

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 17 OCTOBER 1899

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

TUESDAY, 17 OCTOBER, 1899.

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

PAPERS.

The following papers, laid on the table, were ordered to be printed:—

Despatch, dated 4th August, 1899, respecting trade relations between Great Britain and the German Empire.

Further correspondence respecting future administration of British New Guinea.

Fifteenth annual report of the Hydraulic Engineer on water supply.

Report of the transactions under the Agricultural Lands Purchase Act of 1894.

In substitution for the return laid upon the table the 28th of September last, return to an Order relative to guarantees for the proposed extension of the Bowen railway, made by the House on motion of Mr. R. H. Smith on the 14th of September last.

Return to an order relative to Crown lands fronting the Brisbane made by the House on motion of the Hon. E. B. Forrest, on the 4th instant.

Further correspondence respecting the adoption by the Legislative Council of Address to the Queen praying for establishment of the Commonwealth.

FEDERATION.

PRESENTATION OF ADDRESS TO THE QUEEN.

The SPEAKER reported that he had this day presented to His Excellency the Administrator of the Government the Address to Her Majesty the Queen, agreed to by the House on the 4th instant, for transmission to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, with a request that the Right Honourable Lord Lamington, Governor of Queensland, may be permitted to personally submit it to Her Majesty; and that His Excellency has been pleased to make the following reply:—

“MR. SPEAKER,

“It affords me very great pleasure to receive the Address of the Legislative Assembly, and to be the medium of transmitting it for Her Majesty's royal consideration.

"It will also give me much pleasure to communicate to the Secretary of State for the Colonies the request of the Legislative Assembly that His Excellency Lord Lamington, Governor of Queensland, may be permitted to personally submit the Address to Her Majesty.

"S. W. GRIFFITH,
"Administrator.

"17th October, 1899."

QUESTIONS.

EMPLOYMENT OF ALIENS IN CENTRAL MILLS.

Mr. BROWNE (*Croydon*) asked the Treasurer—

1. Is it true that twenty Japanese are employed at the Mulgrave Central Mill?
2. Also that a number of other coloured aliens are employed there?
3. If so, will he take steps to put an end to the employment of coloured aliens in central mills, as promised by Sir Thos. McIlwraith in 1893?

The TREASURER (Hon. R. Philp, *Townsville*) replied—

1. No.
2. Six Malays and six Japanese are employed at the cane-carrier; six Malays clean out triple effects.
3. The employment of coloured aliens in sugar mills is discouraged by every means in the power of the Government.

EXPENDITURE ON GOLD OR MINERAL FIELDS.

Mr. JACKSON (*Kennedy*) asked the Secretary for Mines—

What is the total amount actually expended by the various Queensland Governments for—

1. Rewards for the discovery of gold or mineral fields?
2. Prospecting purposes?
3. Deep sinking?
4. Schools of Mines or Mining Institutes?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. R. Philp) replied—

1. £0,750.
2. £20,384 18s. 8d.
3. £28,191 14s. 5d.
4. £1,067 8s. 7d.

ACTS RELATING TO UNEMPLOYED.

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*) asked the Attorney-General—

1. Will he ascertain whether the Acts of 43 Elizabeth, Chapters, 2, 3; Charles I., Chapters 4, 14; Charles II., Chapter 12; and 12 Anne, Chapter 18, are in force in the colony of Queensland?
2. Is he aware that these Acts empower local authorities to start manufactories, and acquire land in the interests of the unemployed, and open stores for the sale of the manufactured articles and the produce of the farms, also in the interests of the unemployed?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. A. Rutledge, *Maranoa*) replied—

1. The honourable member has not sufficiently identified the Acts of the reigns of Charles I. and Charles II. to enable me to accurately answer the question with respect to them. The Acts of the reigns of Elizabeth and Anne are not in force in this colony.
2. I am aware that so many of the Acts specified as I can identify did deal with matters mentioned in the question.

THE TRANSVAAL CONTINGENT.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE—WANT OF CONFIDENCE MOTION.

On the Order of the Day being read for the resumption of the adjourned debate on the Premier'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. COWLEY (*Herbert*): In rising to say a few words on this question, I will deal first of all with the amendment proposed by the senior member for Charters Towers, Mr. Dawson. It appears to me that the hon. member, in moving his amendment, has taken a very extraordinary course of proceeding. I think had he been sincere in wishing to censure the Government for their action in undertaking to send a contingent from Queensland to accompany the British troops to the Transvaal—had he been sincere in his desire to censure them for doing an unconstitutional action—he should and would have taken the earliest opportunity of proposing this vote of censure, and not have allowed it to remain until now.

MEMBERS on Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. COWLEY: The Government took the first opportunity of bringing the matter before the House in the Opening Speech of His Excellency, and when he debated the Address in Reply he should have stated his determination to have brought forward this motion; or, to be strictly within the proper procedure, if he had believed it was an unconstitutional act, he should have moved an amendment on the Address in Reply, and not have allowed it to go on the voices without the slightest demur.

Mr. McDONALD: The Premier knows why that was not done.

Mr. COWLEY: Perhaps the hon. member is referring to a treaty which was said to have been entered into by the Premier and certain members on the Opposition side, and which those hon. members have since denied.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: The federation question. The federal spirit.

Mr. COWLEY: However, as we have passed the Address in Reply, in which we have stated that every subject mentioned in it will receive the earnest consideration of this House, I think the hon. member has taken a most extraordinary proceeding in moving this vote of censure at the present time. There has been nothing said by any hon. member—there have been no arguments brought forward—to prove that this is an unconstitutional action on the part of the Premier. The only member who touched on it was the hon. member for Enoggera, Mr. Drake, and all he said on the question was that it would be an unconstitutional act on the part of the Government to offer the Defence Force of this colony, or to command the Defence Force of this colony, as a Defence Force, to proceed to the Transvaal; but the difference between the action of the Premier and the contention of the hon. member

is that the Government have not in any way sought to induce or compel men of the Defence Force to leave this colony to fight in South Africa, but have simply, at the request of certain members of the force who have volunteered for service, agreed to accept their services and send them, if this House so approve. Therefore no one has touched on the constitutional question, and no arguments have been brought forward to show that the Government in this respect have acted in an unconstitutional manner.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: You show now that they have.

Mr. COWLEY: How can I reply to arguments that have not been adduced? It is not my custom, as it is the custom of some hon. members, to put up aunt sallies and knock them down. I am here to refute any arguments I think of sufficient importance which have been brought to bear on the question by members on the other side.

Mr. GIVENS: Can you refute them?

Mr. COWLEY: I cannot refute arguments that have never been brought forward. It seems to me that a great deal too much has been made out of this question, though no arguments have been brought forward to show that the action of the Government is unconstitutional. Things have been done and money has been expended by the Government in instances very similar to this.

Mr. DUNSFORD: Two wrongs don't make a right.

Mr. COWLEY: Money has been spent out of session, and has been sanctioned when Parliament has met. In 1896-7, if hon. members will refer to the Supplementary Estimates, they will find that on that occasion a sum of between £200 and £300 was spent by this Government to bring back men who had left our shores and gone to Paraguay. Those men appealed to the Government, stating that they were in a destitute condition; they had been misled by men who should have known a great deal better; they had gone to a country which they believed was flowing with milk and honey, and they found that instead of flowing with milk and honey it was a land in which they had to suffer privations which could not possibly have existed in a country like this.

Mr. LESINA: That is what the immigrants who come here find.

Mr. COWLEY: What did the Government do? Directly they found those men—men who were British subjects, and former residents of Australia—directly they found that those men were labouring under those disabilities and disadvantages in Paraguay—without consulting Parliament, they spent the money which brought them back to these shores. Then they came to this House and stated what they had done, and the money was immediately voted by this House without the slightest demur. In another case, over £800 was spent by the Government during that year without the consent of Parliament, and was afterwards approved by this House also without demur. A number of our Defence Force was sent to England to compete at Bisley. Over £1,000 was spent, and not the slightest objection was ever raised by hon. members on that side, who now assert that the Government have acted in an unconstitutional manner.

Mr. DUNSFORD: That only shows that we have been drifting.

Mr. COWLEY: Whether we have been drifting or not, if this is unconstitutional, to a great extent the Government are justified in their action by the unanimous consent of the House given on those occasions in which money was expended without the consent of Parliament.

It is not the amount of money spent which constitutes an unconstitutional action, it is the principle, and if this is an unconstitutional action the members on the other side are accessory and are equally to blame with the Government, because they on two occasions allowed the Government to pass votes on the Estimates to indemnify them for moneys expended, and on this occasion during the debate on the Address in Reply they never raised the slightest objection.

Mr. STEPHENSON: Circumstances alter cases.

Mr. COWLEY: It is true that the senior member for Charters Towers stated that he would oppose any sum placed on the Estimates for this purpose, and that I could easily understand as a legitimate course of procedure, but to come now and introduce this amendment censuring the Government for the action they have taken, is an unwarrantable action on the part of the hon. member, and will not hold water.

Mr. DAWSON: I apologise.

Mr. COWLEY: The only difference between the two cases is this: In one instance the money was actually expended; in this instance no money has been expended, and if Parliament is of opinion that the Premier has acted unconstitutionally they can flatly refuse, as has been done in other instances, to expend the money. From my point of view there has been no unconstitutional act on the part of the Government. I believe it is absolutely necessary that the Executive of this House—the Government of this country—should, whenever occasion demands, act promptly on their own initiative, without first consulting this House, unless we are in session. If the House is in session and they can lay their propositions before the House they are in duty bound to do so, but when the House is not sitting, and emergencies arise such as this, any members of the Ministry who would sit supinely by and not take the action necessary, I for one would flatly refuse to follow them; and on this occasion, instead of censuring the Government for their action, I must applaud them for doing what is not only right and just, but for setting an example which has been followed by the other colonies.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. COWLEY: Now, Sir, so far as I can understand from the speeches of the leader of the Labour Opposition, and from the utterances of those who have spoken after him on his side, they do not treat it as a constitutional question, but they object to the action itself.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

MEMBERS of the Opposition: No, no!

Mr. COWLEY: The leader of the Labour Opposition stated, when he rose to reply to the Chief Secretary, that it gave him as much pleasure to oppose this motion, as it did the hon. member to propose it.

Mr. DAWSON: I could only speak once. The Premier spoke three times.

Mr. COWLEY: Hon. members on the other side do not so much object to this question on constitutional grounds, as to the proposed action in sending men to assist the British Empire at this juncture. I cannot understand that objection coming from any man who has enjoyed the civil and political liberties such as are enjoyed by hon. members on the opposite side of the House, and by every man in Queensland.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear hear!

Mr. LESINA: And largely won by agitators, too.

Mr. COWLEY: Whether they were won by agitators or not, that is the fact. The leader of the Labour Opposition stated—and repeated the statement afterwards when attention was drawn to the matter—that the Uitlanders in the South African Republic had greater privileges than foreigners coming into this country. I am sorry indeed to think that any hon. member who enjoys the privilege of sitting in this House, and all the civil, religious, and political privileges that we do enjoy, should make such a statement as that.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. COWLEY: Directly a foreigner comes to our shores and wishes to become naturalised, he can do so.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: No. He must be here six months.

Mr. COWLEY: No. If I am wrong I am subject to correction, but I have it on the authority of a legal member of this House that if any European alien comes to our shores he can be naturalised in twenty-four hours. But an Asiatic alien has to reside in this colony six months and be married before he can be naturalised. But it is immaterial whether it is twenty-four or six months. Any man coming from a European country, or from the United States, who wishes to exchange his nationality, can within a reasonable time, and without any harsh conditions, become naturalised as a subject of Queensland, and from that moment he is entitled to all the privileges which any British-born subject is entitled to who arrives in this colony at the same time.

Mr. GLASSEY: He can do so the day after he arrives, but he cannot vote till six months after.

Mr. COWLEY: I thank the hon. member for Bundaberg for that remark, as I wish to emphasise the distinction. I do not think there is anything so liberal as this in any country in the world, certainly not outside the British possessions. The hon. the leader of the Labour Opposition also stated that the Uitlanders laboured under no disabilities.

Mr. DAWSON: I contended that they laboured under no burdensome disabilities.

Mr. COWLEY: The hon. member's statements are not borne out by facts. In the Transvaal no man is allowed to become a burgher until he has taken the oath of allegiance. But that is not the difficulty in the way at all. The real difficulty is that so ably pointed out by the hon. member for Lockyer—namely, the fourteen years' term of residence and other harassing conditions. It is not the question of taking the oath. There are men in the Transvaal and in the Orange Free State whom I know well, who became burghers after only having resided there two years. They went there as young men, attracted to that country by the love of sport; they took the oath of allegiance, married, and took up land, and these men will be found fighting in the ranks of the Boers against the British. At that time there was no great difficulty in obtaining the franchise. The Orange Free State was anxious to get foreigners to settle there. They were not so anxious to get Englishmen as Scotchmen, because they regarded them as a conquered race, like themselves, and "a fellow-feeling makes us wondrous kind." No man who has been travelling in the Transvaal for more than a day or two would think of calling himself an Englishman, if he wished for hospitality. If he came to a house there and was asked what his nationality was, and he said he was an Englishman, he would be told that the next house was not very far away, though it might be twenty miles distant; but if a Scotchman or a

Russian came along he would be treated with the greatest liberality, and would be most royally entertained, because he is regarded as the hereditary foe of the hated English.

Mr. KEOGH: Where do my countrymen come in?

Mr. COWLEY: I have no doubt that they would be very pleased to receive the countrymen of the hon. member, if he was among them. They would probably sympathise with each other. Now, Sir, I am not quoting fables or from newspapers, but I am speaking from personal experience, and no doubt the junior member for Charters Towers will bear me out when I say that all throughout the Transvaal, for many years past—in fact ever since the Boers settled there—there has been the strongest antipathy to the English.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: No antipathy to Australia.

Mr. COWLEY: No; to Englishmen. Even the Free Staters themselves who came to live in the Transvaal, unless things have altered during

the last twelve months, labour un-
[4 p.m.] der the same exclusive conditions as other Uitlanders. They complained, and a conference was held to consider the disabilities under which the Free Staters laboured. Simply on account of residing there for twelve months, or even for six months, they were "commandeered," and compelled to fight for the Transvaal. I am not altogether certain about the alteration which was made, but I know that a conference was held, and the Transvaalers have made some difference in favour of the burghers of the Orange Free State. There is no doubt that—not so much throughout the Orange Free State, but throughout the Transvaal—there is a burning, intense, and increasing hatred of the British, and that has gone on accumulating to such an extent—

Mr. LESINA: The British millionaire.

Mr. COWLEY: Against the British, and more particularly against the English. That has now got to such a point that the question is not of the franchise; it is not a question of trial by jury, but it is a question of the supremacy of the British in South Africa.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. COWLEY: The way in which the British have been treated in the South African Republic has emboldened the Dutch colonists in Cape Colony and Natal to try and shake off British rule, and connive and join with the Transvaalers; and now what do we see there? We see that the country is teeming with traitors. England has been so lenient towards the Transvaal—they have allowed them to go on in their own evil courses, that they have dictated to the British subjects there, and treated them with scorn, contumely, and contempt—until at last the Dutch colonists in the Cape and Natal have been so emboldened that they have actually now declared in many instances that they will fight for the Boers against the British—although they have eaten their salt for years, although they have lived under British rule, have received every consideration, and have had representatives in both Houses of Parliament.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: They have got the rule now.

Mr. COWLEY: They have been treated in exactly the same manner as the British-born subjects.

Mr. STEWART: What is their proportion to the population?

Mr. COWLEY: Any interjection which the hon. member makes to elicit information I shall be very pleased to answer. I will answer that

in a few minutes. What I want to point out is that the question now is one of British supremacy in South Africa. The Transvaal has treated British subjects in such a manner that the Dutch colonists, who have hitherto lived in peace, happiness, quietness, and contentment under British rule, are now rising to shake off that British rule in the hope that the Dutch rule will be supreme, that the British will be driven into the sea, and that Great Britain will lose entire possession of the whole of South Africa. To show that this is so, I will just read an extract from a speech made in the Transvaal by the Rev. Mr. Vorster, of the Dutch Reformed Church, at Burgersdorp. There was a meeting called to consider the question which has now arisen and whether the Boers should fight, and the minister of the Dutch Reformed Church said this—

He did not believe England desired to make war, for she had not enough men to conquer the Transvaal. It might be a bloody war; it might last for years; but the Transvaal and the Free State could raise 80,000 men, and to conquer these, England would need a force of 150,000. Where would she get ships enough to convey such an army? Where horses, and where provisions? England's threat was only a threat—the talk of a man with an unloaded gun. One hundred Transvaalers would shoot 1,000 Englishmen dead. (Loud applause.) All their Maxims would not take the Transvaal.

Another man speaking at the same meeting said—

He prayed to the Almighty that the day might come when the whole of Afrikanderdom would be freed from the foreign yoke.

The question is one of the supremacy of the British forces in South Africa, or the supremacy of the Boer.

Mr. DAWSON: In the Transvaal—not in South Africa.

Mr. COWLEY: In South Africa. In South Africa, as you all know, there is another element which has to be taken into consideration—and that is the native element. Under British rule the native population have thriven to an enormous extent. Under the Dutch rule it is just the reverse. Within the sphere of British influence in South Africa there are probably between 2,000,000 and 3,000,000 natives—that is including the Zulus, the Tongos, the Zwazis, the Griquas, Mosheshi's people, the Basutos, Khama's people, the Natal Kaffirs, and the natives who are settled in the Cape.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: And the Hottentot.

Mr. COWLEY: It is a very hard matter to find a pure-bred Hottentot now. He is like the missing link—very hard to find; but there are between 2,000,000 and 3,000,000 natives within the sphere of British influence, to say nothing of the natives of Rhodesia—I leave them out entirely. Those people are all watching the course of events. They have thriven under British rule. I may say, so far as Natal is concerned, that when Great Britain annexed Natal there were only between 3,000 and 4,000 of a native population, but since that time the native population has increased to over 500,000—many of them refugees from the Transvaal, from the Orange River Free State, and from the Zulu country, driven there by the ill-treatment which they have received at the hands of their conquerors or their hereditary chiefs.

Hon. G. THORN: Have they got the franchise?

Mr. COWLEY: In Natal many of them have the franchise. In Natal there are two laws. The Roman-Dutch law is the law of the land. When we annexed Natal we even allowed the Boer law to remain in force, and it is in force up to the present day. The common law of the land is the Roman-Dutch law. Great Britain saw that if they were to conciliate these people, and induce them to settle down in their

midst, and not carry on a rambling nomadic life, we should make them certain concessions, and one of the concessions was that we should retain their law intact, and that the common law of England should have no effect in that country. The only law which overrides it is the statute law of the country. Under the Roman-Dutch law the Kaffirs have not got a vote, but the statute law of Natal makes provision for their obtaining one. There is also in force in Natal the Kaffir law, in order to, as nearly as possible, mete out equal justice to the Kaffirs, and the administrators of that law try almost all offences, with the exception of murder, under native law. But if a Kaffir native, or a refugee, desires to come from under the native law and elect to be treated under the Roman-Dutch law he can do so, and is then entitled to the franchise. There is no distinction made—whether a man has a black skin, or is an Englishman, or a Dutchman, so long as he has the necessary qualification he is allowed the franchise. This question is one of far greater moment than the hon. member for Charters Towers imagines, or he would never talk of the puny Boer having to contend with the might and power of Great Britain. This is a question of far greater significance, for if the Dutch become the paramount power in South Africa, the whole of those natives will be treated in the same way as previous to the advent of the British, when they were treated in the most diabolical manner. The British would not allow them to be retained as slaves, and when slavery was abolished they would not allow them to be treated as dogs and not as men. In the Constitution of the Transvaal, which is a written constitution, there is an article dealing with this very question, and in no case have the Boers treated the natives as human beings. If the Boer become supreme these people will be treated by them, as they have been treated heretofore, and what will be the result? The same as in days gone by, that the whole country will be in a state of turmoil, in a state of war from year's end to year's end; there will be rebellions on every hand, and ultimately, unless some superior power comes in, as the English came in previously, the Dutch will be annihilated and wiped out in their turn, because they will not be able to conquer and subdue the whole of those tribes now after they have enjoyed liberty and freedom under British rule. But there is another thing that we should take into consideration, and that is why has the Free State interfered? What right has the Free State to interfere? It is simply because they are of the same flesh and blood as the Boers, and because they have been maltreated by the British, or interfered with in any shape or form.

Mr. GIVENS: They are bound by their own interests to interfere.

Mr. COWLEY: No; if they studied their own interests they would be on the side of the British.

Mr. GIVENS: Yes, and be gobbled up.

Mr. COWLEY: The Free State has been protected by the British right from its very existence up to the present time. At one time it was a British possession, and while the British ruled there the Roman-Dutch law remained in force, and educational establishments were set up which exist to the present time, and which are greatly valued by the settlers. But a time came when the Colonial Office were of opinion that they had too many possessions, and they determined to give up the Orange Free State. The very Boers who are now taking up arms against the British, or their ancestors, then sent a deputation with a petition to the Imperial Government begging and entreating them not to

leave them to the tender mercies of the natives of the country. But unfortunately the British statesmen then at the head of affairs did not see the value of their colonies, and the deputation and the petition had no effect. And what was the result? They were attacked by the natives, and the British interfered again, and fought the Basutos, who were a very warlike people, and protected the settlers. They behaved in a most friendly way towards them, and there has been no dispute between them. The only dispute of any importance, so far as I am aware, that has arisen was as to the ownership of the diamond fields. Some hon. member stated that the Orange Free State was robbed of those fields; but as a matter of fact they were not. In 1868 and 1869 the diamond fields were a barren wilderness; there was little game there, and very few people traversed that part of the country, because there was nothing to see and nothing to shoot. There were only a few people living there, and they belonged to a tribe called the Griquas, some under one chief called Waterboor and others under another chief called Adam Koch. When the diamond fields broke out—I am led to this because the other evening hon. members opposite advocated arbitration—when the diamond fields broke out there were four claimants for the country. The Cape Government claimed it as an integral portion of Cape Colony, the Orange Free State claimed it, Waterboor claimed it, and the Transvaal claimed it.

Mr. LESINA: And now the Jews have got it.

Mr. COWLEY: I should advise the hon. member to go there, because I am sure they will recognise him as one of themselves and welcome him into their midst. When the Government of Cape Colony saw that there were all these claimants, and that the country could not belong to all of them, instead of fighting over the question, they submitted it to arbitration, and the arbitrator awarded it to Waterboor. The Government of Cape Colony afterwards bought it from the Griqua chief, and it is now a province of Cape Colony. Why, I ask, has the Orange Free State joined the Transvaal? It is not because they have any quarrel with Great Britain, or any quarrel with the British in South Africa; it is not because they labour under any disabilities; and it is not because their country is overrun with Uitlanders, as they have always welcomed them. At the present time a very large percentage of the Free State burghers are people of British extraction, and the President of the Free State married a Scotch lady. And there are thousands of settlers in the Free State who are greatly averse to the action President Steyn has taken in this case.

Mr. GIVENS: How do you know?

Mr. COWLEY: The hon. member has asked a very pertinent question. I know this because I have relatives living there who are in constant communication with me, and because every week I receive papers from South Africa, both from the Free State and from the Transvaal, and I think I am capable of forming a correct conclusion on the matter.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. COWLEY: That is the reason why I know, and that is the reason why I speak on this question. Why, I again ask, has the Free State joined the Transvaal? It is not because the people there are labouring under any disabilities, but simply because they are determined if possible to drive the British out of South Africa, and to proclaim the whole of South Africa a Boer Republic. That is the reason. The senior member for Charters Towers uses as one argument against this motion that it is cowardly for Queensland to send troops to assist the British

Empire to fight the Boers. This is a question of far greater magnitude than he says it is. It is not a question of fighting the Transvaal only. It is a question of fighting every Boer, and every man of Dutch extraction in South Africa. For months past the Boers residing on the boundaries of Natal have been receiving weapons and ammunition from the Transvaal. For months past intrigue has been carried on by the Boers, and these people have openly threatened that when the Boers rise they will join with them, the same as they did in 1881, when the Transvaal acquired its independence—they will again join them and do their utmost to wipe out the hated British. I say that upon this occasion I must congratulate the Government upon the stand they have taken. When I come to think of the traitorous conduct and the treachery that exists in the Cape and in Natal at the present time, I say that the action of the Australian colonies will do a great deal to show the authorities in the Cape that Great Britain and the British possessions are not to be trifled with.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. COWLEY: It will show the feeling of the British throughout the whole of the British Empire. I believe that if the truth was known—and the truth will come out some day.

