

Government to buy the whole of the property in the district, because it was not worth the amount of money proposed to be expended.

The Hon. A. KETHEL: And then they would have to make an entrance!

The Hon. J. MACINTOSH did not suppose that the 17½ miles of length to which he had referred was more than 8 miles as the crow flies. We had no surety that the work would be carried out in a proper manner. In fact, none of the works carried out by the Works Department had justified the estimates made in regard to them.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 4, schedule, and preamble, agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment; report adopted.

House adjourned at 8:14 p.m.

## Legislative Assembly.

*Wednesday, 18 October, 1899.*

Questions and Answers (Meteorological Conditions—Trustees: Hurstville Park—Inspector and Examiner of Schools—Railway: Jerilderie to Deniliquin—Local Government Bill—Amendment of the Fire Brigades Act—Exchange of Lands, Larras Lake—Crown Lands: Bathurst and Parkes—Entrance to Centennial Park—Charles Meyer—City Railway Extension—Surveyors on Railway Route, Tenterfield to Casino—Stock from Queensland—Transmission of Publications—Amendment of Libel Law—Brands and Private Marks on Sheep—Watchmen, Woolloomooloo Bay—Civil Service Superannuation Fund—Timber Industry—Rentals: School-teachers and Postmasters—Australian Agricultural Company's Estate—Superannuation Fund: Messrs. Barling and Coghlan—Public Service Emergency Clerks—George-street Tramway—Appointments held by Mr. Coghlan—New Guinea Land Syndicate—Suburban Slaughter-houses—The City Railway—Federal Electorates—Papers—Public Works Committee—Volunteer Drill-sheds—Electoral Commissioners' Report—Railway: Glen Innes-Inverell—Friendly Societies Bill—Lismore Municipal Boundaries Bill—Labour Unions Employees Protection Bill—Trade Union (Subscription Recovery) Bill—Public Hospitals (Voting) Bill—Public School, Mansfield—Troops for South Africa—Adjournment.

Mr. SPEAKER took the chair.

### METEOROLOGICAL CONDITIONS.

Dr. ROSS asked the MINISTER OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,—(1.) Has his attention

been directed to a letter in the *Daily Telegraph* of the 25th August, from one Charles Brown of Rushcutter's Bay, in reference to the weather report that was laid upon the table of the House last week in reply to a series of questions by Dr. Ross, anent the late unusual and unprecedented unsettled weather and rainfall that has occurred in Sydney and coastal districts during the last three months? (2.) Will he, after reading Mr. Brown's letter questioning the accuracy of the weather returns furnished by the Government Astronomer, state if he is still of the same opinion that the colony in and around Sydney and coastal districts has not been visited by any unusual or unprecedented amount of rainfall? (3.) Will he, for the information of the public, obtain from the Government Astronomer a return showing when and where in previous years the same unsettled weather and amount of rainfall occurred within the same limited period of three months, and the same number of wet days in the same months of June, July, and August?

Mr. PERRY answered,—I will presently lay this information upon the table of the House in the form of a return.

Dr. ROSS asked the MINISTER OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,—(1.) In view of the disastrous seasons and meteorological phenomena from which the colony of late years has suffered, will he obtain from the Government Astronomer answers to the following questions to be laid upon the table of this House for the information of the general public, namely,—(a) Are there any direct or indirect connection with meteorologic phenomena occurring in these colonies with similar conditions of weather existing in Europe; that is, do the seasons alternate from north to south successively, and in the same favourable or unfavourable manner alike in both hemispheres? (b) Is it a fact that if the summer of Great Britain be hot and dry, the following summer in New South Wales and Australia will probably also bring hot and dry weather or undue heat and drought? (c) If any analogy exists in the weather between the two hemispheres, namely, north and south, will he explain how such meteorologic phenomena arise or occur, if any? (d) By taking a comparison or contrast with the seasons as they exist in Europe, will it have any effect in enabling a more definite and

reliable forecast of weather to be obtained in these colonies, in place of relying, as at present, on changes that from time to time occur locally, and are recorded in Australia? (e) Is it not a fact, borne out by long and close observation made by leading experts, that tropical seasons north of the line are usually followed by analogous seasons and similar phases of weather in the southern tropical seasons; that is, that cold winters in the European temperate zone are invariably followed by cold winters in New South Wales, Victoria, and New Zealand? (f) Will Mr. Russell and his staff investigate and report on these important matters, with the view of sending out pamphlets instructing farmers and graziers how to forecast the general nature of ensuing seasons, so that the system of publication of weather forecasts may become of some benefit to producers, as well as to the maritime interests, that are apparently more immediately concerned in these weather forecasts and reports, and which are confined principally within a very limited period, or only a few hours or days to the meteorologic phenomena or changes likely to happen and occur. (g) From recent rains, high winds, and meteorologic phenomena occurring in the west and south-west portions of the colony, what is likely to be the probable weather forecasts during the approaching harvest season; and is the weather forecast likely to be favourable or unfavourable to the farming and grazing interests? (2.) Will he see that as the subject-matter of these inquiries at the hands of Mr. Russell should prove of wide-world scientific interest, not only to Australia, but also to Europe, &c., that all important meteorologic phenomena in regions likely to precede analogous seasons in our clime should in future be carefully noted, and the public advised thereon by Mr. Russell in his weather forecasts? (3.) Will the Government recognise the wisdom of urging investigations in this direction for the purpose of utilising more fully observations of natural phenomena, which promises to become a field of deep scientific research likely to prove fruitful of good practical results in the way of ameliorating and lessening the suffering and loss that has arisen of late years in these colonies owing to unforeseen disastrous droughts?

[*Dr. Ross.*

Mr. PERRY answered,—As it will take some time to prepare this information, will the hon. member be good enough to move for it in the form of a return?

#### TRUSTEES: HURSTVILLE PARK.

Mr. HAYNES asked the SECRETARY FOR LANDS,—Has he any objection to the appointment of the Hurstville Council as trustees of the Hurstville Park, as advised by a recent public meeting of the townspeople?

Mr. HASSALL answered,—I have no objection.

#### INSPECTOR AND EXAMINER OF SCHOOLS.

Mr. AFFLECK asked the MINISTER OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,—(1.) What are the position and duties of inspector and examiner of schools? (2.) What are the position and duties of district inspector of schools? (3.) What are the position and duties of inspector of schools?

Mr. PERRY answered,—(1.) An examiner is an inspector, who is also a member of the board for the examination of teachers, pupil teachers, &c. (2.) A district inspector has supervision over inspectors in his own district in addition to carrying out the duties prescribed in regulations 96 to 100 under the Public Instruction Act. (3.) See regulations 96 to 100 inclusive under the Public Instruction Act.

#### RAILWAY: JERILDERIE TO DENILIQIN.

Mr. CHANTER asked the SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS,—(1.) Has he yet considered the application made for the construction of a line of railway from Jerilderie to Deniliquin? (2.) Will he state if it is his intention to submit this proposal to Parliament for its approval?

Mr. O'SULLIVAN answered,—I have not yet had time to thoroughly consider this proposal, but it will receive my best attention, together with a number of similar requests.

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT BILL.

Mr. CHANTER asked the COLONIAL TREASURER,—(1.) Will the Government introduce a comprehensive local government bill during the present session? (2.) If not, when? (3.) Will the Government

undertake to deal with this measure before altering the present constitution of the present Parliament by reducing its numbers?

Mr. LYNE answered,—(1 and 2.) If such measure is introduced it will only be for consideration next session. It is not possible to deal with it before Christmas. (3.) It is impossible to say at present.

#### AMENDED FIRE BRIGADES ACT.

Mr. CHANTER asked the COLONIAL SECRETARY,—(1.) Has his attention been directed to the urgent necessity for an amending fire brigades act? (2.) Will he introduce an amending bill during the present session?

Mr. SEE answered,—Yes, and the matter will receive consideration.

#### EXCHANGE OF LAND, LARRAS LAKE.

Dr. ROSS asked the SECRETARY FOR LANDS,—(1.) Has any further action been taken to grant to Mr. Jas. Lee, of Larras Lake, Molong district, an exchange of a barren waterless piece of land, about 200 acres, for a more valuable water reserve of never-failing supply of water, with about a mile frontage to the Molong Creek and Bell River; if so, has any decision yet been arrived at in the matter? (2.) In the interests of *bond fide* settlement, will he, in the above case, see that the interest of the general public is not sacrificed in order to conciliate a spirit of land monopoly, seeing that the Larras Lake Estate already consists of something like 40,000 to 50,000 acres of freehold?

Mr. HASSALL answered,—The exchange has received ministerial approval; but before sending the papers on to the Executive Council I am giving the matter my careful consideration; but I am doubtful whether the decision already given can be reversed, even if expedient.

#### CROWN LANDS: BATHURST AND PARKES.

Dr. ROSS asked the SECRETARY FOR LANDS,—(1.) Are there any vacant Crown lands available and open for selection at the present time in the districts of Bathurst and Parkes; if so, the area of the same? (2.) Will he see that a list of such vacant Crown lands in the above districts

is published in the *Government Gazette* at an early date, for the information of the general public and those seeking to make homes for themselves and their families on the waste lands of the Crown?

Mr. HASSALL answered,—(1.) Bathurst district:—Available for conditional purchase, 210,926 acres; available for homestead selection, 159 acres; available for settlement lease, 5,201 acres. Parkes district:—Available for conditional purchase, 133,553 acres; available for homestead selection, 927 acres; available for settlement lease, 23,481 acres. (2.) It is not deemed advisable to publish such a list in the *Government Gazette*, as the cost would be out of proportion to the benefit which might be derived from such publication. Intending applicants for land can obtain all the necessary information from local land agents, or at the Information Bureau, Sydney.

#### ENTRANCE TO CENTENNIAL PARK.

Mr. WHIDDON asked the COLONIAL SECRETARY,—(1.) Will he consider the necessity and public convenience of a large section of the western portion of the city and suburbs of having the entrance to the Centennial Park, at the intersection of Cleveland-street and the Randwick Road, being opened to the public by the erection of suitable gates for vehicles and foot passengers? (2.) In view of the long time that this portion of the park has been closed, will he give immediate consideration to the foregoing request?

Mr. SEE answered,—Yes.

#### CHARLES MEYER.

Mr. HAWTHORNE asked the MINISTER OF JUSTICE,—(1.) Is he aware that Charles Meyer, who was convicted of stealing a watch from his step-brother, and was sentenced by Stipendiary Magistrate Wilshire, at the Glebe Court, on the 12th instant, to fourteen days' hard labour in Darlinghurst Gaol, is of weak intellect? (2.) If on inquiry the above statement be found true, will he at once release the youth from custody?

Mr. PERRY answered,—(1.) On inquiry it has been ascertained that the visiting surgeon to the gaol considers Meyer to be of weak intellect. (2.) The matter will be fully considered.

## CITY RAILWAY EXTENSION.

Mr. COHEN asked the COLONIAL TREASURER,—(1.) Does the proposed scheme for the city railway extension include the resumption of the Devonshire-street burial grounds? (2.) If so, will timely notice be given of any proposal for carrying this purpose into effect, so as to enable the relatives and friends of those buried there to make necessary arrangements in anticipation of the resumption of the land? (3.) Will the Government consider the question of paying the expenses of removing and re-erecting the monuments?

Mr. LYNE answered,—(1.) Yes. (2.) Yes. (3.) Yes.

## SURVEYORS ON RAILWAY ROUTE, TENTERFIELD TO CASINO.

Mr. C. A. LEE asked the SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS,—Has he withdrawn, or is it his intention to withdraw the surveyors from the railway route Tenterfield to Casino, before the deviations recommended by Mr. Surveyor Kennedy have been surveyed?

Mr. O'SULLIVAN answered,—When this officer has finished his work he will be transferred.

## STOCK FROM QUEENSLAND.

Mr. C. A. LEE asked the SECRETARY FOR MINES AND AGRICULTURE,—(1.) What decision has been arrived at regarding the closing of the New South Wales border against stock from Queensland? (2.) In the event of the border being closed, will he allow of sufficient time for stock *en route* from clean districts to reach and cross into this colony?

Mr. FEGAN answered,—(1.) No decision has yet been arrived at. (2.) If it be decided to close the border a reasonable time will be given, but on its expiry no stock will be allowed to cross under any circumstances. I may add, that seeing that the question is one in which the two colonies are concerned—Queensland and our own—I thought it better to send this question on to my hon. colleague, the Premier, to deal with.

## TRANSMISSION OF PUBLICATIONS.

Mr. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK asked the POSTMASTER-GENERAL,—In view of the circumstance that a large number of trade and other publications are registered for

free transmission through the post as newspapers, will he take steps in the direction of amending the regulations now in operation, thus making them more rigorous in regard to such matter of registration.

Mr. CRICK answered,—As stated by my predecessor, in reply to questions of the hon. member, nothing is allowed to pass free unless it conforms to the definition and conditions prescribed by sections 3 to 6 of the Postage Acts Amendment Act, 56 Victoria, No. 31. A more restrictive definition can only be provided for by fresh legislation, and a bill dealing with the question has already been drafted. I might further state for the hon. member's information, that no doubt the practice to which he refers is being carried on, and that a good deal of matter goes through the Post Office which ought not to do so. As the law stands at present we cannot stop it. Fresh legislation is needed to enable us to do so, and, if time permits, a bill will be proceeded with during the present session.

## AMENDMENT OF LIBEL LAW.

Mr. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK asked the ATTORNEY-GENERAL,—Will he, this session, introduce a bill having for its object the amendment of the law of libel; if not, will he take up the Defamation Bill, passed in the Legislative Council recently?

Mr. WISE answered,—I hope to deal with this matter as early as the business of the House will permit.

## BRANDS AND PRIVATE MARKS ON SHEEP.

Mr. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK asked the ATTORNEY-GENERAL,—Will he cause to be introduced a bill, based upon the lines of the Cattle-stealing Prevention Act, but aiming at securing the prevention of sheep-stealing by rendering it compulsory for butchers and purchasers of sheep and of sheepskins to keep a record of brands and private marks appearing thereon?

Mr. WISE answered,—Not this session; but I will keep the matter under consideration.

## WATCHMEN, WOOLLOOMOOLOO BAY.

Mr. CHANTER (for Mr. QUINN) asked the COLONIAL TREASURER,—Is he aware that watchmen at Woolloomooloo Bay are

compelled to work twelve hours per day ; if so, will he take steps to reduce such long hours?

Mr. LYNE answered,—Yes. I understand this is the case ; but I am having inquiries made as to the hours watchmen are usually employed.

#### CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION FUND.

Mr. D. DAVIS (for Mr. PRICE) asked the ATTORNEY-GENERAL,—(1.) Is it a fact that the triennial reports in connection with the Civil Service Superannuation Fund have not been furnished as provided for by law? (2.) Is he aware that reports on the fund were submitted by Messrs. Teece, Trivett, and Coghlan, and that the last report showed an estimated actuarial deficiency of over £2,000,000 ; if so, will he be good enough to give a detailed statement of the deficiencies estimated by the gentlemen named? (3.) Were any steps taken by the late Government to place the fund on a sound basis, as promised by the Right Hon. G. H. Reid, M.P. ; if so, what are the provisions of such measure? (4.) Is it the intention of the Government to furnish this House with a report on the fund? (5.) Will he introduce a bill to place the fund on a sound actuarial basis?

Mr. WISE answered,—(1.) There was a report in connection with the Public Service Superannuation Fund furnished in June, 1898. That apparently would be the triennial report. The second period of three years has not yet expired. (2.) I would ask the hon. member to put this question to me again at a later date. (3.) I am not aware that any steps were taken by the late Government to carry out the promise of Mr. Reid. (4.) The condition of the fund is engaging the attention of the Government, and I have a bill prepared which will, I hope, place it on a sounder basis.

#### TIMBER INDUSTRY.

Mr. D. DAVIS (for Mr. PRICE) asked the SECRETARY FOR LANDS,—What steps does he intend to take to relieve the disabilities under which those engaged in the timber industry now labour?

Mr. HASSALL answered,—I am at the present time giving the whole matter my best attention, and will introduce a

bill dealing with forests and other cognate matters so soon as the state of the public business will allow.

#### RENTALS : SCHOOL TEACHERS AND POSTMASTERS.

Mr. D. DAVIS (for Mr. PRICE) asked the ATTORNEY-GENERAL,—(1.) Is he aware that the amounts charged as rentals to school teachers and postmasters are, in many instances, in excess of the value of such premises? (2.) Has a report on this subject been prepared by the Public Service Board ; if not, will he have a report prepared upon the subject?

Mr. WISE answered,—There appears to be some misunderstanding in regard to this matter. The valuations placed upon Government premises occupied by the class of officers referred to are mainly required for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of section 61 of the Public Service Act, where the officers occupying them are contributors to the superannuation fund. The principle adopted by the Public Service Board is that the emolument of an officer occupying Government premises is fixed at a salary of a certain amount, with residence.

#### AUSTRALIAN AGRICULTURAL COMPANY'S ESTATE.

Mr. D. DAVIS (for Mr. PRICE) asked the SECRETARY FOR LANDS,—(1.) Has an offer been received by the Government for the purchase of the Australian Agricultural Company's estate ; if so, what are the terms of such offer? (2.) Has he had an opportunity of looking into the papers as promised? (3.) Will he prepare a minute upon the subject, and submit the same for the consideration of the Cabinet, as promised? (4.) Has he any objection to place the whole of the papers upon the table of the House ; if so, when?

Mr. HASSALL answered,—An offer has been received, and I am now looking through the papers ; but as they are of a confidential character I do not think it will be advisable to lay them upon the table of the House just at present.

*At a later stage :*

Mr. EDDEN : I understood the hon. gentleman to say that correspondence had passed between the Government and the Australian Agricultural Company in reference to the proposed purchase of land,

but that the correspondence was of a confidential character, and he did not deem it wise to make it public. I should like to ask the hon. gentleman if it is the custom of the Government to hold confidential correspondence with persons when the public money is to be dealt with, as will be the case if this land is to be purchased? I should like further to ask the hon. gentleman if he will lay all this correspondence on the table of the House, and let daylight into the whole business, inasmuch as it has been taken up by the leading journals of the city and the leading journal of the Newcastle district?

Mr. HASSALL: The hon. gentleman has thoroughly misunderstood the nature of my reply. I said that the matter was under my consideration, but that the documents relating thereto were of a confidential nature, and I did not think it advisable to lay them on the table of the House just at present. There has been no correspondence whatever between this Government and the Australian Agricultural Company with reference to the purchase of land. The matter has not even yet been submitted to the Cabinet. I said last night that I was going through a very voluminous report on the subject, and I have not yet been able to deal with it. The hon. gentleman can rest assured that no steps will be taken by me as a member of the Government—and I feel sure I can answer for my colleagues—with reference to the acquirement of this land without the fullest consideration, and without the matter being thoroughly thrashed out in Parliament.

SUPERANNUATION FUND: MESSRS.  
BARLING AND COGHLAN.

Mr. WISE: I should like, with the permission of the House, to add a few words to my answer to a question asked last night by the hon. member for Quirindi.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. member would be in order in doing that. He can lay a paper on the table.

Mr. HAYNES: I would ask the Attorney-General whether he can give the House any further information as to the question put to him last night by the hon. member for Quirindi?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member cannot ask such a question at this stage.

[Mr. Edden.

Mr. HAYNES: I wish to ask the Attorney-General if he has any further information to give to the House in answer to the question asked by the hon. member for Quirindi last night in reference to Mr. Barling and Mr. Coghlan?

Mr. WISE: In consequence of incomplete information, I stated that there was no official notice at the Treasury of the so-called agreement between Messrs. Barling and Coghlan and the Right Hon. Mr. Reid. I have since been informed that no notice of the agreement had been given to the Examiner of Accounts, to whom the moneys were paid, but that there was a copy in the books of the Treasury. The original agreement was forwarded direct to the gentlemen concerned.

PUBLIC SERVICE EMERGENCY CLERKS.

Mr. McLEAN: I desire to ask the Attorney-General a question in regard to an examination which took place under the Public Service Board some weeks ago for emergency clerks. There has been some delay with regard to the appointments, and I wish to ask the hon. gentleman if he has given an opinion as Attorney-General that the examination was illegally held, or if there is any impediment in the way of making appointments in the case of those who have passed the examination?

Mr. WISE: I have expressed the opinion—I shall be happy to show the hon. member the minute setting it out if he will call at the office—that all examinations for promotion from one grade of the service to another in the case of officers who were in the service at the date of the passing of the Public Service Act are contrary to law; that in regard to the regulation by which the Public Service Board have purported to hold these examinations, if the word “test” used in the regulation is to be interpreted to include examination, so far as that regulation applies to officers in the public service at the date of the passing of the act, it is *ultra vires*. I may say that in giving that opinion I am only giving expression to the declared intention of the act as expressed by the late Prime Minister in Committee when the clause was under discussion.

GEORGE-STREET TRAMWAY.

Mr. WHIDDON: I desire to ask the Secretary for Public Works if anything

further has been done in connection with the appointment of someone to make an investigation relative to the George-street tramway, and would the hon. gentleman have any objection to state to the House what the need was for such investigation?

Mr. O'SULLIVAN : Steps have been taken to appoint a commission to inquire into this matter, but until that inquiry has been made it would be hardly fair to the officers of the department to make any statement on the subject. To-morrow the hon. gentleman will very probably see the names in the paper.

#### APPOINTMENTS HELD BY MR. COGHLAN.

Mr. HAYNES : I wish to ask the Attorney-General what steps have been taken with respect to the occupancy of two offices by Mr. Coghlan—in connection with the Public Service Board and as Government Statistician. Has the hon. gentleman taken any action in that matter, and, if so, what has been done?

Mr. COOK : In other words, have the Government ejected Mr. Coghlan from one of the offices?

Mr. HAYNES : He will have to go out of one or the other!

