalised, and obtain his vote and a share in the Government of the country as much as President Kruger or Kruger's son. In England if a Boer goes to settle down there he may get 10s. a week as an agricultural labourer, and he has to save £5 and live there five years before he can become naturalised and secure a vote, and he can never get a vote for the Upper House because it is a non-elective Chamber, while in the Transvaal he can after a certain number of years get a vote for the Upper House. Here is another point. There is an article published in the *Positivist Review*, by Mr. Frederick Harrison, the humanitarian, teacher, and moralist, who is pretty well known now in almost every part of the civilised world as a person who advocates high thinking and plain living, and whose voice is always raised in behalf of the outcast and the oppressed, and who has worked in the interest of the spread of human freedom. Frederick Harrison, in an article in the *Review* to which I have made reference, deals, under the heading of "Pretexts for War," with the arguments we have had stated here by the raucous-voiced hungry vultures on the Ministerial benches—

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is using language which is not parliamentary.

Mr. LESINA: I beg to withdraw that, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Frederick Harrison, speaking about this "iniquitous war" with the little South African Republic, says it is "as iniquitous and as pregnant with evil as any waged within this century." If the country were not "intoxicated with the craze of Imperialism," it would recognise "the preposterous—nay, the comical—nature of the pretext on which war is justified."

It is not easy (he declares) to recall a ground of war between civilised nations in modern days so grotesque as the British demand for a foreign power to take over our own subjects more quickly than it now does. And this is called the consolidating of the empire and the maintenance of our Imperial predominance.

The other grounds of war from time to time suggested, writes Mr. Harrison, are "so flimsy from the point of view of serious politics and public law that they may be dismissed." He says—

It is admitted (1) that the Transvaal is for its internal law and constitution self-governing and not amenable to British control: that the Convention of 1854 has not been infringed. These things admitted, any threat to the Transvaal to alter its fundamental constitution and recast its franchise law is as preposterous in justice and as repugnant to international law as if the threat were addressed to Germany or France. The only difference is that the Transvaal is a small State, which for years has been greedily coveted by speculators and buccaneers.

Then our methods of oppression are discussed by him, and he says that neither will the excuses put forward for war on oratorical grounds be justified by facts or are they worthy of serious examination. This is an argument I should like to press upon the attention of hon. members opposite who have stated on two or three occasions that the Uitlanders in the Transvaal are being so badly treated that we should certainly arise and go to their assistance. Why do we not arise and go to the assistance of British Uitlanders in other parts of the world. We have British-speaking people treated as badly in other parts of the world. Mr. Harrison on this point says—

There is gross injustice and a corrupt police in Spain, in the Balkans, in Russia; in all these and in many Asiatic and African lands British emigrants have grievances. But we don't think of declaring war on Spain, Turkey, or Russia, demanding that our subjects in these countries must at once be offered the national franchise. The administration of justice, the protection of life and property, is far worse than it ever was in the Transvaal in many lands—such as Morocco, Persia, China, and many South American Republics. But no one dreams of reforming these States by war, for the reason that we should think twice before undertaking such a risk. At the present time British merchants and adventurers fare worse in Portuguese, or Belgian, or French territories in Africa than they do in the Rand. Their outrages do not move the Foreign Office, which knows that threats of war in their cause would mean European complications. British speculators have to put up with what they find at Delagoa Bay, violently as we want to seize it. The risk of seizing it is too great—as yet. The risk of seizing the Transvaal is supposed to be not excessive.

We think that because England is a [10:30 p.m.] great and mighty power, with tentacles extending all over the wide world, and with the command of great naval and military resources, she can come down upon those 130,000 Boers in the Transvaal and wipe them out. You see there is not much risk in it, and that is why we are going to her assistance. If there was much risk probably the Government would not be so eager to send 250 persons from Queensland to take part in this unjustifiable war. There was a good deal of talk indulged in by the Home Secretary to-night with respect to England as the paramount power in South Africa. Frederick Harrison furnishes the reply to that, and I earnestly commend it to the hon. gentleman's attention. He says—

To be the biggest and the strongest gives no title to a State to dictate, interfere, and coerce the internal



affairs of their small neighbours. If it did, what would become of Denmark, Holland, Belgium, Switzerland, Servia, and Roumania, Montenegro, and Greece? All the best traditions of British foreign policy have been centred in efforts to prevent the assertion by so-called paramount Powers of dominion over their weak neighbours.