Mr. STEWART: Hear, hear!

Mr. COWLEY: It will be found that the action of the British possessions, in so nobly offering to assist Great Britain on the present occasion, has had a very great deal to do with the action of Mr. Schreiner and Mr. Jan Hoffmeyer in backing down and retreating from the position they had taken up. I do not wish to prophesy, and I do not intend to prophesy, but I believe that when the history of this affair is written, after peace is restored—and I hope to see the whole of the South Africans living in unity and peace before very long—I believe we shall find that the authorities in the Cape—not in Natal, where they are quite a different class of men—I believe we shall find that the authorities in the Cape, the men now in power, men of education and high standing, men who have received every consideration from the British Government, and for whom the British Government have done everything they possibly could to show that there was no estrangement from them; that they were as much to them as their own natural born subjects—I say that when this history comes to be written I believe we shall find that the Boers in the Transvaal and in the Free State have been guided to a very great extent in their action at the present time by promises of support from the very men who should have done their utmost to show them that they are wrong.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. LESINA: Is that a prophecy?

Mr. COWLEY: I have told the hon. member that I had no wish to prophesy, but I say that is my firm belief, and I have formed that belief after carefully scanning and studying everything I could possibly read on the subject.

Mr. LESINA: The political prophet is very often a dead loss.

Mr. COWLEY: Seeing that that is the case, I ask this House are we doing an unwise thing in sending this contingent over to assist our fellow-subjects of the Empire?

Mr. STEWART: Yes.

Mr. COWLEY: Are we doing an unwise thing to assist our fellow-colonists in Natal?

Mr. STEWART: Yes.

Mr. COWLEY: Those men will join the British forces, and will fight side by side with the British soldiers as citizens of the British Empire.

I say that hon. members on the Opposition side might take a leaf out of New Zealand's book at the present juncture. Hon. members opposite are very ready indeed, almost too ready, to quote New Zealand precedents. I would ask them on this occasion to follow the New Zealand precedent.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. FISHER: You always say they are bad.

Mr. COWLEY: The hon. member is mistaken. I say we can learn a great deal from New Zealand, and we are learning a great deal. I feel assured that when hon. members come to consider the position in which we are now they will act a good, loyal, and a patriotic part on this occasion, and will vote for the resolution. I am certain that on the opposite side of the House hon. members will not be actuated by the same small, paltry, petty spirit which has actuated their leader, the senior member for Charters Towers. I feel assured that there is not a single member in this House but that hon. member who would say that the men of our Defence Force who have volunteered to fight the Boers on this occasion are "curs, cowards, and washbucklers." I do not suppose there is a solitary member on either side of the House who will get up and echo that statement, or say that he believes it to be true.

Mr. KERR: You do not know.

Mr. COWLEY: I do not, and I should be sorry to think there is one.

Mr. JENKINSON: That statement has been repudiated by some on this side.

Mr. COWLEY: Yes, but I want to go further and say that I cannot for a moment believe that there is a single solitary member on the Opposition side, with the exception of the hon. member who poses as their leader, who would make such a statement in this House. I am sure there is not one other who would make it or who would glory in having made it, as the hon. member has done.

Mr. LESINA: Does the making of that statement justify you in cutting Boer throats?

Mr. COWLEY: Unfortunately in the age in which we live these disputes cannot be settled without resorting to the sword. I for one regret exceedingly that there is any necessity for it.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: No, you don't.

Mr. COWLEY: Yes, I do.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: You don't talk that way.

Mr. COWLEY: I regret exceedingly that there should be any necessity for sending this contingent. Whose fault is it that the contingent is sent?

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Dickson's!

Mr. COWLEY: It is not the fault of the British Government. No Government on the face of the earth, no power on earth, would have dealt so liberally, so dispassionately, and so generously with the Boer as Great Britain has done.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. STEWART: Nonsense!

Mr. COWLEY: If they had been dealing with Germany or Russia they would have been stamped out long ago.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. COWLEY: Not long ago a party of Boers trekked into German territory in West Africa, but they were not there three months before they left. They found the treatment there quite different from that they received under British rule. They would not remain there, and although it had cost them a large sum of money and they had trekked a long distance with their wives and families, not a solitary member of that trek settled in German territory. They

were only too happy to get under their own or under British rule again. No Government would have acted so leniently or so generously with the Boers as the British Government has done. They asked them to consider and reconsider the various questions in dispute; they have held conferences, and done their utmost to induce them to arrive at a peaceful solution of the trouble. No troops were sent by Great Britain into Cape Colony or Natal until it could be seen clearly and distinctly that the Boers were only waiting for the Free State to join before they commenced hostilities.

Mr. STEWART: They refused arbitration all the time.

Mr. COWLEY: Only on one point, and on that point their refusal to arbitrate would be justified by every civilised power.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: What point is that?

Mr. COWLEY: The question of suzerainty. I think I have shown that this is a much greater question than some hon. members appear to think, that it is a question of British supremacy in South Africa. I should like to say a few words before I sit down on the question as to whether the Boers of the Transvaal are fit persons to govern either the Transvaal or any other civilised portion of the country.

Mr. STEWART: Oh dear, oh dear!

Mr. McDONALD: Are you an authority upon that question?

Mr. COWLEY: I do not know whether I am an authority, but having known the Boer for many years before I came to this country, and having weekly communication with South Africa, and having perused many English and Dutch papers—Dutch papers printed in English; I do not read Dutch—having read many papers printed in the interests of Dutch government, I am, I think, fairly capable of forming an opinion on the matter. I say the Boers are not capable of governing a civilised community, and they are not fit even to govern a savage community. In no instance have the Dutch in South Africa done anything to enlighten, to educate, or to lift the savage races out of the position in which they found them. Their one rule of those people has been taken from the Old Testament, and they have subjugated the black sons of Ham, and have treated them as slaves. They could not treat them as slaves in the Cape after the British liberated them. At that time, though there were not a great many Boers in the country, they had over 36,000 slaves. When they could no longer treat them as slaves in the Cape, they trekked away, and now they treat the savages who come under them to all intents and purposes as if they were slaves.

They are not capable in this age [4:30 p.m.] of civilisation of dealing with the natives of the country. In Natal

and the Cape every consideration has been shown to the savages. Their own laws and customs have been respected, and they have been allowed to retain them wherever possible. Locations have been given to them, so that no one could interfere with them, and any Kaffir who lives on a location can enjoy his own customs and act with perfect freedom, so long as he does not break the laws of the land. But in the Transvaal it is just the reverse. What has the Transvaal Boer done for the men who have come there to develop the country? Hon. members say they never wanted them to come. Probably they did not, but no power on earth can stop men of a civilised community from going into that country if they wish to do so. It is a recognised principle in these days that there should be freedom of intercourse between civilised powers, and no one but the Boers would attempt to restrict that principle. Enormous sums of money have been spent in the development of the country, and

the Boers have done everything in their power to retard settlement and impede progress; and they have in no way endeavoured to inculcate a right and proper spirit amongst the people who have gone to that country. Instead of doing everything in their power to allay the hostile feeling which exists on the part of the ignorant Boers, the powers that be have encouraged them; they have refused all civil redress to the British inhabitants of the country, and, in fact, have thrown every obstacle they could think of in their way. If they had shown the slightest inclination to be reasonable, and remove many of the disabilities which now exist, the present serious state of affairs could not have come about. But they have done nothing whatever in that direction. They have patrolled the country. When men have met together to discuss burning questions, they have broken up their meetings. When people have ventilated their grievances in a reasonable manner in the public Press, they have seized the press and imprisoned the editors. Only last week I got a letter dated 8th September, in which I was informed that one editor had to flee from arrest, and another was arrested on a charge of high treason.

Mr. McDONALD: How are the editors of papers in India treated?

Mr. COWLEY: After that man was arrested for high treason the Boers were so ashamed of their action, having failed to prove the charge, that they formulated another charge. Only last August Reuter's agent was arrested for sending a cablegram to Great Britain announcing that it was rumoured that the Boer commandants were being called together. He was brought up under the Press law—one of the most iniquitous that has ever been passed in any country—and fined £100. This state of things exists in a country alongside of another country where the Boers' fellow-countrymen are receiving every privilege which can possibly be enjoyed by any British subject in the world; and if they would only reciprocate and treat Englishmen who have flocked to the Transvaal in a reasonable, just, and impartial manner—treat them as friends and not as enemies—there is not the slightest doubt that there would have been no disaffection, and the ultimate destiny of the country would have been that the whole of the South African States would have federated under the British flag. But the treatment which has been meted out to Englishmen, and indeed to all settlers, has been such that no civilised power could possibly stand and maintain its honour and prestige. A crisis has now arrived when Great Britain must interfere or else lose her entire possessions in South Africa. To show that the Boers are not entitled to rule as a civilised nation, I would just draw attention to this fact: I have with me a copy of the *Pretoria Free Press*, dated 19th August, which contains a report of the revision of the Constitution by the Boers, and article 74 of the Constitution now reads thus—

In case of war, rebellion, or other cases of grave danger, the State President may, in consultation with the Commandant-General, and with the consent of the Executive Council, have martial law proclaimed, and every inhabitant without distinction is then compelled to lend aid in defence of the State.

Mr. LESINA: That is the law of nations.

Mr. COWLEY: It is not the law of nations. It is not the law of any civilised country that every inhabitant shall be called upon, no matter whether man, woman, or child to fight against their own country. If two powers are fighting against each other, and there are subjects of each in the respective countries, they never compel those men to take up arms against their own country.

Mr. KIDSTON: Every man in Queensland is subject to military service.

Mr. COWLEY: Every British subject may be, but not every man. That is the difference. I say if people pass a law like that it shows that they are utterly unfit to govern a civilised country, and I say that if the senior member for Charters Towers, Mr. Dawson, who contends that Englishmen in the Transvaal are suffering under no disabilities, would go and live in that country for two or three years—

Mr. DAWSON: Did I not correct that statement before? I never said "no disabilities."

Mr. COWLEY: "No burdensome disabilities" I believe the hon. member said, and I contend that if he went and lived in that country for twelve months or two years he would be one of the very first to agitate against the disabilities our countrymen are suffering under, and he would never rest content until he had obtained redress. Here is article 109 of the revised constitution of the Boers—

The law regulates the constitution of the army (krysmacht), and the cases in which, and the manner in which it, or a portion thereof, can be called up. The law can also compel inhabitants who are not burghers, and also coloured people, to co-operate in the maintenance of the independence of the Republic, in the defence of the territory, or the suppression of rebellions and disturbances.

Now, I am happy to say that all the members of the Volksraad are not mean, narrow-minded, men like a majority of them. There are some among them who can form a fair notion of what is right and what is wrong, and who are not afraid to express their opinions. I still quote from the Pretoria Press, which gives a fair digest of what actually took place in the local Parliament.

Mr. FISHER: Is that a paper published in the British interests?

Mr. COWLEY: No; it is not. I can show the hon. member that it is in the confidence of the Government, and where the Government are constantly giving it information—

Mr. LOVEDAY warned the Raad to be careful with this article. If the article were adopted as it stood he believed a clause would be taken up in the Grondwet which would be in conflict with international law, for it was an accepted provision of international law that no man could be forced to fight against his own nation. Besides it was undesirable to force people to fight against their own nation. According to international law this was impossible, and the impossibility appealed to anyone's common sense. The speaker referred to the case of *Mynhardt v. the Fieldcornet of Pretoria*, by whom the former was commandeered for the Mataboch commando. In this case, which was heard before the Full Court, the Chief Justice was of opinion that strangers could not be commandeered, but the court decided that a person who had resided three years in the country could be commandeered. At the same time the court defined cases in which a man could not be commandeered, for instance, he could not be called upon to fight against his own people or against a people against whom his own people would not fight. The speaker did not wish that any clause should be put in the Grondwet which would be absolutely against the provisions of the law of nations. He then pointed out that the Portuguese were exempted from military service. Other nations claimed the privilege of the most favoured nation, and these also could not be commandeered. It would be better if the Raad so amended the article that it could never be argued that it was the intention of the Raad to force a man to fight against his own people. Was there any member of the Raad who would go to war with men who were compelled to shoot their own kin? It would be preferable to authorise the Government to grant the franchise immediately to any person who declared his willingness to fight for the State on the proclamation of military law.

Then, on a question by Mr. Loveday, as to whether a man would be compelled to fight against his own nation—

The STATE ATTORNEY replied that Article 109 did not speak of "fighting"; it referred to "co-operation for the independence," etc. "Co-operation" did not mean "fight."

So that we see the Attorney-General actually raising a quibble over a phrase of which any man in this House knows the meaning. Of course it is not absolutely necessary to fire a rifle at a foe to be accused of fighting. Any man who assisted in any way would be considered, according to British law and British common sense, to be fighting for or against the Government.

Mr. LESINA: He is given a chance to leave the country. If he chooses to remain he is liable to be called upon to fight for the country.

Mr. COWLEY:

Mr. Louw asked whether compelling a man to fight against his own people was conflicting with international law?

The STATE ATTORNEY said that there could be no occasion for putting such a construction on the article under consideration.

However, I need only quote further in this connection the speech of Mr. Woolmooran, who said that—

Members were trying to get something in the article which was not there at all. It was never the intention of the article to compel British subjects to go and fight against their own people, but they could do other work; they might look after the horses or do other work by which they could co-operate for the maintenance of the independence of the State.

My object in reading this is to show that here are the members of Parliament of the country—perhaps the only good thing that President Kruger has done of late years is to give his members £1,200 a year—who are drawing £1,200 a year of the money contributed by the Uitlanders, passing a law compelling those Uitlanders, in the event of war, to take up arms against their own countrymen and to do everything in their power to maintain the independence of the State. Notwithstanding that it was pointed out to them by one of their own members, Mr. Loveday, that it was in direct opposition to the law of nations of any country calling itself civilised, they passed article 74 of the Grondwet, which I have just read. To show the importance which the members of the Volksraad attached to this article, I may mention that it was carried with loud cheers. I might quote much more to the same purport, but I do not wish to prolong the debate. I think I have shown very clearly that the Boers are utterly unfit to govern a civilised community.

Mr. DAWSON: Don't you call the Boers a civilised community?

Mr. COWLEY: Not as compared with the Uitlanders, who are not only more numerous, but who are superior in every respect, in intelligence, in education, in industry, in wealth, and in everything requisite for the building up of a powerful and wealthy community. And there is not the slightest doubt that if the question is not settled now by the influence of Great Britain it will have to be settled before very long by the people themselves.

Mr. LESINA: Jamieson tried it.

Mr. COWLEY: But the people were not with Jamieson. His was a filibustering expedition, for which there was no justification.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Oh, oh!

Mr. COWLEY: However, we have to deal now with something very different from the Jamieson raid. No great and free nation can see its people brutally ill-treated and ill-used as the English people are being ill-treated and ill-used by the Boers in the Transvaal at the present time. No power whatever, if it wishes to maintain the self-respect of its own people, can allow such a state of things to exist. The English Government have done everything in their power to settle this question peaceably, and with honour, not only to themselves, but to the Dutch. They have given every opportunity to the Boers to come to such a peaceable settlement as would not degrade them in any shape or

form. But they have repudiated every attempt that has been made, and now the questions at issue are to be settled by the arbitrament of war. I do not wish to prophesy, but there is not the slightest doubt that if Great Britain wishes to retain, not only her supremacy in South Africa but her supremacy of the seas, she must settle this question once and for all. Both the Orange Free State and the Transvaal will lose their independence, and the country must from this time forth be recognised as a part of the British dominions. And although much blood will be shed, and a great many valuable lives sacrificed on both sides—and there are good men among the Boers as well as among the British—and many innocent people will suffer; still I believe that as the question has gone so far, and Boers are so inflated with pride and arrogance, no other course is available for the suzerain power. Just one word in conclusion: As a Briton, I cannot doubt the capability or the justice of the British people in supporting the just demands of their fellow-countrymen wherever they may be. But I wish now to give a brief quotation on this subject from a very capable American, Mr. Poulteney Bigelow, who went to South Africa, and has been contributing a series of articles to *Harper's Monthly*. These articles appeared in 1896 and 1897. At any rate, I am quoting from an article which appeared in 1897. It is headed "White Man's Africa." The writer went there as a member of the great American Republic. Everyone knows he is a very capable man, and those who read these articles will see that he is not only a capable man, but that he is a very far-seeing, shrewd observer.

Mr. DAWSON: Is he not vice-president of the St. George's Association?

Mr. COWLEY: I do not know. I know he is an American subject, and that he went to South Africa for the purpose of studying this question on the spot—of getting a correct opinion of the various matters which are agitating South African politics at the present time. He travelled through Portuguese territory and through the Free State, Bechuanaland, Mashonaland, Natal, and the Cape of Good Hope. During his travels he met men of all shades of politics, and men in all positions from the highest to the lowest in the land. The result is that he states the case as fairly for the Boers as for the British, and, knowing the country as well as I do, I think no man could be more impartial or more just than he is. He concludes his article with a paragraph which I think it will not be out of place to read at the present time—

Time can do wonders, and a wonder is once more needed to bring together the conflicting races that are now wasting their energies in recrimination. There must be liberty and peace throughout the country if it is to realise the future which only the other day seemed within its grasp. There must be no question of Dutch, of English, German, or French, if that country is to prosper.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. COWLEY:

All must unite, and there are none too many. The flag of Great Britain represents freedom of trade, freedom of thought, beyond that of any flag on the high seas.

Mr. LESINA: What about the flag of the United States?

Mr. COWLEY: This is by an American—

And in Africa, at least, it is the only flag strong enough and generous enough for our purpose. It guarantees life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness to all within the sphere of its influence. It is, in short, the only flag which to-day makes possible our dream of a white man's Africa.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. COWLEY: These are not the words of an Englishman, but of an educated American. What I wish to say in conclusion is that I do trust hon. members on the opposite side will look at this from a higher point of view and from a higher platform than has been adopted by their leader. I do hope they will rise to the occasion. I hope they will see the necessity of doing nothing derogatory or detrimental to the interests of Queensland. We need not be ashamed of the action of the Government in sending a contingent to aid and assist Great Britain on this occasion. She is worthy of the assistance of every man in the country. I believe that if hon. members go to the country on that question they will find that the bulk of the electors and the bulk of the people are in favour of it, and will strongly support it.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

* Mr. KIDSTON (*Rockhampton*): I do not think that since I came to this House have I listened to a debate of the extraordinary nature of this debate so far as it has gone—in this respect: The Government have been given a direct challenge to justify their doing a particular action before consulting Parliament, and no member of the Government, or supporter of the Government, has attempted in any way at all to deal with the challenge.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: Not one in any way attempted to justify the action of the Government. They have deluged us with any quantity of glittering generalities about the sufferings of the Uitlanders in the Transvaal, and about the wickedness of the Boers. They have talked about the thing in every way, but more particularly about their own burning patriotism. But they have avoided the issue raised by the leader of the Opposition as they would avoid the business end of a wasp. Even the hon. member for Herbert, who has just sat down, while he has made a most able and telling speech on the South African question—and I may just say here that in a great many of the matters he dealt with I entirely agree with him—he evidently speaks from intimate knowledge and from a long study of the question, and if the House was discussing the South African question at the present time it would have been a most appropriate speech. But I claim that for more than an hour past the hon. gentleman has been talking altogether away from the question before the House. He has been altogether irrelevant.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: It seems to be the policy, not only of the Government, but of their supporters, to attempt to becloud the issue before the House.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: What is the issue?

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: The unconstitutional acts of the Government.

Mr. KIDSTON: Here is a member of the Government, and, after the debate has been going on for two days, he asks, What is the issue? (Loud Opposition laughter.) And he will have the audacity to say that the Boers are not capable of governing their country. (Continued laughter on the Opposition side.)

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That is the result or your talking—to cloud the issue. We have got no issue.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: None you can give us.

Mr. KIDSTON: The Premier himself set an example to his followers in this matter in deliberately trying to mislead the House as to the issue. Both in the course of his speech and by means of interjections, he told the House that

the question before it was whether Queensland was going to send troops to the Transvaal or not.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: So it is.

Mr. LESINA: No it is not.

Mr. KIDSTON: I know they will say that and try to get the country to understand that: but it is not the question.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You do not want it to be the question; of course not.

Mr. KIDSTON: Another time will come to discuss that question, as the hon. gentleman will find, and he will find whether I want that or not; but, in the meantime, all that I am pointing out is that that is not the question before the House.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: All right; what is it?

Mr. KIDSTON: Here is another Minister of the Crown asking me what is the question before the House. Why does not the hon. gentleman ask the Speaker or look at the business-paper?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You talked about clouding the issue; you do not seem to understand it yourself.

Mr. KIDSTON: I submit, in contradistinction to what is alleged by the Premier, although he is the leader of the House, that the amendment moved by the hon. leader of the Opposition does not raise the question of sending troops to South Africa at all.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: There are many hon. gentlemen in this House who sympathise with the Uitlanders in the Transvaal just as much as the Hon. the Premier does. There are hon. members in this House who quite agree with the

[5 p.m.] policy of the Imperial Government in South Africa, nay, there are members of this House even, who entirely approve of the policy of sending Queensland troops to South Africa, who yet altogether deny the right of the Government to do this before consulting Parliament—

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: Who deny the right of the Government to compromise Queensland and involve her in this expenditure before consulting Parliament.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: We are consulting Parliament now.

Mr. KIDSTON: If the Secretary for Railways and the Secretary for Lands will look at the business-paper they will see that this is the purport of the amendment. The real issue now before the House is not whether war in South Africa is justifiable; it is not even whether Queensland troops should go there; it is simply whether the circumstances on the 10th July last justified the Government in taking such an important action before consulting Parliament. So far as I am able, I put aside everything that has been said on the South African question; we shall come to that matter later on when the House disposes of this amendment and comes back to the motion of the Premier; then we can discuss the South African question, and we can also discuss the question of sending Queensland troops there or not. In the meantime I invite the House to keep its attention fixed on the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition. The hon. member for Enoggera on Thursday quoted from the letter of the Premier to His Excellency the Governor the offer which was made to Mr. Chamberlain, and he clearly showed by comparing the offer made to Mr. Chamberlain with the Queensland Defence Act that the offer which the Government made on the 10th July last was an illegal offer—an offer which they had no legal power either to make or to carry out. And the Premier, of course, finding out, as he has

evidently found out since, that he had made an illegal offer, resorts to the poor subterfuge of saying now that the men to be sent to South Africa are not members of the Defence Force, but volunteers. The hon. gentleman simply puts himself into this position: Either on the 10th July last the Premier offered Mr. Chamberlain something that he had, or he offered him something that he had not—because he had not any volunteers then—either he made an offer which he could not legally carry out, or he puts himself in the position of those speculators on the stock exchange who oversell in the hope that they will be able to buy in when the market is lower. But whether these men are to be members of the Defence Force or volunteers, the whole subterfuge about volunteers is simply a paltry evasion of the law of Queensland. The real point is this: that the Government promised to send armed men out of the colony to take part in a war of aggression in another state, and if that is not a direct violation of the Defence Act of Queensland, and of the whole foreign policy of Queensland hitherto, then I do not know what it is. The whole spirit of our Defence Act, the whole idea with which we have hitherto paid and trained men in Queensland, has been that we were training and paying them for the purpose of defending the homes and liberties of Queenslanders.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: And it does not matter two straws to call these men volunteers; it is an unmistakable infraction of the law to send armed men out of Queensland at all. If this great change in the policy of Queensland was necessary because of the circumstances in which Queensland found itself, and if the Government found that the law of Queensland did not permit them to send armed men out of Queensland, why didn't they come down honestly to this House and propose an alteration of the Defence Act, the same as has been done in Victoria, so that the men could be sent out of Queensland in accordance with the law? This is the reason: They knew that such an alteration of our Defence Act would mean the ultimate ruin of our Defence Force altogether. It is altogether at variance with the spirit under which the members of our Defence Force have enlisted to turn them into soldiers, to turn them into men who at a moment's notice can be sent anywhere all over the world to fight in a quarrel they know nothing about, and with which they have nothing to do; and I say if you get it understood throughout Queensland that the members of our Defence Force are liable to be sent on foreign service at any moment, at the whim of any Premier who happens to be in power, then you will destroy the Defence Force—not only just now, but you will ruin it for all time. If you alter the law in that respect you will not get the same kind of men to join it. The best of the men join now because of the sense of duty they have to their country, because they wish to qualify themselves to defend Queensland in case of emergency, and these men are not willing to be soldiers in the ordinary sense of that word at all. They are not willing to be sent anywhere all over the world, though they are quite willing to undergo the training and discipline necessary for them to become qualified to defend their own homes and their own liberties, and I say that to attempt to turn those men into soldiers in the ordinary sense of that word will be to destroy the Defence Force of Queensland, and more than that, if the Government had attempted to do this they knew quite well that they would have so outraged the public sense of Queensland in this matter that they would have gone out of office at once. What is being attempted by this subterfuge of

volunteers is simply that the Government are trying to get in the thin end of the wedge of Imperialism.