Mr. WISE : Mr. Coghlan was required by me some three weeks ago to make an election whether he would continue to be on the Public Service Board or a member of the civil service. After correspondence, which I will sooner or later lay on the table of the House, Mr. Coghlan declined to make any election. The papers have now left me and gone to the Colonial Secretary's Office, in whose department Mr. Coghlan in his capacity of Government Statistician is serving, to be dealt with by the Colonial Secretary in a way that I think will be satisfactory to the House.

#### NEW GUINEA LAND SYNDICATE.

Mr. MEAGHER : I wish to ask the Premier if it is a fact that the question of the expenses of the New Guinea Land Syndicate has been brought before the Cabinet at the instance of the Administrator of New Guinea, and whether the hon. gentleman will take no steps himself, but allow the House to deal with the question of the payment of these expenses?

Mr. LYNE : The question has come before me. It has not been submitted to

the Cabinet up to the present. I do not sufficiently understand it at the present moment to deal with it myself. I am going to examine the whole question and it is probable the matter will come before the House before it is dealt with. The late Prime Minister can tell me the amount; I think it is about £4,000.

Mr. REID : Something about that. I promised that nothing should be done until Parliament had had an opportunity of considering the matter.

Mr. LYNE : I did not have time to go into the question, and I at once made up my mind that I should not deal with it, but take it before the Cabinet, and I think it will come before Parliament.

#### SUBURBAN SLAUGHTER-HOUSES.

Mr. O'CONOR : Will the Premier take steps to secure the appointment of inspectors to look after meat killed at slaughter-houses outside the city area—I refer to suburban areas—so as to remove the great danger that exists at the present time to public health.

Mr. LYNE : This is a matter to which I have referred myself several times. I had a consultation to-day with the President of the Board of Health, and I gave him instructions to invite applications for six inspectors for the suburban areas where slaughtering takes place. They will thoroughly inspect those places, and that is the only way in which the work can be temporarily done pending a decision with regard to the abattoirs. I have taken that action to-day, and given the necessary instructions.

#### THE CITY RAILWAY.

Mr. REID : I wish to ask the Premier whether the Cabinet have arrived at any decision on the question of extending the railway to the city; and, secondly, whether they have arrived at any decision in the event of proposing any such extension as to making use of Hyde Park for any station purposes?

Mr. LYNE : A large deputation waited on me on this subject to-day. I told that deputation that the Government intended to refer to the Public Works Committee a proposal to extend the Redfern Railway Station from Devonshire-street to Belmore Park, and that the Government also intended to deal with the extension of the

railway from that point into the city, where there will be a passenger station, but not a national railway station. I also said that it was possible that it might be determined to run the railway just inside Hyde Park and Elizabeth-street, but it was not proposed to take any large area of the park.

Mr. REID: Will any part of Hyde Park be taken for a station?

Mr. LYNE: My own feeling with reference to that is that it will not be done.

Mr. WISE: The hon. member for King Division supported that proposal violently years ago!

Mr. LYNE: There are two or three alternative proposals for providing a passenger station in the city, and it seems to me that this is all that is required. My own feeling is that no portion of Hyde Park will be taken.

Mr. REID: Has not the Cabinet decided the question yet?

#### FEDERAL ELECTORATES.

Mr. NORTON: I desire to ask the Attorney-General a question with reference to the subdivision of the colony into federal electorates for the House of Representatives. Has he come to any definite decision as to the power of the state Government of New South Wales to subdivide the colony into federal electorates?

Mr. WISE: Yes; I have not the slightest doubt of it, and I do not think that any one can entertain a doubt. There is ample power either in the Government or in the Parliament to appoint commissioners for the purpose of dividing the colony into electorates. Whether or not, when the electorates have been subdivided, the Parliament of the colony will have power to make the necessary arrangements for elections is a matter I have not yet considered, and, anyhow, it need not be considered for the next few weeks. My opinion at present is that the Parliament of the colony will have power to do so:

Mr. ROSE: Is it a fact that we cannot fix a quota until we ascertain whether Western Australia will come into the federation?

Mr. WISE: That is so undoubtedly. The final determination of the boundaries of the electorates must, of course, belong to the Parliament. The appointment of a

[Mr. Lyne.

commission, if Parliament decides to adopt that course, or if the Government decide to appoint a commission without consulting Parliament, will be merely for the purpose of collecting information, and it will do the same work as was done by the Electoral Commissioners in subdividing the colony into the existing electorates after the Electoral Act was altered. The final arrangements must, of course, be left to Parliament.

Mr. MEAGHER: In view of the statement made by the Attorney-General that it may be possible that a commission will be appointed for dividing the colony into federal areas without the consent of Parliament, and in view of the state of the finances, I would ask the Premier will he take into consideration the advisability of appointing as a commission the President of the Land Appeal Court? That gentleman could act as a commission as he is doing at present with regard to the site for the federal capital without expense to the public.

Mr. LYNE: The question has been discussed by the Attorney-General and myself as to the necessity for bringing in a bill to give power to appoint this commission. There is no doubt a commission can be appointed without a bill, but I felt that it would be much better to consult Parliament before taking action. That is the reason why we have not at present appointed a commission. I quite admit that if we could get one, two, or three good officers now in the service to deal with the question, without any expenditure except travelling expenses, or something of that kind, it would be the best course to take.

Mr. MEAGHER: Why not appoint the Electoral Commissioners?

Mr. LYNE: I do not know exactly what their position is at present. I think they are now out of the service. Judge Murray is out of the colony, and Mr. Lewis is out of the service. I had an idea of appointing a commission, but it will be just as well to save expense if possible. I may say that if we cannot get time to pass a bill through Parliament, and after the matter is explained to Parliament, possibly it might be a wise thing to appoint a commission of civil servants, who will submit their report to Parliament to be dealt with afterwards. That would have to be done in any case. However, if



we have time to do so, I would prefer to bring in a bill to obtain the authority of Parliament.

Mr. REID: I would suggest to the Premier that he should also discuss with the Attorney-General the difficulty of laying down even provisional boundaries for electorates before we can determine how many members we are going to return.

#### PAPERS.

Ministers laid upon the table the following papers:—

Amendments to Regulation No. 340, relating to apprentices, Fitzroy Dock Works, under the Public Service Act of 1895.

Regulation No. 349, relating to increments to attendants in Public Library—General Division.

Report of the President of the State Children's Relief Board for the year ended 5th April, 1899.

Copies of *Gazette* notices, setting forth the mode in which it is proposed to deal with the dedication of certain lands, in accordance with the provisions of the 105th section of the Act 48 Victoria No. 18, the 41st section of the Act 53 Victoria No. 21, and the 7th section of the Public Trusts Act, 1897.

Abstract of Crown lands authorised to be dedicated to public purposes, in accordance with the 104th section of the Act 48 Victoria No. 18.

Abstract of alterations of designs of cities, towns, and villages, under the 107th section of the Act 48 Victoria No. 18.

Abstract of sites for cities, towns, and villages, declared under the 4th and 101st sections of the Act 48 Victoria No. 18.

Abstract of Crown lands reserved from sale for the preservation of water supply or other public purposes, in accordance with the 101st, 109th, and 112th sections of the Act 48 Victoria No. 18.

Amended forms Nos. 8 and 50, under the Crown Lands Acts.

Notification of resumption, under the Public Works Act of 1888, of land, parish of Petersham, county of Cumberland, for the widening of Piper-street and a lane, Annandale.

Notification of resumption, under the Public Works Act of 1888, of land, parish of Woolmol, county of Inglis, for the supply of water to Tamworth.

Notification of resumption, under the Public Works Act of 1888, of land, parish of Petersham, county of Cumberland, in connection with the western suburbs drainage works, Sydney.

Further report by the Government Astronomer respecting unsettled weather and heavy rainfall in June, July, and August, 1899.

Referred to Printing Committee.

#### PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE.

Mr. NORTON: I desire to know from the Prime Minister if he is aware that a vacancy exists upon the Public Works Committee? If so, will he take steps to

have that important office filled, as much anxiety exists below the gangway with regard to it?

Mr. LYNE: I am very well aware that it exists, and I shall take steps to have it filled.

#### VOLUNTEER DRILL SHEDS.

Mr. COPELAND: Some time before the recent change of Government was brought about I put one or two questions to the then Minister for Defence on the subject of providing drill sheds for the volunteers, and he promised to look into the matter with a view to obtaining a piece of land upon which the £2,000, which was voted two or three years ago for the erection of drill sheds, could be expended. As I have pointed out before, it is very difficult for volunteers to drill properly under the present arrangements, because on many occasions they lose their opportunity to drill by reason of the rain. Will the present Minister for Defence be good enough, under the circumstances, which require that our volunteers should be well equipped, to see that provision is made for the erection of drill sheds?

Mr. SEE: I shall have the matter thoroughly investigated, and I hope to be able to report favourably upon it within a very short time.

#### ELECTORAL COMMISSIONERS' REPORT.

Mr. PRICE: I desire to know from the Chief Secretary if it is his intention to give effect, by means of a resolution of this House, to the recommendation of the Electoral Commissioners in regard to the readjustment of electorates? The commissioners' recommendation cannot have any effect unless it is adopted by this House.

Mr. SEE: I understand that the recommendation was made something like four years ago.

Mr. PRICE: The report of the commissioners was presented four years ago, but it has been in abeyance ever since.

Mr. SEE: I shall have the matter looked into; but when subjects like this are brought before me without notice it is impossible for me to give a direct answer. I think it would be more in keeping with parliamentary procedure if notices of questions of this kind were put upon the business paper, so that departmental replies might be given to them.

## RAILWAY: GLEN INNES-INVERELL.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: As the Secretary for Public Works has given notice of his intention to submit a number of new railway schemes to the Public Works Committee, I wish to know if it is his intention to immediately submit the Glen Innes to Inverell railway proposal to the committee?

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: That line of railway is under consideration, and as I have yet further lines to submit to the committee the hon. member might exercise a little patience.

## FRIENDLY SOCIETIES BILL.

Bill read the third time.

## LISMORE MUNICIPAL BOUNDARIES BILL.

*Resolved* (on motion by Mr. EWING):

That so much of Standing Order No. 399 as requires that a private bill shall be brought in within thirty days from the receipt of the petition be suspended to admit of the introduction of the Lismore Municipal Boundaries Bill, the petition to introduce which was presented to this House on the 29th August last.

Bill presented and read the first time.

## LABOUR UNION EMPLOYEES' PROTECTION BILL.

Bill presented by Mr. Edden, and read the first time.

## TRADE UNION (SUBSCRIPTION RECOVERY) BILL.

Bill presented by Mr. McGowen, and read the first time.

## PUBLIC HOSPITALS (VOTING) BILL.

Bill presented by Mr. Fitzgerald, and read the first time.

## PUBLIC SCHOOL, MARSFIELD.

*Ordered* (on motion by Mr. TERRY):

That there be laid upon the table of this House all papers in connection with the establishment of a public school at Marsfield from the time that the North-west Ryde Progress Association came into existence.

## TROOPS FOR SOUTH AFRICA.

Debate resumed from October 17 (*vide* page 1396), on motion by Mr. Lyne:

That this House is of opinion that New South Wales should equip and despatch a military force for service with the Imperial army in South Africa.

Mr. W. M. HUGHES (Sydney—Lang) [5:22]: We are asked to assent to the equipment and despatch of a military force for service with the Imperial army in South Africa. It would have been well, perhaps, had we been afforded an opportunity to learn from an official source the merits of this most unhappy and unfortunate dispute; but so far as the leader of the Government was concerned, he confined his remarks to a plain businesslike statement of his intention to despatch this force, having, of course, secured the sanction of Parliament, and affirmed the desirableness of doing so. We were only able to learn some of the alleged reasons from the leader of the Opposition why we should take this course. The right hon. gentleman at the head of the Opposition for two hours last evening made an harangue which had it been delivered by plain John Jones or Tom Smith would have met with the contempt it deserved. No man would have sat here to listen to him unless he had been compelled to do so either by party allegiance or by the laws of this Chamber. The right hon. gentleman, when he was not abusive, and vulgarly abusive, was hysterically loyal. One would almost have imagined, in fact I pictured to myself while the right hon. gentleman was marching up and down thumping the table, that Mr. Chamberlain, whom the right hon. gentleman resembles in more particulars than one, was listening with eager ears to the hogwash he was giving us. I can say that it was no more than hogwash, because that any man in a British parliament, in a British-speaking community like this, should be called upon for two hours to allege and continually assert his loyalty, appears to me to place him somewhat in the category of women of doubtful reputation who are the first to proceed to assert their good character. Is there an hon. gentleman in this Chamber—I had almost said is there a man in the country—who, if the empire, whatever that may be, were in danger, would not be ready to defend it? We, and I believe those men who are associated with us both here and in other parliaments, are perhaps in the true sense of the word some of the most loyal subjects the country has. But there is something always required in a contingency of this kind besides the mere empty mouthing of loyalty. The assump-

tion is that all men are loyal until they have proved to the contrary. But what does the right hon. gentleman say? He makes a deliberate and a cowardly charge against the party to which I belong with reference to their loyalty, and charges them with being the upholders of a spurious and rotten democracy. I shall not attempt to defend our democracy. A charge as to the *bona-fides* of our democracy is not to be considered for a moment proceeding out of the mouth of the right hon. gentleman. When we are to be charged with spuriousness and rottenness and shiftness, we will wait for another critic with another reputation and a better record. The right hon. gentleman has done much to endear him to this country. That time has gone by, and his conduct of late has been strange in the extreme. He has alienated the majority of his supporters throughout the country. Those men who came to his standard, and gathered about him and fought under his banner, are now disgusted at his shiftness and his readiness to abandon both his political principles and his ancient friends. The right hon. gentleman, amongst other things, said he did not think it was incompatible with democracy to be loyal to the mother flag. I have to say to the right hon. gentleman, nor is it incompatible with true democracy to treat all men with justice. It used to be the proud boast of the British race that wherever there was an oppressed nation, or a person treated unjustly, whether he was a British citizen or an alien, the powerful arm of Britain was ready to be put out to protect him, and to interpose between him and his oppressor. But according to the right hon. gentleman's latest dictum, this is what may occur: Great Britain may now engage in any infamous war, it may engage in any contemptible and cowardly undertaking, and we here, who have not an opportunity of saying whether we believe it to be right or wrong, are to go along pell-mell at the tail of a great general. For my part, while I still yield to no man in loyalty to the nation I belong to, I am not going to assent to this departure from a principle which for centuries has been established in the mother country, and which will never be departed from without disaster to the nation and to the race to which we belong. I venture to say that the greatest enemies the British race

have to-day are these very men who would shove us into any dispute so long as a handful of powerful syndicators are to be served. What is it that has precipitated this terrible conflict, for it is a terrible conflict? It is a thing that never yet has stained the annals, except once, of the great British race—that they should have deliberately embarked upon this iniquitous enterprise against a handful of men whose whole numbers, collected together, do not equal the population of Sydney and suburbs. Are the Boers so much to be feared, or is the British nation so weak, in spite of the fact that she spends millions every year in making her military force an effective fighting machine, that to-day she is unable to do anything unless New South Wales and Tasmania, and other great military powers, throw in their lot with her? Why, I remember the right hon. gentleman in one of his phases—I forget now which one it was, the last but one, I think—pointing out and holding up to derision the fighting strength of that gallant little island, Tasmania! But now we are to understand that the empire is to totter to its fall if Tasmania cannot send half a unit towards the infamous task of exterminating these unhappy people. I do not care whether the Boers are right or whether they are wrong; and if it were Russia or Germany—if it came for me to decide whether I would live under a Russian or British domination, I would never hesitate, right or wrong, in my choice. But we are now subjected to no such direful alternative. We can now, openly and deliberately, with as much leisure as we choose, enter into a calm discussion as to whether this is a desirable opportunity for the initiation, or, rather, the continuation, of a policy which was initiated when we sent troops to the Soudan over ten years ago. I venture to say that all that was said by the right hon. gentleman last night was said by other men prior to the despatch of the Soudan contingent. The empire then was rocking to its fall. The empire then was in such a position that the world, as it were, was waiting to swoop down with incisive talons upon the British race, and unless it were shown that the empire was solid, and New South Wales was loyal, the consequences would be fatal. Well, the contingent went to the Soudan. They stood behind their machine guns.

They opposed to the simple faith, the enthusiasm and the fanaticism of the Mahdi, the machine gun. They did very well. They brought home a goat—I believe they took it with them. There will be no necessity for this contingent to take a goat. I do not object to any man, or any hon. member, going to the Transvaal. I am given to understand that the minds of several hon. members are so palpitating with military ardour that they intend to go. I hope they will. I hope one hon. gentleman whose name has been largely advertised lately will go. I hope he will go to the front. It would be the one thing necessary to secure my consent to this otherwise infamous proposition, that New South Wales should relieve itself of this incubus, and that the Parliament of New South Wales should be a parliament not thronged with volunteer officers, who, with lightning-like rapidity, and without experience or training, are able to pass as colonels and generals of division. These gentlemen should have the option of being either members of Parliament or officers in the army, unless it is proposed to supersede our admirable system of parliamentary government by a military despotism. Indeed I understand that, although one would not think of it to look at him, that the right hon. gentleman last night was the latest convert to this system. He said that one of the greatest engines for securing freedom and the liberties of the people had been military power; that the great virtues inherent in a large army were mainly responsible for the freedom we enjoyed to-day. There is not one country to-day which has a large standing army which has anything approaching the liberties enjoyed by those countries that have no standing army. Once before we went to war under just such circumstances as those in which we are preparing to go to war now. We went to war at the close of the last century; we were beaten. England then was not so strong as she is to-day, yet she was powerful, and was perhaps a more effective fighting machine than she ever was before or has been since. We went to war against a handful of farmers and backwoodsmen, and we were beaten. We went to war against men of our own country, of our own colour, and of our own language, and we were disgracefully beaten. We went to war with justice on

[*Mr. W. M. Hughes.*

the other side, and nothing but gross ignorance to justify our action; and we propose now to do the same here. It is true, perhaps, that there may be something to be said against the habits of the Boers. We are told that they are dirty, that they are uneducated. I know that in a country so favoured by Providence as this is, where every man is educated to the very pinnacle of possibilities, that must appear a frightful thing. I believe these Boers are not men of culture. How fearful it is to imagine a nation without culture! And yet these men are honorable; they are hard-working, and they ask for nothing more than that they may be allowed to wrest from an unwilling soil enough to keep them and their wives and families. The right hon. gentleman said, "I admit these men are patriotic, that they are courageous, that they are fighting for their country, and that they have a right to do it;" and yet, having admitted so much, he said, "That is no reason why we should not go and wipe them off the face of the earth." He said so in so many words. Now, I do not know whether these men are courageous, or whether they are patriotic or not, but I do know that it is against the law of nations, it is against justice, it is against the eternal principles of that religion upon which the greatness of the empire is alleged to be founded, that we should deliberately force upon another nation, and a foreign nation, our interference in regard to their internal affairs. What is it to us that they will not give a vote to an alien or a stranger unless he has been there for five years? What would have been said during the anti-bill campaign—what was said when Mr. Larke, the Canadian Commissioner, a fellow-citizen of the great empire, ventured to come here and teach us the benefits of federation? Did not those who believed in the bill, as well as those who did not, say, "This man is interfering in a business which does not concern him; we do not want the interference of this foreigner here"? What would have been said at the last referendum if people came in—the French people for instance—and said "Why, this constitution of yours is alien to the great principles of democracy and justice, and if you do not alter it, we will make you"? Why, those who were against the bill and

those who were for it would have banded themselves together as one man, and said to them, "We may quarrel amongst ourselves, but we will allow no outsider to interfere with us." But it appears that a law which is admirable for us does not affect the unhappy Boer, and that a suzerainty which was absolutely abandoned—tacitly abandoned, at any rate—is now to be set up. Although in 1896 Mr. Chamberlain declared that such a war would be fraught with danger, would be infamous and unjust, yet it is proposed now, when the Jameson raid has failed, that this war shall be undertaken in the interests of that powerful clique in Africa whose only desire appears to be to press on and on, not to plant the seeds of Christianity—if it were for that purpose I would cast a vote for this proposal to-night—not to plant the seeds of Christianity, but that they may by fair means or foul put their hands on the best lands and the best property in Africa. Now, what did Mr. Chamberlain say in 1896? He said:

A war in South Africa would be one of the most serious wars that could possibly be waged. It would be a long war, a bitter war, and a costly war, and, as I have pointed out already, I believe generations would hardly be able to blot out the memory of it. To go to war with President Kruger, to enforce upon him reforms in the internal affairs of state in which secretaries of state, standing in their place, have repudiated all right of interference—that would be a course of action which would be immoral.