The argument used by the hon. gentleman, was that because Great Britain is a strong power in South Africa she should exercise it in the direction of interfering in a matter which is purely a matter of domestic concern of the Boer people themselves. To aid in this domestic interference, at the points of bayonets and the muzzles of Maxim guns, we are asked to take some £32,000 out of the already depleted Treasury of Queensland, and to pay £1,500 a month for an indefinite period afterwards. That is to be our monetary contribution towards this swashbuckling campaign. I object to it and shall vote against it. I represent a constituency which has the most wretched water-supply in the country, which a public analyst has certified to be hardly fit for human consumption. And here we have a Government which will not provide the people of Clermont with a decent water-supply, which would not cost £1,000, but is prepared to spend from £30,000 to £50,000 in buccaneering and raiding the South African Republic. I say it is a scandalous waste of public money, and a crying public shame on the men who occupy the position they do on the Treasury benches. They pass by the needs of the people of Queensland, and filch from the public Treasury thousands of pounds to engage in a Quixotic expedition to bring about reform 10,000 miles away from the homes of the workers who are striving to build up Queensland and develop its resources, and who have to drink what is practically almost ditch-water. If President Kruger sent 250 of his Boer soldiers to try to obtain waterworks for some of our wretched country towns, or to get a vote for our 40,000 Uitlanders, would he be occupying a very different position from that assumed by this courageous Government? There is another point. I have used some very strong language with respect to hon. gentleman sitting on the opposite benches, and they deserve it, and I can only hope that it will bring them to their senses. But Frederick Harrison, in this article, calls the Liberal party at home "cowardly liberals." It is thus that they have shown their miserable spirit in this matter—

The country has been violently excited by the organised agents of the speculators and buccaneers. The Jingo boom runs strong, and public opinion has been debauched by swagger and lust of blood more deeply than in the memory of two generations. Official liberalism had not the nerve to face this rowdyism, to do what Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Bright, Mr. Forster, and others did of old. But what were Sir W. Harcourt and Mr. Morley doing? They had cut themselves free of party entanglements: they were free to speak out. A criminal war, destined, no doubt, to strain the Empire to its foundations, certain to embroil South Africa for a whole generation, is a thing more important than incense and candles in a church, more important, and certainly more urgent, than a biography of Mr. Gladstone. It is a pity that his followers should be writing about what Mr. Gladstone did, instead of helping to do what Mr. Gladstone would have done.

I wonder if Rhodes has any agents in this House. We know that every monopoly in the country has an agent here, that there is hardly a railway syndicate in the colony that has not its little agent in this Chamber. I should not be surprised to discover that the Rhodesian gang who raided the Transvaal under the leadership of that medical adventurer, Dr. Jamieson, and Mr. Cecil Rhodes, had their agents in this House, and there is no doubt that the jingo boom runs strong in this country, and that public opinion has been debauched both in the Chamber and in the country by

the lust of blood and the swagger of the hon. gentleman who leads this Government. He has tried to create an unhealthy tone in the public mind. He wants the public of Queensland to see the Transvaal difficulty through red spectacles, through a haze of blood. I have no doubt the music of battle is very gratifying to the ears of that hon. gentleman. It is a pity his love of "derring-do" does not induce him to lead this valiant contingent, and take his chance at the head of the column. But, no; he does his fighting by proxy, and some wretched substitutes are to do his fighting for him in the Transvaal at 4s. 6d. a day. I commend the words of Frederick Harrison to the serious consideration of hon. members before they vote on this question. We have heard a great deal during this discussion about Queen Victoria's reign. We are told that the present reign has been a peaceful one, but that is one of the grossest and most cold-blooded lies ever uttered by a jingo who tries to shed upon the reign a certain spurious glory. What are the facts? I find that during Her Majesty's reign, from 1837 to 1899, we have had between fifty and sixty wars, and we are now going to take part in another.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hardly see what a record of the wars of Her Majesty's reign has to do with the question before the House. The hon. member is going outside the reasonable limits of debate in introducing matters of that kind.

Mr. LESINA: I will deal very briefly with this, and simply say that some fifty or sixty wars have taken place from 1837 up to the present time. They have been waged in all parts of the world, have cost millions upon millions of money, and have led to the destruction of myriads of human lives. And I would remind hon. members that the British war vote for this year is over £40,000,000 for the army and navy, or nearly £1 per head for every man, woman, and child in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. Two shillings a head for education, and £1 a head for Maxim guns.