Mr. STEWART: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: And I would like to know from the Premier, or from any member of the Government, whether we are to understand that this is the beginning of a new time in relation to the Imperial Government, whether we are to understand that every time after this when Great Britain is engaged in a war anywhere throughout the whole world, that a contingent of armed men from Queensland will be sent to take part in that war; and, if it does not involve that, who are to be the judges as to what are the right times to send contingents to help the mother country in her hour of need, and what are the wrong times? Is that to be a matter that is to be left entirely in the hands of the Government of the day? If the Premier for the time being is to decide whether Queensland is to send a contingent to the help of the Imperial army—and suppose in the event of the next war in which Great Britain is involved, the then Premier does not see fit to send another contingent, would that be understood to be a censure on the Imperial Government by the Government of Queensland? If the offering of this contingent is so necessary now to show the loyalty of Queensland, would it not be just as necessary to show this loyalty in the event of another war? If this is the position, and the Premier is able to do this or not, what chance has Queensland got to show its loyalty or patriotism? If the next Premier does not do this, then Queensland will be blamed for being disloyal. It seems to me that to admit that the action that has been taken is right, opens the flood-gates very wide indeed; and I would like to ask the Premier if he has considered the far-reaching consequences of this proposed action. But whether these men are members of the Defence Force or volunteers, two things are very clear. First, the action of the Government means a radical change in the foreign policy of Queensland, and it also means involving Queensland in a very large expenditure, because this £30,000 or £40,000 to be spent on this war is a very small matter, compared to what she will have to spend, if she enters on this sort of policy. This radical change in our policy, involving the colony in large expenditure, has also been adopted before consulting Parliament.

Mr. STEWART: All for a title.

Mr. KIDSTON: I am not concerned with the hon. gentleman's motive; I am only concerned as to whether what the hon. member did was justifiable or not. We have been told that Parliament is being consulted—that we are being consulted now. To what extent are we being consulted? Supposing the House refuses to implement this promise made by the Premier, this is what will happen. I will just give hon. members the opinion of a gentleman who is consulting us, and the opinion of a gentleman who is now being consulted. The Attorney-General, one of these gentlemen who is consulting us, said—

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.

The Hon. E. B. Forrest said—

I think the time is past when the question of our sending troops to the Transvaal can be considered on its merits.

Mr. BELL: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: If that is true, in what sense are we being consulted? I hear the hon. member for Dalby say, "Hear, hear." No doubt he will give his opinion on this question, but he is in just the same position as we are. He has the

high and lofty privilege of saying "Yes," but he must not say "No." Is that a position in which to place the representatives of a free people—a free Parliament? I say that it is most arrant hypocrisy for the Premier to come down with such a pretence. It is turning Parliament into a bed of justice, such as the ancient despotic monarchs of France did long ago—before the revolution—when they asked their decrees to be registered. Here is our dictator sitting on the other side, and we have the high and lofty privilege of being allowed to register his edict. We are being consulted in that sense.

Mr. BROWN: And insulted now.

Mr. KIDSTON: There may be some hon. members who believe that there will be no injury to the credit of the House or of Queensland if we refuse to implement the promise made by the Premier in July last. To those hon. members who think that, then the offence of the Premier is not so very deadly—it is only attempting to murder the privileges of Parliament. But to those hon. members of this House who, like the hon. members for North Brisbane, the Attorney-General, and the hon. member for Dalby, believe that the House is not in a position honourably to do anything else but vote "Yes," then I say that the offence is the most deadly that any responsible officer of Parliament could commit.

Mr. GIVENS: Unpardonable.

Mr. STEWART: Treason, treason!

Mr. KIDSTON: No offence could be more deserving of parliamentary censure; and whatever is done now about sending troops to the Transvaal, if this House wishes to remain anything higher than a mere catspaw of the Government of the day, it will make clear its censure of the conduct of the Government. I admit that the Premier, under certain circumstances, might have acted as he has done; but there is only one justification for the Premier taking such action as this—that is, in the case of some sudden danger to Queensland, and I even admit in the case of some sudden danger to the Empire, which necessitated immediate action. The Premier admits this himself. The hon. member said—

The Government should consult Parliament whenever it is practicable, but there are and there must arise crises in which the Government of the day will have to accept the responsibility of immediate action.

I entirely agree with the Premier in that. If a hostile fleet had appeared on the coast of Queensland, then it would have been the duty of the Executive to take action at once, and consider afterwards.

Mr. DAWSON: Immediately call Parliament together.

Mr. KIDSTON: In that case I would have been quite prepared to justify anything that the Government of the day had done in good faith—even if they had "smashed the tables o' the law in time o' need to load their guns with." But was there any danger to Queensland? Did any danger to Queensland suddenly appear on the 10th of July last, or did any sudden danger threaten the Empire on the 10th of July last? I submit that if the Government cannot show that there was some sudden danger threatening the Empire, then the Government is altogether without justification. Now, was there any sudden danger on the 10th of July last? Why, on that date the Imperial Government had not declared war, nor had war been declared against them. Nay, the Imperial Government did not know, when this offer was made, whether there would be any occasion to accept it or not, so little danger to the Empire was there. Here is what Mr. Chamberlain said—

They hope the occasion will not arise.

Well, if they were still in a position that they hoped the occasion would not arise, it seems to me conclusive evidence that the occasion had not arisen.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: "While there's life there's hope."

Mr. KIDSTON: Remember again that the question we are discussing is not whether troops shall be sent, but whether on this date, when the offer of troops was made, there was such urgency as justified the Government acting without consulting Parliament. I would ask the House to consider one or two points in connection with this matter. Hon. members will remember that this Parliament was to meet—and, as a matter of fact, did meet—on the 12th of September.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: When you said nothing whatever about the matter.

Mr. DAWSON: I did, on behalf of the party.

Mr. KIDSTON: Whether a mistake was made in tactics or in policy by the Opposition or not is not the question the House is discussing. The House is discussing now an amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition, and accepted by the leader of the Government as a want of confidence motion.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: It may be all very good, as a passing quip, to say, "Why did you not move this at some other time?" But it has nothing at all to do with the question before the House. It does not matter whether this amendment should have been moved at a previous time, or whether it should not. The question is that it is moved now, and that the Government have accepted it as a want of confidence motion.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You absolutely approved of the Address in Reply.

Mr. DAWSON: No.

Mr. KIDSTON: And unless they are simply wanting to throw dust in the eyes of the House and the country, they will address themselves to the amendment. I have asked the House to remember that Parliament met on 12th September. Now I will tell hon. members what happened in New South Wales on the 6th of October:—

The Government have decided to sanction the offer of the New South Wales squadron of lancers now in England to serve in the Transvaal. The Premier, Mr. Lyne, has cabled the fact to Lord Carrington, from whom the offer was first received. The Premier, however, made it clear that the acceptance would be subject to the approval of Parliament, but has cabled the decision of the Government, so that the men may embark for the Cape. By the time they arrive there Parliament will have had the opportunity of dealing with the matter, and definite instructions will then be cabled. There is nothing constitutionally wrong with that action.

Mr. GIVENS: That is the only way to get over the difficulty.

Mr. KIDSTON: Remember that for several weeks before this the Premier of New South Wales was urged by the jingoes in that colony to copy the example of the Premier of Queensland, and he told them that the Government could not make an offer of troops without the sanction of Parliament, and it was only because the 10th of October was very near—when the Lancers were leaving England to come back to New South Wales—that he was constrained because of the urgency of the case to consent to their going to the Cape. But even when he was constrained by the circumstances of the case to make an offer, it was only a conditional offer that he made. The very same in Canada. Here is what happened in Canada on the 6th of October—

Sir Wilfred Laurier, the Canadian Premier, denies that any offer of troops has been made to the Imperial Government. He further states that if Great Britain

forces the fighting against the Transvaal, any troops that could now be sent from Canada would arrive in South Africa too late to be of any service, but if war were delayed there would be time to obtain Parliamentary sanction for the despatch of a Canadian contingent.

I have what happened in each of the other colonies. Each of the other colonies acted in the very same way. Queensland alone is under a dictatorship.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: Queensland alone has a Parliament so utterly spineless that the Government of the day can do anything they like, confident in their majority to carry it out afterwards.

Mr. DAWSON: All these other offers were made after the Queensland Parliament was sitting.

Mr. KIDSTON: That is the point I want to make. This Parliament met on the 12th of September, and these offers were not made until the 6th of October, and then they were only conditional upon the approval of Parliament. I want to ask the House has anything dreadful happened to the Empire between the 10th of July and the 6th of October, because the mother colony of New South Wales and the greater colony of Canada refrained from offering troops for a few weeks to the Imperial Government?

MEMBERS of the Opposition: No, no!

Mr. DAWSON: Before Kruger blew his nose violently and shook the Empire.

Mr. KIDSTON: Oom Paul has not landed in England or sacked London. Nothing dreadful has happened. Now would anything dreadful have happened if our Premier had acted as the other Premiers acted in this matter?

Mr. LESINA: He would have lost his leadership in the matter.

Mr. STEWART: He would not have advertised himself.

Mr. KIDSTON: Some talk has taken place during this debate regarding the unconstitutional action of Sir Samuel Griffith, when he was Premier of the colony, in making the agreement about the naval squadron with the Imperial Government. When Sir Samuel Griffith came out and submitted that agreement to Parliament in the form of a Bill, the hon. gentleman now at the head of the Government said he did not think—not that Sir Samuel Griffith had power to make such a bargain—but he did not think that the whole Parliament was justified in making such a bargain without consulting the constituencies.

The PREMIER: Where do you find that recorded?

Mr. KIDSTON: I find that in the *Hansard* of 1887; and remember that the [5.30 p.m.] agreement regarding that naval squadron which Sir Samuel Griffith made with the Imperial Government was made distinctly on the condition that it should be approved by Parliament. But our new dictator does not hint anything about the approval of Parliament; he tells Mr. Chamberlain what he will send him. I have wondered several times whether this is a case of the New Guinea business over again. I should like to see the hon. gentleman removed to the Upper House, so that his colleagues would have the privilege of repudiating his action, and saying that he had entered into this agreement without their knowledge or consent, the same as they did with Sir Hugh Nelson over the New Guinea business. This is an unfortunate colony in this respect: That we only find out these little things when it is too late, when the authors of them get put on the shelf, and we have to deal with a new Government. To tell the truth with regard to this matter, the Premier has never claimed that there was any urgency in it at all.

The PREMIER: Oh, yes, I have.

Mr. KIDSTON: I sat in this House two days listening to this debate, and I went over the reports of the speeches afterwards, and while I have heard it said that the case was urgent, yet I do not think any hon. member on the other side of the House, or on this side for that matter, has attempted to show that there was any urgency in the matter.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Everybody expected war to be imminent.

Mr. KIDSTON: As a matter of fact the Premier gave two reasons for acting as he had done, and they are so extraordinary and throw such a flood of light on the situation that I am sure the House will excuse me if I read those reasons. The first of the reasons the hon. gentleman gave wonderfully illuminates much of that lip loyalty which we have had from the other side during this discussion. I venture to say there are members on this side of the House, of whom I claim to be one, who are just as loyal to the country they live in and to the country they were born in as any member on the other side can possibly be. But I refuse to have the best feelings of my nature played upon by needy politicians. Listen to what the Premier himself says—

The offer was made, as hon. members will see from the correspondence, on the 10th of July. Hon. members will know that Parliament had by its own action deferred its sitting until after the 2nd of September.

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

The PREMIER: Then the emergency may have passed away.

This great danger to the Empire that justified our Government in taking such unusual and unconstitutional action might have passed away unless the Premier jumped at the opportunity to show his loyalty.

The PREMIER: Does that not show that I considered it urgent?

Mr. KIDSTON: It shows that the hon. gentleman was consumed with a burning desire to exhibit his loyalty—that he was crawling up to Mr. Chamberlain. There was no necessity in the circumstances of the case for him to jump at such an opportunity. Why did not Mr. Lyne, in New South Wales, and Sir W. Laurier, in Canada, jump at the opportunity? There was one explanation of the circumstances of the case which is so outrageous that I am sure the House will not entertain it. It has sometimes been the case in Australia that politicians, who have been pitchforked by a fortuitous concurrence of circumstances into the position of Chief Ruler, were so small-souled that they were unable to appreciate the dignity to which they had been raised, or were so tinpot in their souls—if I may use the expression—that some little distinction, some star on their breast, or a bit of ribbon, or some trumpery tinpot bauble moved them to do things that no amount of service to their country would move them to do. The word of the Premier here almost forces one into the belief that he is a man of that kind, and that that was the motive of his action in this matter. The second reason which the hon. gentleman gave for his extraordinary action is more infamous than the first one, and I hope that hon. members who intend to support the Government will listen to it and carefully consider what it means. The hon. gentleman had been speaking about the Defence Force, and he said—

I believe they were never in a better or a more efficient condition, but, notwithstanding their efficiency, they have not had practice in actual warfare. They have never been out where shots have been fired in anger, and these men are now anxious to have an education in military school alongside those heroes who have made Great Britain famous and have upheld the dignity of her great Empire. It will be a splendid school for them.

This Christian gentleman sends an army of men out of Queensland to make war in a neighbouring country that they may learn their trade. Is not that infamous? Whoever in modern times heard any public man unblushingly give expression to such a reason for declaring war in a neighbouring state? If the Czar of Russia gave expression to such a reason for sending an army into one of his neighbours' territories the whole public sentiment of Europe would rise up in indignation against him. I could understand a Zulu chief who regrets that peace has prevailed so long that his young warriors are growing up unaccustomed to warfare, sending a regiment into Natal or the Transvaal for the purpose of teaching them their trade, because "it would be a splendid school for them" and they would become inured to war. I could understand a savage like a Zulu chief doing that, but I cannot understand—I will not say a Christian gentleman—but a man living in this last year of the nineteenth century, publicly standing up and unblushingly giving as his reason for declaring war on a neighbouring state, that he wanted his soldiers to learn their trade. I cannot conceive of any more infamous reason than the hon. gentleman could have given than that. I say in all earnestness that the man who is capable of doing that, who is capable of cold-bloodedly avowing such a reason for sending men over to the Transvaal, deserves not stars for his breast, but stripes for his back.

The PREMIER: Then you don't want the troops to go.

Mr. KIDSTON: We will discuss that question when we come to it. The Attorney-General, when he was speaking the other night, said, in reply to an interjection, that it was not good to mix up two questions at the one time, and I quite agree with him. It is better to keep to the question before the House, and that is the amendment of the leader of the Opposition. What I would like to ask is whether such reasons as the hon. gentleman gave appealed to hon. members of this House? Are hon. members prepared to go before their constituents and repeat those reasons which the Premier gave as justifying the extraordinary action which he took on the 10th July last? In any case, whether they are prepared to accept those reasons as satisfactory or not, it cannot be alleged that those reasons show any urgency in the circumstances sufficient to justify the Government acting in such a matter before getting parliamentary approval. There was one thing when the Premier was speaking which very much amused me. He was seeking to justify the action he had taken, and he tried to justify it by assuring this House that the action had greatly impressed the great powers of Europe.

Mr. DAWSON: "The nations of the earth," he said.

Mr. JENKINSON: He must have his little joke.

Mr. KIDSTON: The 250 men from Queensland had greatly impressed the great powers of Europe. Upon my word I thought I was listening to some new comic opera, and that it was "Poo Bah" in another character. If the hon. gentleman had said that he had much convulsed with laughter the great powers of Europe he would have been much nearer the truth. This policy of attempting to impress the great powers of Europe may be a wise policy or it may not. We are not discussing that just now; but I beg to assure the House, and indeed the House knows it very well, that whether it is a wise policy or not it will in the end be a very expensive policy.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: I claim that the action of the Government in this matter was simply an act of dictatorship—an attempt to nullify Parliament that is altogether without justification, and if Parliament does not take prompt

steps to resent it, then Parliament will be consenting to becoming the mere catspaw of the Government of the day.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: I would just like to point this out further: that deep as the insult is to Parliament generally, it seems to me that the deepest insult in this matter has been offered to the supporters of the Government.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: They are used to it.

Mr. KIDSTON: Probably they are used to it. Evidently the Premier thought that if he did not compromise his followers in this matter, if he did not compromise Parliament in this matter, if he allowed the matter to come before Parliament unprejudiced, as it were, he would be unable to count upon the support of his followers; but if he was able to come before them, the Government being compromised, then he could appeal to their party loyalty to see him through. Of course that seems an outrageous supposition, and I have no doubt that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House think I am saying something derogatory to them.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: Yes, they do think so, and I will therefore just let them hear that that is not so much my opinion as the opinion of the Attorney-General one of their own leaders. The Attorney-General presumably knows his own followers and judges accordingly.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That is more than your leader does his, anyway.

Mr. DAWSON: He gets very close to it.

Mr. KIDSTON: The Attorney-General, who presumably knows his own followers, and judges accordingly, told us that—

Party loyalty very often goes a good deal further than some other kinds of loyalty—

We have heard a good deal about the 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 party victory.

Mr. J. HAMILTON (Cook): He was alluding to members on your side.

Mr. KIDSTON: No doubt the hon. gentleman was kind enough to apply those words to our side of the House, but I submit that the Government who had that idea of this House was very likely—and the circumstances also justify us in thinking that they also applied them to their own side beforehand.

Mr. J. HAMILTON: Always the *tu quoque* argument.

Mr. KIDSTON: They felt they could be confident of their party loyalty if they could not be confident of their loyalty to their country. If this cool assumption is not dishonouring to the members who follow the Government, I fail to find a name for it. It is simply prostituting party government, asking them to sacrifice their country for their party in helping the Government to make Parliament the catspaw of the Government of the day. I have said about all I want to say in this matter. I would just point out that it has been shown that the Government on the 10th July last made an illegal offer of troops to Mr. Chamberlain, which they had no legal power either to make or carry out; that the offer they made was a radical alteration of the whole foreign policy of Queensland, and that it has involved Queensland in unknown expenditure. I also claim that there was no urgency on the 10th July last such as would justify the Government in taking this extraordinary action. I have shown that the Premiers of the other colonies, quite as loyal as our Premier, and the Governments of the other

colonies, quite as loyal as our Government, waited—waited to consult their Parliaments, and that no harm at all resulted to the Empire. And I challenge the Government, and the followers of the Government to keep to the amendment, and show this House the danger that has been averted by the Government ignoring Parliament. It is not the question as it stands to-day that we have to deal with under this amendment, but the question as it was on the 10th July last.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: The question is not whether we shall send troops to South Africa or not. There is no man who reads the amendment, and can understand one whole sentence of English, but can see that the amendment does not even raise the question as to whether troops should be sent or not. The question is simply this: Whether the Government were justified in doing what they did before consulting Parliament?

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: And I call upon the Government to show cause why they should not be condemned on this count. In my opinion no amount of professions of loyalty will justify this House in condoning such an unconstitutional abuse of power as the Government have been guilty of.

* Mr. BELL (*Dalby*): The junior member for Rockhampton has tossed superlatives about very freely. During the course of his speech we heard the hon. gentleman vilifying the Government, and applying such epithets as "most unblushing," "most infamous," and he almost exhausted the vocabulary of vilification of which even he is capable.

The TREASURER: He always does that.

Mr. BELL: I say that we can never too often protest against such language. If the hon. gentleman asks us to believe that that language is the result of conviction that some unconstitutional course has been taken, or that some wrong has been done to the colony of Queensland, all I can say is that he is trading on the credulity of this House, because we on this side know—and suspect that some on the other side know—that the reason which leads the hon. gentleman to use that language is nothing more nor less than a yearning desire to sit on this side and possibly on the Treasury benches; and that he is following the principle laid down by some politicians, that you only have to throw enough mud and some of it will stick.

Mr. KIDSTON: Are you following that example?

Mr. BELL: I am not following that, or the hon. gentleman's example. The criticism which I direct towards him is perfectly healthy. I believe it to be a perfectly accurate criticism, which has this distinction that a great deal of his has not, and that is that it is couched in perfectly parliamentary language. Now, the hon. gentleman has asked us to address ourselves to this particular amendment, and not to be led away by the herings that are drawn across the trail. He asks us to look at the amendment, and judge it on its merits. Well, let us look at the amendment, and although I yield to no one in admiration for the ability of the hon. gentleman who leads the Labour Opposition, and have no desire to be in any way acrimonious in this matter, yet I am sure the hon. gentleman himself must regret as much as anyone else the remarks which he addressed to this Chamber in reference to our Defence Force.

Mr. DAWSON: I never mentioned the Defence Force.

Mr. BELL: The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well what I mean. He was pouring contumely on the men who belong to the Defence Force.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS of the Opposition: No, no!

Mr. DAWSON: Volunteers.

Mr. BELL: I say, although I have an admiration for the hon. gentleman, I cannot help saying that I am astounded that a man of his ability, and occupying such a position, should have been responsible for the extraordinary amendment that we see now on the paper. We know what the original motion is, but the hon. gentleman, I suspect, like the hon. gentleman sitting alongside of him, has got his eye on the benches opposite, and thinking he saw an opportunity here comes down with the proposal that after the word "Queen," on the 3rd line of the motion, certain words should be interpolated; not that all the words after the word "Queen" should be struck out and certain words interpolated, but that the words he proposes should go into the body of the original motion. Let the hon. gentleman contemplate, if the amendment is carried, what a hotch-potch of language we get. We get in the amended motion an absolute contradiction.

Mr. DAWSON: We will deal with the rest of the motion afterwards.

Mr. BELL: The hon. gentleman knows that we do not do business in that way. If we were to deal with it in that way, the hon. gentleman should move that all the words after the word "Queen" be omitted in order to insert these other words.

Mr. DAWSON: The amendment is within the Standing Orders.

Mr. BELL: The hon. gentleman has made no reference to all the words after the word "Queen," and if I have to seek for an explanation of the conduct of the hon. gentleman I will not seek for it from the point of view of any stupidity on the hon. gentleman's part, but rather because of a want of unanimity amongst those whom he calls his followers.

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

Mr. BELL: There has been a conflict behind the hon. gentleman in regard to the drawing up of this amendment, and the result is the extraordinary production that we see on the notice paper.

Mr. LESINA: You don't like it?

Mr. BELL: In conformity with the opinion I have formed of the hon. gentleman, I certainly prefer to take that view of the matter.

Mr. DAWSON: I am simply dividing the two questions proposed by the Premier. I want two votes.

Mr. BROWNE: You did not consult the hon. member for Dalby.

Mr. BELL: The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat took up the line of argument that this was an unconstitutional action on the part of the Premier, because the Defence Force were being devoted to a purpose for which they were never intended. But, before I go further in that direction, let me turn to the junior member for Brisbane South, whom I now see in his place, and let me allude to a statement he made during the course of his speech when he said he concurred with me in some remarks I had made in a previous session that the Government were monopolising a great many of the functions of Parliament.

Mr. TURLEY: "Usurped" was the word you used.