There is the speech also delivered by Lord Derby, who was Secretary of State in the Gladstone Liberal Administration, in which he directly repudiated any claim of suzerainty or paramount power over the South African Republic. Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, who was Secretary of State for the Colonies in 1896, as he is to-day, declared that this war would be a bitter, costly, and immoral one; yet now, although it is possible to settle the dispute by an appeal to arbitration, he has decided to appeal to the arbitrament of the sword. All I can say is that if these colonies are led into this infamous attempt to crush a handful of people very like ourselves, if it be our lot under any set of circumstances to lose the protection of Great Britain, the very same treatment might be accorded to us by Russia or any other Continental power. Therefore, I say we should be actuated by a desire for jus-

tice, and the party to which I belong is actuated, I believe, not by a spurious and rotten democracy, but is actuated by a love of humanity generally. If it comes to this, that we are to choose between one nation and another, we shall never hesitate as to which nation we shall give our allegiance, whether right or wrong, when it is in the last extremity. I join with those who say that when the die is cast, when two nations—ourselves and any other—are engaged in a life and death struggle, it is not the part of any citizen of either of those nations to inquire, "Why am I fighting?" but to fight. But when it comes to a great pugilist attacking an infant, and asking his little brother to come and hold the infant while he gets at him, it savours too much of political bravado and swashbuckling to be on all-fours with the noble traditions of the British race. It was the proud boast of England that she was the admiration and the envy of all the nations. The French nation in 1789 turned to England to copy her institutions. She was then the cradle of liberty. During the Napoleonic wars, when all Europe was under the sway of that admirable engine of democracy—a military power—Britain alone stood between Europe and a military despotism. But to-day what have we? We have the right hon. gentleman, who for five years has led this country, standing up and declaring that military supremacy is one of the most admirable methods for securing the liberties of one's country. The hon. gentleman, doubtless, was well advised in what he said. I realise thoroughly what the hon. member was doing it for. No man who listened to the right hon. gentleman last night, as he pawed and thumped, and paraded in front of that table could have any doubt that the hon. gentleman was not speaking to us at all; he was speaking to the power over the water. It simply meant, "In the event of any little trouble, Joseph, just call on me; I will be the man for the occasion." It is the old, old thing. I can only deplore that the right hon. gentleman should have made any pretence to be any longer a good democrat. Possibly he may be able to explain away much of what he said. No one listened with greater regret to what he said than I did. No one has ever admired the hon. member more than I have. Although I fought and worked

*Second night.*

against him, still, no one ever had greater admiration for his abilities than I have. But when he stood here and declared that the party to which he owed his long tenure of power—if he owed it to any party—were the professors of a spurious and rotten democracy; that they were disloyal; I can only say that such a man is very ungrateful.

Mr. COOK: He said nothing of the kind!

HON. MEMBERS: Yes, he did!

Mr. COOK: He said absolutely nothing of the kind!

Mr. W. M. HUGHES: He certainly did. I should like to point out that the right hon. gentleman has not always been so great an advocate for militarism or for interfering with the affairs of the empire. Some years ago the late Sir Henry Parkes moved a motion and the right hon. gentleman protested most vehemently against the growing military feeling all over the country, and he opposed the motion strongly. Only twelve months ago, when an expedition was being led against the Afridis, the right hon. gentleman declared that he did not believe in taking part in these filibustering expeditions. Now all that is changed. Of course I am not at all surprised, but still the country at large should know that he has changed all that.

Mr. HAYNES: He has been home; he has been inoculated!

Mr. W. M. HUGHES: That may be. I suppose every hon. gentleman here was extremely surprised after hearing all this mouthing of loyalty, to find that only a few weeks ago the right hon. gentleman gave an answer completely at variance with his utterances last evening. According to the documents read by the Attorney-General last night it was plain that the attitude that the right hon. gentleman assumes to-day is different from what he assumed then, when he was of opinion that this affair does not call for active interference on the part of this House. We are now asked to send troops to the Transvaal, not because the empire is in danger, but only to show the solidarity of the empire. It may be so; but if we are only going to have a parade of our solidarity, we are at the same time going to commit acts of shameful immorality and the grossest injustice; and I say that such a

[Mr. W. M. Hughes.

parade is an undesirable thing. We have been accused of being disloyal. I only wish to say that our idea of loyalty and morality is not the same as the right hon. gentleman's. I shall not enter into a dissertation on morality; but the first idea of morality was confined to the family—that is to say, a man might burgle or thief from anybody outside his family, but it was extremely immoral to do so within his family. He might kill another man's wife; but he was not permitted to kill his own. That was afterwards extended to the tribal idea of morality. It was wrong to do anything against a fellow-tribesman. By-and-by it was extended to the national idea of morality which we hold to-day. Latterly we have extended it still further. Now it is an accepted canon of ethics that it is wrong to do an injury to any man, whether English, Irish, Boer, or anybody else. That is the morality on which we take our stand. I venture to say that it is a morality which, whether accepted or not, is based on the principles on which our religion has stood so long.

Mr. SAWERS: Do you include Chinamen?

Mr. W. M. HUGHES: I cannot charge my conscience with having done a wrong act, even to a Chinaman. I should never do a wrong act to any individual Chinaman. I would try to keep the Chinese race out of this country, both for their good and for ours. The right hon. gentleman said he could understand that if the Boers had wished to keep the Uitlanders out they should have done so, and it would have been all right. He said that if the Transvaal Government, seeing the danger there was of the country being swamped by the Uitlanders, had passed a law to prevent it, then the present position taken up by Great Britain would be indefensible; but that British subjects having been allowed to go into the country, they had rights, and the empire must protect the just rights of its subjects. There are two things urged there, one is that the British have exercised paramount power over the Transvaal which is absolutely opposed to what is laid down in the treaty. Secondly, that the Boers did not have an opportunity of keeping out the British since 1884; but it was specially laid down in the treaty that they had to allow the British in.

You will remember that last night the right hon. gentleman read something from "Haydn's Dictionary of Dates" showing that in 1881 there were 38,000 Boers and only 5,000 Uitlanders, so that in 1884 there would be a vast preponderance of Boers as compared with the Uitlanders in the Transvaal. They could not see then what an immense influx would subsequently take place. The discovery of diamonds and gold had not then been made to any considerable extent. Therefore, when the Boers executed that treaty they had no idea that there would be such a tremendous influx of Uitlanders, and they never had an opportunity to do more than enter a protest against the influx. Therefore, the hon. gentleman displayed the most profound ignorance of what he was talking about. Whatever may be said about the morality of the hon. gentleman's statements last night, his ignorance of the facts of the case transcend everything. He was absolutely not seized of one fact in connection with this matter that would bear investigation, and he hurled insults across the Chamber which were directed chiefly at the members of the labour party. I am exceedingly sorry that the right hon. gentleman is not here now, because I think it is unheard-of that when an hon. gentleman—especially such a one as the hon. member—has for two hours abused chiefly the party which, only the previous night, he stated that he admired, and was proud of their allegiance—his friendship for them being marred so far as he was concerned only by one mistake of theirs—and has then, at the end of his speech, made a weak, hump-backed apology—it is, I say, unreasonable, that he should be allowed to escape the castigation which he has so richly deserved. But, as the right hon. gentleman has explained to me the reason why he has had to go home, I shall not say anything further about his action in that particular, except that, to my mind, his apology was no defence of his conduct at all. The right hon. gentleman should have been seized of the facts of the case. Although he tried to hide from the House the fact that the offer of troops came from this side of the world, that the movement was set on foot here; and though he pointed out that there was a very great difference between men volunteering to go, and that fact being made

known to the Home Secretary, and the Government of this colony taking the initiative, I venture to think that no one saw his point. There is no difference. I do not want to prevent men from going to the Transvaal.

MR. NORTON: I rise to ask you, Mr. Speaker, to make the announcement in regard to the tea adjournment, which I believe you intend to make to-night. Some hon. members are leaving the Chamber under the impression that you will leave the chair at 6 o'clock!

MR. SPEAKER: Some hon. members have suggested to me that during the summer months it would be well to adjourn for tea at half-past 6 instead of at 6 o'clock.

HON. MEMBERS: No, 6!

Other HON. MEMBERS: Half-past 6!

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot take a division upon the proposal; but, as the general expression of opinion seems to be in favour of an adjournment at 6 o'clock, I shall now leave the chair until the usual hour 7 o'clock.

[Mr. Speaker left the chair at 5:59 p.m. The House resumed at 7:3 p.m.]

MR. W. M. HUGHES: The right hon. gentleman told us last night that what we had to consider was the fact that we had here a number of citizens of the empire who had volunteered to help Great Britain in her difficulty. These were not pressed men, but volunteers who had offered to shed their blood and who were prepared to yield their lives for the honor and safety of their country. And the right hon. gentleman asks, "What right have we to prevent these men from going?" I reply that we have no right to prevent them from going. Let them go. We have no sort of control over them, and there is nothing to prevent any citizen from going from here to the Transvaal, and if he prefers it, staying there. But what we have to consider is, should the taxpayers of the country be mulcted in the sum of £30,000—that is the estimate; but I suppose the expense will run to £100,000 before it is finished—to provide means for sending these men away. If there are 600 men in this country who wish to volunteer for service in the Transvaal, by all means let them go; but I think that that part of the right hon. gentleman's speech was as illogical and as foolish as the rest of his argument. We

*Second night.*

have nothing to do with these men, and we do not require them. I wish now to say one or two words about what I may term this colonial jingoism. It was formerly the peculiar prerogative of the people of Great Britain alone amongst the British people to clamour for war. That most undesirable and immoral feature had not extended to these shores, and until the Soudan contingent was sent away there were no blood stains upon this country. But, since the inception of what is known as the federal spirit, there has been a tendency upon the part of a great many who formerly were the most determined opponents of militarism and jingoism to come round and point out to us that it is our duty to stand by the empire through thick and thin. I say that our duty is perfectly clear. So long as we are prepared to accept the protection of Great Britain we must be ready to lend her a hand in the hour of need; but it does not follow that when, by the machinations of a band of buccaneers she has been landed in a difficulty with the Boers of South Africa, or with any other people, that we should be led by the nose also. The hon. gentlemen who have spoken from this side of the House have declared that, in their opinion, this war is ill-advised, ill-judged, and immoral; and, with the exception of Mr. Dangar, I have heard no one state that it is a just and advisable war. I understand that the motive underlying the favour which some men have shown to it is the statement that Boers have ill-treated the Uitlanders, and I have seen several cablegrams dealing with the ill-treatment of women and children of the Uitlander population by the Boers. I have some small experience of cablegrams, and it is my opinion that one can hardly look at anything more unlike what it professes to describe than is a cablegram. We must recollect that the gentleman whom rightly or wrongly, we accuse of fomenting this disturbance, are men of immense substance, and that a cablegram like anything else may be bought; you can manufacture Armenian atrocities; you can manufacture defeats; and you can manufacture victories by the help of cablegram. It is now declared that, although the Americans in their war in Cuba had many adventures, they gained very few victories; but it must be remembered that they had with

them many war correspondents behind whom was plenty of money. Now, we are asked to believe, upon the authority of a few cablegrams, that the Boers have ill-treated the women and children of the Uitlanders.

Mr. NORTON: And cablegrams have contradicted that statement!

Mr. W. M. HUGHES: No doubt the statement has been contradicted, and the contradiction is at least as reliable as the original statement. But what I wanted to point out is that, because some of the Uitlanders have been, since the ill-feeling has been promoted, treated unjustly, surely that is no reason why we should rush into war. I ask is it a strange thing here to treat foreigners unjustly? Have we not heard, in connection with the Lambing Flat riots, that Chinamen were nearly swept off the face of the colony? We know that Chinamen were dropped down mines, that they fell down there, or by some mysterious means got to the bottom. This is considered nothing at all. This is not a *casus belli* with China; nothing of the sort.

Mr. ARTHUR GRIFFITH: Nothing of the kind has been authenticated against the Boers!

Mr. W. M. HUGHES: Nothing at all. It is possible that some women and children may have been hustled and harshly treated by men who were justly irritated. I am not defending this sort of thing. I am only pointing out that these men may have been after all greatly irritated, and their manners, perhaps, fall short of those of a Chesterfield. I heard one gentleman argue that one reason we should go to war was that the Uitlanders were denied an opportunity to be tried by a jury of their own countrymen. That is the most astonishing statement I ever heard. It is most strange, because when a German is accused of a particular offence, is he tried by a jury of Germans? When a Chinaman is accused of a particular offence we do not try him with a jury of Chinamen!

Mr. ARTHUR GRIFFITH: Another reason is that they do not speak English in the state schools!

Mr. W. M. HUGHES: One has to be amenable to the laws of the country in which one lives. No one compelled these men to go to the Transvaal. They went there of their own free will; they were

[Mr. W. M. Hughes.]



free to come away ; but they stayed there, and, being there, they are amenable to the laws of the country. It is to be regretted, perhaps, that these laws are not more liberal ; but that is no reason why we should interfere. I only desire to say now that the franchise, as I understand it, for the lower house of the Transvaal, is two years' residence. After he has been two years in the Transvaal, a person can then be naturalised, and get a vote. You cannot do that here. Kruger promised to give the Uitlanders a vote for the Upper Raad when they had been seven years there. That was his offer. But you cannot get a vote for this House if you have been here seven years ; so that this franchise is at least as liberal as is the Queensland franchise, although it is, perhaps, not quite as liberal as is our own. I shall be glad to hear from any person, not an hysterical outburst of loyalty, but some arguments supporting the statement that the Transvaal should be treated other than as a foreign nation. I should like to know why the Transvaal should be treated otherwise. We are now told that we are to enter into this war because the other colonies have gone into it, and that it would look bad if we were behind them in the matter. I do not know that this is any better argument than to say that, whatever is done, whether right or wrong, we must stand by it. I have already said that, in case of danger to the empire, the whole people must, whether they like it or do not like it—they should anyhow—lend a helping hand. But suppose the other colonies, whom the leader of the Opposition complained about, forestall us. Victoria is now regarded as a shining example of patriotic virtue in Downing-street, a fact which the hon. gentleman at the head of the Opposition most bitterly deplored, and he certainly did his best to remove that impression by his speech of last evening. We have to remember that Great Britain did not require our aid, and did not ask for it. It may seem rather an imputation that in her hour of need, Britain does not require, does not ask for aid from one of her colonies, but it is nevertheless a solemn and notorious fact. This hysterical desire for notoriety of a particular kind, of a kind which was unnecessary, and even valueless a little while ago, but which of late has become

an essential virtue if we desire success, is a new political religion. If you desire success, if you wish for notoriety, it is absolutely essential that you shall appear before the eyes of the home Government as patriotic, and when titles fall heavily on your country you will not be missed. I have here "Vattel," who is one of the best authorities upon international law. I put this forward to show that according to this most renowned jurist there is absolutely nothing in the circumstances which now confront us which justifies the entrance of Britain into this war. He says :

In order to estimate the justice of an offensive war the nature of a subject for which a nation takes up arms must be first considered. We should be thoroughly assured of our right before we proceed to assert it in so dreadful a manner. Two things are necessary to render it just—(1.) some right which is to be asserted, that is to say that we are authorised to demand something of another nation, (2.) that we be unable to obtain it otherwise than by force of arms. Necessity alone warrants the use of force. It is a dangerous and terrible resource. Nature the common parent of mankind allows of it only in cases of the last extremity when all other means fail. It is doing wrong to a nation to do violence against her before we know whether she be disposed to do us justice or to refuse it.

A great deal has been said about Kruger's wriggling. But are we to condemn a man merely because he is a wriggler. If that is so, how insecure are the foundations of the greatest statesman of Australia ! He has wriggled. If you were on as sharp a pin, as he was and is on, you would wriggle too. You would wriggle if you were confronted by as determined and desperate a butterfly hunter as Great Britain, knowing that in the end you would be pinned tightly on the card with your name neatly inscribed over the circumstances under which you met your unhappy fate. What has this old man done ? Has he not done the best he could for his country ? What is his alternative ? His people must fight, or be exterminated, or lose their existence as a nation by the overwhelming predominance of the Uitlanders. A nation so situated would do well to die sword in hand rather than be wiped out, blotted out of the map of Africa by the slow and insidious process of political reform. Now we have been accused, as I have said, of giving, as we propose to do, a vote of disloyalty. I am glad to say that we

*Second night.*

stand here to-night in company with some of the most illustrious Englishmen that have lived during the last hundred years. It was Chatham who warned the Commons, when he was confronted by an ignorant and blatant crowd, perhaps by a more ignorant and more blatant crowd than those who throng the Commons now, clamouring for a declaration of war against the American colonies. It was the Earl of Chatham who warned them that it was the beginning of the end. Has it not been so? Was he not the truest friend of England when he pointed out that by precipitating a conflict Great Britain would inevitably lose that which she went to war to maintain? Had that war not been precipitated the world would never have known a division of the English-speaking race. It was Fox who protested against the infamy of the war against France. Did not John Bright protest against the Crimean war, one of the greatest blunders ever committed by any administration in Great Britain? And, last of all, we stand in the company of Gladstone, a man who ended a struggle similar to this upon which we are now entering, and ended it, in spite of all that might be said against that great man, to his eternal honor and to the happiness and welfare of mankind.

AN HON. MEMBER: We now have to reap what he has sown!

MR. W. M. HUGHES: It is hard to say what would have happened had we gone on. But if the hon. member can view with equanimity the spectacle of a united South Africa arrayed against the power of the British Empire, he must be of a more optimistic turn of mind than I am. You cannot bring a nation like that to your knees; you must exterminate them. There were the Albigenes, and there was a schism. It was wiped out when the Albigenes were wiped out. These men come of that sturdy stock that furnished the bulwark of Protestantism in Europe, who stood for a hundred years as the symbol of liberty. If you think that you will get rid of these people in South Africa by anything else than extermination, then you little know them. Right or wrong, there they are; and while a man of them stands in South Africa you will have to bayonet or shoot him before you obtain peace.

[*Mr. W. M. Hughes.*

MR. NORTON: They shielded the Pilgrim Fathers in Holland!

MR. W. M. HUGHES: They come from the same stock as we do; and the man who can under these circumstances view the prospect with cheerfulness differs entirely from myself. All I can say here to-night is, that I stand here to give a vote against this proposal; and in doing so we are in company with the most illustrious and patriotic Englishmen of the day.

MR. COPELAND (Sydney—Phillip) [7:23]: I do not know whether to attach any significance to the fact that, so far as we can judge, the same gentlemen who are going to oppose this motion were, most of them, opposing resolutions only a little while ago in favour of federation. They were all, they said, strongly in favour of federation; they were all federalists, but not under that bill. And it seems to me, that on this occasion, they are all loyalists, they would all fight for the mother country, they would all fight for the strength of the empire, but not under this war—not under any other war, I think. There is no war which Britons have waged for hundreds of years, but that men of the same disposition as these gentlemen opposing this have also found reasons to oppose. Some men have always found cause for complaint. They are always loyal, but always against that war.

MR. NORTON: What about John Morley?

MR. COPELAND: If the hon. member will kindly refrain from interrupting I shall not say the slightest thing to give provocation. I think we had an exhibition here last night that was a disgrace to our legislative chamber. We ought to be able to carry on a debate of this kind without saying anything personally offensive.

MR. NORTON: So we will if you keep the late Premier in order!

MR. COPELAND: That hon. gentleman does not happen to be present to-night. There is no necessity for us to say a word personally offensive to each other. I am quite prepared to give every member of this Chamber credit for the same honesty of intention that I have myself. I believe other hon. members are just as loyal as I am. They look at this question from a different standpoint, but they are as much entitled to hold their opinions as I am to hold mine. Therefore, I merely ask for

the freedom of speech that every man ought to be entitled to in giving utterance to the opinions he holds. I am free to admit, also, that there are great grounds for doubt about the wisdom of this war. I admit that freely; and I go further—I go as far as any member of this Chamber in the direction of saying that I regret very much that there is a war, and I regret very much that there should be any war. I think the time is fast coming when we shall be able to settle these great disputes without war. At least, I hope so, and that is one reason why I am prepared to support the British Government; because I feel quite sure that while the British nation and the American nation are in the ascendancy, that is the only chance we shall ever have of settling these disputes by arbitration instead of by the sword.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Boers were prepared to settle this dispute by arbitration!

MR. COPELAND: But what kind of arbitration? Calling in foreign nations to settle a dispute between a suzerain power and a subordinate state, for that is really the position the Transvaal holds to the British Empire. I somewhat regret the form which the motion of the hon. member at the head of the Government has taken. The hon. gentleman, I am sure, will readily acquit me of a desire to level any reproach against him, but I should like to have seen the resolution worded in a somewhat different form. We must all know perfectly well that the British Government are not dependent upon any assistance we can give them. God forbid that they ever should be. It would be a poor lookout for this country if the British nation had to depend upon a paltry 250 or 125 volunteers that we might have to send from this country. We all know, and are all free to admit, that in accepting the services of our troops Great Britain does so merely for the purpose of placing her children in this position: One hon. member spoke of a cat and its kittens. Now, Great Britain, as the British bulldog, is really giving its little puppies an opportunity of having "a taste of the fight." That is all she is doing—training the colonies—and that is what we want to do in sending our men away. We want to show, first of all, the solidarity

of the empire. We want to show that we are a part of the empire of Great Britain, and that we are men enough to take our share in the responsibilities of nationhood as well as its advantages. Therefore we say, "Let us send a few of our men, let us show you that there is a little pluck to be found in Australia, in your sons on the other side of the world, as well as in the British soldier; give us an opportunity of showing what we are made of." Great Britain, on the other hand, says, "Well, we are prepared to put up with the inconvenience"—because that is really what it is. It is an inconvenience, and will be an inconvenience to the British army, to have our raw recruits amongst them. Still, it is a good thing for this country that our raw recruits should be trained and be converted into adept soldiers, so that they should have some skill and knowledge to enable them to defend our country if ever the time should come, and it is very possible it may come, and come before very long, even arising out of this very Transvaal difficulty. Then is it not desirable that our troops should be trained? The only way for them to be trained is for them to go and see actual warfare. The British Government are not craving assistance from us, but are willing to accept what we choose to send to them in the way of serviceable troops, merely for the purpose of showing, in the first place, that the empire is united in all quarters, and, in the second place, to give us an opportunity of training our men. Perhaps the Government have had very little time to consider the form of this resolution. I am free to admit that they have been hurried a great deal at the present juncture, and have had little opportunity of giving consideration to this question. I know the Premier has not had a moment to spare to see any one or to consider anything. The chief value of any aid we can give will be simply as an expression of loyalty to the empire. It will be merely telling the world, "Understand that if the British Empire gets into difficulties, if you do what is very apparent you would like to do—some of these nations would like to stand by until they saw England in a corner, and then would be first to spring at her throat, and all the more so if they believed there was any disloyalty in the colonies, all the more so if

*Second night.*

they believed that England's colonies would be her weakness, just as we found it to be the case some time ago, when the Soudan contingent went away. We know that at that particular time the whole of Europe was snarling and snapping at the heels of Great Britain. We had Germany snarling at her about German New Guinea. We had France snarling at her about the New Hebrides, and we had Russia attempting to capture a part of Afghanistan—all inclined to attack England because they thought at that particular time that England's weakness was her colonial empire, which she would have to defend in case of war, and therefore there would be a chance of grabbing a portion of it for themselves. There can be little doubt that if ever England's strength should be taxed to its utmost, Australia would be one of the first countries that either Germany or France would endeavour to seize upon so as to enlarge its colonial empire.