The PREMIER: You do not pay for it.

Mr. LESINA: Two shillings a head for putting in brains and £1 a head for knocking them out. I am not surprised at the Government's attitude, and I have no doubt that the persons on the other side who regard this war as a just and honourable war would feel a sense of bitter disappointment if by any accident the contending parties were to come to terms and the probability of war done away with. I am reminded, by-the-way, that during the evening I referred once or twice to drapers' assistants being among our force for the Transvaal. I find that I am wrong, and that not one solitary draper's assistant is going to the war.

The PREMIER: It will be brought against you.

Mr. LESINA: There are only about two drapers in the whole of my electorate, but it is out of consideration for the feelings of drapers that I correct my mistake. I do not believe, either, that a solitary grocer has volunteered. In reference to the method of recruiting which is being adopted, I should like to mention that in South Brisbane a man was approached the other day by a person who is likely to be in command of a company, who patted him on the shoulder and said, "Well, old man, I trust you will not disappoint us, and that you will see the Empire through?" Then he was actually invited to the nearest public-house, and he was informed that Britain required his services. He was actually put in this position that he felt that if he did not volunteer to take part in the war it would be turning dog on his old companion. I object to these means being adopted to induce members of the mounted infantry to volunteer for service.



We have also been told about the bond that ties us to the dear old mother land. I have heard that remark before. It is a familiar observation.

The PREMIER: What is your mother country?

Mr. LESINA: I may say that at nearly every public banquet I have attended it has been a regular thing for persons under the influence of wine to get up and, with very flushed faces, speak of the silken bonds that tie us to the dear old mother land, and, as the hon. member for Maryborough would say, "Dear old England." Well, what are the bonds which tie us to the old country? Are they not debenture bonds? Paper bonds and nothing more. I remember some time ago, when Abdul Hamid, the Sultan of Turkey, was ravishing the Christians of Armenia, dealing out death by means of his bloodthirsty myrmidons, who slaughtered men, women, and children, the Right Hon. William Ewart Gladstone stumped the principal towns of Great Britain trying to work up a feeling against that bloodthirsty Eastern despot, and the Government then in office, the same Government as at present, treated him with a certain amount of disdain. I remember that both the Radical and Conservative Press cried out for vengeance against Abdul Hamid; but did the agonised appeals of the wretched women, the dying groans of the massacred men, the piteous cries of the dying children, arouse any desire in the breast of the head of the Government to assist in preventing those horrors?

The PREMIER: They were not British subjects.

Mr. LESINA: Were they not fellow Christians appealing to a stronger power for assistance? Was the head of the Government appealed to by the Uitlanders of the Transvaal? Did they ask the hon. gentleman to send 250 fiery persons to help them? Did he receive any cable from them, and if so, why did he not lay it on the table of the House? We know nothing about appeals from Johannesburg from persons drawing £50 a month. The fact of the matter is that the Premier has been running this country on his own in the spirit of a South American autocrat. In South America persons who indulge in too much dictation generally meet the same fate as a person named Borda, who not long ago was physically and forcibly removed. I trust the hon. gentleman will not continue these tactics. If these Uitlanders had wired for assistance we should have known something about it, but they did not. The hon. gentleman has taken it upon himself, at the suggestion of certain military persons, to give assistance, and he has given it without consulting Parliament, and that is why the leader of the Opposition has tabled this amendment. He has done so in order to express disapprobation of the action of the Premier in taking upon himself without the authority of Parliament, to commit the country to an expenditure of £32,000, and £1,500 a month for an indefinite period of time. For that reason, and because I think this House should be taken into the confidence of the Government, because I think members of this Chamber should always be asked their opinion about any important matter of public policy, I shall vote for the amendment and against the motion of the hon. gentleman. I shall now close with one last point.

The PREMIER: Hear, hear!

Mr. LESINA: The hon. gentleman will no doubt be glad, for I have given him a warm half-hour.

The PREMIER: You talk the House out.

Mr. LESINA: I have noticed in this connection—and it is a matter to which attention has been drawn throughout the country—that hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches are quite content to draw their big salaries for administering the affairs of the country, but

whenever any real business is going on they go outside.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You drive them out.