Mr. BELL: Possibly. The Government were "usurping" the functions of Parliament, and the hon. gentleman took the point that the Premier should be condemned, because he had given further evidence of that inclination. I wish to tell that hon. gentleman that the construction he has put upon my words is entirely

erroneous. What I said was that when Parliament was sitting there is a distinct disposition on the part of the Cabinet to restrict the opportunities that are given to private members to discuss public business; that they were monopolising, or showing a tendency to monopolise the initiation of all business, and that private members' rights were consequently very much curtailed. That is what I meant, and I certainly am not responsible for what the hon. gentleman thought I meant, because it really seems to me there is too great a disposition, if there is a tendency one way or the other, for the Parliament in other respects to usurp the functions of the Administration. I have very rarely seen in these colonies anything that corresponds to the vigorous and independent action of the British Cabinet. I never saw or read that the British Cabinet is always in mortal fear of what Parliament is going to do. It takes definite action and knows that one great section of the community is behind it, and when it knows that, it is able to go to Parliament and abide the result with equanimity. But I say that in these Australian colonies, so far as we can form a conclusion from the actions of Governments and Cabinets, the tendency is to stand in too servile a fear of Parliament; to think too little of whether the country is with it or not, and to look entirely to the mere majority of the moment. So that when the hon. member for Brisbane South tries to enlist me as a recruit to his views I must respectfully decline to accept his shilling. I decline to follow the hon. gentleman on that particular subject, and I say that I welcome the action of the Premier as being some attempt to stem the tendency which I, at least, view with regret. I hope we shall have more, for the future, of this energetic action on the part of the Government, who will not be afraid to take action on their own account.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. LESINA: Abolish Parliament altogether.

Mr. BELL: The junior member for Rockhampton said that the Defence Force was being diverted to a purpose for which it was never intended, and that the Government should have brought down a Defence Act Amendment Act in order to give them power to send abroad, when opportunity required it, the forces of the colony; and he went on to say that if the Government had done that it would have meant the destruction of the Defence Force. I differ entirely from the hon. gentleman. I say if some opportunity were given to the Defence Force of this colony to smell powder, if it could be held out as an inducement to enlist to the young men of the colony that the force was not really an artificial force—but there was a probability, if only a remote one, of their seeing service—then

I say that nothing which could possibly be done would have a greater tendency to popularise the Defence

Force. I observe that by the amendment of the leader of the Opposition we are asked to insert after the word "Queen" the following 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.

The words I take exception to more particularly are the words "an indefinite and practically unlimited expenditure." I venture to say that in the history of the world there has never been a military expedition despatched which will cost so little money as the 250 men we are about to send from these shores. The financial arrangements which the War Office have made for the payment of those troops are in the highest degree on a liberal scale, and really it is almost a question to my mind whether this colony

would not be taking a better part if it insisted upon bearing a greater proportion of the cost of the expedition than the War Office arrangement is asking it to bear. As I understand it, the expenditure of this colony in connection with the despatch of that force ceases as soon as they land on South African shores. I do not know whether I am correct as to that.

Mr. MAXWELL: You are wrong.

The PREMIER: You are quite right.

Mr. BELL: The hon. member for Burke says I am wrong, and the Premier says I am quite right. Standing, as I do, between two eminent critics, perhaps the hon. member for Burke will pardon me if I prefer the authority of the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government. What I understand is this: that as soon as the Queensland troops land on South African shores, they are paid all their expenses by the Imperial Government, at the same rate of pay as any other man in the Imperial forces. If we are going to send troops at all, we surely could not ask more than that. Furthermore, as I understand it—subject to correction by the hon. member for Burke—those troops are to be placed on board a transport on their return by the Imperial Government, and the whole of the expenses of their return is to be charged to the War Office. If there is a man in this Chamber who is going to take exception to such terms as that and calls himself a patriot, all I can say is that his patriotism has distinctly a monetary value. I say that term so liberal have never before accompanied the despatch of any military expedition. In connection with those operations against the Boers, I think anyone who is at all acquainted with English politics at the end of 1879 and the beginning of 1880, apart altogether from the particular questions that are now animating this debate—anyone familiar with English politics in the years I have mentioned can hardly fail to be particularly interested in the developments that are now taking place in South Africa. If hon. members will cast their minds back they will recollect the salient features—I shall touch on them most briefly—with regard to South African affairs previous to the convention which was concluded by the Liberal Government in 1881. There had been three great proposals, on three different occasions, in South Africa, for the federation of those various States. The first was made by Sir Benjamin D'Urban, the next by Sir George Grey—a name which is one to conjure with on the benches opposite—and the third by Sir Bartle Frere; and everyone of those three attempts was checked and rendered unsuccessful by the action of Ministers and Under Secretaries in Downing street. The men on the spot, the people who had practical experience of what was necessary to weld together the divergent interests of the various races of South Africa, recommended a certain course. Three different administrators, at three different periods, recommended a certain course, and on each of those occasions they were thwarted by the action of Downing street; and the dominating influence of Downing street was a policy of non-interference—a desire to allow those communities that were not British to work out their destiny as far as they could. And I make this comment, as an absolutely accurate historical retrospect, that the British Government cannot fairly be charged with any undue Imperial interference in South Africa. They cannot be called a greedy power, who desired, on the slightest provocation, to absorb the struggling Dutch communities in South Africa. If that contention is put forward, the answer is that on the three occasions to which I have referred the question of federation was refused to be entertained by the Imperial authorities, and to that refusal is entirely owing the South African question as we understand it to-day. The last

great attempt was made by Sir Bartle Frere, a man who came with a tremendous reputation from India as an administrator. His proposal for the federation of the South African States was made at the tail-end of the Conservative Government then in office, and it met with so much disapproval from the Liberal Government, which came into power in the early months of 1880, that he was recalled by Mr. Gladstone's Administration, and a very different policy indeed was embarked upon. It was the Liberal Government that really sowed the seeds of the crop that is being reaped to-day in South Africa. The Liberal Government, or rather Mr. Gladstone, animated by what all must admit who know anything about him to be the very highest motives, had a particular weakness—that is the only word I can apply to it—for those struggling communities. He admired the struggle of the Boer population in the Transvaal for self-government, and although he hesitated for some time to reverse the policy of Sir Bartle Frere and of the Conservative Government, yet, nevertheless, when he saw the energetic protest they were making by force of arms at the end of 1880 and the beginning of 1881, after the attack on Majuba Hill, he made the convention of 1881, and followed that three years later by the convention of 1884. An hon. member opposite—I think it was the hon. member for Clermont—made an interjection that the people of the Transvaal had won their independence by conquest and force of arms. I think that to make a statement of that kind is an absolute travesty on history and the facts. The people of the Transvaal were granted the independence they enjoy entirely through the magnanimity of Mr. Gladstone, and to the extraordinary personality of the then head of the Government. It is not too much to say that there was probably not another man in England that could have made peace after Majuba Hill, and still remain in office. After all, the peace which followed Majuba Hill is not so much a tribute to the magnanimity of England, or the broad-mindedness of the English Cabinet, as to the magnetic and, probably, unprecedented personality of Mr. Gladstone.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BELL: Mr. Gladstone was a man who seemed to imagine—he gave indications of that feeling on many occasions—that other people and other communities were guided by the same high standard of humanity as he was himself, and if hon. members will take the trouble to read the speeches—the verbatim reports of the speeches—of the leading politicians of England delivered about that time, they will see that Mr. Gladstone fully believed that his magnanimous action would have the effect that the Boers would henceforth be the friends of England for ever. We know, in the light of what has followed, that, so far from tending to that, that magnanimous action was looked upon as having been brought about by fear, and that the Boers looked upon themselves as the conquerors, but so far were they from being the conquerors that, within a matter of three or four days after Majuba Hill, it is as certain as any military thing can be certain that the Boer forces would have been wiped out by the force then under the command of Sir Evelyn Wood.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. BELL: I suppose that very rarely has any English general been placed in such a position as the commander of these forces—that he had the forces under his command in such a strategic position to his opponents, that a matter of only a few hours must have seen their practical annihilation in a military sense; yet on the very eve of the opportunity which would have enabled him to secure revenge for the defeat

British arms had sustained, he received a cable, sent at the instigation of Mr. Gladstone, which announced that an armistice had been declared. We know what has followed. Before, however, I go on with what followed, let me call attention to the speeches which were delivered the other night. I regret the hon. member for Brisbane South is not in his place, because I am going to make reference to a remark he made in the course of his speech. The hon. member quoted the remarks of Mr. Chamberlain, who is now Colonial Secretary, and the man chiefly responsible in the Cabinet for the administration of South African affairs. He quoted the remarks of Mr. Chamberlain, who, in the Liberal Cabinet of 1880, was President of the Board of Trade, made somewhere in the provinces of England on this South African question, and said that Mr. Chamberlain announced it was only an act of justice to give the Transvaal Government their freedom; and the hon. member went on to contrast what Mr. Chamberlain said then with what he was doing now. I say that no greater justification could be given to the Colonial Secretary in the British Government, in the action he is now taking, than the remark of the President of the Board of Trade in 1881, because it shows that, in the teeth of the fierce unpopularity that was created in England by the armistice concluded after Majuba Hill, Mr. Chamberlain had the courage to get up and adhere to his leader, and extenuate and defend the action his Government had taken in concluding peace with the Boers and giving them their independence. When a man, something like eighteen years afterwards, comes forward and declares that the policy which they enunciated amidst so much unpopularity was a total failure, and it is essential in the interests of South Africa that the Transvaal should get its independence taken away from it and brought more closely under the dominion of England, a greater compliment could not be paid the present Colonial Secretary, or a stronger or more forcible argument brought forward to demonstrate the exact significance of the present position.

Mr. FISHER: Is that your position—to take away their independence?

Mr. BELL: That is my own particular position, if hon. members want to know. I cannot answer what the British Government is going to do if it beats the Boers; but I have strong opinions as to what they ought to do. They ought to put an end once and for ever to such a word as "Independence" in connection with the Transvaal.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. BELL: I am glad to see the hon. member for Brisbane South is in his place now. I was saying in his absence that the quotation he made from Mr. Chamberlain's speech in 1881 really strengthens the position of those who desire to interfere in Transvaal matters.

Mr. TURLEY: But he is in a different position now.

Mr. BELL: He occupied exactly the same position, except in name, then as he holds now. He was then a member of the Cabinet, as he is now, and he had the courage to face the unpopularity—the first blow struck at the popularity of the Gladstone Government of 1880—and endorse what Mr. Gladstone did, and say it was the fairest thing to give the Boers their independence. After eighteen years he now turns round and says he looks upon their policy as a vast mistake. The hon. the junior member for Brisbane South, during his remarks, pointed, in support of the position he is taking up, to some observations he said were made by the present leader of the Liberal party, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman. I do not know where he got his authority for saying that

Sir Henry Campbell-Bannermann was a sympathiser with the Boers, I know of no political question that has arisen in England on which there has been such remarkable unanimity among the political leaders of all thoughts and all parties as on this question. The hon. the leader of the Labour Opposition talked about the radical Press being against this interference. I say there has never been a public question on which there has been so much unanimity in the Press as there has been on this question. As to what the hon. gentleman said about Sir Henry Campbell-Bannermann I will read these few observations which, I think, rather knock the bottom out of his contention with regard to that gentleman. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannermann, speaking on this matter, rather in contradiction to what the hon. member for South Brisbane attributes to him, says—

Mr. TURLEY: What is the quotation?

Mr. BELL: You are about to get it. You were not so anxious to give me your authority the other night.

Mr. TURLEY: Yes, I gave the date.

Mr. BELL: Yes. I had to wring it out of you before I got it.

The SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. TURLEY: I ask for information and cannot get it.

Mr. BELL: You are about to get it. He says—

The Uitlanders have not the municipal government, the police protection, the organised maintenance of order, the even-handed administration of justice which in all civilised communities are regarded as the very elements of civil rights and civil freedom.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. TURLEY: When was that said?

Mr. BELL: I do not happen to know the exact date when it was uttered, but it might have been uttered at any period during the last eighteen years with perfect appositeness in regard to the position of the Transvaal. It is as much the truth to-day as it was any time during the last eighteen years, and I am glad to think the leader of the great Liberal party, the basis of whose platform is extension of the franchise and liberalism, is not taking the attitude which the hon. gentleman in the most reckless way attributed to him; and that the Radical party in England is a great deal more consistent than the Radical party and the Labour party in this colony. The Liberal party in England believes in the extension of the franchise. The party opposite talk about the extension of the franchise, and one man one vote, and all the rest of it, while in the Transvaal we have 30,000 men and not a vote between them.

Mr. McDONALD: There are 46,000 in Queensland.

Mr. BELL: And they are supporting a party which will continue that condition of things. We have heard during the discussion of the unwarrantableness of British interference, and consequently of Queensland and Australian sympathy with that interference in Transvaal matters, and we are assured that we have no right whatever—I think it was the hon. member for Clermont who spoke on this point, and said that we were interfering in what, after all, is merely a matter of domestic legislation, and that we ought to leave the processes of ordinary constitutional agitation to settle the difficulty. In order to show that it is not unwarrantable interference with domestic legislation, I desire to read out one or two sections from the convention of 1884—the latest convention. If I were to read from the convention of 1881, it would probably give greater point to my remarks, but I shall read some from the convention of 1884, which show that the interference—in my opinion

the much too long delayed interference—of the British Government in Transvaal matters is based really upon treaty rights—that is, the contract which one community makes with another. We have heard a great deal about these conventions, and it is just as well to read out one or two sections from them. Article 4 of the convention of 1884 says—

The South African Republic will conclude no treaty or engagement with any State or nation other than the Orange Free State, nor with any native tribe to the eastward or westward of the Republic, until the same has been approved by Her Majesty the Queen.

Such approval shall be considered to have been granted if Her Majesty's Government shall not, within six months after receiving a copy of such treaty (which shall be delivered to them immediately upon its completion), have notified that the conclusion of such treaty is in conflict with the interests of Great Britain or of any of Her Majesty's possessions in South Africa.

It has been said in regard to the convention of 1884, that the word "suzerainty," which was in the previous convention of 1881, is not mentioned here, but if it is necessary that the word "suzerainty" should appear in such an article as that I cannot understand it, for if ever any form of words gave one nation suzerainty over another it is that article 4 of this 1884 Convention.

Mr. JACKSON: That is only with regard to external affairs.

Mr. DAWSON: What do you understand by "suzerainty?"

Mr. BELL: I may tell the hon. member for Kennedy that they have repudiated over and over again; and the particular match that brought this flame about was the announcement from Pretoria that they refused to regard England as being in a position of the suzerain power.

Mr. DAWSON: Don't you think the word "suzerainty" has been badly chosen?

Mr. BELL: I think it is a most admirable selection; it denotes perhaps too mildly a condition of things that indicates the relations that ought to be occupied.

Mr. DAWSON: The London *Times* says it is badly chosen.

Mr. BELL: The hon. gentleman has brought about the highest authority he could bring if he quotes the London *Times*, but I would like to read the article in which he says that opinion was expressed.

Mr. DAWSON: It was quoted in the *Courier* about a week ago.

Mr. BELL: I have read article 4; I will now read article 9—

There will continue to be complete freedom of religion and protection from molestation for all denominations, provided the same be not inconsistent with morality and good order; and no disability shall attach to any person in regard to rights of property by reason of the religious opinions which he holds.

That is the country which, because a man is either a Roman Catholic or a Jew, refuse him any political privileges whatever.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. BELL: Now I turn to article 14, which is the last quotation I shall make—

All persons, other than natives, conforming themselves to the laws of the South African Republic (a) will have full liberty, with their families, to enter, travel, or reside in any part of the South African Republic; (b) they will be entitled to hire or possess houses, manufactories, warehouses, shops, and premises; (c) they may carry on their commerce either in person or by any agents whom they may think fit to employ; (d) they will not be subject, in respect to their persons or property, or in respect of their commerce or industry, to any taxes, whether general or local, other than those which are or may be imposed upon citizens of the said Republic.

Now, Sir, I ask if any man reading that article would come to any other conclusion than that the Government of the South African Republic did not intend to make any distinction between any

of its citizens. Is it necessary for any community in the British Dominions to adopt an article such as that in regard to its administration? It is taken for granted in any British community that every one of these conditions is a part of public administration; but when you are dealing with a people like the Dutch in the Transvaal it is necessary to put in those safeguards. I am glad to see the junior member for Rockhampton back in his place, because I had not quite concluded what I was saying in reply to something that hon. member said. At 6 o'clock I was describing some remarks the hon. member made as to the effect he believed any extension of the functions of the Defence Force would have upon that body, and I ventured to say that if it were legal to call out the Defence Force for foreign service on an emergency the effect would be to make that body popular rather than the reverse. I have not discovered any indication in any member of the Defence Force which makes me think that they are disinclined to engage in any fighting when opportunity offers.

Mr. STEWART: Let us have a standing army at once.

Mr. BELL: I can only say that a standing army is a very good thing, and certainly, even in the country from which the hon. gentleman comes, Scotland, the belief in the efficacy of a standing army is increasing rather than waning. So far as I know we have had one man a member of the Defence Force, who, when the opportunity presented itself to him as an individual to engage in foreign operations, seized upon it. I allude to Mr. Robert Gordon, of Townsville.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. BELL: He distinguished himself, and by his actions reflected glory upon the Queensland Defence Force.

Mr. DAWSON: He did not ask the Government to pay.

Mr. BELL: I admit that all members of the Defence Force are not alike. I believe the junior member for Rockhampton has had a military career. There was a period, I believe, in the history of the hon. gentleman when he was either a member of the Volunteer Force or a member of the Defence Force—I forget which.

But the hon. member entertains [7:30 p.m.] some radical ideas with regard to the duty of a soldier—ideas that seem to me the very antithesis of the conventional idea of a soldier. He seems to imagine that the chief function of a battalion of infantry is to hold indignation meetings, to find fault with officers, and to grumble at the regulations. (Laughter.) If I mistake not, the hon. member has left behind him a record which, if extended to many more corps, would render the force a perfectly useless body. And yet the hon. member attempts to pose as an authority on the Defence Force of Queensland! The hon. member suggested that if any member of the force offered his services for this work the result would be that the force would become depopulated, and that is casting a slur upon them.

Mr. KIDSTON: I rise to make a personal explanation. I never said anything of the sort. I said the effect would be to destroy the Defence Force by turning them into soldiers in the ordinary meaning of the word.

Mr. BELL: The hon. member's explanation was perfectly inaudible to me. But this is quite certain. The hon. member said that if we offer troops now we shall always have to do so. I confess that I do not think it would be a bad thing if we always have to do this. I believe that this disposition on the part of the British dependencies to take part in British affairs is one of the healthiest signs of the world's growth that has occurred in this century.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. BELL: It is only in a recent period indeed that English people have realised what a great people they are. I do not think that it is more recent than the eighties—probably on the occasion of the first Jubilee—that this great Imperialistic spirit manifested itself in England and elsewhere. There was another spirit manifested at the same time, and that was the recognition of the importance of the British fleet—that that fleet was an important factor in keeping the Empire together. It is only since the eighties that we find that spirit manifested—that recognition of what is now known as the Imperial idea in public affairs. And, in my humble opinion, it would be unstatesmanlike to enter upon any step that would tend to dwarf that sentiment, or to interfere with its progress. Although, no doubt, some persons ridicule the feeling, I believe that there is no greater idea animating the progress of the world than that of spreading the power of the British Empire which I have referred to. And certainly I have no sympathy with the junior member for Rockhampton when he says that the action of the Government on this occasion will mean that we shall have to send troops on other occasions, and that we should not send them. I hope that we will always send troops on occasions like this. I am proud of the British fleet, and, when I see it at anchor, it seems to me that we are yet in swaddling clothes. We owe our independence to the supremacy of that fleet, for if it went under, the independence of this colony would not be worth six months' purchase. And when we have to depend on this fleet for our independence, we should make some endeavour to render back in kind the military aid we owe to England, and do our little best in sending troops to assist Great Britain in any operations she may be engaged in. I don't think we should sit still, twiddle our thumbs, and allow the British fleet and Great Britain to do everything for us. I think it is a very good thing for these colonies to embark on these undertakings, and I hope we shall see a good many more of them.

Mr. KIDSTON: We should provide for our own defence first.

Mr. BELL: I hear the hon. member for Croydon say something about the jingoistic spirit.

Mr. BROWNE: No. I never said anything about jingoism.

Mr. BELL: At any rate several hon. members on the other side have said something about it in a depreciatory spirit. But I do not see that there is any reproach attached to the word "jingo." It came first into politics as an epithet in 1873, after the Berlin treaty, when England adopted a very firm foreign policy, when she determined to put a stop to the progress Russia was making southward. It should also be remembered that the word "jingo" was first used in connection with the foreign policy of a Conservative Cabinet. The party that used that term as an expression of opprobrium was the Liberal party, under Mr. Gladstone, in 1830, and there is no man to-day who is an impartial critic who will put the foreign policy of the Liberal party against the policy of the Conservatives under Lord Salisbury and Lord Beaconsfield. The men who used that expression as a term of opprobrium were the supporters and admirers of Mr. Gladstone, and when we look at the matter in the light of our experience at Khartoum in 1885, and the Transvaal in 1881, I do not think we are likely to sympathise with those who use the word as a term of condemnation. I was very much struck by an observation which

fell from the hon. member for Clermont when he said he did not believe in nationality. I don't know what he wishes to substitute for that.

Mr. LESINA : Cosmopolitanism.

Mr. BELL: He ridiculed the idea of patriotism. I only know one other man who used similar arguments, and that man was hanged for assassinating President Carnot of the French Republic. He was hanged, not for his opinions, but for the mode in which he gave expression to them. I have no doubt that in a century or two the idea of the hon. member for Clermont may become more popular. We may realise that after all, as this individual that I am alluding to said, the whole world is our fatherland, and that the idea of nations is a great mistake. But I do not know that we are in a condition to apply principles of that kind in any practical sense to the amendment now before us. We have to realise that, however laudable the idea may be, we are in a period of civilisation when the idea of nationality is very strong indeed, and if any man is going to conduct public policy, ignoring the conception of nationhood, he will come to very great grief indeed. I am sorry that a member of the Queensland Parliament, living under the flag of Great Britain, should despise the sentiment of nationhood, and think that there is nothing in it, because he ought to congratulate himself upon belonging to the most distinguished nation that perhaps the world has ever seen. We heard during this discussion some reference to Irishmen hurled across the Chamber—references to the inconsistency of any Government sympathising with action against the Transvaal, which permitted Ireland to remain as it was. There is no comparison between the two countries. The hon. member for Clermont endeavoured to pose—perhaps he thinks it is rather a good political line—as the champion of Ireland. I am a great deal more of an Irishman than ever the hon. member was, and my sympathy for Ireland, I venture to say, is a great deal more disinterested than any sympathy the hon. member may profess to have. But I say that whereas the Uitlanders in the Transvaal have not got a single representative in the Transvaal Parliament, the Irish people—Home Ruler though I am, and always have been—I say that the Irish people have got an infinitely greater proportion of representatives in the British House of Commons than either England, Scotland, or Wales. When, therefore, the hon. member uses such an electioneering dodge—as I venture to characterise it—by bringing forward such an argument, he is actually ignoring the facts. I admit that some radical alteration is necessary in the system of governing Ireland, but to try to institute an analogy between the condition of things which prevails in Ireland and what is happening in the Transvaal is absolutely blinking one's eyes to the facts.

Mr. GIVENS : We will tell you all about the facts by-and-by.

Mr. BELL: I have no doubt we will have the hon. member's version of the facts. The junior member for Rockhampton, during his remarks, resented some reference being made to his loyalty. To my mind, the radical question that is dissevering the two sides on this matter is the question of loyalty, if I am quite in order in saying so. I say there is an indifference to Imperial interests which is approximating to disloyalty on the part of some hon. members, at all events, on the other side; and although the junior member for Rockhampton indignantly repudiated any suggestion of the kind, and said that he was as loyal as anybody on this side of the House, I can say that if it ever came about that she had to depend on such a laborious apolo-

gist for non-intervention as the junior member for Rockhampton, we might well say "God help Great Britain."

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: Great Britain can help herself always.