AN HON. MEMBER: That will be the time to fight!

MR. COPELAND: The time to fight is when any part of the rope is likely to be stranded. Would any sensible man say, "Oh, this is not the time to fight, while the fight is taking place at the Transvaal; we will wait until the fight comes to our own shore." Then some of them would say, "Oh, yes, but the fight is in West Australia; wait till it comes to New South Wales." And then when it came to New South Wales, I suppose, each man, carrying out the same policy, would take his rifle and go and stand at his own front door, and say, "It is not the time to fight when the invaders have landed on our shore; I am going to fight when they attempt to attack my house and my household gods." That would be the time when the hon. member's policy would come in. We should be prepared to fight at any point where the empire is threatened. It is our duty to give all the assistance we can whenever there is a dispute between the empire and any other country. To say that the Transvaal is a small country is hardly a correct representation of the case. A nation depends not upon its acreage, but upon the number and the quality of its fighting men; and it cannot be gainsaid that there are a number of fighting men in the field now in the Transvaal and the Free State; in addition to that, we do not

know the countless numbers of men of foreign nations that are already giving strong evidence of their willingness and desire to take up arms against Great Britain. We see that some 1,500 Germans have volunteered, and how many may that be the precursor of? It may be that in a few weeks, instead of 1,500, we shall have 5,000 or 10,000 Germans volunteering for war against Great Britain.

MR. HAYNES: We may have 15,000 Germans volunteering to marry our high people in England!

MR. COPELAND: I hope the hon. member will talk sense.

MR. SPEAKER: Last night I tried to impress upon hon. members that these interruptions should cease. There is only one course open to me, and that is to remove those hon. members who persist in making them. Am I to be forced to take that course? It rests with hon. members themselves. I have no desire to do it.

MR. COPELAND: I was going to refer, first of all, before I got to the solid matter, to the fact that I think the Premier would have done well to have included in his resolution some expression of loyalty from this colony to the mother country. It is the loyalty that is wanted; it is not the men. All the British Empire desires is that we should be loyal to the old land, and the only ready means we have of showing our loyalty is to say, "Well, we will send you some of our men."

MR. LYNE: Perhaps the hon. member will allow me to say that the wording of the resolution is in accordance with the wording of the resolutions in three of the other colonies, though somewhat different from that in Victoria. That is the reason I worded it in its present form.

MR. COPELAND: I intend to endeavour by an amendment to supply the omission. The hon. gentleman knows I am as anxious about this matter as he is himself, and I think he will see the wisdom of accepting the suggestion I am about to make. I propose to insert a few words after the word "House," so as to make the resolution read as follows:—

That this House desires to express its continued and unbounded loyalty to her Gracious Majesty the Queen, and, while regretting the necessity for the war now in progress in South Africa, desires to express its fullest concurrence in the policy pursued by the Imperial Government with a view to securing the social and politi-

[*Mr. Copeland.*]

cal rights of free men for all British subjects whose lawful occupations have made them residents of Boer territory, and is of opinion that New South Wales should equip and despatch a military force for service with the Imperial army in South Africa.

I take leave to say that the British Government would appreciate a resolution of that kind more than they would appreciate the actual sending of a number of men.

MR. LYNE: It would complicate matters very much!

MR. COPELAND: I do not think so. If we are loyal, why should we be ashamed to express our loyalty? I cannot imagine a man being loyal and afraid of giving expressions to that loyalty. If a man were loyal and afraid of anyone knowing it, and afraid of voting for it, I should say his loyalty was significant by its absence, or else he was too cowardly to give expression to it. I am quite sure the hon. member is neither of these. I believe he is as loyal as I am, and I do not think he is afraid,—at least he ought not to be afraid—of giving expression to it. If we are not a loyal people in God's name let us knock this farce on the head! The English Government do not want our 250 men; they simply wish to have an expression of loyalty from us. If we are not loyal she can do without us. We are in duty bound to render aid and assistance, as a matter of common equity to the mother country. It is as much our duty to volunteer for service to maintain the power of the empire as it is for the people of Yorkshire, Essex, or any other part of England to do so. We are part and parcel of the British Empire and as long as we accept any of the advantages of the empire it is our duty to share the burdens and the inconveniences of the empire. Hon. members may laugh; but I can very well imagine that men who are disposed to oppose this motion would not have had the privilege of coming here if some of their fellow-citizens had not been more inclined than they are to take up the sword. What right have we here, if a strong nation has no right to say to the weak party, the possessors of the land, you must make room for us? Why do we not bundle up our traps and leave this country to the black-fellows? What right had the people of New Zealand to take that country? Look at the monstrous war which was raged in that country, as

no doubt many hon. members would have called it? Will any man tell me that the Maoris of New Zealand are not as brave a race as the Boers of South Africa? They are every whit as brave. They are more honorable, and better men in every sense of the word. If we are to adopt the policy of those hon. members who oppose the motion, we are bound to abandon this country to the aborigines, and the New Zealanders are bound to abandon their country to the Maoris. So we might go to all parts of the empire which Great Britain has acquired from time to time. I believe it is one of the laws of nature—a predestination—that the better type of humanity should displace the lower type. I have no hesitation in saying that the Boer is the lowest type of white humanity. You cannot name to me any other race of white people so low in the scale of humanity as the Boer.

AN HON. MEMBER: Except the Yorkshire Boer!

MR. COPELAND: The Yorkshireman has the courage of his opinions, and would not be afraid to meet the hon. member's bore, whether small bore or large bore. We are supposed to know very little of the merits or demerits of this question, and I think I may be allowed to quote slightly from speeches recently delivered in the House of Commons. It may be assumed that prominent members of the House of Commons ought to understand this question a little better than we can be supposed to do.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why?

MR. COPELAND: Because they have had a better opportunity of doing so.

MR. ARTHUR GRIFFITH: They are farther away than we are!

MR. COPELAND: As a matter of fact they are not. I have here a report of the debate which took place in the House of Commons on 7th August, 1899, which is not very far back in ancient history. I will quote from a speech delivered by Sir Ellis Ashmead Bartlett, who, of course, will be called a rank tory, and everything else.

MR. NORTON: He is a young man of 23, who married a rich widow of 70!

MR. COPELAND: He is a barrister and has been nineteen years in Parliament, and twice he has been a minister in the

*Second night.*

British Government. He must have been born very old if he is a mere child of 26 or 27 years.

Mr. NORTON: He married Baroness Burdett-Coutts!

Mr. COPELAND: No, that was his brother. This is what Sir Ellis Ashmead Bartlett said, and inasmuch as he has twice held the post of Civil Lord of the Admiralty, it may be fairly assumed that he has taken the trouble to make himself acquainted with the facts quite as much as any hon. member here. He said:

The franchise concession has been made by the Colonial Secretary the key of the position; but the difficulties of the Transvaal will be by no means settled, even if the full demands of Sir Alfred Milner are accepted by the Volksraad. Such questions as the independence and honesty of the Transvaal High Court, the impartial and uncorrupt administration of the country, the removal of religious disabilities, the equal benefits of education and language, and the just incidence of taxation are almost, if not quite, as important as that of the franchise—a rather doctrinaire remedy, which, after all, is only a means to an end, and a means that a great number of the Transvaal Uitlanders do not ardently desire. Moreover, the bare gift of the franchise by the Volksraad can be easily neutralised by those restrictive conditions and artifices in which the Boers have proved themselves quite pastmasters, and which would prevent any effective addition of Uitlanders to the electoral power of the Transvaal. These are details, and very important details. The main thing, however, is that her Majesty's Government should make it plain to President Kruger, and to the Boer Executive, and Volksraad—that is, to the thirty-three persons who are absolute masters of the Transvaal, with more than a Venetian absolutism—that no evasion or shuffling will be permitted, and that the settlement made now must be complete, final, and must be honestly observed. There has been too much palaver and too much "soft sawder" in all this Transvaal business. The result has been that for eighteen long years the Boer President has played a successful game of bounce, and England and British interests and the rights of the Uitlanders have been steadily driven down hill. No subject has been the centre of so many myths, of such huge humbug, and of so much pseudo-glorification as the Boer government of the Transvaal. The Boers are not even the original proprietors of the country. They are only interlopers of some forty-seven years' standing, who have oppressed the real aborigines in the most barbarous and cruel way. They are not the majority of the white population, nor the best part of it, nor the most industrious. They number less than two-fifths of the white population, they pay less than one-sixth of the taxation, and they have not one-tenth part of the education of their Uitlander neighbours. The Boer Republic is a sham, and a republic only in name. It is, in fact, a corrupt oligarchy,

[*Mr. Copeland.*]

worked by a handful of clever and designing persons for their own benefit, dependent for its existence upon prejudice and race hatred, and employing all the worst, most venal, and most tyrannical methods of the most unscrupulous autocracy in the world in order to maintain its power. The Kruger regime is, in fact, a vast extortion machine. The present Boer resistance to our just demands is not a struggle for liberty or justice, for there is neither liberty nor justice under the Transvaal Government. It is simply a struggle for unjust and monstrous peculation, a last effort of a most corrupt oligarchy to keep its hold over a rich and promising field of exploitation.

There are the opinions of a man who may be looked upon as being quite as competent to form an opinion, or almost as competent to form an opinion as even the hon. member for Northumberland; and it seems to me that the question before us resolves itself into two parts: We have to send men, and sending men will cost money; the question arises, are we entitled, not so much to send men as to allow men to go? I agree with that part of the speech of the leader of the Opposition. These men have volunteered to go; we should not think for a moment of sending men if they did not offer to go. The question arises, have we a right to allow these men to go and take their share of the responsibilities of the nation? I say that if we were to refuse to do this we should be the meanest people on God's earth. The empire has endowed us with the grandest estate on the face of the earth. We possess, at this moment, one-eighteenth part of the whole land surface of this world.

Mr. FERGUSON: And yet we are not satisfied!

Mr. COPELAND: It has come to us as a heritage from the mother country, for which we have never paid one shilling, and it has never cost us one drop of blood; but it cost a great many drops of British blood and hundreds of thousands of British lives, the lives of British soldiers and sailors, and a good many millions of British money to enable them not to fight for this country directly, but to enable them to maintain their supremacy amongst European nations. Can it be doubted for a moment, if Great Britain had ever lost her supremacy, that France, Germany, or some other country would not immediately have taken possession of this country, and then we should not have been here? We

stand here with this free gift of more than one-eighteenth of the whole land surface of the earth.

AN HON. MEMBER: In New South Wales!

MR. COPELAND: No, Australia. This is an Australian contingent, which is going to render a little loyalty and nothing more, a little assistance to the mother country. Surely we ought to be prepared to take our share in the burdens of the empire quite as much as the people of England. If we are not to fight for the empire, why should the people of England fight for it? According to some hon. members, it is time that we laid down our arms and allowed other nations to walk over us. If we were to adopt the policy of those who oppose this motion, we should be content to say, "Let the people of the Transvaal do as they like." Then, later on, a quarrel would occur between Great Britain and some slightly stronger power than the Transvaal, and we should be told again, "What right have we to fight against those people?" We have been asked over and over again, "What right had we to go to the rescue of Egypt?" and we have been told that we had no right to send troops to the Soudan to fight against the Arabs; that we should let France, or some other power, take possession of the provinces of the Soudan. Applying the same principle everywhere, Great Britain would have to withdraw from India, and leave the vast outlying portions of her territory unprotected. If she did that, how long would they remain as they are now? Would they be governed by a wiser or a gentler power than Great Britain? Would any of the races which are subject to Great Britain be in a better plight than they are in to day if they were subject to Germany or France or Russia? Will any hon. gentleman say that the British rule is a harsh or unjust rule? Can Great Britain be honestly and truthfully charged with having perpetrated injustice upon any part of her empire? Has she done any wrong to the Boers? Did she not come to the rescue when the Boers stood a chance of being wiped out by the assegais of the Zulus? And what has been her return? From that day to the present moment the Boers have never missed an opportunity to heap every kind of insult and contumely upon Englishmen, and to

commit robbery and villainy upon British subjects. Miss Olive Schreiner has recently published a shriek in support of her brother's political treachery.

AN HON. MEMBER: We have traitors here, too!

MR. COPELAND: I have no doubt that we have.

MR. NORTON: If the hon. member is a loyalist I want to be disloyal!

MR. COPELAND: Miss Schreiner has recently published a work in which she attempts to support her brother's treachery to the empire. But if we read the "Story of an African Farm," published by the same authoress a few years ago, before this trouble became so prominent, we do not find the Boer pictured there as a saint.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who says that he is?

MR. COPELAND: Some hon. members would make one think that the Boers are the most righteous people upon God's earth, and that these men are fighting for their homes, for justice and freedom. But was there ever a nation under the sun, was there ever an islander in the South Pacific who, when his territory was invaded, did not fight for freedom and for liberty? In the great majority of cases, however, the greatest blessing that ever fell upon such people came to them when they were invaded by people of a superior race, because these brought with them civilisation and the knowledge of freedom. Those peoples did not know that they were slaves, or that they were ignorant, but when freedom came, bringing with it education and intelligence, they began to realise, as we Anglo-Saxons realise, that it was the best thing that could have happened to them to be invaded by Great Britain. Reference was made a little while ago to the separation of the United States from the British empire; but, as an Englishman, I say that the declaration of the independence of the United States of America is the best thing that ever happened in this world. Never since civilisation was known has anything of greater importance happened in the world than the War of Independence. And, unjust though that war was in its inception, its results have given nothing but good to humanity. No doubt there may be some objections to the present war against the Boers. Some people may think that the dispute might have been settled by arbitra-

*Second night.*

tion, or that there is nothing worth fighting about. When you are not there, you can easily think that. But when men, the fellow-countrymen of those who have howled in this Chamber from session to session about the advantages of one man one vote, go to the Transvaal and find that there is there nothing of the kind, can we expect them to say that it is of no consequence, and nothing to fight for? But those who claim to have worked such wonders here ignore the position of their fellow-countrymen in the Transvaal.

Mr. MCGOWEN: We have always looked at the equal value of the vote!

Mr. COPELAND: What has that to do with the question about which I am speaking? Do I want to build up any unequal values? Has any one ever asked that the Britishers shall have more rights in the Transvaal than are enjoyed by the Dutchmen there?

Mr. MCGOWEN: The hon. member was willing to give Tasmanians more rights than the people of New South Wales!

Mr. COPELAND: Utter nonsense! Here we have the old true federalist, but "not under this bill"?

Mr. FERGUSON: The old true Britisher, but not under this war!

Mr. COPELAND: I am prepared to take my share in the responsibilities of nationhood, and since England has conferred upon us this vast territory which we inhabit, it is contemptible to weigh a paltry £30,000 in the balance—because the cost of sending away our volunteers will amount to only £30,000, which is actually less than 6d. per head of population. Even if we are called upon to pay £60,000, the expense will not amount to more than 11d. per head of the population of the colony. In this connection, let me draw hon. members' attention to one or two facts. I find that when Captain Cook took possession of Australia—

An HON. MEMBER: Oh!

Mr. COPELAND: It is a very easy matter for the hon. member to laugh at Captain Cook, but he himself would not make a big toe-nail to a man like Captain Cook. Captain Cooks do not grow where the hon. member came from. When Captain Cook discovered Australia the British nation had a national debt of £127,000,000, and I wish to show what it has cost Great

Britain to maintain the supremacy which has enabled her to retain this territory for us. In 1855, when the British Government handed over to us as a free gift all the lands, the minerals, the royalties, and the wealth of this colony, the national debt was £837,000,000, or £710,000,000 more than when Captain Cook landed here. It cost Great Britain £710,000,000 to maintain her supremacy and to keep together her empire, and to that sum is to be added the lives of hundreds and thousands of British sailors and soldiers who have fought for the freedom which we enjoy. Is it not then contemptible for us, when the British supremacy is called into question, to refuse to send some of our men, and to pay some of our money in bearing our just and fair share of the troubles of the empire? Last year it cost England 11s. 1½d. per head of population to pay for her army and 12s. 3½d. to pay for her navy. Surely if every man, woman, and child of the highly taxed populations of England, Scotland, and Ireland have to pay £1 3s. 5d. per head for maintaining the British forces, we, who are in so much better position financially, should be willing to contribute something out of the free gift which the mother country has conferred upon us. England gave to New South Wales 196,000,000 acres of land.

An HON. MEMBER: It has pretty well all gone now!

Mr. COPELAND: Only 46,000,000 acres have gone, so that there are 150,000,000 acres left to sell. Up to the end of 1897 the amount of money actually received by this country by reason of this free gift was £43,821,000, with £11,624,000 of unpaid balances, making a total revenue from land sales of £55,500,000, and we have still 150,000,000 acres left to sell. That amount of money is altogether apart from the revenue derived year by year from the occupation of the land, so that I have no hesitation in saying that the free gift of the British empire to the people of New South Wales has already returned to us pretty nearly £100,000,000. Last year our gross land revenue was £1,976,000, and deducting the cost of the Lands and Mines departments—£457,000—that left us a net profit of £1,500,000.

Mr. ARTHUR GRIFFITH: What has this to do with the Transvaal?

[Mr. Copeland.]



Mr. COPELAND : If the hon. member has not brains enough to understand what I am saying, it is not my fault.

Mr. ARTHUR GRIFFITH : Well, I admit that I have not !

Mr. COPELAND : Our netland revenue last year was equivalent to £1 2s. 6d. per head of the population, that is what the free gift of Great Britain to us was worth last year.

*[Applause in the gallery.]*

Mr. SPEAKER : I should like to point out to the people in the gallery from which the applause has come that if there is any further demonstration there, I shall have the gallery cleared. There must be no noise in the galleries. If the messenger knows who the person is who applauded, he must remove him from the gallery.

*A Stranger* : I was not aware that it was against the order of the House to applaud, and I will retire, sir.

Mr. SPEAKER : In that case, you may remain.

Mr. COPELAND : I was pointing out that last year there came into our pockets £1 2s. 6d. per head from our land. Let us see what it has cost to defend us. The cost of the British army and navy amounts to £1 3s. 5d., and in addition to that the British taxpayer has to pay by taxation, not from the sale of Crown lands, but by actual taxation, 12s. 5d. per head interest on the national debt, which accumulated during the time that England was protecting Australia for the present occupants of it ; so that the taxation of the English people for this matter amounts at present to £1 15s. 10d. per head.

Mr. EDDEN : I have no desire to curtail the hon. member's remarks, but, in my opinion, they are very much wide of the subject under discussion. If the hon. member is allowed to go into the question of land revenue, I suppose other hon. members will be allowed the same latitude. I think the hon. member has been out of order for the last fifteen or twenty minutes.

Mr. NORTON : I certainly think the hon. member must be in order. He is giving reasons why this motion should be carried. One of his reasons, as I gather from his discourse, is that we owe a debt of gratitude to the old country. This is largely a matter of sentiment !

An HON. MEMBER : No ; of cash !

Mr. NORTON : An appeal has been made to us, and I take it that the hon. member is deftly mixing sentiment with cash, and is endeavouring to show by statistics that we have received such benefits from the old country, putting aside the fact of our being a dumping ground for convicts for half a century, that on that ground alone this motion should be passed.

Mr. SPEAKER : The proposition is that the Government should equip and despatch a military force for service in South Africa. Surely it would be in order for an hon. member to advance as a reason against that, that the state of the finances did not justify that course. Would it not be equally in order for an hon. member to show that the additional cost entailed by the equipment and despatch of a force of this kind would be so trifling, in comparison with our income, that it was not worth consideration at all ? That is what, I take it, the hon. member was trying to prove. I cannot rule him out of order.