Mr. LESINA: My one last point is this: It has been said, and it is a curious fact, that the only wise persons in this world are the persons who agree with us. Hon. gentlemen on the other side appear to think that they are the only wise persons, and the persons who agree with them support this vote. Members on the other side fancy we are pig-headed because we do not agree with them on this particular question. Of course we do not. Hon. gentlemen on the other side are resolute; hon. members on this side are pig-headed. What is resoluteness on the other side is pig-headedness on this side; what is idle curiosity on this side is simply evidence of an inquiring mind on the other side. If we want facts and information—

The PREMIER: You have facts enough. You distort them.

Mr. LESINA: I am not distorting facts. The position taken up by hon. gentlemen on that side—the impression they have created on my mind—is that hon. gentlemen on this side who disagree with them are bigoted, pig-headed, and obstinate. Yet we are just as much entitled to take our view on a national question of such importance as this as they are. We are doing that, and we are maintaining our right to do it. I trust that the right we have attempted to maintain by replying to the arguments and facts adduced by the other side will have the effect of creating in the public mind the impression that the action of the Government is not in keeping with the proper and honest government of a country like this.

The PREMIER: The question is: Do you want the volunteers to go or not?

Mr. LESINA: That is not the position. This, briefly, is the position: We, on this side, and hon. gentlemen on the other side also, disagree with the action of the Premier in pledging this country and this Parliament to a certain thing before he consulted them. If he is allowed to do this—if he is allowed to make this a precedent—he might go and do other things Parliament after Parliament, year after year, and session after session. It is not a correct thing, and it is not a thing we should allow him to do. He will next pledge the country, and its people, and its money, to take part in some other Quixotean thing in other parts of the world. He will probably make some treaty with the Japanese, or the Chinese, or the Philipinos, or some other race of people in some other part of the world. He will probably offer the loan of the warships lying on the placid bosom of the river here to America to settle the Philipinos. In fact, we shall have to keep a sharp eye on him, and if hon. members will only vote for the amendment, they will give him a deserved slap in the face for having had the impudence to pledge the credit of the colony to the Imperial Government and the lives of 250 of our fellow-citizens in carrying out a war about the merits of which this House has not formulated any opinion so far. That is the correct attitude hon. members must assume in voting on this question to-night. It is not a question of whether the contingent should go or not. The amendment says that while in sympathy, and expressing our loyalty to the Crown and throne, we disapprove of the action of the Premier in pledging the credit of the country and pawning the lives of 250 of our citizens and certain of our buckram heroes who are to lead them in the gory van of battle, without consulting Parliament first. That is the principle members are asked to vote for. They are asked

to express an opinion whether they believe or do not believe that the Premier was justified in the month of July—war has not started yet.

Mr. ANNEAR : Yes, it has started.

Mr. LESINA : Say it has started, it had not started four months ago, and, on his own responsibility—"dead on his own" as the saying is—

The PREMIER : Your arithmetic is faulty.

Mr. LESINA : It was in July that this thing first came to the front. The hon. gentleman, on his own initiative, practically conspired with a certain military person in this colony, who is in the pay of the country, to send 250 colonists away to the Transvaal. He fixed it up himself. He took it on himself to wire to Mr. Chamberlain, telling him not to be scared about the Boers. That was four months ago when there was no necessity for war any more than there was practically yesterday, and he asks Parliament to vote this money. Even if Parliament does vote the money before the House rises, or even if it does not vote the money, it ought to administer a slap in the face to the hon. gentleman for what he has done. I trust hon. members will keep that point well in view, for if we justify him in doing that, we may find in recess that he will be offering some shipping company about £20,000 and somebody else the loan of the warboats, and saying it is repudiation if we do not back him up. We must set our feet firmly down on any policy of that kind. If the leader is going to take into his hands the whole government of the country, and take charge of the Treasury and of the lives of our citizens, Parliament will be a farce ; and we had better let him administer the country as a benevolent dictator.

MEMBERS on the Opposition side : Hear, hear !

Mr. COWLEY : I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Question put and passed ; and resumption of debate made an order for Tuesday next.

#### PAPER.

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

Return of approved applications for agricultural (conditional and unconditional) and grazing farms and grazing homesteads under the Crown Lands Acts, 1884 to 1895, in each district in the colony, for the years 1885 to 1898 inclusive, showing the total areas and rents paid thereon.

The House adjourned at fifty-eight minutes past 10 o'clock.