Mr. BELL: The determining factor in this amendment now before the House is not really the constitutional aspect of it, as some contend. It is not merely the advisability in the abstract of sending troops to South Africa or not. It really is a difference on the essential question as to whether the Empire shall be a union or not. In conducting our discussions here, and in our politics, we should view with a very grave suspicion some of the arguments that come from some members on the other side, because the basis of their arguments is so radically different to the standpoint that members on this side generally take up. I certainly, on this amendment, will give my vote most cordially indeed against it. I consider that the amendment itself is about as jumbling a performance on the part of a leader of a party as this colony, at all events, can show. I am astounded that it should have come from a man of the intelligence of the senior member for Charters Towers. As I said at the outset, it makes absolute confusion of the whole motion, and certainly stultifies anyone who votes for it. But whether with regard to the construction of the amendment itself, or whether with regard to the principle which it expresses, I am equally heartily against it, and I say that this colony of Queensland will not perform a humiliating act by opposing such a proposition.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. STORY (*Balonne*): There has been a challenge thrown out from the other side, asking members of this party to distinctly say whether they approve of the action of the Premier or not in taking the responsibility upon himself of promising this contingent for service in the Transvaal. Well I answer that question most distinctly for my part, by saying that I approve most heartily and thoroughly of the action of the Premier. It shows that he is worthy of the position he holds. He has followed the advice that the Labour party has given many and many a time—to trust the people. He has not only trusted the people—(Opposition laughter)—but he has trusted Parliament.

The PREMIER: Hear, hear!

Mr. STORY: And he has also trusted the troops. He knew perfectly well when he took that responsibility on himself that he would have to come to Parliament for the money, that he would have to go to the people for approval, and that he would have to go to the troops for volunteers. That was an immense risk for any single man to take, and I think therefore that the hon. gentleman has been thoroughly justified in doing so. That this Parliament will justify his action, there is not the slightest doubt; that the people approve of it, I think we can see more and more every day; and that the volunteers will be found—although I know nothing whatever personally about it—I do not doubt for a moment. In fact, it seems to me that there are numbers of men volunteering who are really not fit to go. (Opposition laughter.) The men are so anxious to show their loyalty that men who are not physically fit to go are quite willing to volunteer. The remarks that were made from the other side about officers speaking to the men is an indication that they intend to choose the very best men they can get for the contingent.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER of the Opposition: Without going themselves.

Mr. STORY: Now, as to the justice of the war from the point of view of England's position,

That is made perfectly clear by the action of the British Parliament. The matter has been discussed there most intelligently. They are much closer to the scene of action than we are, and the whole English people seem to be unanimous. They have had an appeal from over 21,000 Uitlanders asking for assistance. Everything pointed to immense consideration having been given to the question in England, and the fact that England has taken the action she has taken should be enough to satisfy the people here that she has right on her side. That is only speaking generally. But if that were not sufficient, then the treatment that the Uitlanders, especially Englishmen, have received, is absolute justification for the action of England. The hon. member for Lockyer, in his speech the other night, quoted outrages that hon. members on the other side seemed to regard with a certain amount of humour, because they are a great distance away from the scene of those outrages.

Mr. TURLEY: The truth was given from this side; that is the only difference.

Mr. STORY: The truth was given from this side. There was one case in which the person who was annoyed and insulted was only a washerwoman, and there was a little giggle of laughter went up from the other side because a fuss was made about a washerwoman being annoyed. It does not matter in the slightest degree whether a person insulted in a strange land is a washerwoman or anybody else—if she is a British subject she will receive protection. When men go into a woman's house while she is sleeping and pull the clothes off on purpose to gammon that they are making a search, it is time that England went to war, so as to show the world that wherever a British subject may be he or she will receive the protection of the British Government.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: That was done by the police in Queensland in 1891.

Mr. STORY: It is not done here, at any rate, not in any place I know, and if it should be the persons concerned would be brought to account for it. But in the Transvaal it seems—I am speaking partly from what I know—every jibe, jeer, insult, and indignity that can possibly be thrown at a person are heaped by the Boers on British subjects; and they have put up with it in the hope that a constitutional means to remedy it would be found. It is well known, and has been proved over and over again, that the fact of a person being a British subject makes him safe, even among savages, because they know that if he is improperly interfered with there will be a day of reckoning.

Mr. LESINA: That sort of thing won't wash.

Mr. STORY: It will wash. But leaving the question of the justice of the war, which is pretty well admitted on all hands. I may say a few words about our volunteers. When I first came to Brisbane to live I heard our military men and the Defence Force discussed on different occasions, and there always seemed to be some little fun to be made out of our brave defenders. It was always suggested that they were very good men to walk along the street and show their plumes to the ladies, and all that sort of thing, but that if an enemy was to come down our coast our volunteers would be over the other side of the Range finding the shortest way to Cunnamulla or Thargomindah. I know that those things were said partly in joke and partly in earnest. But now, when there comes an opportunity of proving their valour, it is said by the leader of the Labour Opposition that they are curs and cowards to go and fight before they are obliged to do so. I do not know that that is a general thing for an Englishman to wait to be kicked before he will fight. Generally, I believe, if there is a chance of fighting, and they have good reason

to fight, they take the first opportunity of doing it. I am sure there is no bloodthirsty desire among our men in volunteering to go to the Transvaal, but as they are soldiers they are enrolled for a certain purpose, their business is to fight, and to get as much experience as possible in their calling. It is quite possible that they might fight an enemy without having any great animosity against them, but I think that in future our volunteers can hardly look to hon. members on the other side for approbation, whether they fight or not, because they will be blamed in both cases. I am sure that the hon. member for Clermont will not take it badly, or in an ill temper, when I say that his speeches afford me immense amusement—when I do not get indignant. In describing our Defence Force some queer freak came over him, for he said they were all narrow-chested drapers. Why should a draper be narrow-chested? And why should all our volunteers be drapers under any circumstances? And why should a draper be sneered at in any way at all? I take it for granted that there are many drapers of quite sufficient stature to remonstrate with the hon. member for Clermont in a way that would be very convincing to him, and that would prove to him that they are neither narrow-chested nor wanting in pluck. It is quite a mistake to take up a line like that. Such a remark once made may be regarded as a joke, but when it is many times repeated it is an insult to a number of persons who do not deserve it. There seems to be a sort of democratic veneer on the hon. member, and when a man in a certain position does anything that hon. member disapproves of he immediately refers to his social position as something which is to his discredit. That is altogether a mistake, and I should advise the hon. member to be more particular on that point.

Mr. LESINA: Thank you, thank you!

Mr. STORY: The hon. member for Dalby has forestalled me in some remarks I was going to make about the hon. member's dislike to any man being proud of his nationality. The hon. member says he cannot see why any man should be proud because he happens to be an English man.

Mr. LESINA: Or a Turk.

Mr. STORY: I cannot imagine how a man can possibly be an Englishman, or of English descent, without being proud of the fact. The hon. member, however, says you ought not to be proud of it, because it is an accident where you are born. I contend that even if it is an accident a man can call himself one of the members of the greatest nation on earth, he has an absolutely good right to be proud of it, just the same as if he belonged to a family which had made itself glorious by deeds of heroism, or exploration, or discovery, or anything of that character. Surely a man has a right to be proud of something that attaches to him! If not, we have nothing to be proud of; there is nothing left to be proud of. And the reverse of that is exactly true—that there is nothing to be ashamed of—because everything is an accident. According to the hon. member, if a man happens to be a countryman of Shakespeare he has nothing to be proud of, and Shakespeare himself had nothing to be proud of, because if he had been born somewhere else he could not possibly have been the man he was. I say we have a great deal to be proud of in belonging to a nation which has such a number of men of mark in all lands, great heroes, and men who have distinguished themselves in great naval battles and in great wars. I can understand that it is quite possible in some cases we have nothing to be proud of in ourselves, but if there is one thing left that will comfort us for that, it is

the fact that we are the countrymen of the men who have made their names great in history.

[8 p.m.] The hon. member said—and it seems to be a sort of peculiarity of his—he said something about the British flag, and he never rises an inch above the retail price in Queen street of the material. “The British flag,” he says, “can be bought at Finney’s for 4½d. a yard.” If it could be bought for 2½d. a yard it has such associations connected with it that not all the money in the whole world would bribe a Britisher to change it for any flag that flies.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. STORY: Whether the hon. member is proud of that flag or not, at any rate he is living under it, and derives the benefits we all derive from living under it; and under no other flag could he say what he does say in this House.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. STORY: Under no other flag would he have the opportunity he has under that flag of talking whatever nonsense he likes to speak. I can understand that the hon. member could never understand the Britisher’s feelings when he talks about his flag, because he does not possess the necessary attributes to enable him to do so. The hon. member for Croydon, who always makes a very nice speech, suggested that it would be better to send this £32,000 to Britain, and to keep our men at home. I suppose he meant that for a joke, but it is a very small joke. It seems that the British Government have asked for a vote of £10,000,000.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: They are going to.

Mr. STORY: They have given notice that they intend to do it, and so the Chancellor of the Exchequer would probably put our £32,000 in his waistcoat pocket and forget all about it—it is such a small amount. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to be unable to look at this aspect of the case: that Queensland and the rest of Australia sending their men to help England means more than many millions paid into the English Treasury.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. STORY: When England starts in a just cause, and her sons come from all quarters of the earth to help her, there is a greater moral lesson in it than if we floated a loan and subscribed it over and over again. This is a time when we may prove our loyalty, because England does not need our fighting help; but she does want our moral help, and we have to prove to the whole world that we are one British nation, and that the British nation stands together in times of trouble. There was a demonstration in London some little time ago when the New South Wales Lancers left for the Cape. Is it possible, do you think, that thousands of people in England would get into the streets and wait there for hours to cheer to the echo a few mounted troops leaving England to go to the Cape, when they can send them themselves in tens of thousands? No, they recognised there was something far deeper in the matter than these few troops going to the Transvaal. They recognised the fact that they were Englishmen from another quarter of the earth, and that they were ready to go immediately—almost before they were sent—to where their duty pointed. It was not that the Empire wanted them to fight for it, but because they represented one part of the Empire that was ready to stand up for the mother country under any circumstances.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. W. HAMILTON (Gregory): Their mothers have sent for them. They won’t let them go.

Mr. STORY: They will let them go. It has taken many centuries to build up the great

Empire to which we belong. We have come through times of awful trouble, tribulation, revolution, and that kind of thing, but now England stands pre-eminent in the world. We must either go on or retreat. England can never increase her power and hold the blessing of peace in her hand as she will unless every part of the Empire is ready at any time to go with the mother country. This is the great lesson that is being taught all over the world. It is only about two years ago that American sympathy with England was sufficient to avert a European war. There were rumours of war, and England seemed to be standing alone. All at once a feeling of kinship sprang up, and through all America there seemed to be promises of help and sympathy, and that was quite sufficient to call the attention of the European countries to what it meant to quarrel with England.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. STORY: The hon. member for Rockhampton, Mr. Kidston, laughed at the suggestion that the Premier was sending these men to the Transvaal on purpose to impress the European countries, but, although it may be a very small contingent that is being sent from Queensland, I am perfectly certain it will impress the European countries, because what deduction would they draw from the fact if all the Parliaments in Australia were like hon. gentlemen opposite, and every proposition to send troops to the aid of the mother country was negated and the troops were not sent? What would they say? Would they not say, “England can no longer depend on her colonies. She stands alone. They have drifted apart, because they do not come to her help, and there is a feeling growing up throughout the colonial Parliaments adverse to England, and she cannot depend on her colonies?”

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. STORY: If it ever comes to pass that the Federal Parliament that is to control our troops is represented by such men as that—once it is known that in necessity England is deserted, then I say the decay of the Empire commences.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. STORY: England can always protect herself if she confines herself to her own territory, and if this feeling gets abroad that the colonies are not inclined to assist, then they must take the responsibility of their defence upon themselves, and England will do what she did long before the Labour party or Australia were heard of—hold her own when she is attacked. It is a most painful thing for a man who has grown up in one country, and under one law, to think that any feeling like this could possibly arise in a young country like this, and amongst men of British descent.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Not all of them.

Mr. STORY: This feeling of jubilation at any reverses England might suffer. When it was made public here that it was untrue that Canada had offered to help England, it met with a sort of cheer from the other side as if they were glad of it.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. STORY: I think hon. members opposite are making this a party matter, forgetting what they are saying—forgetting the great responsibility they have, and forgetting that their words will be quoted far beyond the confines of this colony. The trend of the speeches of the leader of the Opposition, and the three members who followed him on the other side of the House, was that no troops should be sent to the Transvaal. I read the three speeches to-day very carefully, and it was not the action of the Premier to which they objected—that part of the question was deserted almost immediately each

commenced to speak—but there was a distinct disinclination on their part to send anyone to help Great Britain in the Transvaal.

The PREMIER: Yes; that is the point.

Mr. JACKSON: Could they not go on their own?

Mr. STORY: The hon. member for Kennedy asks if they could not go on their own. How could a lot of men get together and prepare themselves for such a campaign unless they were under the control of some superior authority? We have heard from America how certain wealthy men organise certain corps or battalions, usually cavalry, and maintain them; but there must be some person in the community who will take the lead and the responsibility of sending the troops away. We have heard of the probable worth of the men when they do go, and I think we have a very fair instance in the case of Lieutenant Gordon. There was a man visiting India on his own private affairs, and in face of innumerable obstacles—which seemed insurmountable at first—he got to the front. He was prevented from getting as far to the front as he would have liked, but at any rate he forced himself forward and proved the metal that was in him. He was a thorough bushman, and a splendid horseman, and the service he did showed not only that he had been well trained in the Queensland force, but that he was a serviceable and valuable addition to the forces in India. That man wants to go to the Transvaal. Would the hon. member for Clermont class him as a weak-chested draper, or prevent him from serving his country? If we are willing to supplement the English forces, and if England is willing to receive our contribution, then I think we should send them, with the assurance that they will be well received. I only want to say in conclusion—because I do not intend to make a long speech—that, of course, no one in this House can accept the amendment. It was never intended to be passed at all. It was only intended to be voted upon. That amendment should be withdrawn.

The PREMIER: No.

Mr. STORY: Another one may be substituted that will probably have pretty well the same effect, but which will permit of people voting upon it. I trust, however, that the Premier will not allow one single amendment to be made to the motion which he has proposed.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. STORY: If he falls upon this amendment, he falls upon the very best thing his Government could go down upon.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. STORY: They know their duty, and they have tried to do it, and there is no disgrace in failure. If hon. gentlemen opposite like the disgrace attaching to the placing of obstacles before such a motion, let them have it. I must say one word more before I sit down. After the hon. members for Lockyer and Maryborough had concluded their speeches there was some discussion as to the manner in which this debate had been reported. Now, I am not going to mention any names, although it is perfectly evident to everybody in this House that the report of the *Courier* on the morning of the 12th, so far as "Gallery Notes" are concerned, was not a correct record of what transpired in this House.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Yes, yes!

Mr. McDONALD: Perfectly fair.

Mr. STORY: The speech of the leader of the Labour party was toned down on purpose to suit him, and certain motives were imputed to the

hon. member for Lockyer, which I know myself were absolutely without truth. Now, there is one thing we have a right to claim in this House—because everything we say goes abroad throughout the country—and that is that our utterances in this House should be reported fairly, and that whatever comments are made should be fairly made, so that the public may judge for themselves. It is not fair to trim the speeches of certain members, or impute motives to any hon. gentleman that I am sure he was not in any way guilty of. I am going to vote for the Premier's proposition; and I hereby add my protest against any such amendment as that which has been moved by the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. McDONALD (*Flinders*): I am rather surprised at the hon. gentleman making the reference he did in the last portion of his speech. I think it is unfair and unjust.

Mr. DUNSFORD: Why does he not attack a man able to defend himself?

Mr. McDONALD: The man who writes those notes has to earn his living by it, and the only effect which the remarks the hon. gentleman has made may have a tendency to bring about, is his discharge from the position which he occupies.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. ANNEAR: What about the attack made against a writer in the *Telegraph* by your side?

Mr. McDONALD: On two previous occasions the hon. member for Maryborough has made similar attacks, and has had to withdraw them.

Mr. STORY: You have made similar attacks yourself.

Mr. McDONALD: At all events, "two wrongs do not make a right," and I think the action of the hon. member for Balonne is most unfair to the writer of "Gallery Notes."

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. ANNEAR: You know that those comments were very unfair.

Mr. McDONALD: As far as I read them, they were fair comment.

Mr. STORY: No, they were not.

Mr. McDONALD: As a matter of fact, among the Press of this colony, the *Courier*, above all others, is possessed of the most jingoistic spirit, and that paper is making an effort to back up the Government in every possible shape and form. I have sat in this Chamber all the afternoon, in the hope that some hon. gentleman opposite would have sufficient courage to get up and defend the action of the Government, but I have heard nothing but a lot of wild statements. I listened very patiently to the hon. member for Balonne, and a great deal of what he said was very interesting and instructive. I listened as patiently to the hon. member for Herbert. He made a most interesting speech, and gave a lot of information which no doubt is very useful to Parliament and the country. I listened carefully to the hon. member for Dalby, who gave us a long, rambling speech.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: A good speech.

Mr. McDONALD: A good speech from the hon. gentleman's point of view, no doubt. I like on all occasions to hear the hon. member for Dalby speak, whether I agree with him or not, but I expected both the hon. member for Dalby and the Hon. the Attorney-General—considering the positions they occupy, the training they have had in the law, and their general knowledge of international law—to have given us some justification of the action of the Government. Now the hon. member for Rockhampton, Mr. Kidston, dealt entirely with the matter from the constitutional aspect, yet the hon. member for Dalby in his speech did not attempt in any way whatever to justify the action of the Government, or to

refute the arguments of the hon. member for Rockhampton. The whole tenor of all the speeches we have listened to this afternoon was as to whether this war is just or unjust.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Oh, no; that is not so.

Mr. McDONALD: Well, I will make my own statement in my own way, and the Secretary for Lands is at liberty to get up and speak afterwards. The hon. members for Herbert and Dalby made some little reference to the constitutional question, the latter remarking that he hoped the Government would more often indulge in similar energetic action. The hon. gentleman went on to say that he believed the action of the Government was perfectly justified, and in support of the position he took up he referred to several matters in which the British Government took action independent of Parliament. The hon. member then went on to state that he hoped to see more energetic efforts made by the Government of the colony in this direction. Let us follow the hon. member's argument, and suppose there was a Government in power which had strong leanings towards the Labour party. It will be remembered that a few years ago there was a strike in London called the London Dock strike. At that time the pulse of the people of Australia was pretty unanimous in the support and sympathy they gave to that strike, and as a matter of fact some £50,000 or £60,000 was voluntarily sent from this colony to assist the London dockers. Here was a case where, if the hon. member's reasoning and logic are good, a Government in sympathy with the dockers might have sent them £50,000 of the Government funds, and then have justly come to Parliament and said, "We have quite gauged public opinion, and have sent the money knowing that Parliament will sanction our efforts." Who would be the first to offer objection to that? The hon. member for Dalby and all the hon. gentlemen sitting on the other side of the House. Yet this is the exact position we are now placed in. There is no end to the illustrations that might be drawn if the Government were allowed to spend money without the sanction of Parliament in the manner they have been doing on the present occasion. The case of the Naval Tribute Bill has been referred to. It is well known to every hon. member that for his action in connection with that Bill the Griffith Government was turned out and the McIlwraith Government came in, in 1888.

Mr. J. HAMILTON: What ridiculous nonsense!

Mr. McDONALD: I have only just looked up McIlwraith's speech on the occasion in the Centennial Hall, and I observe that that was one of the strong points he took, and that it was the ground on which he started the National party in Queensland.

Mr. J. HAMILTON: Parliament had then expired by effluxion of time.

Mr. McDONALD: I am well aware of that, but the hon. member may remember that that was one of the strongest things brought against the Griffith Administration, and that it was practically on that question that McIlwraith founded the National party. And it was on the top of that party that McIlwraith came into power. The thing was not assented to until such time as Sir Samuel Griffith was made to swallow every principle he had ever held in his connection with the politics of the colony. Every principle that that gentleman had at that time he was made to swallow so that he might keep faith with the British Government in carrying that particular measure through. He sacrificed those principles so that the Naval Tribute Bill might pass. The hon. member for Herbert told us that such a thing as this has never been chal-

lenged. I would remind the hon. member, and it is within the memory of every member of this Parliament, that not so many years ago a similar action was challenged. It was at the time of the banking legislation during the crisis of 1893, but the Government did what I, and most people who have studied the matter, believed to be an unconstitutional act in over-riding an Act of Parliament by allowing certain institutions to go free of stamp duty. On that occasion we had a Government which was prepared not only to spend money without the sanction of Parliament, but to over-ride an Act of Parliament in favour of certain people, which meant a loss of revenue to the colony of £38,000 or £50,000. The Government never kept any correct record of it—so they said in answer to a question—and I estimated the loss of revenue at from £40,000 to £50,000. There is another case of which I may remind the hon. member for Herbert, although no doubt he has come across it in his reading of our "Votes and Proceedings" and the records of *Hansard*. At one time a difficulty arose between the Government and the A.S.N. Company. The A.S.N. Company was supposed to be making an attempt to extort a very large sum of money from the Government to make a contract to carry the mails along the coast. The Government did not think they were justified in handing over such a big monopoly to the A.S.N. Company, and giving them the large price they asked for that particular contract. What was the result? The result was that Sir Charles (then Mr.) Lilley, who was then leading the Government, thought the best thing to be done under the circumstances was for the Government to provide steamers of their own, and with that object in view Mr. Lilley went to Sydney and made arrangements for the purchase of certain vessels. I believe one, the "Governor Blackall," was actually purchased for the Government at the time. What do we find afterwards? The very moment Parliament met Mr. Lilley was taken to task for having incurred a certain expenditure without the sanction of Parliament. It deemed its privileges to have been so outraged, as far as I can gather from the somewhat meagre account that appears in *Hansard*, that no one would move and second the Address in Reply, and he had to do that himself. And if my memory serves me right, J. P. Bell then moved a vote of no confidence in the Government, and when that was moved it brought about the downfall of Mr. Lilley.

Mr. BELL: You are not giving the facts, but a perfect travesty of what took place on that occasion.

Mr. McDONALD: If the hon. member wants me to go into the details I will get *Hansard* and read the whole question for him. If my facts are not correct, let the hon. member, or anyone else on the other side, get up and dispute them. There is no getting over this fact—that Mr. Lilley was defeated on a no-confidence motion moved by J. P. Bell for doing exactly the same thing that the Government are doing to-day. Yet we find hon. members on the other side prepared to support them through thick and thin.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: It was Sir T. McIlwraith who made the agreement with the Australasian Steam Navigation Company without the sanction of Parliament.

Mr. McDONALD: That does not prove anything. It only adds another crime to the already large list we have of the actions of strong men in this House attempting to over-ride the will of Parliament, and which are as near to dictatorship as one can possibly imagine.

Mr. BELL: Will the hon. member—

Mr. McDONALD: I don't mind the hon. member interjecting. Having made his speech, he is muzzled. He is merely being allowed to interject. That is the length

[8.30 p.m.] of the hon. gentleman's chain.

The only member who is off the chain to-night is the Hon. the Minister for Lands. We are to get a long speech from him on the cruelty of the Boers, and he will probably compare them with Paraguay, and similar cases. (Laughter.) I maintain that hon. gentlemen on that side of the House have, in no shape or form, attempted to show us that they have done constitutionally right in following the course they have. The Hon. the Attorney-General lays down a most remarkable doctrine. He states—

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.

I am prepared to admit that. The hon. gentleman has only got to refer to the authorities on the table of the House, and he will find that that is so. But surely the only deduction to be drawn from the hon. gentleman's statement is that the Premier of Queensland has declared war on some other State at the present time.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: No.

Mr. McDONALD: That is the only inference which can be drawn if that is the only case; and I am at one with the hon. gentleman that this is the only case in which the British Government can act in an emergency. Further, the hon. gentleman says—

If they made a mistake in declaring war on their own responsibility, Parliament afterwards deals with the Government that has made the mistake.

We are in exactly the same position now. Has not the Premier of this colony pledged the honour of this colony to send 250 men to the Transvaal; and having pledged this colony to this matter, what are we asked to find? Even if the Government are turned out to-morrow and another is appointed to sit on those benches, they would have to fulfil the pledges the hon. gentleman has made.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. McDONALD: That is exactly the position we are in, and it is a mere farce for the Premier to come in now and ask Parliament to sanction what has been done, because he knows he has already committed this colony. If it was £100,000 or £250,000, this House and Queensland is practically bound by that pledge just as if Parliament had given sanction to it. The hon. gentleman goes on further to say—

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.