Mr. COPELAND : I was pointing out that every man, woman, and child in this country, last year, derived an absolute net revenue of £1 2s. 6d. per head from the land, while the only expenditure in connection with the defence of this country, including military pensions, the Australian naval force, the volunteers, the Albany and Thursday Island forts, amounting in all to £270,000, was equal to 4s. per head of the population. Deducting 4s. from the land revenue of £1 2s. 6d., we were still benefited last year to the extent of 18s. 6d. for every man, woman, and child in the country. Now the Colonial Treasurer comes along and asks us to spend the odd sixpence—that is what it amounts to, leaving us with a net revenue from the land alone of a considerable sum of money. We are not like the British taxpayer who has to put his hand in his pocket to pay taxation at every turn to contribute to the maintenance of the British navy and the British Empire. Our contribution comes from this free gift of the mother country to the people of New South Wales, and after paying this 6d. per head, after contributing to this little gratuity involved in sending a small contingent to the forces in South Africa, we should still have 18s. per head left. I know what will be said. We have been told in these debates before that it is the duty of the mother country

*Second night.*

to maintain her army and navy for the sake of her trade—to protect her trade. I have always thought that there were two ends to trade—that the buyer was benefited, and that the seller was benefited. There is no law of which I know which compels us to sell any of our produce in British territory. We are free to send it to any part of the earth. We can take it to Germany, America, or to Russia. We only take it to Great Britain because we have there a ready market, and because she pays us the best price. If it be beneficial to Great Britain to protect our commerce, it must be equally beneficial to us to protect it. I find that the over-sea trade per head of the population of Great Britain amounts to £18 14s. 3d., whilst the over-sea trade of the population of New South Wales per head amounts to £31 18s. 5d., yet we contribute 6½d. per head for naval defence, while the people of Great Britain contribute 12s. 5d. per head, we having double the amount of ocean-borne trade that they have. Let us take a further glance at the facts. If Great Britain had a monopoly of our trade, there might be some reason for the argument that she should contribute a greater proportion of the cost of protecting that trade by means of the British navy; but, as a matter of fact, while our trade with the United Kingdom last year—our exports and imports over sea-borne—amounted to £15,500,000, our import and export trade to foreign countries amounted to nearly £14,000,000. Surely if that is held to be a reason why Great Britain should pay the cost of the defence of this trade by having her fleet in our waters, and by protecting British commerce wherever it may be, ought we not to look to Germany, to France, and to the United States to contribute? The United States alone had half as much trade with us last year as had the British Empire; but we do not expect the United States to pay a share of the cost of defending that trade. It is unreasonable, unmanly, and cowardly for the people of this country to continue to pocket the proceeds from land sales and land occupation, and to allow the hardly-taxed people of the mother country to continue to pay the burden of our defence. It is cowardly, it is a disgrace to our manhood, that we should continue to do so. When we are asked to contribute a paltry sum of £30,000, we

[*Mr. Copeland.*

find hon. members saying that we have no right to spend this money—that we have no right to put this country to the cost of a pint of beer per man, 6d. per head, or, if the thing lasts for twelve months, 1s. per head. Not a farthing of it comes out of our pockets; every farthing will come out of the sale of the Crown lands of this colony, an absolutely free gift to us from the mother country. I cannot understand the heart, I do not know the nature of the blood, of the man who would attempt to refuse this quota for national defence. It is not really the Boer whom it is necessary to conquer. We know already that other nations are ready to spring at the throat of Great Britain, and that we should soon have them on our foreshores. Do you think that if France and Germany found us in a crippled state they would allow us, a handful of people, to retain possession of this one-eighteenth of God's earth? They would say, "Why should we not have a share of it? Had not our explorers as much to do with the discovery of Australia as had those of Great Britain? Why not annex the Northern Territory?" What is to prevent it? The only way to prevent it is to strengthen the bonds of the empire. Let us, therefore, as one man resist the enemies of Britain as though they were landing on the foreshores of Sydney Harbour. The best way to defend this country is to do so at a distance. The best policy is to keep the enemy out of our own territory. Do not let us wait until they come to our doors. That is a policy this Government will act wisely in following. I hope the Premier and the Government will see the wisdom of not sending the artillery, but will send two units of infantry, with a few extra men—lancers—to complete that unit. I hope they will send them away well equipped, and give them all that is necessary, so that the British Government will not have to pay the hard-earned taxation of the British people, which is wrung like blood from the poor, to pay the cost of our undertaking, while we are reaping such a princely fortune from the land—that free gift of the mother country. The Premier is reported in the *Sydney Morning Herald*, and in the *Star*, to have said last night that the cost of the Soudan expedition was £700,000. I took the trouble, through the librarian, to inquire at the Treasury this afternoon, and the

officials there gave me these figures:— Instead of £700,000, £123,664 was the actual net cost —

AN HON. MEMBER: The Premier said £200,000!

Amendment proposed.

MR. ASHTON (Goulburn) [8·26]: It did not require any great power of prophecy to foretell the attitude which the hon. member who has just concluded his speech would adopt on this question, since that occasion which is well within the recollection of every hon. member in this Chamber when the hon. member for Philip Division, in his place in this House, expressed during the fiscal debate the regret that the constitutional arrangements of this country necessitated the settlement of such a question as that by legislative means instead of permitting each individual protectionist to take a battle-axe and bathe himself in the blood of the hated men who occupied the benches on your right. We knew that it was so bred into this hon. gentleman that it was only necessary for him to smell blood, even at a distance of 10,000 miles, for him to positively writhe with a desire to participate in the slaughter.

MR. COPELAND: I am the best natured man in this House!

MR. ASHTON: I know the hon. gentleman is. No one in the House has a greater respect and admiration for this bulldog quality of the hon. member than I have, and it is very difficult to reconcile this characteristic of extreme bloodthirstiness with the general amiability of the hon. gentleman's character. I prefer to judge him not by the concluding portion of his speech, but by the opening sentences in which I think he revealed his true nature. He said he regretted this war, bitterly regretted that any such thing as war should take place at all, and he looked forward to the time when all these disputes would be settled by arbitration. But before he got to the conclusion of his speech he told us that it was the best thing in the world that the American war took place, the best thing in the world that racial war after racial war had taken place, leading, as it did —

MR. COPELAND: Otherwise the world would never have had civilisation!

MR. ASHTON: Leading as it did to the survival of the fittest. It seems to me that in both of these sets of views,

representing the true opinions of the hon. member, the only system of arbitration he would be satisfied with would be one in which Great Britain was the umpire on every particular occasion. I am not going to waste words to-night in assëverating my loyalty to the British Empire. Every man in this Chamber is known so well to every other man in the Chamber that I suppose no one entertains any doubt whatever as to the loyalty of the individual members of this Parliament. And those who talk loudly are apt to forget in what true loyalty consists. Did anyone question the loyalty of the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone? Does anybody question the loyalty to-day of such a man as Herbert Spencer, or Mr. John Morley? May not the truest loyalty be evidenced by a long life of service to one's country in raising and ameliorating the conditions of the people at home, and not seeking to fight unrighteous quarrels abroad? It is not necessarily a test of loyalty that we should follow in the footsteps of the hon. member who has just concluded his speech, and say that for a man to be loyal he must thirst for the shedding of his fellow-creature's blood. That is not my definition of loyalty; it is no one's definition of loyalty. The doctrine has been preached, not so much in here as outside, that it is no part of the duty of members of this Parliament to discuss the question of the merits of the quarrel between Great Britain and the Boers. From that proposition I entirely and emphatically dissent. The question that must meet us when we come to consider the matter is, is the empire in danger? Is the objective of the war upon which the mother country has engaged an attempt to assist the weak? Those are questions which we, as self-governing colonies, are bound to ask ourselves in connection with such a proposal as this, and if the answer to both those questions is in the negative, as in my judgment, and in this case, it is emphatically in the negative, I take up the same position that was taken up in connection with a different matter in this country by the late Sir Henry Parkes, and I say that the conduct of each self-governing colony must be determined by that consideration. I will say a word or two upon that aspect of the matter later. We had a speech last night from the right

hon. gentleman at the head of the Opposition party, which opened with a complaint levelled against the Prime Minister that he had not brought this question forward in a manner adequate and suited to its importance. That may be so. The Prime Minister rested his case—and he possibly touched the strongest point when he did so—simply on this contention, that it was necessary for the unity of the empire to be proclaimed; and as all the other colonies had taken steps towards this end, it was only proper that New South Wales should do the same. I say that the right hon. gentleman who complained of the terms of the Prime Minister's speech, did so in that he said that the hon. gentleman's treatment of the question was not suited to its importance and seriousness. I appeal to the House as to whether that right hon. gentleman did not drag the question down into the very mire. He questioned the loyalty—seriously questioned the loyalty—of those who thought it right to oppose this movement, and he said that such opposition came from a spurious and rotten democracy. Since I have been in this House, I have never heard a speech compressed into two hours which contained more gross misrepresentations of fact, and betrayed a more complete ignorance of the subject in hand, than was given evidence of by the hon. gentleman's speech last night. He repeated a statement he made in the Town Hall the previous evening, that if the position taken up by the Boers had been that they had declined to admit the people of any other race into their country, that would be a position which he could have respected; and when he was reminded last night, in one of the numerous interjections which beset him, that in both the 1881 and 1884 conventions, there were clauses which made it absolutely incumbent upon the Boers to give free ingress to every nationality under the sun, with the exception of natives, and give them a free right to carry on any business and any form of commerce, the hon. gentleman's rejoinder was that the Boers should then have resisted that proposal. An answer of that kind, I repeat, betrays a complete ignorance of the whole history of the Transvaal Republic. It should not be necessary in this Chamber, at this stage, to state the *a b c* of this question. But

[*Mr. Ashton.*

when we find a right hon. gentleman, a member of her Majesty's Privy Council, who is naturally looked up to as a leader of political thought, especially on national questions—when we find a gentleman occupying a position so high as that betraying such a gross ignorance of the facts, it may be pardonable if one or two words are said on the *a b c* of the question. What was the position? The Boers originally formed part of the Dutch settlement in South Africa. Early in this century Cape Colony was ceded to the British Government. The present Transvaalers, who had chafed under the government of the Dutch company, chafed still more under the government of the British.

Mr. NORTON: Would the hon. gentleman allow me, as he is going to give the *a b c* of the matter —

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. NORTON: I am asking the hon. gentleman a question!

Mr. SPEAKER: That cannot be permitted. Suppose every hon. member desired to put a question? The hon. gentleman can speak and give any information he desires.

Mr. NORTON: I am very pleased to hear, Mr. Speaker, that you intend to put the practice down, absolutely.

Mr. ASHTON: I am not going to follow this out in detail. All that I say is that the Boers formed part of the Dutch settlement. They trekked, as every one knows, and under the provisions of the Sand River Convention they were given by the British Government complete powers and complete independence. Immediately after that independence was given the Transvaalers did what the hon. member says they should have done—they passed laws which had as their object the keeping out of other races, and that is quoted by the anti-Boer party as one of the acts of maladministration on the part of the Transvaalers. Everyone knows that the British Government put an end to that Sand River Convention by annexing the Transvaal, and the annexation was full and complete. I say that one of the alleged grievances which the British Government had against the Transvaalers at that time was their attitude towards the other races. The annexation took place and the country was restored, as we all know, after the annexation, by the Gladstone Government. It was restored under

the terms of the 1881 convention, which contained the provision to which I now refer, namely, that every nationality in the world should have the right of free ingress into the Boer country, and should have the right to carry on any form of business which they were disposed to carry on. It was a matter of give and take, and at the direction of the British Government those terms were accepted. It is within the memory of most of us how the independence of the Boers was restored. It was taken away from the Boers in this way. A representative of the British Conservative Government was sent up to the Transvaal with instructions to annex the country if it were desired by a majority of the Boers. That is to say, owing to native wars, the condition of the Transvaal had become somewhat parlous, and the external operations of the Transvaal towards the natives was assumed by the British Government to constitute a menace to the British communities. On a distinct instruction the representative of the British Government who went to the Transvaal was to effect the annexation if a majority of the Boers desired it. The annexation was effected. Immediately after that act was carried out, a petition, signed by 80 per cent. of the Boers was presented to the English Government, protesting against the annexation. It was followed almost immediately afterwards by the rebellion. That rebellion was put an end to by the action of Mr. Gladstone when he restored, on the terms of the 1881 convention, the independence of the Transvaal. One of the best answers that could be given, both to the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Phillip Division, are the observations made by the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, who was then a member of the government of the day. By way of justification of the restoration of the independence of the Boers he said :

As soon as the Government became acquainted with the true feeling of the Boers, as soon as it became manifest that to conciliate them anything that fell short of absolute independence was impossible, then the restoration of their independence was absolutely called for by a regard to our treaties and engagements and the honor of our country. Under the circumstances which he had described, to have continued to maintain the annexation would have been an act which he could only describe in terms which had been applied by a high authority to a different subject as an act of force, fraud, and folly.

These were the views of Mr. Chamberlain when he was a member of the Gladstone Government which restored the independence of the Transvaal. Mr. Gladstone's defence of the matter was that the stoppage of the war, for which he was so generally blamed, was a question of saving the country from sheer blood-guiltiness. That 1881 convention was carried out by the British Government with one reservation—which was strongly objected to by the Volksraad; but inasmuch as it had been signed by the representatives of the two countries, the British Government said it was impossible to alter the terms of that convention until it had been formally ratified and the value of its provisions tested in actual working. That reservation and the implied promise which was involved in it was fulfilled three years after when, owing chiefly to the objections of the Dutch to a clause providing for the suzerain power of Great Britain, the 1884 convention was substituted for the 1881 convention, in which every reference to the suzerain power was omitted.

Mr. Cook : But complete independence was not given to them !

Mr. ASHTON : If the hon. member means that the Boers had no power to enter into treaties with foreign powers, I concede it ; but if the hon. gentleman means to contend that independence in the matter of local self-government was not conceded to the Boers, I deny it. As I concede the statement made so freely here that we are not in the best position to understand all the details affecting the merits of this question, I do not desire that my *ipse dixit* on such an important matter should be accepted. I quote Mr. Chamberlain. In a despatch to Sir Hercules Robinson, after the Jameson raid, Mr. Chamberlain wrote this :

Since the convention of 1884, Her Majesty's Government have recognised the South African Republic is a free and independent government as regards all its internal affairs not touched by that convention.

He desires the chartered company to note that the South African Republic is a foreign state with which Her Majesty is at peace and in treaty relations.

On the 13th February, 1896, in the House of Commons, he said this, and its importance at the present juncture cannot be over-stated :

We had explicitly repudiated any right of interference in the internal affairs of the Transvaal.

*Second night.*

The other quotation has been already given by the hon. member for Lang Division, and it deals with the same question. Mr. Chamberlain said :

A war in South Africa would be one of the most serious wars that could be possibly waged. It would be a long war, a bitter war, and a costly war ; and, as I have already pointed out, I believe generations would hardly be able to blot out the memory of it. To go to war with President Kruger, to enforce upon him reforms in the internal affairs of a state in which secretaries of state, sitting in their place here, have repudiated all right of interference, would be a course of action which would be immoral.

When he refers to the position taken up by secretaries of state, it must be remembered that Mr. Lowther was Under Secretary of State for the Colonies in the government that carried out the annexation of the Transvaal, and in justifying the annexation of the Transvaal on the ground that its external policy particularly towards the natives constituted a menace to the well-being of the British communities of South Africa, he said :

To make the internal misgovernment of that state a pretext for intervening and acquiring territory for political influence would have been a most unjust policy, and would have constituted a grave international crime.

No doubt it was to that statement that Mr. Chamberlain referred when he made his observation that it would be immoral on the part of the British Government to interfere with an independent state like the Transvaal, on the ground that its internal administration was not what it ought to be.

Mr. Cook : —————

Mr. NORTON : I call your attention, sir, to the disorderly interjection of the hon. member for Hartley. I am continually called to order in this House, and I call your attention to the continual interruptions of the hon. member for Hartley. I ask that the same treatment be dealt out to him that is dealt out to me.

Mr. Cook : I submit that I have made no more interjections during the speech of the hon. member for Goulburn than have been made by other hon. members, including the hon. member for Northumberland. I do think you should prevent the hon. member for Northumberland from jumping to his feet constantly in the disorderly way in which he is doing.

[Mr. Ashton.

Mr. SPEAKER : I do not think the hon. member has any right to tell me what I ought to do. Although the hon. member for Northumberland has been guilty of continuous interruptions, the hon. member for Hartley has interjected two or three times. I stopped the hon. member for Northumberland from directly putting a question to an hon. member who was addressing the House, and I pointed out to him that if that right were conceded to him, and the same demand were made by every other hon. member, it would be absolutely impossible to carry on business. There are interjections and interruptions which it is not always expedient to notice ; but when there is continual interruption to one speaker from one quarter, I feel bound to stop it. I do not think the hon. member for Hartley has been guilty of that to-night, although he has interrupted two or three times.

Mr. COOK : They have only assisted the debate !

Mr. SPEAKER : They ought not to be made.

Mr. ASHTON : So far as I have been able to follow the controversy which has attended this difficulty, I have not seen any allegation that the interference with the Transvaalers has taken place as to any part of the external policy of the Transvaal. It is purely on the ground that the internal administration of the Transvaal calls for interference. I contend strongly that every question of that kind that may be raised must be governed by the terms of the 1884 convention. There are two or three clauses which deal specifically with the questions now engaging attention. Article 7 of that convention says :

No person who has remained loyal to her Majesty during the late disturbances shall suffer any molestation by reason of his loyalty, or be liable to any prosecution or civil action ; and any such persons shall have full liberty to reside in the country, with the enjoyment of civil rights and protection for their persons and property.

A question has been raised as to whether the phrase "civil rights" comprehends political rights. I believe that the balance of opinion is that it does not comprehend political rights ; but we must bear this in mind, that that clause deals only with those persons who were engaged in the Transvaal prior to the rebellion. Article 14 of the convention is the one which

governs the relations of the foreign inhabitants of the Transvaal generally. It says :

All persons other than natives conforming themselves to the laws of the South African Republic—

We cannot attach too much importance to these words—laws which the republic, as constituted at the time of entering into this convention, carried out by their duly appointed representatives.

All persons other than natives conforming themselves to the laws of the South African Republic will have full liberty, with their families, to enter, travel, or reside, in any part of the South African Republic. They will be entitled to hire or possess houses, manufactories, warehouses, shops, and premises. They may carry on their commerce, either in person or by any agents they may think fit to employ. They will not be subject in respect of 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 Transvaal.

HON. MEMBERS : Hear, hear !

Mr. ASHTON : I do not understand what those evidently satirical "hear, hears," are meant to convey. If they are meant to convey the assertion that there has been any breach of the treaty in those respects, my reply is, first, that I deny it, and secondly, that I declare that in no particular has there been any complaint on the part of Sir Alfred Milner in that respect. There has been no contention that there is inequality of taxation. There is a complaint that there is a dynamite monopoly.

AN HON. MEMBER : And other monopolies !

Mr. ASHTON : There may be other monopolies. I believe that there is a drink monopoly ; but there is also a drink monopoly in the colony of New South Wales, and there is a drink monopoly of colossal proportions in the United Kingdom. On the subject of the dynamite monopoly, can anyone seriously urge that it is a ground for a resort to arms ? Has not New South Wales a perfect right, which no one can interdict, to levy a royalty upon her gold ?—and if the Transvaalers wished, instead of or in addition to the levying of a royalty upon gold, to raise money by a dynamite monopoly, is that a matter for the interference of an outside power ? However mistaken from

an economic point of view such a monopoly may be, it is established by the clear and unmistakable exercise of the right of self-government. We have come to a pretty pass in pressing our hatred and our envy of the Boers to the uttermost extent if we would seriously contend that the existence of a dynamite monopoly justifies a resort to arms ! As a matter of fact, all the great and small objections, whether real or imaginary, which have been urged against the Transvaal Government have been abrogated by the representative of Great Britain in the demand for a liberalisation of the franchise, or, to put it more accurately, for a reduction of the period preceding naturalisation. The whole question lies there in a nutshell, and the position of the Transvaal Republic may be put by means of a very simple parallel. Suppose the colony of New South Wales were a free and independent state, and had within its borders an industry which exercised a particular charm and attraction to, say, the Russians, who came here and continued to come in such numbers until they outnumbered or threatened to outnumber the local population of British descent, and then made a demand for equal political rights in order that they might take the work of governing the country out of our hands ; that would be a parallel of the position in the Transvaal to-day. I think few people dispute that that is the position, disguise it as they may. Differ as we may upon the question, should Great Britain push them all out of the way, we must admit that the demand that has been made upon the Transvaal by the British Government goes right down to the root of the independence of that state. They are asked to choose between two things, and in being given that choice, they are placed between the devil and the deep sea. They must either have their independence taken from them by force of arms, or they must submit to a system which will permit of it being taken from them by slow constitutional process. That is their alternative.

Mr. MACDONALD : How would that argument apply in South Africa to the Afrianders ?

Mr. WILLIS : It has put a traitor there in the position of prime minister !

Mr. NORTON : I call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to these continued interruptions !

*Second night.*

Mr. ASHTON: The first answer to the pertinent question of the hon. member for Coonamble, to which I take no exception, is that the difficulty which now besets the Transvaal Republic is one which can beset only a small independent state; in the nature of things it could not arise in connection with a big empire. But to go a step further in answering the question, let us consider this: We know that the Dutch in Cape Colony outnumber the British there by two to one. Suppose that they exercised their right of self-government to convert Cape Colony into another Dutch republic, what would happen? Such action would only be the affirmation of the principle of government by majority, but would it be tolerated by the British Government?

Mr. KIDD: You could not prevent it, because they have got the franchise there!

Mr. ASHTON: It could not be prevented except by force of arms. But even if the desire to do such a thing existed, the mere fact that the whole power of the British Empire was there to prevent it, and would inevitably be used to that end, is the best check upon disloyalty to the British Empire if, as is alleged, it exists. I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that the Boers, however much they may be interfering with the convenience and the interests of Great Britain, are in this matter doing only what every man in this Chamber, and in New South Wales, would do under similar circumstances. That is the answer to the hon. member. We have it, upon the authority of more than one secretary of state, that it would be immoral and a grave international crime to interfere with the internal administration of an independent state. Suppose it were not, what becomes of national independence in any respect whatever? If the contention of Great Britain is one that should be conceded—if, as soon as foreigners have been attracted to a state in such numbers that they outnumber the original population, they should be naturalised and be given full and free political rights—what becomes of the independence of small states? Conquest, under such a system, would be easy. There would be no need for recourse to arms; all that would be necessary would be to encourage immigration to a country, and then it could be taken possession of by constitutional means. The *reductio ad absurdum* of the proposi-

tion is that the Asiatic races would be entitled constitutionally, without any protest by those belonging to the civilised parts of the world, to enter into unquestioned possession of every corner of the civilised world. If we are ready to press our national rights against other nations, short of an appeal to arms, and if the doctrine laid down by the hon. member for Phillip Division that there is to be no concern of *meum et tuum* in this and in other matters, but everything is to be determined by the battle-axe and the Maxim gun, we plunge into chaos at once. If we are not to go back to that condition of things, we must recognise the rights of the Transvaal in this matter. I may be utterly wrong, but if I am wrong, I err in the best of company. I am quite content to err on the side of humanity in company with such men as Gladstone, Herbert Spencer, and John Morley. I have the greatest sympathy, notwithstanding the terms in which she was referred to tonight by the hon. member for Phillip Division, for the position which Miss Olive Schreiner has held upon this great question. It is because I take that view that I regard this war as a wrongful war. To put it in the plainest of plain terms—which I shall not hesitate to do—I believe that it is the wickedest war of modern times. I believe that the franchise question is not a *bona fide* grievance. I do not believe that the great majority of the Uitlanders have gone to the Transvaal to stay. I believe that if they had to submit to the rule of the South African Republic they would hesitate before they cast off their allegiance to their mother country; and that must always be a condition precedent to naturalisation in a foreign state. Sir Alfred Milner stated positively in his despatch that, paradoxical as it appeared, the only way to save British subjects was to enable them to cease to be British subjects. If the franchise is the real root of the difficulty, if it has not been put forward to cover up something else—some object which it is not politic to disclose, whether it be for the advantage of the British Empire or not—why do not we hear something of it from other Uitlanders? There are many citizens of the United States of America in the Transvaal, and they, I assume, value their political rights just as dearly as do the

[Mr Ashton.]



members of the British Empire. Why, then, have we heard no statements of their grievances in connection with the franchise? Why has President Kruger appealed to the President of the United States to act as arbitrator in this matter? Is he a likely person to be singled out for such an important duty if the franchise grievance were the real and not only the nominal grievance in connection with this matter? Why is it that the British subject only is the one who is complaining of disabilities? I am afraid, sir, that this is not a war which has been made by the people of England; I am afraid it is a war which has been chiefly made by that party amongst whom Mr. Rhodes exercises a controlling influence. An hon. member asks me why the people of England support it? I have not the slightest doubt that this proposal of the Government will be carried in this House. I have very little doubt that it will meet with the approval of the great majority of New South Wales, and for this simple and natural reason that whenever the interests of the empire or the racial question is raised, nine out of ten men who cannot be expected to go into every abstruse point in a great and complicated question will naturally sympathise with their own race. That is the answer to the hon. member, and I think it is a fair answer.

Mr. EWING: Can the hon. member tell me this: Why do the home Government—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. ASHTON: An hon. member asks me—

Mr. NORTON: He will keep order as I do!

Mr. ASHTON: The hon. member asks me why the whole of the Liberal party of England have coincided with the action taken by the Government? In the first place that is not correct. The whole of the Liberal party of England have not coincided with the Government's action. A proportion of the members of the Liberal party, if past utterances can count for anything, are against the action of the Government in this matter. To be perfectly fair to the hon. member, I am quite free to admit that now that the countries have come to war, a great many members of the Liberal party have deemed it proper policy that England should present a

united front. The question we have to consider—and no more important question can be raised in this House or in this country—is whether we are as much bound by the action of the British Government as the members of the British Parliament are?

An HON. MEMBER: Yes, we are!

Mr. ASHTON: If it be true that when the British Government engages on a war these colonies must, without any discrimination, without any consideration of the merits of the quarrel, of the policy of the war, take part in it, then we enter upon a stage of national life in this country which no one, up to the present, has ever dreamed of.

Mr. QUINN: Must we not—

Mr. NORTON: Chair!

Mr. QUINN: Must we not suffer by a war the empire is engaged in?

Mr. NORTON: Mr. Speaker, I rise to order, and call your attention to the fact that the hon. member for Bligh Division is now doing exactly what you distinctly prohibited me from doing. To assist you, Mr. Speaker, in keeping order I call your attention to his conduct, and I claim the same rule for him as is applied to me.

Mr. QUINN: I am very sorry, sir, if I have transgressed the orders of this House; but I think you will acquit me of doing it frequently. The question I asked was asked with a view to the fuller elucidation of that particular point by the hon. member who is speaking. I think, sir, you will admit that it was a legitimate interruption.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are interruptions which ought not to be tolerated, and those are continual interruptions. There are some hon. members who seem to think it is their duty to interrupt everybody; but there are other members who only occasionally interrupt, and I certainly am not going, unless it is persisted in, to interfere with such interruptions.

Mr. NORTON: I will only do it occasionally!

Mr. SPEAKER: At the same time, these interruptions ought not to be made. The hon. member for Bligh Division will have an opportunity to speak by-and-by if he thinks proper, and every hon. member in addressing the House, under our own standing order, is entitled to be heard without interruption.

*Second night.*

Mr. ASHTON: I would rather welcome the hon. member's question, if I may be permitted to say so, than otherwise, and I am sorry that the hon. member did not have a better opportunity of putting it explicitly in order that I might have caught its full meaning. A question put by a very persistent member, the hon. member for Hartley, was also an exceedingly pertinent question. He asked what I meant by "must." What I meant by "must" ought to be plain. It has been contended throughout this debate, and outside that because the mother country is engaged in war, we are bound not to question the merits of that war, but to send aid as an affirmation of the loyalty and unity of the empire! Now that doctrine carries with it compulsion. It is not the duty of the colony to send troops to participate in any war in which the mother country likes to engage. That is a matter within the discretion of the colony. The colony, as a colony, is in precisely the position of an individual as a volunteer. In matters pertaining to individual volunteering, the questions which first present themselves to men's minds are, is this a war which has as its object the maintenance of the empire, is it a war which seeks to repel aggressions, which aims at pulling down the empire, or is it a war which has as its object the assistance of the weak? These are the questions which should present themselves to every individual volunteer, and according to whether he can answer those questions affirmatively or negatively so should he decide for himself whether or not he should take part in the war. These are the considerations which should animate a self-governing colony, and it is because I hold these views that I say it will make for an infinitely better result if we choose a better time for asserting the unity of the empire than at present. It is essentially a question for us to consider whether or not this is a just quarrel, and we may be most loyal to the interests of the empire if we abstain from taking part in the quarrel; and if we manifest our disapproval of that quarrel, we may be most loyal to the interests of the empire by taking that course. I have referred to the question of the morality of this war, and I have quoted on the subject two secretaries of state, of whom Mr. Chamberlain is one, who both denounce

[*Mr. Ashton.*]

interference with the internal administration of the Transvaal as an immoral act and an international crime.

Mr. COPELAND: Under different circumstances

Mr. ASHTON: Not under different circumstances.

Mr. SAVERS: Why should not the hon. member be guided by his opinion now?

Mr. ASHTON: Because his opinion does not commend itself to my judgment.

Mr. COPELAND: ———

Mr. NORTON: Chair!

Mr. ASHTON: I honor the hon. member's opinion when it commends itself to my good judgment, but not at other times.

Mr. FERGUSON: That is the hon. member's standard!

Mr. ASHTON: It is everybody's standard. I have quoted from the convention, and referred to the grievances which have been alleged against the Government of the Transvaal, to show, as far as I can show, that it is not contended that there is a legal ground for interference with the Transvaal. One of the most serious aspects of this question, in my judgment, is the political aspect. I believe this quarrel will end in a racial war in South Africa, and that means, I believe, the holding of that country in military subjection. The political consequences of that, and the possible consequences to the empire, can hardly be estimated. I believe that this war is a mistaken one from every point of view, and for that reason, as I have no other means of showing my disapproval of it, I intend to vote against the despatch of troops. I admit fully the force of the argument which has been employed in this debate and outside, that there is an exceedingly inconvenient aspect about New South Wales standing aside when the other colonies are manifesting in a more or less practical form their loyalty to the empire. I admit the awkwardness of that aspect, and I recognise that taking up such a position as that is liable to misconstruction. Personally, I am so determined not to give countenance, as far as I can avoid it, to this enterprise that I am prepared to take that risk. I believe that New South Wales if disposed could manifest her loyalty in a no less unmistakable manner, and no less practical manner, if she applied the money

she proposes to spend in sending this contingent to South Africa to a fund for the relief of widows and orphans.

Mr. CRICK : It is the same thing !

Mr. ASHTON : Does one need to sympathise with a war in order to assist the women and children who are left desolate by that war ?

An HON. MEMBER : It is offering a premium to fight !

Mr. ASHTON : That is hair-splitting of the finest character. I might be just as strongly opposed to the Boers as the hon. member for Phillip Division is ; but I am perfectly certain that the hon. member for Phillip Division would not decline to contribute to a fund for the relief of the widows and orphans of the Boers after the war. Then what becomes of such an observation as that we are offering a premium for war by establishing such a fund ? I say that it would relieve us of the inconvenient aspect of the question which has been argued so strongly by some hon. members, and it would be applying money to an infinitely more practical end than that to which it is now proposed to apply it, and would thereby bring about infinitely better results. I do not propose to move an amendment to that effect ; I believe it would be premature. It is within the bounds of possibility that such a fund may not be needed ; but I say it would be an exceedingly good course for the colony to adopt, a course that would be divested of a great deal of the theatricalness ; but at the same time of a great deal of the blood-thirstiness which surround the course which has been taken in other quarters.

Mr. COPELAND : Those sentiments did not build up the British Empire !

Mr. ASHTON : I am quite prepared to admit that. But at present I prefer to accept that side of the hon. member which believes in the substitution of arbitration, and not the bloodthirsty side of him, which, I think, is not the best side. I believe that that would be a tangible and practical form of manifesting the loyalty of the colony of New South Wales, and our sympathy with those who fell in the war. I am not prepared to send the troops ; I am prepared to take the course that I have indicated, and I submit the proposal to the House, not for the purpose of putting it in the form of an amendment, but simply

because I say that there are other means of manifesting the loyalty of the colony than that proposed by the Government.

Mr. COOK (Hartley) [9-24] : I have listened with very great pleasure indeed to the speech of the hon. member, and I recognise that he has made by far the weightiest contribution to this debate from his standpoint. There can be no doubt about the question. The hon. member has put a case which needs answering, and I say at once that I do not quarrel with his logic at all ; I simply dispute his facts. Running through the whole of the hon. member's speech has been an assumption which I do not think is warranted by the facts of the case. He assumed all through his speech that the Transvaal was absolutely independent of the mother country. That is the crucial point of the whole question. If the Transvaal is independent in every particular ; if England is to be regarded as a foreign power, as foreign, for instance, as Russia, then I admit that the hon. member's logic is sound ; but if it be not a fact that it is an independent country ; if it be a fact that the Transvaal is not independent of England, as Russia is, I say it completely cuts away the ground of the hon. member's argument. The hon. member put the whole case in a nutshell when he said that from his point of view English interference in the Transvaal was no more justified than Russian interference would be here. This raises the whole question as to whether there is a power exercised by England under treaty of paramountcy or suzerainty, whichever we like to call it. "Paramountcy" is the word they use in the old country, and, by-the-by, I have not heard a single Liberal leader say anything to the contrary but that this power does exist, and is active to-day. Even John Morley has never said anything to the contrary. On the other hand, all Liberal authorities in the old country have advised the Boers to recognise this, to recognise the superiority of England in regard to the Transvaal, and to recognise her supreme authority. That is what the term implies. If it be a fact that such authority is in existence, I say that the hon. member for Goulburn has been arguing all through on wrong premises. No speaker here to-night has approached the subject but has admitted that there are very great grievances

*Second night.*

to redress in the Transvaal; but the tenor of the debate so far has been that if people in the Transvaal do not like it they should leave. The tenor of the debate has been that the Transvaal belongs to President Kruger and his tribe. If that is so, and it is all a matter of fact, then they are right in saying that these Uitlanders should submit to whatever conditions they impose. But I say the whole question again is: Is it a fact that England has any power in the Transvaal under a treaty as we know it to exist, or has she not? The question is, as put by the hon. member for Goulburn in his illustration: Has England any more to do with the Transvaal than Russia has to do with New South Wales? Now, that is a matter of fact that can be tested, and the way to test it is, it seems to me, to refer to the terms of the treaty itself. Article 4 of the convention deals with this very question. The hon. member for Goulburn avoided quoting that article. He quoted a number of others, dealing with the civil powers of the Boers and bearing upon the civil rights of the Uitlanders, but he did not quote this, which is the key to the whole position. It is as follows:—

The South African Republic will conclude no treaty or engagement with any state or nation other than the Orange Free State or with any native tribe to the eastward or westward of the republic until the same has been approved by her Majesty the Queen.

Mr. ASHTON: Will the hon. member permit me? I thought I was careful to point out that I confined my contention to this—that there was no right to interfere with the internal administration. I freely admit the right of Great Britain to interfere with external matters affecting the Transvaal.

Mr. COOK: I take it that the greater includes the less. Is there any sense or reason in a treaty which makes the very existence of a nation itself subject to the power and will of another nation, making any arrangements as to internal government save such as are subject to the nation which has power to interfere with the very existence of the state? Does not the hon. member see that it is the easiest thing in the world to conceive of a treaty with a foreign nation vital to the integrity of the Dutch republic? The making of that treaty may be all the same objectionable to England, and yet England under this

[*Mr. Cook.*

very treaty has power to step in and prevent it, the existence of the state being vitally concerned. England has power, according to this treaty, to prevent the state of the Transvaal from doing things vital to its integrity, to its very existence, and it is a mere quibble to say that she has no right to interfere with the Transvaal internally. That I think is the way in which the hon. member begins to get confused in his argument. His facts are wrong, and therefore his conclusions upon them must be wrong too. As bearing upon the rights and wrongs of this question, the hon. member also was careful to ask why it was that no complaint came from Uitlanders other than the British Uitlanders. There is a simple answer to that, and it lies in the fact that 80 per cent. of the total Uitlanders are British Uitlanders. May I remind the hon. member that there is a cause which does not favour his side of the argument why these other Uitlanders have not been so persistent in appealing to their own governments? It is a matter of notorious fact that President Kruger himself has been intriguing with these other countries against Great Britain throughout the whole business, and that, perhaps, is one of the gravest charges which Great Britain may make against President Kruger in the whole controversy. Here is Great Britain exercising this power of preventing the Transvaal from making treaties with other nations, yet while that power exists in black and white, President Kruger has, time and again, sought to make treaties with other powers.

Mr. ARTHUR GRIFFITH: Would the hon. member give us an example; an assertion like that is of no use?

Mr. COOK: No one but the hon. member wants an example. Does he deny that President Kruger has sent a minister to Germany for the purpose of asking their active intervention in case of trouble?

Mr. ARTHUR GRIFFITH: That is not making a treaty!

Mr. COOK: It is very much worse. Is it not known that he sent a special envoy to America to try and get something there to his own advantage, as distinct from the advantage of the British Government—in antagonism to the British Government?

Mr. HOLMAN: To ask for friendly intervention!

Mr. COOK : No such thing. It was a sinister intervention, which must be remembered side by side with President Kruger's statement that he is fighting all the while for the independence of the republic. That is his point. President Kruger does not say that he is content with independence within the limits prescribed by this treaty. He tells us again and again that he wants to be rid of English interference ; that he wants to be independent of the British Government altogether. There is only one way of doing that. Before that can be done the treaty must be abrogated. There must be another convention to alter the terms of the treaty, or it must be ignored by both sides. So long as it is in existence, the relations of the Transvaal to England are very different from the relations of Russia to the Australian colonies at the present time. That is where the hon. member makes a serious mistake in arguing this question, arguing it ably though he does. He ignores the terms of this convention, which gives England the power to strike at the very very root of the existence of the Transvaal Government. If that be so—and I take it that we cannot get away from the terms of this treaty—then there are other articles in this treaty which seem to me to touch on this question of the civil rights of the Uitlanders. For instance, article 14 goes on to say that they

will not be subject in respect of their persons and property, or in respect of their commerce or industry, to any tax, whether general or local, other than those which are or may be imposed upon citizens of the said republic.

I say that the spirit of that article has been torn to tatters many times during the recent internal government of the Transvaal. The dynamite monopoly need only be named. A very succinct account of all the disabilities under which the British labour in South Africa was admirably given in the quotation of the hon. member for Phillip Division. He truly said that such disabilities would not be tolerated for twenty-four hours in this country. My point is this, that the interference of the English Government at the present time is the alternative to a severe internal war ; that is to say, a revolution or a civil war. As surely as the Uitlanders exist there would be civil war if the matter were not settled in the way in which it is proposed to

settle it. Now I hope that those of us who feel impelled to vote for this motion may be given as much credit for sincerity as is given to those who are opposed to it. The Government say nothing about the motives and sincerity of other hon. members.

Mr. THOMAS : The hon. member's leader called it a spurious, rotten democracy !

Mr. COOK : He did not make the assertion which the hon. member says he made.

Mr. THOMAS : I heard him !

Mr. COOK : The words were used, but not in the way in which the hon. member quotes them. But it is of no use to bandy words in this Chamber. We should confine ourselves to the consideration of the justice or otherwise of the motion. The disabilities under which the Uitlanders labour have been described fully again and again. The disabilities of the Uitlanders have been proclaimed very persistently.

Mr. HOLMAN : What are they ?

Mr. COOK : Is the hon. member serious ? Does he know of no disabilities on the part of the Uitlanders ?

Mr. HOLMAN : I want to know if the hon. member knows of any !

Mr. COOK : I am afraid it is no use wasting further time over that aspect of the matter, when the hon. member tells us that the Uitlanders have no abuses to complain of. This is a good way to test the matter. There are 90,000 or 100,000 Uitlanders in the Transvaal Republic, all of whom I take it are, on the average, as reasonable-minded men as we English colonists are. Would it be possible for this war to be undertaken in a colony like ours, with nothing to provoke it ? Would such a condition of things be possible without the slightest basis in the shape of grievances ? Is it possible that things could have been brought to their present position without the slightest complaint of any kind from anyone ? I know what hon. members who take up that extreme position say. They say it is on account of the syndicators and shareholders. All the syndicators and shareholders in the world could not create a condition of things like that in this colony, and it is the worst possible tribute to the sense of the Uitlanders to imagine that such a state of things could occur in the Transvaal. We must suppose that the Uitlanders are nothing more nor less than fools.

AN HON. MEMBER : They are not that !

*Second night.*

Mr. COOK : But that must be the case if they are harried into a war of this description, and compelled to leave the country as refugees, when they have no reason to complain of their treatment by the Government. Is it likely, when they are doing well, that they would throw up their occupations, leave their homes, and take their families with them, all for the sake of a few capitalists? The statement is a monstrous one, on the face of it, and the reason given is totally inadequate to account for these dire occurrences. The cause lies deeper than that. The people have real grievances. It is not the case of one big grievance, such as the dynamite monopoly; as in nearly every other quarrel, there are many grievances which have been going on for a long time, and it is the occurrence of fresh grievances from time to time which may account for the different result in Mr. Chamberlain's judgment. We are told that in the year 1896 Mr. Chamberlain condemned as impossible a war of this description. Hon. members believed him then. They will not believe anything he says now about the righteousness of this war, but they believed him then. He was telling the truth then. I suppose he is not telling the truth now, but trying to cloak something over.

An HON. MEMBER : He could not be telling the truth on both occasions!

Mr. COOK : I think he could. The condition of things in the Transvaal has altered a good deal since 1896. The present crisis has been growing during the past three years by a process of steady progression, and while a man might have been justified in 1896 in believing that war was impossible, he might, in 1899, fairly conclude that war is abundantly justified. There is the fact that 90,000 or 100,000 people are suffering from disabilities, not in a foreign country, but in a country which England has made possible from every standpoint, a country which England has maintained and prevented from being wiped out altogether—I mean as to the Dutch possession—a country as to which there is a distinct relation of paramountcy as evidenced by the treaty. When British subjects in a county like that are treated in the way these people have been treated by the Boers there is abundant ground for inter-

[*Mr. Cook.*

ference. I admit the case would be different if we were dealing with a foreign country—a country as foreign, for instance, as Russia—but we are dealing with a country from which England has never let loose its hold, and over which it possesses rights by treaty in black and white, signed by Kruger on behalf of the Dutch people.

Mr. ASHTON : Mr. Chamberlain repudiated any liability as to the internal affairs of the Transvaal, and if that was true in 1896 it is true to-day!

Mr. COOK : Mr. Chamberlain made that declaration with a reservation. When he spoke those words he assumed that all the other articles of the convention would be obeyed in the spirit and in the letter. Mr. Chamberlain says now, that the bond has been broken, and, therefore, the obligation to abstain from interference no longer exists. There is one other point to which I should like to refer. The hon. member for Lang Division said that our attitude on this occasion is that of assisting a big bully to oppress a weak antagonist—that we ought not to assist Great Britain in acting the bully. The assumption in all these statements is that we are something distinct and separate from Great Britain, that we are not the same people, and do not belong to the same empire. I utterly repudiate any such suggestion as that. I say that any obligation of the empire is our obligation. Every duty of the empire is our duty; every advantage of the empire is ours; every privilege possessed by the empire is ours too.

Mr. ASHTON : We have no voice in the making of wars!

Mr. COOK : Why? Not because we are in any way inferior, but from the point of view of expediency, because it would be impossible for us at this distance to have any voice.

An HON. MEMBER : It is because we are a self-governing people!

Mr. COOK : Nothing of the kind. Our being a self-governing people does not debar us from interfering with the affairs of the empire. It has been conceded in the old country, time and again, that it would be to the advantage of the empire if we could have representation in London, but that has seemed to be impracticable; we are too far away, and it is not convenient. It is from no constitutional principle at

all, but it is the merest matter of expediency. What lies at the bottom of the matter is this: that the Government at home can do our foreign business for us better than we can do it ourselves. I venture to say that in this war Great Britain is fighting infinitely more for Australia than for England. Our men are in the Transvaal. The sturdiest miners of those fields are Australian miners; it is they who complain, too.

Mr. ARTHUR GRIFFITH: I heard one of them say that they would prefer to be governed by the Boers than by the mine-owners.

Mr. COOK: Whilst the hon. member has heard that, I have heard exactly the contrary. I was talking a short time ago to a man who came from there. He was a good man, too—a miner—and was ready to take up his gun at any moment. Judging from the disabilities under which he had to suffer, the individual statement of the hon. member does not count for much. The hon. member wants some particular grievance airing. The hon. member has heard a grievance to-night from the hon. member for Phillip Division. Let him attack that if he wishes. It was a very ably stated grievance, too.

Mr. HAYNES: And thoroughly under-done!

Mr. COOK: I do not wish to discuss that with the hon. member. The hon. member might condescend, at least, to let us alone.

Mr. HAYNES: A conservative like the hon. member wants to be left alone!