I presume from that, that the hon. gentleman meant that Parliament must withhold supplies. What would the result be in the midst of a war? How could we possibly withhold supplies? As a matter of fact, once war is declared we should either have to go on with it or back down dishonourably.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: War is declared practically, whatever we may do.

Mr. McDONALD: I do not wish to be drawn into that question at all. That question can be dealt with as soon as the amendment is disposed of. At present it is merely my duty to point out that this is an unconstitutional act on the part of the Government. The Hon. the Attorney-General has laid down the doctrine that the proper course to follow is, if you do not approve of the action of the Government after

war has been declared, you can withhold supplies. Is there anything so stupid that a man could possibly utter? Can any person imagine for a moment, in the middle of a desperate struggle between two nations, you can withhold supplies?

The TREASURER: He never said so.

Mr. McDONALD: The hon. gentleman says he never said so. I will read the hon. gentleman's speech. He can get up and correct it if I make a mistake—

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.

What does that mean?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: It means that when they get into Committee of Supply they simply turn the Government out, and the next Government will, of course, have to carry on the war.

Mr. McDONALD: So we come to this position—that in the event of war being unjustly declared or bungled, right in the middle of this the Government can be changed. What would that end in? Probably civil war. That is exactly the position the hon. gentleman would force us into.

Mr. GLASSEY: Swap horses while crossing the stream.

Mr. McDONALD: It is amusing to see the hon. gentleman when he deals with the matter further on. Dealing with the speech of the hon. member for Brisbane North, he takes up this attitude on the constitutional question—

The hon. member for North Brisbane, 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.

First the hon. gentleman attempted to prove that the action of the Government, in acting without consulting Parliament, was correct; and then takes up the position that Mr. Chamberlain must have known that the offer was made subject to the sanction of Parliament. Why, there is no word in the whole of the correspondence that has taken place, and which has been laid on the table of the House for our guidance, not one solitary word to indicate to Mr. Chamberlain in any shape or form that the Government was going to ask this House to sanction the Hon. the Premier's proposal.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Mr. Chamberlain has asked the British Parliament for £10,000,000.

Mr. McDONALD: I quite understand Mr. Chamberlain has got to do that; but it has nothing to do with the present case at all. There is another point. The Hon. the Premier asks in his motion that we provide sufficient money for equipping a contingent of volunteers. Now the hon. gentleman never thought for a moment that there was going to be volunteers sent. As a matter of fact, the hon. gentleman never referred to anything else—we find here in the very proposal the hon. gentleman made to the Imperial Government—than that they were going to send the Defence Force. If they were not going to send the Defence Force, then the hon. gentleman must have been saying what was not true to Mr. Chamberlain, or he was making an attempt to deceive Mr. Chamberlain as to who would be sent there. What are the facts of the case? The Commandant asked—or, rather, suggested—in the first

place that a contingent might be sent, and the hon. gentleman in accepting it, refers to the Defence Force again. Further, what do we find when officers connected with the Defence Force are sent through the country to different places? We find that they actually get the Defence Force on parade, and then a long rambling speech is made about the glorious British Empire, and the death struggle the British Empire is in, and the probability that if they do not get 250 men to fall into line to go to the Transvaal the whole of the British Empire will become a total wreck. We find that the officers of the Defence Force are not volunteers, but they are using their position, as members of the Defence Force, to try and induce other members of the Defence Force to join this contingent for the Transvaal, so as to keep faith with the Premier. There is another point I think the Government should have looked into before they made any promise, and that is the position of the troops. In the first place they offer to send a portion of the Defence Force; then they find that is illegal, and now we find we are in this position: It is a debatable point whether all those volunteers about to leave for the Transvaal will not have to resign their positions in the Defence Force of this colony. I am one of those who believe that no member of the Defence Force can leave our shores to fight in any other country unless he resigns his position in that force, and that applies to officers as well as men. That is a point which the Government will have to take into consideration before the contingent goes. If the Government were honest and sincere in this matter, the position they should have taken up is this: If they believe, as the hon. member for Dalby believes, that on all occasions when the British Empire is going to war we should contribute a portion of the force required, the one honourable course for the Government to pursue is this: they should immediately amend the Defence Act so as to allow the Government to send those troops away whenever they think proper. But they did not do this. The only argument the Premier advanced on the question of urgency was that he wanted to get in before the other colonies, and I would remind him that he is one of those who a little while ago was preaching about the federation of these colonies—saying that the colonies should be one. Where is "the brotherly love" when the hon. gentleman is trying to take a point on the other colonies when he knows there is a movement on foot to send a federal troop away? The hon. gentleman ignores the principles he laid down during the federation campaign, and tries to get in first, and—as the hon. member for Rockhampton stated this afternoon—it is questionable what were the motives of the hon. gentleman. I think, and I say, that the action taken by the hon. gentleman was for the express purpose of securing the title to which he is looking forward.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must not impute motives.

Mr. McDONALD: I will not pursue that line further. If the hon. gentleman gets it he is welcome to all the glory it may bring him. (Laughter.)

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McDONALD: The hon. member for Story—I mean the hon. member for Balonne—wanted to convince us that the question now before the House is whether we approve or disapprove of the contingent going away, but I maintain that that is not the question before this Assembly.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. McDONALD: I was rather surprised this afternoon at the action which the hon.

member for Herbert, Mr. Cowley, took in attempting to discuss the main question, seeing he himself was so strong, when he held another position in this House, in always trying to confine hon. members who spoke to the particular amendment before the House. I want to impress upon the House generally that no member on the other side is making any attempt to justify the action of the Government in this matter. The senior member for Brisbane North put the matter clearly the other evening when he stated that the colony was practically bound to the arrangement the Premier had made, and I agree with that hon. gentleman that whether we are prepared, whether the House is prepared to defeat the Government on this particular amendment at the present time or not, this House is legally bound to follow out the compact the hon. gentleman has made. As I said at the outset, I do not intend to say much on this question. I merely want to keep the debate in the channel it should go in; beyond that I do not intend to speak much further at present. The question raised by the amendment now before the House is whether the Government have acted constitutionally in making an offer to the Imperial Government to send troops to the Transvaal without the sanction of Parliament, and the contrary has been successfully proved by the junior member for Rockhampton beyond the shadow of a doubt. So convincing was that hon. gentleman's reasoning that we find the Government are not prepared with a solitary member on that side—not even the hon. member for Dalby with his trained legal mind and his large experience in dealing with constitutional questions and other questions in connection with international law—even that hon. gentleman has never attempted to justify the action of the Government in this particular case. I hope that whenever the vote is taken, hon. members of this House will recognise that the question at issue is whether the action of the Government is justifiable in sending troops to assist the Imperial Government without the sanction of Parliament.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. D. H. Dalrymple, Mackay): I cannot understand why hon. members opposite are so anxious to know whether the action of the Government on this occasion requires particular justification. It seems to me that if the action of the Government here requires justification, the action of all the Governments of the other colonies also requires justification. I know that the Labour party will no more approve of any Imperial action than they will approve of any action taken by other Parliaments in these colonies. There is nothing peculiar about that attitude of the Labour party. They do not come forward in a frank and open manner and say that the people of this colony do not approve of the sending of this contingent, but they approach the matter by a sideward, which, to my mind, is absolutely contemptible.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The leader of the Opposition has moved an amendment which I will ask any intelligent member of the community to pronounce an opinion on. If I am not permitted to use the word inside the House, outside I would call it "rubbish." It is a most mixed and entangled statement—practically an exemplification of the "Yes-No" policy which hon. members opposite have endeavoured to pursue, but which they will not pursue, without my marking time, so to speak. Now I shall read this proposal with the amendment which was brought in—apparently in

all seriousness—under the guise that the Government had committed some grave constitutional mistake. The motion reads—

That this House renews the assurance of its loyalty and devotion to the Throne and Person of Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen.

That is the first clause, and I would point out that the leader of the Opposition expressed the opinion that this was entirely superfluous—that there was no reason why the colony at this juncture should assure Her Majesty of its loyalty. Later on the same hon. member pointed out that this was probably put in with a deep design, but still he left that clause in, to which he objected. Then the amendment goes on—

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; 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.

(Laughter.) I really cannot find words to express my opinion of this amazing conflict of words.

Mr. McDONALD: Can't you find anything about Paraguay?

Mr. STEWART: Or the French Revolution?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I don't choose to be interrupted on this occasion. Hon. members opposite have shown that they don't sympathise with patriotism, or with the burdensome disabilities and grievous injustices suffered by the Uitlanders. They deny that these things exist, and they won't support the determination of the British Empire to redress these wrongs. They have said that the action of this Government is most unjustifiable.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: They hold that under no circumstances should the action of this colony have preceded federal action by the other colonies. That is really what they are driving at. The real objection on the other side is to have nothing to do with the other parts of the world, outside Queensland. They don't want that great federation of the Empire which will bring about strength and security. They look at the matter from a microscopic point of view; they cannot view any question in a broad light, which will benefit the world at large. The great object at the present moment before their optics is by a side wind to knock the Government out on the mere paltry pretext that they have acted unconstitutionally. But I am not aware that we have acted unconstitutionally. The other colonies have done exactly the same as we have done, perhaps with the exception of New South Wales.

Mr. TURLEY: But in different ways.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Perhaps in very slightly different ways—only a technical difference—there is no real difference. All the other colonies really made the same offer, inasmuch as they stated to the Secretary of State for the Colonies that men had volunteered for service. We asked for the opinion as to what kind of troops would be acceptable to the Secretary of State, if it were decided to send any.

Mr. DAWSON: What date?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS:

What does it matter whether it was [9 p.m.] Monday or Tuesday. That is not the point. The hon. member again

fixes his attention upon a microscopic point. At any rate, this led practically to the same result, and the action that I have referred to was taken by the Premiers of every colony before the sub-

ject was even mooted in Parliament. Each colony was committed to the same extent as, and no more than, this was—that is, if you open negotiations with the Secretary of State for the Colonies and telegraph to him that men were volunteering in the colony, and would the Secretary of State accept the offer, if an offer was made—the mere fact of making that offer to some extent—but only to a very small extent—pledges the colony to make the offer, subject always, of course, to the approval of Parliament. In all cases Parliament ultimately determines whether or not troops shall be sent. Now let us consider what has occurred. The Premier some time back sent, under precisely the same circumstances as occurred in the other colonies, information—or rather made an offer of troops to the Secretary of State. The hon. member for Brisbane North says, that if two or three words had been added there would have been no trouble in the House; but, if those two or three words had been added, the Labour party would simply have discovered some other means of attacking the Government—and if they had discovered any other means, it would have been infinitely more to their credit. The hon. member for Brisbane North says some more words should have been added. The Attorney-General, in addressing the House, pointed out, what I should say any schoolboy could understand, that when an offer of troops was made by the Premier of a self-governing colony to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, it is preposterous to suppose that the Secretary of State for the Colonies could possibly misunderstand the offer. The Premier is not dealing with the King of Abyssinia, or with the King of the Cannibal Islands. People who know anything whatever about constitutional government must know that an offer of this sort—whether it is expressed in so many words or whether it is not—cannot possibly mean anything else than that the offer is subject to the approval of Parliament. The Premier has no power—as everybody knows—to do anything without the sanction of Parliament. It was merely a way of ascertaining the feeling of the authorities at home, and it was just as legitimate a way of ascertaining the feelings of the Secretary of State as the way adopted by the other colonies—to cable home and say that troops were offering, and would the Secretary of State accept them? Then what took place next? As soon as Parliament met these facts were stated in the Governor's Speech—that the offer had been made, and that the offer had been accepted—and the House accepted that statement without comment.

Hon. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON: The Address in Reply went through like a shot.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: So it did; and what did that prove? It proved that either hon. members opposite—

Hon. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON: No—both sides.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: On this side we do not object to this. It proved that hon. members opposite were singularly blind, or they refused deliberately to do their duty. At that time the whole of the facts in connection with this matter were laid before the House. The House was seized of the facts—

Hon. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON: No.

Mr. J. HAMILTON: Quite true.

Hon. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON: I intended to move the adjournment of the House next day.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The hon. member was away on that occasion, as he frequently is. At any rate, it does not meet my contention that the House knew just as much then about the whole of this transaction as it does at the present time.

A MEMBER of the Opposition : The papers had not been laid on the table then.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS : The junior member for Rockhampton, Mr. Kidston, told us to-night that there should be no neglect to preserve the privileges of the House in a case like this, when the Government does something it is not entitled to do—that Parliament is bound to resent it promptly. Did Parliament resent this? No, it sanctioned it; and I say that if anything wrong has been done, the House, by giving its sanction, is *particeps criminis*. It has offended also, and there can be no condemnation by this House of the action of the Government, if it acted unconstitutionally—which I entirely deny—without involving the members of this House as well. If it is wrong, they were wrong a month ago in not taking exception to it. Now what becomes of the allegation that the Premier has committed the colony to anything? He has committed the colony to nothing at all that I am aware of, except the statement that certain persons here had volunteered, and that he, with the consent of Parliament, would place them at the disposal of the Imperial authorities. He has done nothing more than that. If the House says now what it ought to have said, I venture to say, a month ago, that this is unconstitutional, and it will not agree to it, the House can say so. If the House chooses to refuse, no money has been spent at all.

Mr. GIVENS : What about the contracts for the overcoats?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS : These cases which hon. members bring up of some one—Sir Charles Lilley, for instance—having in bygone times gone to Sydney and incurred an expenditure that Parliament never told him to incur, and of his suffering accordingly—such cases do not apply in the least. The House has full control over this expenditure at the present moment, and it is as much within the determination of the House at the present moment as it has been within the determination of the other Parliaments of Australia. Therefore, I say, that contention does not hold, and the statement that it is unconstitutional can only be sustained by their postulating that Joe Chamberlain—

Mr. DAWSON : Oh, be respectful!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS : The Secretary of State for the Colonies, if you like—knows nothing whatever about constitutional government, and is as ignorant of the usages of self-governing colonies as though he had never heard of constitutional government, and was not a member of the greatest Parliament on earth. There is another matter I wish also to refer to. It was brought forward by the hon. member for Croydon. I deal with this because, after all, I think these are the two principal points out of which it has been endeavoured to make capital. It is that we have broken away from federal action—that we are not acting in unison with the rest of the colonies. I maintain that if we can show that we are acting in unison with the other colonies—and most undoubtedly we are—we can treat the hostile comment to which we have been subjected as only the ebullition of distrust which we might expect from our opponents when our policy bids fair to be successful. In this matter I affirm that we are acting just as the other colonies of this great continent are acting, and that whatever condemnation my hon. and very shortsighted friends on the other side may pass upon this Government applies to all Governments of Australia. With that knowledge we can afford to feel pretty cheerful under their carping criticisms. We are charged with having broken away from federal action, because

we are not sending our troops as part of a federal contingent, but as a unit. The other colonies are doing the same thing; they are sending their troops as units to South Africa. As will appear from the papers before Parliament, the southern colonies suggested federal action, and the Premier of this colony consented, and desired that federal action should take place. I think I may say that most of us desired it. The Premier sent down the Commandant of the Defence Force of Queensland to meet the military representatives of the other colonies and arrange for a federal contingent, of which the Queensland corps was to form a part. Why, then, should hon. members say that if this is not carried out it is owing to any default on the part of the Government? It is owing to no such default. The Government anticipated that the Queensland corps would form part of a federal contingent, but that intention was put on one side in consequence of a request which proceeded from the Secretary of State for the Colonies that it was desirable that units only should be sent to the Transvaal. Therefore, the report of the Commandants was not acted on, but the Government, in deference to the expression of opinion of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, which has been conformed to by everyone of the colonies, intend to send our troops as a unit. Now, I propose to deal with some of the remarks which have fallen from the hon. member who preceded me, and who I am glad to say, did not make any particular statement with regard to the right or prudence, or propriety, or otherwise of sending troops to the Transvaal. Whether he refrained from doing so because his feelings did not coincide with those of the leader of the Labour party and the other members who led off in this debate, I do not know; but he said nothing whatever as to whether it is right or wrong to do what is proposed by the Government in this matter; and he did not endeavour, as four or five members who rose from the Opposition benches endeavoured to do, to cover private and patriotic men with unjustifiable vilification. I think it is possible that members of the Labour party may discover before long that it is not prudent to be too candid in expressing their opinions; that it is not a method that is calculated to gain votes; and that the public, whose servants they are, will not in the least sympathise with them when they say such things of members of the Defence Force, because they feel probably a more patriotic impulse than some of us do, and are ready to leave their friends, and perhaps their wives and children, in order to hold out their hands to men whom they believe to be oppressed in South Africa, and who, after all, are their own flesh and blood. I say, they are men whom the country at any rate will appreciate; and those epithets which are cast upon them will most undoubtedly recoil on those who use them, for the majority of the people in the country are right-thinking people, and will recognise deeds of nobility and honour where those deeds of nobility and honour are done. We may, I presume, accept what the leader of the Labour party says as being, to some extent, a fair reflex of the general opinions of that party; but not only has he called these men names, and applied opprobrious epithets to them which are not deserved, he was followed up by other hon. members on that side of the House.

Mr. JACKSON : He was speaking for himself then.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE : You change your minds—three days make a difference.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS : I say he was followed by other hon. members—

Mr. DAWSON : I take the full responsibility of what I said.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: When I make harmless interjections, as I do occasionally, hon. members on the other side, including my hon. friend, the hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba, get up and call attention to the fact that I have been guilty of disorderly interjections. All interjections, we know, are disorderly, but, though I do not mind them, yet I would remind hon. members that there will be plenty of opportunity to reply to me. I do not say that the leader of the Opposition is a cur; I believe him to be a courageous man, and that when he commits himself to a statement he will stand by it, and accept the full responsibility of his opinions. To that extent I am willing to do full justice to the hon. member. I regret that I am compelled to refer in terms probably of censure to what the hon. member has said.

Mr. DAWSON: Say what you want to say, and never mind apologising.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: We are perfectly good friends, and I hope we shall continue so, but when the leader of the Opposition expresses himself in such a very extraordinary way it is only legitimate for me to call attention to the fact. The position he has taken up in this case in regard to the Government is one which in my opinion is based on two facts. First of all hon. members opposite are anxious to overcome their adversaries, and they believe that with one or two defections from this side—defections of members who think they can conveniently go over there on a constitutional question—and with that natural hostility which hon. members opposite apparently have to anything which is of a large and broad nature, they can combine all parties. But I say that in the speeches of the first four or five members who took part in this debate on that side the fact was manifest that they object to sending any assistance to our kith and kin in the Transvaal. Every possible effort was made to prove that the Boers were white men, and that the British were interlopers, and that no matter what happened to them they deserved to be oppressed. That was practically the argument of hon. members. But I am not dealing with their arguments. I am endeavouring to deal with the position they took up, and the statements which they made may be taken as a fair indication of their own judgment and of their preconceived notions. I call attention to the fact that the leader of the Opposition spoke of our men who said, "We will stand up for our own blood; never mind where they may be, if they are wronged we will help them"—I say I call attention to the fact that so far from the leader of the Opposition being impressed with the nobility and self-sacrifice of those men, he called them curs and cowards.

Mr. DAWSON: You are entirely wrong there; quote *Hansard*, will you?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I am quoting *Hansard*.

The HOME SECRETARY: Is it revised *Hansard*?

Mr. DAWSON: No, I never looked at a proof.

The HOME SECRETARY: We all know what you said.

Mr. KIDSTON: As the Government have no defence of their own to give, they attack the leader of the Opposition.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: If the leader of the Opposition is not prepared to be attacked, then I recommend him not to attack men who, at any rate, are as good as himself.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: And who are unable to defend themselves.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Yes, and who have no opportunity here of defending themselves.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Now, I take another hon. member—

Mr. DAWSON: You quote what I said.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I will quote the words literally.

Mr. DAWSON: I am used to being misrepresented.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I do not know why the hon. member should ask me to quote his words when he knows perfectly that those words are the very words he used.

Mr. DAWSON: No.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I will obtain the words the hon. member used presently, and I will read them word for word.

Mr. DAWSON: You read the words, and don't get angry.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I have nothing to get angry about. Passing from the leader of the Opposition for the time, we will come to another hon. member.

Mr. DAWSON: Oh, quote those words before you go to the other member.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: A member of some ability and education. I refer to the hon. member for Mitchell.

Mr. DAWSON: Do you think that is just or fair? You made a statement about me—why don't you quote the words?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I will give the hon. member the exact words in a moment.

Mr. DAWSON: Do it now.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: When he knows the exact words he will be able to find their exact light. I will quote them later on.

Mr. DAWSON: Go on. It does not matter. It's all the same.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I am referring now to the statement made by the hon. member for Mitchell. What is his conception of the volunteers of this colony, who are mostly men of the Defence Force? Does he look upon them as honourable men? He says—judging them probably by himself, but I do not know where he gets his canons of honesty or loyalty from—he said these men if they leave this colony, the moment they are three miles away they are outside of the dominion of the colony itself, and it is probable, at any rate he says they may, after we have paid £30,000 as the cost to us of sending them—they may, as soon as the voyage is over, take service with the Boers. That is his opinion. That is to say, he believes these men to be traitors, and objectless traitors. Another thing—which probably did not occur to him—this suspicion which he entertained of our volunteers, of the members of the Defence Force of this colony, apart from its being a most ungracious suspicion and a most unjustifiable suspicion, is a suspicion which could be just as well entertained of the federal contingents. If it is true of the Queensland contingent, it is true of the contingents from all the other colonies of Australia. To imply for one moment that these men who leave our colony for no other motive, I take it, than that of rendering succour to a number of our oppressed fellow-subjects in South Africa, that these men, under any possible set of circumstances that could be conceived, would sell the people in whose service they were, that they would abandon the noble cause in which they had enlisted, and that they would be traitors and sell themselves to the Boers—it is a most unjustifiable insult. It is nothing else. Now I shall be very happy, more especially as I was called upon to do it, to read that hon. member's own words.

Mr. KEOGH: He has just gone out.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS : That does not affect the fact. I cannot help it if the hon. member has gone out. The statement I made will be thoroughly borne out by what I read, and any hon. member opposite can get a copy of *Hansard*—if he is as suspicious of me as he seems to be of the volunteers he can do so. (Laughter.) If he has half as bad an opinion of me as he has of the Defence Force, any hon. member who cares to do it can do so. At page 347, line eight, I find that the leader of the Opposition said—

I am not ashamed of myself. I have absolutely no respect for the man in this colony who would volunteer his services to go over to the Transvaal. The man who would do that is in the broadest sense of the term a rank and arrant coward.

MEMBERS on the Opposition side : Read on.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS : I will read on. Don't you alarm yourselves ; I am not in the habit of reading part and dropping the part that does not suit me. He says—

I do not mean that he is a coward in the sense that if he were to meet the enemy he would run away from him, that he would turn tail and show the white feather.

MEMBERS on the Opposition side : Hear, hear !

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS :

Or that he is not game to stand up to a man of his own weight, and either give or take a thrashing. But I mean that he is a coward in this sense—coward is perhaps not the correct term, cur is more correct, for he has more of the dog nature in him than human nature.

MEMBERS on the Opposition side : Go on.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS : I am not going on for a week. I will read a little more of it, but I have to deal also with what other hon. members said. The leader of the Opposition went on to say—

My observation of dogs has been, that when one dog gets another dog down, every other mongrel in the immediate neighbourhood thinks it is his bounden duty to bite the dog underneath, and so I say the men to whom I refer have more of the dog nature than human nature in them.

I should like to know how that improves the epithets which the hon. member showered upon his fellow-colonists ? I have referred to the statement made by the hon. member for Mitchell, which practically was, or its implication was, that the 250 men who would go from here to the Transvaal would be traitors. The hon. member for Croydon, besides talking of them as "swashbucklers," and so on, said that when they left as volunteers and became soldiers, they were "butchers." I do not know that a man because he is a volunteer and is willing to go and fight for his country and his flag occupies a less noble position than he did before. It does not seem to me that he does. If a man is a volunteer, what is he a volunteer for ? He volunteers to defend his country. Now, I know what hon. members will say—and it strikes me that this is exactly an instance of the extraordinary microscopical character of their intellectual eyes—they will say that he does not defend his country because he goes to the Transvaal. Doesn't he ? I take it that the best way, the most sure way of getting peace for the world, of getting security for not only Australia, but for all the rest of the Empire, is that those men who are interested in Queensland, Victoria, Australia, and those men who are citizens of Canada, wherever that may be—whether they may be on the Atlantic coast or the Pacific coast, or any other part of the British Empire, will not only go and write leading articles at home, but will actually volunteer, and will lend the right arm of force, will join together to succour any portion of the British Empire. Then I say that is not only the way to preserve the British Empire, but to preserve the colonies they live in.