Mr. COOK: I claim that in supporting the motion I am asking for the same privileges for my countrymen which I enjoy for myself. If that is conservatism I am a conservative. I am asking for these privileges at the urgent request of those who have lived here by my side, and who have gone, taking their all with them, and have made their homes there, and who are now politely told by some people that they ought to clear out if they are not satisfied. No question enters into their suggestion as to their ability to clear out. It seems a light thing that they should be told to break up their homes and "trek" if they do not like what they have gone to. The question which we must get back to all the time is this: Is the Transvaal a foreign power to England?

Mr. ARTHUR GRIFFITH: Chamberlain says it is!

Mr. COOK: Mr. Chamberlain says nothing of the kind. Perhaps we might as well hear what Mr. Chamberlain in the Queen's speech does say. His latest utterance is as follows:—

The position of my subjects in the South African Republic is inconsistent with the promises of equal treatment on which my grant of internal independence to that republic was founded, and the unrest caused thereby is a constant source of danger to the peace and prosperity of my dominions in South Africa.

That is what Mr. Chamberlain says. He says the treaty has been broken. That is his latest utterance, and it is of no use quoting any other. I think, in a discussion of this character, we should do very much better if we kept to arguments instead of bandying abusive epithets about the Chamber. For instance, the hon. member for Lang Division described what has been said on the Opposition side of the House to-night as hogwash. He had a gibe at the late Premier's eyeglass; he spoke of our fellow-countrymen in the Transvaal as aliens.

Mr. ARTHUR GRIFFITH: They are aliens there, of course!

Mr. COOK: The hon. member hoped that one member of this House would go to the front and be shot. Of course, that is his way of joking. He described the war as a contemptible and monstrous one, urged on by a handful of speculators. He said it was a filibustering expedition, and he went on to instance some of the little wars in which England had been engaged. The hon. member made a lengthy reference to the American war. The hon. member looks upon that war as a little one. I call it a huge, gigantic struggle. The hon. member referred to it as one of the memorable wars in which England had been engaged, and in which she came out second best. What was the reason why the American people fought so persistently and determinedly for their independence?

Mr. ARTHUR GRIFFITH: For the same reason as the Boers are fighting for theirs!

Mr. COOK: For the same privileges as the Uitlanders are asking for now. England was oppressing them as the Boers are oppressing the Uitlanders to-day.

Mr. MACDONALD: The British were taxing their tea!

*Second night.*

Mr. COOK : Every article which comes into the use of the Uitlanders in their daily toil is taxed.

Mr. ARTHUR GRIFFITH : ———

Mr. SPEAKER : The hon. member must keep order. He has been interrupting during the whole course of the hon. member's speech.

Mr. ARTHUR GRIFFITH : The whole of my interruptions have been relevant !

Mr. SPEAKER : That does not make them less disorderly.

Mr. COOK : There is an exact parallel between the Uitlanders of to-day and the Americans at the time they fought for their independence. They threw off the yoke of the English Government, because it was thought to be oppressive, just as the Uitlanders are protesting against the oppressive yoke of the Boers to-day. The American people were under the direct control and government, and were part and parcel, so to speak, of Great Britain, whereas the Boers are not the same dominant masters of the situation as the English were on that occasion. Therefore, instead of fighting them as the Americans fought England, the Uitlanders appeal to their countrymen outside. They say, "enforce the treaty rights, enforce the spirit of the treaty." I say that if the spirit of that treaty were in operation in South Africa to-day there would not be a single complaint among the Uitlanders, except the ordinary complaints which are made everywhere. It is obvious that the treaty has been violated again and again, in spirit, in intent, and in letter, and that is why the Uitlanders are protesting. It is because the spirit of the treaty has been broken, because equality of civil rights has not been conceded to the Uitlanders, that they take up the position which they do to-day. What attitude ought we to take in this country with respect to this question? It seems to me we ought to consider the sentiments which were uttered by the Attorney-General last night. I entirely agree with the hon. member for Goulburn, that no man who does not believe in the righteousness of this war, ought to sanction it. I have no sort of sympathy with the statement of the Attorney-General, who told us last night that he had no sympathy with the attitude of the home Government in relation to the Boers. I have no sympathy with the man who

[*Mr. Cook.*

supports the proposal for armed intervention, and who at the same time does not believe in the justice of doing so. The question of justice comes into the purview of the consideration of the whole of this matter. If I were in the position of the Attorney-General I would not have sat in my place in the Cabinet and have arranged a system of armed intervention against people whom I believed to be in the right. This is an hon. member who goes prating about the country with regard to the delicacy of responsibility as applied to government. One feature of this Government, he said, was to be the possession of power with responsibility. Here is a man prating like that before the public of the country who deliberately takes a course in the Cabinet which he believes to be against his best judgment and against the dictates of his conscience. His position is outside the Cabinet immediately he realises that fact. I can understand a man surrendering his own opinions concerning this or that bill affecting some part of our civil rights in the internal government of the country. Government by cabinet can only be carried on by mutual concession of opinion on the part of members entering into that arrangement. But when it becomes a question of the integrity of the empire, as it is here, it is a very different matter; when it means, as this undoubtedly does logically mean, that we pledge our country and our pockets to the last shilling and to the last man, the question is a much wider one. Let no man blink the logic of it. This proposal means that if we send troops, and if England calls for more, we shall keep on sending as long as England does. If that is the position—and the question affects our integrity as a colony—if it affects the fountain of our very existence, surely that is a matter on which a man ought not to surrender his opinion as to what is right and what is wrong. I was amazed last night to hear this declaration of the Attorney-General that he assisted to frame all these estimates as to the cost and so on, and that while he agreed to armed intervention, yet looking at the matter in its own intrinsic substance, he did not believe it was a righteous war. I remember when some time ago a very different condition of things existed in England. I remember when the Indian Empire was menaced by Russia, John



Bright, who has been quoted here, was in the Gladstone Government. Did he stop in the Cabinet, as the hon. member for Ashfield has done? No; he walked out of the Cabinet. He said he would not give his consent to sanction a war which he believed to be an unrighteous one. He did not necessarily go outside and object, and impede the course of the Government, but he said that in his conscience he did not approve of this war policy, and he refused to remain in the Government. Why did he do so? Because the question of peace and war is the most vital of all to a people who value their independence and freedom. I should have preferred the Government to have taken a very different attitude upon this question. I think that the speech of the hon. member at the head of the Government yesterday was a very sorry one in many respects. We have the Premier, who is the executive power, who has to give force and shape to this policy, getting up in the House and solemnly assuring us that he is loyal to the empire. I wondered if it needed this declaration from the hon. member, made in cold blood, and made to this House deliberately as if he were making it in some private circle to men who never knew him before, or his opinions. He declared to the House that he and his colleagues were loyal to the empire, and would do what they could, if need be, to preserve its dignity and independence.

Mr. FERGUSON: The leader of the Opposition occupied two hours in saying the same thing!

Mr. ARTHUR GRIFFITH: And he showed a deeper ignorance of the matter than the Premier!

Mr. COOK: I suppose the reason of that was that the Premier said nothing. He said nothing as to the rights or wrongs of the question. He never attempted to justify the proposal. He merely submitted the scheme of the Government, and told us to deal with it. I do not object to the head of the Government being sensitive to the opinions of this House. I think it is a position which the Premier can rightly take up when he yields as far as possible to what he believes to be the temper of Parliament. But, on the other hand, we have his Attorney-General saying that this Government, for the first time in many years, is going to act with a keen sense of responsibility in all its operations and in

its executive functions. Therefore, we might have expected that the Attorney-General would not consent to any scheme coming before the House except one which was cut-and-dried. We might imagine, after what he had been saying at Ashfield, that he would come forward and ask the House to give him £30,000, as Sir George Turner asked his Parliament to do, and telling the House that they must give him the money, with an absolutely free hand in the disposal of it. That is what I would have expected from the Attorney-General. No; he talks of responsibility as applied to executive functions by the hour when he is outside, but it seems to me that he does not respect it at all in his place at the Cabinet table and in the Executive chamber. There is reason to complain of a want of definiteness in the attitude of the Government on this question. I have much more to say, but as the hour is late, and other hon. members wish to debate the question, I shall content myself with what I have already said. No man can feel more bitterly regretful than I do in regard to this war, but under the circumstances I cannot see how the colony can recede from its position of friendly sympathy towards the home Government in its conduct of these operations, without sacrificing everything in the shape of dignity and propriety. I believe that every other colony will take part in this war, and we cannot remain behind simply because we do not know exactly all the rights and wrongs of the question. I admit that we ought to have a very definite opinion on this subject before entering into the quarrel, but we must gather that opinion, I take it, from treaty rights quite as much as from hearsay and from what we read in the newspapers. If it can be shown that England has no right to interfere with the Transvaal, and that the Transvaal is as independent of her as Australia is of Russia, I have nothing more to say; but I claim that the treaties show that her Majesty's Government have reserved to themselves their right of interference at any time they might think necessary to secure fair play for the Queen's subjects. I believe that the treaties give them the right to prevent the Transvaal from doing what within recent years she has tried half a dozen times to do, to make treaties with other powers against

*Second night.*

the will and without the concurrence of Great Britain, and this right of interference also being guaranteed by treaty, the grievances of the Uitlanders make a very strong claim for interference.

Mr. HOLMAN (Grenfell) [10.13]: I must plead guilty to having on two or three occasions during the evening been betrayed into interjections which I am aware were disorderly, and which I have no doubt were unwelcome to those in possession of the floor; but I think I may allege in extenuation that every one of those interjections was animated by a very real anxiety, an anxiety shared by nearly all those who hold the opinions which I have risen to support, to ascertain if possible what are the facts, or the alleged facts, upon which the intervention of Australia in the South African trouble is proposed. We have had the spectacle of three representatives of responsible statesmanship in this colony standing one after another at the corner of the table and addressing themselves to the question before the House at, I would almost say, intolerable length; but though they dealt with it from, I imagine, every standpoint that represented itself to their minds as desirable and advantageous, not one of them produced anything but vague denunciation of the backwardness, the ignorance, and the turpitude of the Boers.

Mr. COOK: I deny that statement so far as I am concerned!

Mr. HOLMAN: I would make an exception in the hon. member's favour. I admit that he, to some extent, broke through the rules set by his predecessors, and endeavoured, however feebly, to bring back the debate into the region of ascertained facts and treaty rights. But with the exception of a few words here and there in the hon. member's speech, the action advocated on that side of the House is based upon the vaguest declamation and the most absolute uncertainty and ignorance as to the situation in South Africa to-day. We are asked to arm and equip 375 of our fellow-colonists, and to send them to another country to shoot men down. A very bitter responsibility will rest upon the head of every man in this Assembly if a single man is killed by our action in sending away this contingent, and it can be shown afterwards that we were mistaken, and threw in our weight with

the wrong side in an unjust and unrighteous quarrel. Every man in this House has, therefore, a right to whatever information may be in the possession of those who urge the sending away of this contingent. Hon. members ask us to sanction this expedition; but when we ask them what are the breaches of the treaty to which the hon. member for Hartley refers, what are the grievances under which the Uitlanders suffer, and what are the differences between the treatment meted out to Uitlanders by the Boer Government and the treatment meted out to other foreigners by other civilised governments, we are met with paltry allegations and shufflings. The hon. member for Hartley asked me would I assert that there were no grievances? I say that there are no people in the world who have no grievances, and I admit that the Uitlanders have grievances. Their grievances amount to this: that the Transvaal Government refuses to permit the Uitlander, the alien, the stranger within its gates, to take any part in the political life of the country until he becomes naturalised. But the grievance exists in full force in our midst to-day. There are men in my own electorate who, although they have been in this country for fifteen years, have never had a vote and never will have a vote, no matter how long they may live in the colony, or how industrious may be their share in the work of the colony, unless they throw off their allegiance to their native land and swear allegiance to the Queen of Great Britain and Ireland. But they do not want to do that, and, therefore, we, as a self-governing colony, refuse to allow them the political rights that we enjoy. The position is the same in the Transvaal. I agree with the right hon. member for King Division that it does not matter whether the Uitlanders number 10 or 100,000, so far as the point at issue is concerned. The franchise law of the Transvaal is under the control of the Transvaal authorities, and requires a certain period of residence before naturalisation. No man can be admitted a citizen of the Transvaal until that condition is complied with. Yet that is the only grievance which has been urged with any shadow of substantiation on behalf of the discontented Uitlanders. What other grievances are there? We are told that they are taxed. I interjected, when the

... [Mr. Cook.

hon. member for Hartley was speaking, "How much?" I wanted to know what were these burdens which were too grievous to be borne, and to redress which 400 men must be sent from New South Wales, to carry fire and sword through the country. But, apparently, the hon. member did not know. He asked me if I denied that the Uitlanders were taxed, and he told me that the taxation was too notorious to need pointing out by him. That is what they all do. I have here a work from which I shall, with permission, inflict a short passage upon the House. Seeing the absolute ignorance on every vital fact in connection with this matter, which has prevailed so far with every hon. member who has supported the proposal, I think, even at this late hour, these facts may not altogether be thrown away.

Mr. COOK: Is the hon. member sure that they are facts?

Mr. HOLMAN: Yes; and I will give the authority in a moment:

In 1895 the Crown Reef Gold-mining Company produced gold worth upwards of £420,000, and distributed nearly £97,000 in profits. Its payments to the Government for rents, licenses, and all other privileges and rights amounted to £1,191 9s. 10d. In the same year the Robinson Company, which had produced £651,000 in gold and distributed £346,000 in dividends, paid to the Government £395 11s. 8d. The New Chimes Company, producing £93,000 in gold and distributing £32,000 in profits, paid under the head of rates and licenses, together with insurance premiums, £664 16s. 5d. The Transvaal Coal Trust produced 266,945 tons of coal, and paid to the Government, £53 15s., while the Consolidated Land and Exploration Company, in which the Ecksteins are the largest shareholders, and which owns more than 250 farms of 6,000 acres each, paid to the Government in the shape of taxes, including absentee tax, no more than £722 2s. 6d.

These are the total payments made by these plundered associations, these men whom we are asked to weep over, whose sweat, whose enterprise has built up the bone and sinew of this country, and who are now being robbed by the associates of Kruger and his gang.

Mr. COOK: Who says that?

Mr. HOLMAN: F. Reginald Statham, a well-known press writer who has lived upwards of twenty years in South Africa. He is also author of a book called "Blacks, Boers, and British," and is one of the best informed men who have written on this subject.

5 H

Mr. COOK: Does he assert that that is the total amount that has been paid?

Mr. HOLMAN: By those companies. Now we will take the question of indirect taxation. We are asked by the hon. member for Phillip Division to groan in sympathy with the unhappy Uitlander, who was taxed on the tools he used, and the food he ate, and the clothing he wore, in order that a corrupt and riotous government might wallow in wanton luxury at his expense. We were asked to deplore the extraordinarily high tariff which was put on by this government, and which it is now the duty of New South Wales to remove by force of arms. What is this tariff? Here are the facts, which have now been published for nearly two and a half years by the writer of this book, and which I, filled with an anxious desire to acquaint myself with the literature of the subject, have never seen contradicted yet. If the hon. gentleman can find that Mr. Chamberlain has anywhere contradicted these statements let him or his colleagues show it to us. Here is the book which awaits contradiction. What are the figures? On butter the tax is 5s. per 100 lb. in the Transvaal and in Cape Colony 3d. per lb., which is exactly five times as much as is charged under Kruger. On cheese the tax is 5s. per 100 lb. in the Transvaal and 3d. per lb. in Cape Colony; on coffee the tax is 2s. 6d. per 100 lb. in the Transvaal and 12s. 6d. per 100 lb. in Cape Colony, once more five times as much.

Mr. BARTON: Can the hon. member say whether a man who imports into the Transvaal does not pay extra taxation on goods which have already paid taxation in Cape Colony?

Mr. HOLMAN: Yes, if he imports them over the Cape lines. There are lines running through Natal and the Portuguese territory by which goods may be imported into the Transvaal. I understand that quite recently a system of drawbacks has been established whereby a dweller in the Transvaal has to pay nothing, whichever way his goods come in. Whether he pays it or not the question is, who puts the tax on? Supposing he does pay this additional taxation, owing to his goods having passed through Cape Colony, we are not going to take up arms to compel Cape Colony to reduce their taxation. It is to the Transvaal our efforts are to be directed. Soap,

*Second night.*

it may be interesting to know, is taxed at 4s. 2d. per 100 lb. in Cape Colony, and in the Transvaal at 5s. per 100 lb. Sugar is taxed at a higher rate in Cape Colony than in the Transvaal. It is taxed at 8d. per lb. in Cape Colony, and at 2s. 6d. per 100 lb. in the Transvaal. How is machinery taxed?

All machinery for mining purposes is subject to only  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. import dues, the term "machinery" being stretched by the Government to its uttermost possibilities to meet the mining industry, and it is made to include sheet-lead, cyanide, &c.

As regards the dynamite monopoly, the difference is that, whereas in Cape Colony dynamite can be obtained at 60s. per case, it can be bought in the Transvaal for 90s., a difference of 30s., which is taken up in railway carriage and in taxation.

Mr. Cook : Fifty per cent. !

Mr. HOLMAN : Fifty per cent. for a railway carriage of nearly 600 miles. I mention these facts thus late in the debate to provide some basis for a discussion which I submit has hitherto wandered on with none ; which has suffered, so far as our side is concerned, from an absolute absence of facts, or allegation of facts, on that side, and which has apparently suffered on that side from the fact that the supporters of this proposal have absolutely no knowledge of affairs in South Africa, save that which can be gained from the lying, distorting medium of the Johannesburg press. Unfortunately, it frequently happens that the proposals of a government are supported in their most blatant and most bloodthirsty aspect by those whose duty, one would imagine, would be to criticise them, and that is the case here. I wish to lay this statement of the case before the House. This is a case, it is said, in which it is very difficult for us to obtain information. That I admit. We are a long distance away, and all the news trickles through several channels before it reaches us. But I would suggest to the reasonable men on the other side who have not yet committed themselves to this proposal that it may be a fact that the news may become tainted until what we see represents only in the faintest possible degree the actual facts with which we have to deal. I ask the House to notice what happened about a fortnight ago, when all New South Wales was stirred to its depths by the appalling rumour of the purchase of cyanide by the

[Mr. Holman.

Boers with which to poison in thousands either Uitlanders or their women and children, or Kaffirs, or other hapless and unsuspecting victims of the incarnate fury of the Kruger gang. To-day the cyanide story is abandoned, and none is so poor as to do it reverence. A little later the story comes of the heartrending scenes among refugees slowly getting away from Johannesburg. There is nothing in that description about the leaders of the reform party sneaking out of Johannesburg with false beards or in women's costume. But we hear a great deal about the unhappy women and children who were described as starving in open trucks provided by the brutality of the Boer Government, and exposed to the insults and abuse of the Boer population. Time passes by, and this unhappy story of the refugees dies like every other story that comes from that source, and more exciting incidents come to the front. Feeling having been stirred up, it is no longer necessary to feed the flames by tales of this description. Then attempts are made to raise the passion of indignation against the tactics of the men who throw trains loaded with women and children off the line, and carry on their war, reckless of all the amenities of civilisation against defenceless persons. This turns out also to be a lie, an absolute lie, invented, I doubt not, as all the other stories coming from that quarter have been, by interested representatives of the little gang of buccaneers who have been from the beginning the head and front of all this movement. The time has now come to speak plainly, and to throw all the pretence that this is an affair of the empire to the winds. I do not know whether it is necessary for me to say that I am loyal to the empire. I happen to have been born in England, and come of as solid and patriotic English stock as the hon. member for Phillip Division or the hon. member for Hartley, and I say that I have a profound respect for my own nation. Whilst I am loyal to the empire, I see with emotions of shame and indignation which I can hardly express, the name and reputation of that empire being dragged in the dust at the behest of a little gang of swindling speculators on the Rand. We know that this affair is no movement of the empire at all. We know how the whole trouble between the Dutch and the British

racés at the Cape has been stirred up since that masterly and statesmanlike pacification was brought about by the greatest Englishman of the century. Every time there has been a rift in the lute at Cape Colony a revival of the old hatred between the Dutch on the one side and the English on the other—every time it has been possible to create trouble there at once we trace the hand of Cecil Rhodes pulling the string that sets everything in motion. I say that he is the man at whose behest we are now asked to send our gallant but misguided men to fight in the Transvaal.

MR. HAYNES: It is now reported that £5,000 is offered for Rhodes's head!