MEMBERS on the Government side : Hear, hear !

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS : It is the most rational way. It is not because a power is weak that it gets along quietly. On the contrary the state of things at the present day is this : If a nation is weak the hawks swoop down upon it—just as with animals it is when they are weak that they are attacked. When nations are strong they are respected.

If they are strong, their strength is [9:30 p.m.] respected. Is it not worth while having our strength respected ? It shows what British national rule is, that while we have five millions of people here in Australia, five millions of men in British North America, people more or less of our own race ; while we have a great number more in South Africa, and forty millions in the United Kingdom, yet it is seldom necessary to assert our strength. Is it not a great thing for us to pull together ? What do hon. members opposite mean when they talk about unions and blacklegs ? They would have us blacklegs. (Cheers).

Mr. STEWART : How many Boers are there ?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS : Whether as a matter of sentiment or utility, I maintain that it is our bounden duty to fall into line with the rest of the Empire. It is our quarrel. It is not the quarrel of England alone.

Mr. STEWART : How many Boers are there ?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS : The hon. member is very good at disorderly interjections. There is one Boer at all events in this House. I am pointing out, as well as I am permitted to do, why the people of Queensland should take part in this matter.

Mr. KIDSTON : That is not the question.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS : What is the question ? Is the twopenny-halfpenny amendment which we have heard read called the question ? I am dealing with the whole original question, and not with an abortion of that sort. Hon. members opposite want me to take for my text what they are pleased to call the "constitutional question," and I have no doubt the next speaker who rises on the other side will say that none of us have refuted the arguments brought forward by the junior member for Rockhampton. Do hon. members opposite ever expect that we shall refute arguments to their satisfaction ? That is the confusion of ideas into which they have fallen. They say, "Because you have not refuted my arguments, therefore you have given no good reasons." But no good reasons would refute hon. members to their own satisfaction. I never expect to convince them. All that we can hope is to convince the public, and we may hope, regarding the constitutional question, as they call it, that the country will not be altogether guided by them. The real reason for the whole of their action is that they desire to knock the Government out, and they think they have here the opportunity which they have been waiting for. If they had thought that a month or two ago when we were debating the Address in Reply, the facts were exactly the same as they are now, and the proper time to have acted was then, because probably by delay whatever disappointment may occur will be all the greater.

Mr. KEOGH : Federation was in the way then.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS : Of course something was in the way.

Mr. KIDSTON : Would you have justified yourself then ?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS : What hon. members want is to get me off the trail. I am replying to the constitutional question as far as I propose to reply to it, and if hon. members are not convinced they can comfort themselves with the reflection that I never

thought they would be. They do not intend to be convinced. They never came here to be convinced, and they would not admit it if they were. What I was endeavouring to show, and what I have shown to all those whose ears are not closed to reason, is that it is our policy to fall in with the rest of the colonies and not to blackleg on the union. (Cheers.) I say with regard to the constitutional question we stand on practically the same ground as the other colonies.

Mr. KERR: You rattled on a former occasion.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: It simply to my mind revolves itself into a question of right or wrong. That is the essential question for the public to decide. Hon. members opposite would say to a man who had rescued another man from drowning, "Did you get the rope over his left arm or over his right arm?" and if the man did not get the rope over the right arm they would blame him for having rescued his fellow human being from drowning. That is the ground of objection they are taking to the action of the Government, but I trust that the public will look at it from a more enlightened and broader aspect, in an atmosphere outside the region of party politics, in a fearless and unbiased manner. They will say: "Is it right or wrong for us to show that we have sympathy with the people in South Africa, people of our own race who we believe have been cruelly treated," and will we by our action endorse the action of the mother country when she says to her sons in South Africa: "I will succour you, I cannot turn a deaf ear to your complaints; I will assist you to the best of my power; I will interpose; you have been long suffering, you have been patient, we had hoped that this matter might have been settled without the brutal arbitrament of war, but if it cannot be then we are prepared to go to any lengths to assert your rights and ours." I say that if the mother country had not interposed in the interests of our fellow-colonists in South Africa, who have been suffering for years and years, she would have lost the respect of every British citizen.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Her interposition in South Africa is a guarantee for our security, for the security of the people in South Africa, and for her own security, and if we turn deaf ears to our suffering fellow-colonists a few short miles away, what may we expect when our time of trouble comes, and we are in need of succour and assistance? Should we then call for the help of those whom we have abandoned to their fate? I say if ever there was an occasion when the young stalwart sons of the mother country should rally round her it is in this case, which, I say, is not England's quarrel, for—unless looked at with the microscopical eyes of hon. members opposite—England should be and is there to help and succour those who claim her for a motherland. I claim then that the Premier has done right, and I have little doubt that the public will recognise that that is the essential question, apart altogether from what hon. members persist in calling the constitutional aspect of the case. What do hon. members opposite say in regard to the few heroic men who are willing to expatriate themselves and take up arms against a tyrannical and ignorant people? They talk about the "poor Boers," and when it is pointed out that they flog and torture the native black to death do they not reply, "We flog and torture at St. Helena"? Their whole talk resolves itself into an apology for the Boers, and nothing is more extraordinary to my mind than the fact that men while declaiming on the rights of citizenship and the rights of the people, and

who make the remedying of their fellow-colonists' supposed wrongs the one aim of their existence they are content to stand idly by and applaud the actious of a tyrannical anarchy—an oligarchy which but for the considerateness and sympathy and assistance of the British Empire would have been wiped out by the Zulus, who would have wetted their spears with their blood. These men so far from reciprocating the kindly treatment which they have received in the rest of South Africa where they were under no disabilities whatever, have shown the stuff that is in them by depriving the Uitlanders of any say whatever in the government of the country; ignoring the fact that their own independence has been secured to them by the mother land of those over whom they would tyrannise. These are the men whom our friends opposite endeavour to applaud and excuse, because they will not accord to our own people the same fair treatment which has been accorded by the British to the Dutch throughout the whole of South Africa. When the Orange Free State and the Transvaal were given back to the Boers it was on the understanding that our people should be treated fairly and justly, and that they should have some rights. How are the Dutch people treated at the Cape? They are in the majority, and they govern; and why should not they? But what happens in the Transvaal, where the Britishers are in the majority? They not only do not govern, but they have not got a voice in the government unless they have lived there for fourteen years—suffered fourteen years' tyranny. How is it possible, when we consider these facts, that we can look with absolute unconcern and indifference upon the treatment of our people in the Transvaal. The Afrikaner majority govern Cape Colony. The British majority in the Transvaal have not even a member in the controlling Chamber. True, they have a representation in one of the Chambers, but it is of no practical effect. Unlike this country, although they have two Chambers in the Transvaal, it is the upper Chamber that is absolutely dominant. Those men for years and years have been grossly ill-treated and outraged in every way. I might read you quotations in proof of this, but plenty of quotations have already been given. I will refer hon. members to something perhaps more convincing. Lately a great many thousand people have left Johannesburg as fugitives and refugees. Some of those are men. What happens? And those 21,000 men who signed the petition, why do hon. members opposite speak of them as capitalists, as if because a man happens to earn more than £3 a week he must be hounded down in some way? Those 21,000 men, I take it, were not capitalists, nor were the fugitives. They know exactly what has happened. Were they satisfied with the state of things in the Transvaal? Did they hold public meetings and condemn the British Government for its attempted interference in the Transvaal? No. They came down to Durban, and 3,000 of them said, "Enrol us in the army; we will go back to Johannesburg; but we will not go back as slaves; we will go back as free men." That, I take it, is about the best evidence—I know of no better—that the men are so indignant with their wrongs, that they desire to go back and do what they can to see that they get better treatment in the future.

Mr. DAWSON: That is not the Queensland Government.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I have not the slightest idea what the hon. member's interjection means. Let us now turn to the hon. member for Croydon, who certainly is a man of standing and intelligence and ability. How does he regard this matter? Does he regard

it as a matter in which the Government have made a small mistake, or does he deal with it on its own merits? He talks about the jingoistic fever and so on. He says he objects to having a lot of our young men sent away to fight in a quarrel they know nothing about, and, I suppose, in a quarrel in which he would have people believe they have no interest. I have already pointed out that they have a direct interest in men of their race standing shoulder to shoulder and making common cause against oppressors and enemies. The hon. member refers to that as butchery.

Mr. BROWNE: Where do I refer to that as butchery.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: He talks about their being trained up as butchers. The hon. member's idea of the volunteers resembles that said to have been expressed by a volunteer corps in the United Kingdom. They said their condition was that they were not to be sent out of the country. But that is not the sort of stuff our volunteers are made of.

Mr. BROWNE: I do not want to stop the hon. gentleman's argument, but I distinctly deny that I used the word he puts into my mouth.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I will read the hon. member's exact words from *Hansard*. He said—

In a young country like this we should wait until we were asked for assistance, or until the old country needed that assistance, or until we were attacked, and then do our best to show the old country that we do not want to drain every man and shilling we can get out of her, but are willing to defend ourselves as our forefathers defended themselves; but to start unasked, uncalled for, and offer to send a lot of our young men out to train them up as butchers into a quarrel they had no hand or part in, and which they know nothing about, is the thing that should be deprecated by every member of this House.

Mr. BROWNE: Hear, hear! But you infer that I called them butchers.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The only possible inference I can gather from that remark was that the moment a volunteer went away to take part in a war outside the colony he was being trained up as a butcher, and that that was why he objected to it. The hon. member, as a rule, speaks to the House in a way which is creditable to his intelligence, and the reasons he gave on this occasion for not sending our young men out of the country were very clear. He first says there is no necessity. I say there is a necessity, and it is a necessity that is felt by 10,000,000 British subjects outside the United Kingdom, if we wish to preserve our self-respect.

Mr. STEWART: Where are those 10,000,000?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: In North America, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa. Then the hon. member says it is a dangerous precedent. Dangerous! What is not dangerous? You might fall down going home, and there is no reason why you should not. I say it is a very good precedent, a precedent which if carried out in a clan makes that clan a strong clan. If the members of a clan will stand together shoulder to shoulder, making every clansman's quarrel their own, that clan lives; while the clan which will not stand together loyally, which does not make each clansman's quarrel its own, dwindles away, disappears, and there is no more of it. By standing shoulder to shoulder in this business we are setting a most admirable precedent, and one which, if followed, will probably ensure the better security of our race; for we have not only to consider this matter—I do not consider it merely from the standpoint of the present. We have got about 4,000,000 people here. We have got about 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 in British North America. How many shall we

have in thirty years? In thirty years we ought to have double—10,000,000 in each place, and so on. So, at the present day, we want to take steps to be secure. We want strength to be secure. We have Japan and the dusky myriads of the East. We have the stupendous empire of Russia. We have North America, from whom, I hope, we may expect nothing but friendship, with some 65,000,000 people. There is an earth hunger throughout the world. We see small nations being swallowed up, and we may look with some complacency about our future if we know we can depend on not only the sympathy but upon an alliance of the English-speaking races.

Mr. DAWSON: Do you think the Empire is in danger?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The country is in danger if we have men in the Empire who will never help one another. What kind of an Empire is that?

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Is it a trades union kind of Empire? I can say that if this precedent is followed it will probably be fraught with grand and profitable consequences—

Mr. McDONALD: If 70,000 can beat 40,000,000 the sooner the Empire collapses the better.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Another instance of the narrow-minded manner in which the hon. gentleman and his associates look upon this question. The 40,000,000 you talk about are separated from each other by a great many leagues of sea. There was a time when the Austrian Empire, and another time the Duke of Burgundy, with great armies could not prevail against Switzerland. It was not because of numbers alone, but because of the mountains and other natural difficulties. And I say that in the Transvaal at the present time the Boers have got many advantages. They are on a high tableland that is 7,000 miles away. They have got, as it were, the centre of the position with all its surrounding advantages. The hon. gentleman says, "Cannot our Empire fight them? Cannot the United Kingdom beat them?" Certainly she can. There is no doubt about that. It is merely a question of time and expense. That is not the whole of the question. Does the hon. member imagine for one moment that the willingness of the mother country to accept our contingent on this occasion is caused by her own dire necessity. It is nothing of the sort. The desire of the mother country is to welcome these men who come from here, and from Canada, and from North America, and from New Zealand as her own children, and fight side by side with them, having their moral support. It is not a case that she cannot go and overrun the Transvaal. That is one thing, but the other and the great thing—which the hon. gentleman would see if he would only use his intelligence; and the hon. gentleman has plenty of intelligence if he would only deign to use it—that the presence of our troops there, these 250—

Mr. DAWSON: Will make the Boers fly.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: They represent Queensland any way. They represent not only what Queensland is, but what Queensland may be. The day will come when there will be 40,000,000 men in Queensland—in a generation or two. Therefore, the men of Queensland going there represent a potential force the magnitude of which it is impossible to calculate. There will be a day when British North America will have 100,000,000. They may be small in themselves, just as the British flag may be if you look at it as a bit of calico, as the hon. member for Clermont appears disposed to do. But whatever

it may be, you must look at what it symbolises, and if you look at what it symbolises it is one of the grandest things on earth.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!
 The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: These contingents which are being sent by affectionate colonies to help a sister colony in South Africa carry with them prodigious importance; and if someone said the Emperor of Germany—although no one said so—might look upon the appearance of these men in the field of battle with a certain amount of concern, there would be nothing ridiculous about it. It is a matter of profound importance. It will affect the distribution of the power of the world if it is well-known that, in all circumstances, where the battle is just and right, British people will be found acting as one.

Mr. DAWSON: Ah! my opinion, as expressed, was that injustice should not be done.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Does the hon. gentleman challenge that?

Mr. DAWSON, and members of the Opposition: Yes, yes!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I am glad of that. I have ever regarded hon. members opposite as being inconsistent, and in this my judgment is again confirmed. What does their action in this show? That they have no sympathy with their kind; that their sympathies are with the capitalistic Boers. I may tell them that Oom Paul is worth a great deal more than a million. The Boers are very rich men. They have no sympathy with the poor. What are hon. members opposite sympathising with at present? With a rich, tyrannous oligarchy. Now, I will take the hon. member for Enoggera. He, too, although he was very mild in his expressions, is under the impression that if a volunteer becomes a soldier he sinks into a lower scale.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: He is a soldier himself.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That is, that if any volunteer, at any period of his life, justifies his own existence by fighting, he sinks into the lower scale.

Mr. DAWSON: No. It is a different matter.

Mr. RYLAND: A professional soldier.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: He is no more a professional soldier or a mercenary soldier if he goes across to South Africa—

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: He is.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Not a bit. The hon. member for Brisbane South could see nothing in this except the jingo spirit. Then we come to the hon. member for Clermont. He has no respect for the British flag. I did not suppose he would have; I should not expect him to. Then he talks about the Defence Force—about narrow-chested drapers' and grocers' clerks. I have already said, and I think it may be repeated, that it is not quite a democratic thing to sneer at a man on account of his occupation. It does not become a man, even if he has been elected to the dizzy eminence of being a member of this House, to stand on his dignity and sneer at people outside. After all, whether they are grocers' clerks, or any other clerks, I suppose they are honestly doing their duty.

Mr. LESINA: Or even a retired chemist.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I will deal with this matter, which I perceive has sympathy amongst that row of democrats opposite, even the leader of the Opposition. That is to say, making little of a man because of the particular occupation in which he is engaged.

I will say this—whatever the hon. [10 p.m.] member may say with regard to grocers' clerks and drapers' clerks, and whatever he may say with regard to persons

engaged in commerce and trade—above which the hon. member may think he is at present—he may say of the hon. member for Fortitude Valley that he was a draper's assistant; he may say of me that I was a druggist's assistant—I am not aware that I am any less worthy member of society on that account—no matter whether I was or was not, I will say that at no time of my life did I depend upon an ancestral barrel-organ, and at no time of my life was I ever warned off a racecourse.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. LESINA: I may have an ancestral barrel-organ, and I will take you on as a monkey if you offer. I'll play "God Save the Queen" to please your jingo followers.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: So far as I am aware, whether you take the question from a constitutional point of view, or from the point of view as to whether on the whole it was a right thing or a wrong thing to do, I am perfectly easy in my mind. If the Government are to be defeated, let them be defeated; but it would be a misfortune—it would be a disgrace—to Queensland, if in a matter of this sort, where we are taking exactly the same part as that which has been taken by the other colonies—

MEMBERS of the Opposition: No.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: If the Government were to suffer defeat, because everybody outside would never suppose such a result could occur unless hon. members in the House had objected to the substance of the motion themselves, and were, whether they liked to confess it or not, opposed to the people of Queensland in this particular matter of falling into federal union. This is the only time in which the colonies have had an opportunity of really and practically acting as one. We know that not only in this country but outside the colony, I am sure, it would have a very great effect in bringing the colonies themselves together, and it will have a great effect also in bringing the federation of the Empire about, and it may have some effect ultimately in bringing about that greater federation which we call the federation of the world. I say this action on the part of the Government is in defence of Queensland, and is the best thing that could be done to strengthen Queensland, and I believe it is not only the best method of strengthening Queensland, but it is the best method to give practical evidence of our desire to live in union with our fellows in the rest of Australia. It is distinctly a federal sentiment. Constitutionally it is right, and I firmly believe that in getting the approval of Parliament to the despatch of this expedition we are doing what 90 per cent. of the people of this colony would ratify to-morrow, and they would feel that they were not being done any injustice to.

Mr. LESINA: How do you know that?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: If we take the opinions we see expressed in the Press, if we take the opinion of the man in the 'bus and of the man you meet, they are nearly all desirous that in this business we at any rate, having been perhaps the first in the field, shall not be the last to come forward, and above all things, that we shall be ready to take the hand of our fellows in the other colonies.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. GIVENS (Cairns): When the hon. member got up to address himself to the question before the House I thought from his reputation that he would have approached it in a broad, statesmanlike spirit, and made a speech which would have helped to solve the difficulty we are in—I thought he would have approached the

subject from a higher standpoint than that of flinging personalities across the Chamber. But instead of a broad statesmanlike treatment of the subject, what did we find? All the time he was speaking he treated the House to nothing more than the empirical observations of a political quack, and I say so fearlessly. Probably having spent one-half of his life compounding quack medicines for suffering humanity he is going to spend the other half in compounding political nostrums for a suffering colony. (Laughter.)

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Very efficient in both cases.

MR. GIVENS: I have not the slightest doubt—

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Don't go away. Take your gruel. (Laughter.)

THE SPEAKER: Order.

MR. GIVENS: I have not the slightest doubt that many individuals in this colony are able to speak feelingly about the quack medicines supplied by the hon. gentleman; and if he occupies his present position much longer the people of the colony in future will be able to speak feelingly of his political nostrums.

MR. DUNSFORD: He does not even sugar-coat them.

MR. GIVENS: I do not intend for a moment to be dragged off the question at issue in this discussion. The question to be debated is the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition, and that amendment does not say we shall not send a contingent to South Africa; it has nothing to say as to the justice of sending a contingent or as to the merits of the South African question; all it asks the House to consider is whether the position taken up by the Government in offering this contingent without the sanction of Parliament is legal, constitutional, and justifiable.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

MR. GIVENS: That is the question, and I notice that the Government, the Premier included, and several hon. members on that side, have carefully refrained from discussing that aspect of the question. The hon. gentleman who just sat down told us at first that he was not aware that the position of the Government required justification. It does not matter a straw whether it requires justification or not, it is very evident that they have carefully refrained from approaching that aspect of the question. Again, he told us that if the action of the Government and of the Premier requires justification, then the action of every one of the Australian colonies requires justification also, because they have all taken similar action. That is an entire misstatement of the case, and I challenge any hon. member on the other side to show where there is any parity between the action of this Government and our Premier and the action taken by the other colonies. All the other colonies have dealt with the matter in a constitutional way, in that they have got the sanction of Parliament. Before committing their colonies to any expense, and before enrolling any men, they approached their several Parliaments and got the necessary authority for their actions. Our position is this, apart altogether from the question of whether a contingent should or should not be sent from this colony: whether the Premier or the members of the Government should not have approached Parliament and got the necessary sanction or authority before making this offer of troops. We have heard a great deal about loyalty—that the fact of sending troops is an evidence of loyalty, but many and many a time in the history of England men who were stigmatised as rebels, proved the most loyal subjects and heroes England ever had.

MR. BELL: Give us one instance.

MR. GIVENS: I can quote a whole volume of them.

MR. BELL: Well, let us have one instance.

MR. GIVENS: Not only did the House of Commons—the representatives of the people—repudiate the action of its Premier, but they also repudiated the action of the Government on several occasions, and even when war was going on they refused to grant the necessary supplies to the King, and if the hon. member for Dalby is not acquainted with these historical instances, his university education must have been very meagre. The man who is loyal to his country is the man who will come forward in defence of what he believes to be right in the interests of the people. No matter what the consequences may be. The Secretary for Lands said the amendment was contradictory and inappropriate, but that has nothing to do with the merits or demerits of the question itself, because if this amendment is carried, there is nothing to prevent the House from making further amendments to bring the amendment in conformity with the original motion. At present we have nothing to do with the sending of troops to the Transvaal, or the justice or injustice of the war. It is merely a question whether the Premier or the Government has a right to commit this colony to an indefinite expenditure, because I take it that if this contingent is sent the £30,000 or £32,000 will be a mere flea-bite, and I have a right to ask the Premier and the Government what right have they to incur this expense without the sanction of Parliament. The Premier has taken up the position of dictator, and he says the honour of the colony is at stake, and if the contingent is not sent that honour will be forfeited. The honour of the colony is not at stake, because Parliament has never been consulted. But the honour of the Premier is at stake, and also the honour of the Government; and not for a single moment would I sacrifice the interests of the people to preserve the honour of the Government, especially when I believe they have nothing to preserve. That is the position. The honour of this House is not at stake. The offer, I say, was made without the consent of Parliament, and Parliament should have the right to say whether that offer should be ratified—to say whether they should refuse or consent to the expenditure of such a large sum of money, not having been consulted. The Attorney-General pointed out that Mr. Chamberlain must have known that the offer from Queensland was made subject to the sanction of Parliament. Now, if Mr. Chamberlain knew that, he could not feel offended if we refused to endorse the action of the Premier. The Secretary for Lands said we on this side seemed to be opposed to federation and to the union of the Empire, and laid stress on the fact that hon. members had gone into the matter of federation with enthusiasm a short time ago. But if I remember rightly, the hon. member, the Secretary for Lands, was very cool on that question; in fact, I heard he was strongly opposed to federation, and yet he comes down here and accuses hon. members on this side of being in fear of union. The ablest advocates of federation—that is, those in our own colony—were many hon. members sitting on this side of the House. They were the most earnest and hardworking in this work. He also alleged that hon. members on this side of the House, in moving this amendment, only desired to knock out the Government. That is quite right; I have got that desire very strongly, and I think it is a very laudable ambition. At any rate it is an ambition of which I have no cause to be ashamed, or that I am going to make an apology to the House or to the Secretary for

Lands for entertaining. I consider that a Government which tries to make this Parliament surrender the liberties of the people and hand over the government of a country to such an extent as this Government wished to be done into the hands of a few men who have portfolios, that Government deserves to be fired out, and the sooner it is fired out the better for this Parliament and for the people of the colony generally. A Government which desires to take authority out of the hands of Parliament, which presumes to arrogate to itself the right to incur such a vague expenditure, and the right to decide upon such a matter as the sending of troops to South Africa without consulting Parliament, the sooner it is fired out the better. Of course we are told that all the other colonies are going to send troops, and that we should not refrain from joining in with them. I have pointed out before, and I will point out again, that that is not the question which we are now considering. After this amendment is disposed of, we can then approach that main question if we so desire; but I intend now to confine myself strictly to the amendment, and I do not intend to be dragged into a discussion of the main question. Hon. members opposite wish to cloud the issue, and throw dust in the eyes of the community generally, by bringing in the question as to whether it is desirable to send a contingent to South Africa, or whether the war in South Africa is a just war or not, whereas that has nothing to do with the question before the House. I reserve my right to speak on that question when the present question is disposed of, which is whether the action of the Government is constitutional and justifiable. There are very few troops, I notice, offering in many of the colonies. South Australia has only got a few—so I learn by late telegrams. But no matter what the other colonies are doing, they have approached the subject in a constitutional way, and they are not deserving of condemnation for having done so. It is a question for the Parliament to decide, and Parliament having decided in a proper way no one can throw a slur upon the Governments of those several colonies. But I wish the House to pay particular attention to one point the Secretary for Lands made use of. He said that the other colonies were doing precisely the same as Queensland, and had made precisely the same offer as Queensland has made—that is, that they have offered troops for service in the Transvaal. Now, when the Premier was introducing the original motion, he said that the Government had not offered “troops”—that they had offered “volunteers.” There seems to be a great difference of opinion in the Cabinet. The Premier says one thing, and the Secretary for Lands says another. Which are we to believe?

Mr. ANNEAR: The men were volunteers.

Mr. GIVENS: I deny that the Premier had a single volunteer at the date that he made the offer, and I challenge him, or any Minister, or any member on the other side of the House, to adduce one tittle of proof to show that they had a single volunteer on the 10th of July, when the Premier made his offer. Not only did they not use the word “volunteer,” but they never made use of the word “volunteer” in the correspondence at that time. I will read to the House a tittle of the correspondence, so that the House and the country may understand whether this question of “volunteers” or “troops” cropped up at that time. The first correspondence we have on the subject is a letter from the Commandant, Major-General Gunter, to the Chief Secretary, dated 6th July:—

SIR,—I have the honour to submit for approval a recommendation that the services of a contingent of Queensland troops, consisting of 250 officers, non-commissioned officers, and men of the Queensland

Mounted Infantry, with a machine gun section, be offered for duty with the Imperial troops in the event of hostilities breaking out between Great Britain and the Transvaal.

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

Not a solitary word about volunteers in that! But even if there was, are we to suppose that the machine gun has volunteered too? Yet it is part of the Defence Force. It has been bought with money voted for Defence Force purposes. The very word “defence” itself precludes the possibility of either the Defence Force or any of its gear or armament being employed in a war of aggression, such as it is proposed to employ this contingent in. There was not a single word about “volunteers” in the suggestion of the Commandant. Neither was there in the communication made by the Chief Secretary to His Excellency the Governor, and dated 10th July, which I shall read—

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.

I should like to ask where is the reference to volunteers in that? He offers a contingent of “troops,” 250 in number, and the word “volunteer” is never mentioned, so that the evident intention at the time was that those troops should be sent irrespective of whether they were willing to volunteer or not.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: What nonsense!

Mr. J. HAMILTON: We cannot send a man without his consent.

Mr. GIVENS: We never heard a word about volunteers in the correspondence until 27th September—that is, fifteen days after Parliament met. This is in a letter addressed by Lieut.-Colonel Percy Ricardo to the Commandant:—

SIR,—I have the honour to state that I have now sufficient volunteers to complete the Mounted Infantry and machine gun sections, as laid down in the Field Service Manual—namely, 271 officers, non-commissioned officers, and men.

That is over two months after the offer is made before the word “volunteer” is used. Notwithstanding that Lieutenant-Colonel Ricardo says they have sufficient volunteers here, I am not disposed to give too much credence to the statement, because I notice in to-day’s papers that we have telegraphic news informing us that last Friday and Saturday officers of the Defence Force were cadging round Warwick to get more volunteers. Now, if they have got sufficient men, why are they going cadging round the country to get more?

Mr. FORSYTH: Because they want the pick.

Mr. GIVENS: Considering that they have 200 or 300 already, and that all the volunteers are supposed to be infallible heroes—very brave men, and everything else—it seems to me that we have a very poor assortment of men in the Defence Force if we want an extraordinary number to pick from.

Mr. ANNEAR: They must be sound.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: We want single men.

Mr. GIVENS: I would like to point out before I go any further that the Premier, and all the other Ministers who have spoken on the subject, have told us that the question of the advisableness of sending a contingent was brought before Parliament at the earliest possible moment. That I absolutely deny.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: It does not matter—the fact is there.

Mr. GIVENS: I hope hon. members will bear with me a little while I prove my contention to the hilt. I admit that it was mentioned in the Governor's Speech.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: And referred to.

Mr. GIVENS: The Secretary for Lands, and the Premier also, said that the House approved of it. The House did not approve of the Governor's Speech at all. All that it did by passing the Address in Reply was to assure His Excellency that they would take the matters contained in the Speech from the Throne into their serious and earnest consideration. And we are proceeding now to take that portion of the Speech into consideration.

[10'30 p.m.] If, by merely putting words into the Governor's Speech to the effect that the Government intended to bring in legislation on certain subjects, that is sufficient to have that legislation accomplished, why should we have Bills brought in and read a first, second, and third time, and considered at length in committee? We know that it was merely mentioned in the Address in Reply and that the House promised to take into their earnest and serious consideration the various matters referred to in the Opening Speech; but the attitude taken up by the Secretary for Lands is that when we adopt the Address in Reply we approve of the proposed legislation in the Governor's Speech. Practically, he says that when we promised to consider the matter, we adopted that portion of the Speech referring to the offer of troops for service in the Transvaal. We did nothing of the kind.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You never lodged a protest against it.

Mr. GIVENS: I say emphatically that the leader of the Opposition got up and distinctly informed the Government that if it was intended that any money should be expended on this matter it should have his most strenuous opposition, and the strenuous opposition of this side of the House. If hon. members opposite, who are so very ingenious, say that they brought this matter before the House at the earliest possible moment, how can they explain that they did not come forward with a motion like this asking the sanction of the House to the proposed expenditure immediately after Parliament met on the 12th of September? If they were so sure that it was a non-contentious matter, and that they had a majority in Parliament, and in the country at their back, why did they delay an hour in asking parliamentary sanction for this expenditure? Although, as pointed out by the hon. member for Rockhampton, Mr. Kidston, it has been found necessary in extreme cases to give large powers to the Executive for the time being, yet, I would remind hon. members, it has always been the practice when extraordinary action like that has been taken for the Executive to call Parliament together as soon as possible, and the very first thing they do is to ask Parliament to sanction their conduct of business during the recess. That is the constitutional practice, as, I think, will be admitted by every hon. member in this House. Therefore, I take it that Parliament having been called together on the 12th of September, and the Government having acted in that unconstitutional manner during the recess, it was their bounden duty to ask the approval and sanction of Parliament to that action before they proceeded with any other business. The action of the Premier is unconstitutional in two respects. As a matter of fact it was illegal, because he offered the service of troops which he had no right to offer, inasmuch as the Defence Act distinctly states that the Defence Force shall not be employed outside the

Australian continent, and that it shall be employed only for defence purposes. Further, he had absolutely no right to offer the use of armament which has been purchased by this colony for defence purposes. That is a distinct breach of the Defence Act, inasmuch as it is a diversion of money which has been devoted for one purpose to another purpose—a sending away of armament which has been purchased for the defence of the colony to be used in a war of aggression—and if the hon. gentleman wishes to get parliamentary authority for sending away a portion of our defence force and a portion of our armament, I contend that it is necessary to bring in a Bill for that purpose. I am honestly convinced that if the Premier's action were tested before the Supreme Court it would be found that even if this House gave the necessary authority by passing this motion for the required expenditure, his action is unconstitutional and illegal. And I am very much inclined to think that before the hon. gentleman is very much older he will have very good reason to regret that illegal action. The other unconstitutional aspect of the question is that before there was any necessity for rushing into this thing, before Great Britain was threatened in any way, so long ago as the 10th of July, the Premier made this offer. It is within the knowledge of everybody that there was no emergency at that time, and that the offer was not a necessity to the Empire or to Queensland; and the Premier, as head of the Executive of the colony, should not have used his position to do any action which he could not justify up to the hilt as an absolute necessity. We have been told a great deal about the federal spirit, and about the union which exists between this colony and the other colonies, and how we should join with the other colonies in sending a contingent to the Transvaal. But as a matter of fact the Premier himself stated here that he rushed this offer in order that Queensland might occupy the proud and noble position of being the first to offer troops; he wished to forestall the other colonies, and make a great fellow of himself at the expense of the colony. But whenever there is a measure of reform brought into this House, whether it is a proposal to establish an old-age pension system, or to enact a factory law for the well-being of our factory hands, or to enact an early closing law so that the people who occupy positions in shops may have a little leisure, we are met with the objection by hon. members opposite, especially by members of the Ministry, that none of the other colonies have adopted such legislation. That is a fact which there is no gain-saying. Read *Hansard*, and you will find it on almost every page; you will see how the Government have resisted every reform because it has not been adopted by the other colonies. Why then in this matter should the Government try to steal a march on the other colonies? If in matters of reform it is desirable that we should wait for the lead of the other colonies, it is equally desirable that in the matter of sending a contingent to South Africa we should wait for their lead; if the principle is good in the one case, it is equally good in the other. But it is not the desire to occupy the grand, lofty, and noble position of being the first to rush into the breach and assist the Empire that was the motive in making this offer. What the motive of the Premier was in making this offer I leave the colony to judge; I should be ashamed to say it myself. The Secretary for Lands said it would be ridiculous not to give the Premier of a self-governing colony very large powers; in fact, he practically said we should not tie his hands, but allow him to do as he liked, and not repudiate his action. I would point out that if we are going to have a self-governing colony the sooner we tie the hands of

the Premier the better, if he is to take notions of this kind, and we are not to repudiate his action, or we shall soon cease to be a self-governing colony. Parliament had been prorogued but a very few days when he made this offer. He knew as a matter of fact that Parliament would be meeting again in a very short time, and yet during that short recess between the federal session and the present session, he practically commits this colony to an expenditure of £30,000 or £40,000, he says, but my opinion is that the amount will probably not stop short of £250,000. My opinion on the point is just as good as the hon. gentleman's, because though he may be a better financier than I am, he is interested at present in making his case look as good as he possibly can from his point of view, while I am interested only in saving the colony from needless expenditure.

Mr. DAWSON: Unwarranted expenditure.

Mr. GIVENS: Whether the expenditure is warranted or unwarranted is a matter of opinion; and if the Premier thinks it is warranted I do not grudge him his opinion, but it is not mine. The Secretary for Lands also said, "Of course the offer was made subject to the approval of Parliament." If it was, where is the honour of Parliament involved in this amendment?

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear.

Mr. GIVENS: There is no pledge given that Parliament will approve of it; and I take it that this House has a perfect right to refuse to endorse the proposal, or to vote one single farthing to carry out that proposal.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Do so.

Mr. GIVENS: The Secretary for Railways does not concern me a little bit. He is generally recognised as a funny man in this House. The hon. gentleman never takes things seriously, and if a man is drawn off his remarks by a thread of that description, the sooner he leaves this House the better. I for one do not intend to be drawn off my remarks by the genial gentleman who occupies the position of Secretary for Railways in this House. Supposing Parliament does refuse to endorse this proposal, or to vote the money, what position will the Government be in then? Can we get the assurance of the Premier that there is no money being spent on the proposal now? He has given no such assurance yet, and I want to know what authority he had for spending a single farthing upon this proposal without the consent of this House? It is not a matter of domestic politics, of usual, everyday concern. It is a distinct departure from anything hitherto done by this colony, and as such it should have been subjected to the closest scrutiny and discussion in this House before it was given effect to, and the Premier should most decidedly have obtained the consent of this House before he took any such action. The Secretary for Lands also stated that when the Address in Reply was before the House we knew just as much about this matter as we do now. With all respect to the hon. gentleman, I take the liberty of disputing that absolutely, because the House knew nothing at all about it. We had not the correspondence before us, or any estimate of what it would cost. We had nothing to go upon, and the leader of the Opposition followed the right course when he waited for all the necessary information before taking action. It is ridiculous to ask an hon. member to take action upon a matter he knows nothing about; and we were perfectly right to wait action until we knew something about the proposal, what it really meant, and how it originated. But, because we waited for the necessary knowledge, we are twitted for not taking action before. That is the ridiculous position assumed by hon. gentlemen on the other side. We were not in a

position to take action before; and in any case, we are not here to be dictated to by the other side, who, if I judge the situation rightly, have quite enough to do now to look after their own affairs without starting to teach us how to conduct ours. The Secretary for Public Lands also stated that the House has still as much control over the expenditure as if no offer had been made. Of course we have, and yet we are told that we dare not refuse to vote it; for the honour of the country and the honour of Parliament is at stake.

Mr. DAWSON: That is it—repudiation.

Mr. GIVENS: The honour of the Premier and the continuity of his Government may be at stake, but it is no reason why the good government of the colony should be sacrificed to maintain the honour of the Premier, and the continuity of his Government is not a sufficient reason for carrying out this proposal, and the House has a perfect right without incurring any dishonour, and without having any slur cast upon it, and it can repudiate the action of the Premier in every respect without incurring the disapprobation of any honourable man. The Secretary for Lands also said that if the Premier had broken away from the federal action his conduct would have been worthy of the severest condemnation. As a matter of fact we know—because the Premier himself has told us—that he made a great splash in order to get away from federal action to get in first, and be before the other colonies. That is a fact the Premier will not deny. We are told now by the hon. gentleman's own lieutenant—the Secretary for Lands—that the hon. gentleman should have taken federal action, and if that is so we can reasonably claim the vote of the Secretary for Lands for the amendment, because the Premier admits that he did not take federal action, and the Secretary for Lands has said he is deserving of the severest condemnation if he did not. The Premier has said that he rushed in in order to get ahead of the other colonies, that he might occupy the grand and glorious position of being the first to step in and save the dear old mother country. There is one serious aspect of this question which I think should not be overlooked, and it was approached and mentioned by the Secretary for Lands. He said that it is not prudent to be too candid in giving an expression of opinion about the Defence Force. While members on this side were speaking, the Premier and other Ministers interjected that the words uttered by hon. members on this side would be treasured up and remembered against them. I ask, Is it a desirable thing to threaten this side of the House with a military dominance and with military displeasure because we openly and fearlessly express an opinion upon a military question? It is said that when we get outside we will lose our seats, or some other terrible calamity will overtake us if we do not truckle to this military despotism that threatens us. Are we to be told that? That is the position taken up by hon. members opposite who tell us that our words will be treasured up against us. If I were to go outside this House and lose forty seats in Parliament because of my opinions, I say I will be a free man while I live, and while I occupy a seat in Parliament I will freely, openly, and fully express my opinions about the military, or about any other people if I think they are deserving of criticism, and I will not be frightened off doing my duty by any threats hurled across this Chamber by members on the other side.

Mr. LESINA: What of the French military despotism?

Mr. GIVENS: I would like to point out that in the countries of Europe where they have military despotism, the greatest evil that could befall any people, civil liberty is almost entirely subverted, and the people are at the beck and call

of their military masters. Is that a desirable state of affairs to bring about in Queensland, and yet that is what is threatened. If this wave of jingoistic feeling is allowed to overrun the country, if we are to be threatened with such and such penalties at the hands of the Defence Force when we are performing our duties in Parliament then I think the sooner we take a lesson from the state of affairs in Europe the better it will be for us. Every time we notice anything in the shape of military domination we should nip it in the bud and prevent it from going any further. Of course anything that may be said from this side of the House is always treated as a matter of no importance by hon. members opposite, and we are supposed to look upon Ministers as a superior order of beings. The Secretary for Lands addressed himself to the question in his high-flown superior style, and said it was no use attempting to reply to what hon. members had advanced from this side. It is very possible that, although he affected to disdain our arguments, he refrained from dealing with them because he was unable to do so with any effect. Again, I would point out that instead of throwing sneers like that across the Chamber he should endeavour to treat the arguments on their merits. If I was the vilest scoundrel living, if I was a murderer, or the greatest scoundrel that Australia had ever seen, the fact would not derogate one iota from any argument which I might enunciate. The argument is either good or bad, and however vile I may be the argument I make use of is as good as that of the man who is held in the very highest respect. I think that is a very logical position to take up, and I think all arguments should be treated on their merits, if the hon. gentleman has the intellectual capacity to do so. Now, several hon. members on the other side who have addressed themselves to the question have had a great deal to say about an alleged statement made by the leader of the Opposition in moving his amendment, it being said that he called the Defence Force curs and liars.

Mr. DAWSON : I never mentioned the Defence Force.

Mr. GIVENS : I would point out that he did not do anything of the kind. All he did at the time was to make use of a very forcible illustration. He pointed out that if two dogs were fighting—one a big dog and the other a little one—and the big dog got the little one down, all the mongrels in the neighbourhood thought it their bounden duty to worry the under dog. That was used only as an illustration, and it was a very forcible and very true illustration. But let me use another illustration, which I think hon. members opposite will not object to. If a sixteen-stone man, well trained in the art of fighting, was to tackle a little eight-stone man not trained to the art, what would be thought of another little eight-stone man who rushed up to the assistance of the sixteen-stone man. Would you think that the second little man who rushed up to help the big man was a very estimable character? Yet that is the position of Queensland. Here we have England against the Transvaal; England—a great big powerful nation, well trained in the science of fighting, and perfectly armed, and she is going to tackle a little handful of people numbering 60,000, when Queensland rushes in and offers to help her. I cannot but think that a man who would help a big man thrash a little man is guilty of a cowardly and reprehensible act, and that being so in the case of individuals I do not see that there is any difference when the combatants are an aggregation of individuals. A great deal of capital was attempted to be made out of the alleged fact that members on this side were attacking members

of the Defence Force who had no opportunity of defending themselves. For my part I never heard any attack made upon them at all. I have a good many friends in the Defence Force, and I am not going to attack them or say a word against them. I say in this matter the members of the Defence Force are not to blame. It is the officers who are bringing the pressure to bear, and the head of the Government is forcing them into this position. But if for a single moment our action was reprehensible in saying anything against any member of the Defence Force, what can be thought of hon. members opposite who made a most base and cowardly attack upon a reporter who is occupied in the gallery simply because he, in the faithful discharge of his duty, would not act as a special pleader for them.

Mr. STORY : What are you talking about?

Mr. GIVENS : If the hon. member for Bonna Vonna—

The SPEAKER : The hon. member is not in order in alluding to the hon. member for Balonne as the hon. member for Bonna Vonna. I trust the hon. member will not pursue that course. He must address any hon. member by the name of his constituency.

Mr. GIVENS : I beg to withdraw the expression. The matter has been mentioned so frequently that the words were mentioned inadvertently.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER : A *lapsus lingue*.

Mr. McDONALD : The member for nowhere.

Mr. GIVENS : The members for Balonne and Maryborough made a cowardly attack upon a reporter in the gallery because he would not prostitute his position and become a special pleader for them.

Mr. ANNEAR : What was the attack made two sessions ago by a member of your side on Mr. Brooks, a reporter for the *Telegraph*?

Mr. GIVENS : I do not care if every man on this side made an attack upon a reporter; that does not excuse the attack of those two hon. members.

Mr. ANNEAR : There was no attack. It was a statement of fact.

Mr. GIVENS : As far as I know, and I am as capable of judging of literary merit as any member on the opposite side, being a pressman myself, I think the "Gallery Notes" are fairly accurate, and the only fault I ever found with them was that they gave a little too much prominence and weight to the utterances of Ministers.

Whether they are right or wrong [11 p.m.] the Government want to have a servile Press praising them up. By their wealth and influence they would, if they could, prostitute every paper in the colony to their own ends, until our Press, instead of being independent, candid critics, would become absolutely worthless. And I would point out that if reporters in our gallery are to be subjected to attacks of this kind they will no longer have an unbiased and untrammelled position, and their reports will be of no value to the public. Formerly we could look forward to their reports knowing that they would contain a fair and honest criticism on the actions of hon. members on both sides of the House. Now, because the hon. member for Balonne has not been praised, and because the hon. member for Maryborough has not been praised—

Mr. ANNEAR : The hon. member for Maryborough wants no praise.

Mr. GIVENS : Not only has the hon. member for Maryborough made an attack upon a reporter which he cannot substantiate, but I call to mind that he made an attack upon me, which he afterwards admitted to myself was not true.

Mr. ANNEAR : I did nothing of the kind.

Mr. GIVENS: And he also promised that on the first opportunity he would make the *amende honorable*, which he has not done.

Mr. ANNEAR: If I find the statement I made is untrue I will do so.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GIVENS: I am not so much concerned with that, but I do say that members of this Chamber, who occupy a privileged position, should not abuse that privilege to attack persons who do not possess it.

Mr. ANNEAR: You are a nice person to give us lessons in good taste.

Mr. GIVENS: If I were to give lessons in good taste, I certainly should not accept the hon. member for Maryborough as a pupil, because I know that any such lesson would be entirely wasted upon him. The whole argument of the Secretary for Lands, that our action in the Transvaal will tend to show the world that our Empire is one, has, I contend, absolutely nothing to do with the question before the House, which is: Was the Premier justified or not in his action? It is not a question of defending ourselves, or of defending the Empire, or anything of that kind. It is the question whether our Premier should commit the colony to such an action, and incur such a large expenditure without the sanction of Parliament? I insist that that shall be the clear-cut issue put before the country, and the issue upon which this House shall be asked to vote. No matter how the Government may wriggle and try to shuffle out of the position, that is the position they are in, and the country will know it. I have very little more to say on the subject. I am opposed to this action of the Premier's because it is unconstitutional, because he is putting himself superior to the law and superior to Parliament. Without the sanction of Parliament he has no right to incur the expenditure of sending a single volunteer or a single piece of armament purchased by the colony for the defence of the colony to take part away from the colony in a war of aggression. That is the whole point. Looking back upon the history of the Empire, we find that whenever the liberties of the people were at stake there has always been a noble band of patriots in the British House of Commons who have battled for those liberties, and who have repudiated the actions not only of Premiers but of kings. And great a man as our Premier is, he can hardly be compared in greatness with a king of England. If time permitted I could quote dozens of instances in which they have repudiated the action of a king, even when war was going on and had been going on for years, ever since the House of Commons won the right to have the supreme and sole control over the expenditure, which right they won in 1297, over six centuries ago. When we find that men even in that age, which is not supposed to be so enlightened as this, were prepared to take any risks to win and preserve the liberties of the people, surely the patriots of the present day, who are in this House of Assembly, should be prepared to follow the noble example set them by their forefathers. The only price we will have to pay if we repudiate the action of the Premier is that the continuous Government will cease to exist, and that the Premier's honour will be slightly tarnished. For my part, I do not care a straw for the Premier. That is his lookout, not mine. If he places his honour in jeopardy, he should not call on me to rescue it for him. (Loud laughter from hon. members on the Opposition side.) Further, I do not think that hon. members on this side, nor yet do I think that hon. members on the other side of the House, or the country generally, have so much reason to be in love with this continuous Government that they should desire to see them there.

Mr. J. HAMILTON: The people will insist on them sitting there.

Mr. GIVENS: The people do not do anything of the kind, because if hon. members will analyse the figures of the votes cast at the last general election they will find that, notwithstanding the plural votes, the majority of the votes cast were cast for members on this side of the House. There is no denying it. I can hear the hon. the senior member for Maryborough, Mr. Bartholomew. He has an historic precedent for knowing more about politics than anyone else. I remember that Dickens says that the three tailors of Tooley street had enough knowledge to govern all England, and I do not see why one tailor of Maryborough should not have enough knowledge to govern all Queensland. The position is: Are we prepared to sacrifice the liberties and the privileges of the people, as represented in this House, in order to save the honour of the Premier, who has placed it in jeopardy on his own motion, and to save the continuous Ministry from extinction at the present? I am not prepared to do so. I am prepared to battle to the utmost of my power to maintain the privileges of Parliament. That is what I was sent here for, and I offer no apology for doing it. I consider that the Premier has acted in such an illegal and unconstitutional manner that he should be thrown out and without any apology for doing it.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

Mr. MACKINTOSH (*Cambooya*): I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

The PREMIER: I have no objection to the adjournment of the debate, if hon. members deem it desirable to further discuss the subject. I only wish to express the hope that we will come to a conclusion shortly. It is to be regretted so much time has been wasted, seeing what remains to be done this session; and I hope hon. members on the other side will try to bring it to a conclusion to-morrow night.

Mr. DAWSON: There has been no time wasted. The country is getting the best of hon. members' wisdom.

Question put and passed; and the resumption of the debate made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

The House adjourned at fifteen minutes past 11 o'clock.