MR. HOLMAN: Personally, I should be glad if £5,000 could be so well invested. I say again that this is the position as it presents itself to the minds of many of us. I trust the House will bear with me whilst I endeavour to deal with the matter without running over the ground so admirably traversed by the hon. member for Goulburn. Making a passing reference to that hon. member's speech, I wish I had, like that hon. member, the judicial calmness that would permit me to contemplate these things in that serene and equable frame of mind which he brings to bear on the proceedings of the House. I must for a minute ask the House to consider what has happened since 1890. There is the key to the situation. In 1887 gold was discovered in the Rand, and an inrush of Uitlanders commenced. In 1890 special legislation was introduced in the Volksraad by Kruger to deal with the new position of affairs. What did that legislation embrace? First, liberalisation of the mining laws, so that the new-comers would be well looked after. It embraced a proposal for building railways, so that the heavy freight which had to be paid to Cape Colony could be dispensed with, and it finally embraced legislation to effect the reduction of the term necessary for naturalisation. That was in 1890, when the amalgamation of the two races was in rapid progress, and when there was comparatively little danger of any outbreak. A few months later a change in the political affairs of Cape Colony put Cecil Rhodes at the head of the Government as administrator, and there the Governor was Sir Henry Loch, who was previously Governor of the adjoining colony of Victoria, but who was a

weak and incapable administrator in the troubled waters of South African politics. And those two men between them, Rhodes acting in the joint capacity of managing director of the chartered company and Premier of the colony, with the pliant tool, Loch, in his hands, advanced steadily from one intrigue to another, every one of which had the object of ultimately obtaining the Rand gold-field as a private property of the company. What did they do when they got a concession from Lobengula? The Dutch proposed to trek into the adjoining country, a country never under the control of Lobengula, and establish a kind of second republic, but they were met by the Imperial administration under the influence of Cecil Rhodes with the threat that such an expedition would be stopped by armed force—an expedition into a country in no way under the protection of Great Britain. Trouble came up in Swaziland. If the hon. member has the effrontery to say that the Boers broke the convention of 1884, let me ask does it not give the Boers the right to deal with Swaziland according to their own lights? One of the most solemn agreements ever entered into by the Imperial Government was deliberately broken within six years of its being signed; it was thrown to the winds, and all the business of Swaziland was settled without regard to the wishes of the Dutch republic after they had had the assurance that their wishes would be supreme. That was done under the influence of Cecil Rhodes. The Matabele war was a step taken to influence the sale of the chartered company's stock. Things were slack; they wanted new territory, and they could only get it by stirring up war. They stirred up a war against the Matabele by means of lying telegrams and despatches. They had a man there living in the country. He lived in Buluwayo, so peaceful was the country and free from suggestions of any attack upon the British settlement that he lived in the Matabele country—in Lobengula's own kraal at Buluwayo. He lived there, and from there sent out day by day despatches to the order of the Rhodes gang at Capetown, describing the formation of Matabele impi and the marching of regiments north and south. These despatches were not published in the local papers at Johannesburg or Capetown, where they might have been criti-

*Second night.*

cised ; but they were sent straight through, without reaching any local centres, to the columns of the London *Times* and *Standard*. They worked up a feeling against the Matabeles, and the suggestion was conveyed to the English public that we were leaving a handful of settlers to be overwhelmed and crushed by the impending hordes of Matabeles, and that steps must be taken immediately. The word was given at last that the administrator there, Dr. Jameson, could do whatever he thought necessary to protect the interests of white settlers, and that most infamous war was entered upon immediately. To complete the story, the messengers of Lobengula sent to ask for an explanation, to offer any terms, to ask what securities would be demanded from them by the Cape Government to save them from war. These messengers, in defiance of the laws of humanity and as well as of nations, were seized as prisoners and shot as spies. That is a fact which no man can gainsay.

Mr. ARTHUR GRIFFITH : Suppose the Boers had done a thing like that !

Mr. HOLMAN : They would be said to have been guilty of an outrage, of which we should never hear the last. This was done under the direction of a man who has been the evil genius of the Cape settlement from the beginning. Let us follow him in his further steps. Each step had for its object the stirring up of feeling against the Dutch. We are told that the native tribes were stirred up. I admit that the evidence of that is a little less conclusive than is the evidence of other matters ; but finally the coping-stone was put to this long series of offences by the Jameson raid, an incident quite fresh in the memory of all. Not one member of this House can raise his voice in defence of that most infamous attack upon a friendly people, to whom Britain was then tied by the strictest treaty obligations. A little gang of filibusterers, of highwaymen—you can call them nothing else—headed by a man, I admit, of considerable parts and abilities, rode forth in the middle of the night hoping to carry everything before them, and, finally to seize the gold-fields, as had been tried before them. This brings us to the question of Mr. Chamberlain's change of attitude in 1896. He was a man who was detected in what, in the eyes of the world, was a flagrant crime.

[*Mr. Holman.*

All Europe was outraged and astounded. Jameson and his companions were imprisoned ; but how did Chamberlain deal with Rhodes, the instigator of the whole affair ? The hon. member for Hartley said he preferred to take Mr. Chamberlain's latest word upon this question. I say that Mr. Chamberlain is to-day a proved accomplice in the whole crime, that he himself was *particeps criminis*. That cannot be denied, and his *ipsi dixit* has no more authority ; as information than, and is of similar value to, that of the least informed of those hon. members who have supported this proposal in this debate. That is the position in which we find Mr. Chamberlain. He said that by treaty obligations in 1896 we divested ourselves of all shadow of right to interfere with the internal affairs of the Transvaal. Has that been altered since ? In no way.

Mr. Cook : He did not say that !

Mr. HOLMAN : The hon. member for Goulburn read the quotation :

Her Majesty's Government have recognised the South African Republic as a free and independent government as regards all its internal affairs touched by the convention.

Those are the words of Mr. Chamberlain. Has there been any alteration since ?

Mr. Cook : Is that all Mr. Chamberlain said at that time ?

Mr. HOLMAN : Did he say anything in qualification of that ?

Mr. Cook : But is that all he said ?

Mr. HOLMAN : It is not. The hon. member said that Mr. Chamberlain had a reservation in his mind. This was the reservation—that the convention should be honorably fulfilled in spirit and letter by the Dutch. I challenged the hon. member while he was speaking to show in what way the Dutch had violated the convention. The hon. member knows that he cannot show it. When all has been said, what does all this vague clamour against Boer rule amount to ? No overt act has been charged against them. Suppose they had broken the convention, it is from the Dutch, and not from the English, that the offer to proceed to arbitration has come. Suppose the hon. member and myself draw up an agreement. The hon. member says I have broken it ; but I hold a different view. I am prepared to submit the matter to some independent judgment. If I say that if I have broken

the agreement I will make him every recompense, what more can he ask for? That is the position in which the Boer Government are. The English Government say they have broken the agreement. The Boers say, "Show us in what way." The English say that they cannot show them; but that the agreement having been broken they will disregard it, and advance by force of arms.

Mr. COOK: I should like to say one word!

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has no right to speak unless the hon. member for Grenfell will give way to him.

Mr. COOK: I only wish to say that I deny all the things the hon. member is attributing to me. He is putting into my mouth words I never used.

Mr. HOLMAN: I must confess I find it is difficult to discover what hon. members who supported the motion did say. The majority have gone through a kind of process of obtaining what information they could while they were on their feet from the interjections of critical listeners. The position I want to put before the House is this: If I misrepresent the hon. member for Lithgow he must accept my assurance that I do so quite unintentionally, and I shall be glad to be put right at once. The hon. member assured us that he has based his support of this interference on the fact that the Transvaal was not an independent or foreign country. Against that we have Mr. Chamberlain, whom the hon. member quoted as his authority. What does he say? That ever since the Convention was signed her Majesty's Government had recognised the South African Republic as a free and independent government, and Cecil Rhodes, the Premier of Cape Colony, was desired to note that the South African Government was a foreign state. That is in an official despatch. He is to note that the South African Republic is a foreign state with which her Majesty's Government is in treaty relations. The hon. member says that the English Government has a right of control over the state's external political relations, and that, therefore, it must control its internal affairs. Now the man who is driven into such an unhappy sophism exposes the wretched position of the case he is supporting. The hon. member had the happiness of being a member of the most long-

lived Ministry in New South Wales. While he was in that Cabinet it exercised control over his external political relations. Did it exercise any control over his internal relations? While he was in it did it control his actions as a man, as a householder, as the father of a family? Did it control his internal affairs—the expenditure of his money, or the employment of his leisure time? The hon. gentleman knows it did nothing of the kind; and he knows that in nations, as in individuals, the control of external relationships has nothing whatever to do with the control or direction of the internal functions of a state. Those internal functions have been left entirely to the independent control of the Boer Government by the explicit words of the 1884 convention, and chief amongst those functions is that of the naturalisation law. On that point the Boer Government is absolutely an independent state. It will be admitted that there is no higher judicial authority on this question than the Chief Justice of England, who said:

The position of the South African Republic is determined by the two conventions of 1881 and 1884. The result is that under these conventions the Queen's Government recognises the complete independence and autonomy of the South African Republic, subject only to the restrictions of the convention of 1884 to the effect that the South African Republic should have no power to come into any treaties without this country's consent.

I ask whether the distorted ingenuity of the hon. member for Hartley can get over a declaration like that. The hon. gentleman is not in the legal profession; for Heaven's sake let him confine himself to the plainness and honesty which so creditably distinguished him during his exercise of ministerial capacity! Why should he, under no obligation of any kind, seek to wriggle and twist around a plain statement of the case like that? The Uitlander then goes into a country which the Chief Justice of England declares to be an independent and autonomous country, and he goes there at his own risk. He goes there and submits himself to the conditions, legal and physical, which are in force there, and if every word which is alleged to-night, in this vague and unsubstantial way, were founded upon a genuine and undeniable fact, if the very ravings of the maddest jingo in New South Wales were true, and every grievance that has

*Second night.*

ever been imagined for the Uitlander were a reality, the answer to it all would be this—that the country is not a gaol, that if a man does not like it he is free to leave it to-morrow. An hon. gentleman says, how can a man leave it? I say it is his own affair. When a man goes into another country he goes there at his own will. Kruger did not bring these men there; he did not invite them there. The Dutch did not want them to go there. They were forced to let them go there by the superior power of the British Empire. That provision was forced upon an unwilling republic, and the Uitlanders, being there, are there entirely at their own risk.

Mr. HAYNES: We will be hunting the Russians out of Russia presently!

Mr. HOLMAN: It is a well-known fact that at the bicycle works in Germany there are many thousands of English artisans employed. That is the case in certain large cities in Germany where this is the leading industry. Those men are foreigners in a foreign country. They have to submit to the German law. They cannot speak their own language in the courts; they cannot have their own language used in official documents. They have no votes. Why does not the hon. gentleman propose to send 375 men to coerce the German Government to grant the rights for these men that are demanded on behalf of Uitlanders from the Transvaal Government?

Mr. COOK: Because they are not oppressed!

Mr. HOLMAN: That is not oppression in Germany which is oppression in the Transvaal.

*That in the captain's but a choleric word,  
Which in the soldier is flat blasphemy.*

That is not oppression in Germany, because the Germans are too big, too formidable, to be coerced. But with an insignificant little state like the Transvaal every patriot in the House, swelling into importance with the jingo emotions which possess his little twopenny-halfpenny soul, feels called upon in the interests of humanity and freedom to go to the relief of his oppressed and down-trodden countrymen. There was a time indeed when to belong to the English race and to fight under the English flag was an honor.

An HON. MEMBER: When was that?

Mr. HOLMAN: That was a time when England stood up—as we were reminded

[*Mr. Holman.*]

with unnecessary detail last night by the right hon. member for King Division—and alone withstood in the interests of freedom the might of conquering France. In those days it was, perhaps, a fair thing to say that England did stand up on behalf of liberty and freedom. There was a time when English statesmen and English politicians did not fear—I will not say to draw the sword—but, at all events, to measure their forces with the proudest and mightiest empires on the Continent. Within this century England has been within measurable distance of war with France, when France was at its highest. It has made war with Russia. It has exchanged defiance with almost all the powers of Europe. But to-day the English race has fallen on a time when apparently the utmost it can do is to bully weak and struggling powers. England can threaten a country like Venezuela; it can send an expedition into the Soudan. It can fight the Zulu; and it can now, after a long process of negotiation, finally draw the sword against the Boer.

Mr. BARTON: Would the hon. member mind telling us one thing—whether he wants the Boers to win or the British?

Mr. HOLMAN: I am not to be alarmed at any question of that kind. Whilst my country is fighting in a just cause I hope I shall be as ready to support its claims as any other member. But as I believe from the bottom of my heart that this is the most iniquitous, most immoral war ever waged with any race, I hope that England may be defeated.

HON. MEMBERS: Shame! Shame!

Mr. NORTON: Bunkum! Bunkum!

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. NORTON: Am I to be singled out and called to order when the hon. member for Inverell is yelping like a rabid jingo dingo?

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I called both sides to order.

Mr. HOLMAN: I say this—

Mr. STOREY: Withdraw that remark!

Mr. EDDEN: I rise to order. Every hon. member who has addressed the House to-night has had full liberty of speech. Mr. Speaker has threatened to hurl from the Chamber any hon. member who dared to interject, and now, on this side of the House, hon. gentlemen who ought to know better are putting questions to the hon.



member who is speaking, for the purpose of creating what I would term a sensation!

Mr. BARTON: Is this a question of order?

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: No; the hon. member is not stating a point of order.

Mr. NORTON: I rise to order!

Mr. EDDEN: And I rise to a point of order. The hon. member for Grenfell has been shouted at by hon. members, who have been grinning here like mopokes!

Mr. NORTON: I rise to a point of order, and I do so in the interests of debate!

Mr. SLEATH: I rise to order. Is the hon. member in order in—

Mr. NORTON: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I claim my privilege as a member of the House. I claim my privilege and right to raise a point of order!

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The hon. member will please be seated for one moment. The hon. member for Wilcannia has also risen to a point of order.

Mr. NORTON: I rose prior to the hon. member for Wilcannia!

Mr. SLEATH: I rose to ask your ruling—

Mr. NORTON: I claim my privilege inasmuch as I rose first!

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Will the hon. member be seated for one moment.

[Mr. Speaker entered the Chamber.]

Mr. NORTON: Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that I rose to a point of order, and as I did so the hon. member for Wilcannia rose and interrupted me as I was in the course of stating, and before I had time to state it. If that be the fact—and I am in the hands of the House in regard to the matter—I claim my privilege to state my point of order.

Mr. SLEATH: I do not see that there is any necessity for all this disturbance. I rose quietly, without giving offence to any one, and Mr. Deputy-Speaker called me. I rose with the intention of seeing whether we could not avoid the unnecessary disorder which had been going on for some time, particularly on the part of the hon. member for Northumberland. The hon. member for Grenfell was speaking, and the hon. member for Kahibah rose to a point of order. Mr. Deputy-Speaker asked the hon. member for Kahibah to be seated, whereupon the hon. member for Northumberland rose. The hon. member

for Kahibah again rose, and went on to state that certain hon. members had interjected. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, after hearing the hon. member for Kahibah, declared that there was no point of order. [Inter-ruption.] If hon. members will only have the decency and courtesy to observe the rules of Parliament, and listen—

Mr. STOREY: I do not think we should have a speech of an hour's duration from the hon. member!

Mr. SLEATH: I ask your protection, Mr. Speaker. If I am to be insulted by the hon. member for Randwick or any one else I shall certainly assume a different attitude from that which I have assumed. I ask for your protection, Mr. Speaker, and if I do not get it I shall be quite able to protect myself.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to point out that when an hon. member is addressing himself to a point of order, he is not addressing the House at all; but he is addressing the Speaker, and no hon. member has a right to interject or interrupt him.

Mr. SLEATH: When the hon. member for Kahibah resumed his seat I rose. Mr. Deputy-Speaker declared that there was no point of order. The hon. member for Grenfell again rose. I was called by Mr. Deputy-Speaker, and before I had an opportunity of saying a word the hon. member for Northumberland rose and dramatically claimed his rights and privileges as a member of the House.

Mr. NORTON: Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet at the time.

Mr. SPEAKER: I shall have the hon. member for Northumberland removed from the Chamber if he interferes with the hon. member for Wilcannia in his statement.

Mr. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK: Mr. Speaker —

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK: That is very unfair!

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will resume his seat. The hon. member may have his opinion about the matter; but he must not express it to me. The hon. member for Wilcannia is stating a point of order, and he has a right to state it to me and not to hon. members.

Mr. SLEATH: I was called by Mr. Deputy-Speaker, and I was not allowed to

*Second night.*

proceed any further than to say that I rose to ask his ruling in reference to the conduct of certain hon. members of the House. The hon. member for Northumberland and several others have during the last hour—not in an ordinary tone of voice, but in a continuous yell—been interfering with the decorum and proper carrying on of the work of the House. I do not wish to raise any frivolous objections; but I do object to hon. members being allowed by the force of sound to drown the remarks other hon. members may make. I trust that if they insist in disturbing the good order of the House, you, Mr. Speaker, will see that other hon. members, who are prepared to abide by your rulings, are protected, and will have the opportunity of hearing the discussions as they proceed.

Mr. NORTON: I have very few words to say. If I am wrong, I shall bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, immediately. I do not suppose the hon. member for Wilcannia has intended to wilfully misrepresent the facts; but I claim that he has not placed them fairly before the Chair. I rose, and audibly stated, "I rise to order." I had not uttered two words; I was not permitted to state the nature of the point of order, let alone to put it before the Chair, when the hon. member for Wilcannia rose and persisted in obstructing my privilege to rise to a point of order. Those are the simple facts.

Mr. SPEAKER: Had not the hon. member for Wilcannia been called?

Mr. SLEATH: Yes.

Mr. EDDEN: I do not know about that!

Mr. NORTON: He had not been called!

Mr. SLEATH: Mr. Deputy-Speaker called me when I rose.

Mr. HOLMAN: The hon. member for Northumberland was at my side, and as a matter of fact, he rose twice. On the first occasion he rose before the hon. member for Wilcannia!

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Wilcannia is wrong in stating that the hon. member for Northumberland has been interjecting for an hour. I only left the Chamber at a quarter to 11 o'clock.

Mr. SLEATH: Well, Mr. Speaker, it seemed to be a very long time.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member would think it was much longer if he were sitting where I am. There is no necessity for

[*Mr. Sleath.*]

these disturbances. The hon. member for Grenfell has given expression to an opinion which, perhaps, he ought not to have expressed here. It was, however, an opinion of his own, and I do not see that any point of order could apply to it. It may have been indiscreet for the hon. member to have used the language he has used. It is, however, for him, of course, to answer to the people who sent him here for using it. I think the matter had better drop at this point.

Mr. NORTON: May I, for my future guidance, ask whether it is my privilege, and the privilege of every other hon. member, when he rises to a point of order, and catches Mr. Speaker's or Mr. Deputy-Speaker's eye, and is permitted, although not actually called by name, but having the Speaker in full view and listening to him as he proceeds—is it in order for any other hon. member, before he has stated his point of order, to rise to another point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will excuse me for saying that he is somewhat impetuous. The hon. member has no right to open his lips until he is called by the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker. As soon as he is called by name by one or the other, he has the right to speak. As I have stated on previous occasions, there is a tendency here for hon. members to jump up and address the Chamber without waiting to be called. They have no right to do that. Of course, the hon. member for Northumberland, or any other hon. member raising a point of order, ought to be heard at once, and the hon. member who is addressing the Chamber must take his seat when the point of order is raised.

Mr. NORTON: By your permission, Mr. Speaker, I desire to have my privilege, and the privilege of other hon. members, clearly defined. It is true that Mr. Deputy-Speaker requested me to take my seat for a moment. Evidently that request implied that he had designated me. He asked me to sit down for a moment, and I did so.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think hon. members will recognise that they ought to act as reasonable men. Mr. Holman.

Mr. HOLMAN: I recognise that this interruption arose out of an expression of mine, and I think I am entitled to add one more word. You, sir, were not in the chair at the time that it took place; but,

of course, it will be within the knowledge of every hon. member that the proceedings during the last few minutes have been somewhat heated, and I may say that I expressed myself in a manner which carried somewhat more than I altogether intended. My anxiety is, and has been all through this fight, that in this long duel which has been taking place between the independent burghers on the one hand and the marauders of the chartered company on the other, that the Boers may win. That has been my wish ever since I have been capable of understanding the morals of the case. That is the answer which I give to the question of the hon. member for Hastings-Macleay. Amongst the remarkable reasons which have been adduced in support of this proposal this evening was one from the hon. member for Phillip Division to the effect that such an expedition would be of the greatest training value to the men who take part in it. He is apparently under the impression that it is our duty to take 300 or 400 picked men from our forces, to send them to the Transvaal, and let them shoot a few Boers like snipe, and that they will come back all the better men for the experience. I submit that if we are a body of reasonable men, and if we have any power whatever of considering the rights of people outside our own borders, there is not one of us who has a right to consider this question in so cold-blooded and inhumane a fashion as has been indicated by the hon. member. These men, we are told, are to be sent to the Cape, and to be employed there to shoot down men who, rightly or wrongly, for anything they know, are defending their own homes, men with whom they have no quarrel, and with whom their country has no quarrel. These men are to act the part of what can only be described as that of assassination in a cause of which they know nothing. All this is to be done so that their musketry may be improved, and it is to take the place of so many visits to the targets. I do not know that the House has fallen to the level of indorsing such a sentiment. If those are the feelings of hon. gentlemen who are supporting this proposal, I can only say that the ruin of an empire, whose moral views have so far sunk as to allow it to make an expedition of this character actuated by such motives, is an

event of the near future. The English Empire has done much, and is undoubtedly a large civilising factor. That is a fact which we delight in, and which none of us deny. But the Englishman has no rights in the world peculiar to himself. The heaven-born Englishman is entirely an invention of the jingo press. We are not called upon to set right the other countries of the world, and to instruct them in the management of their affairs, and to dictate to them in their own internal concerns. No doubt we have a right to interfere on behalf of our fellow-subjects when those fellow-subjects are really oppressed, when those fellow-subjects have no other hope of redress of grievances under which they languish save the armed intervention of their country. But that that is the case in the present instance will not be alleged for an instant by the other side. The majority of the Uitlanders have not asked for assistance, they are under no grievances which are not common to all aliens living in foreign countries. These men are not oppressed, they are not slaves, they are not robbed. It is free to them to find shelter in friendly British territory not 100 miles away. They do not wish to do so, they elect to stay there, because on the whole they are better off in the Transvaal in spite of all their disabilities than they would be in Natal.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the case of the man Edgar who was shot by a Boer policeman?

MR. HOLMAN: That case which has been properly brought up by the hon. member would have been a legitimate ground for intervention by the English Government. It was a case for inquiry by the English Government, but the English Government did not inquire, and does the hon. member know why? Amongst other reasons, because the Boer policeman who shot this gentleman named Edgar, was himself a man named Jones, an English subject in the employ of the Boer Government. He was the man who committed this high-handed act of brutality on a fellow English subject.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why was not the law allowed to take its course?

MR. HOLMAN: The Boer law did take its course, and justice was done according to the Boer forms of law. He was an English subject living under Boer jurisdic-

*Second night.*

tion. The English Government, standing by and cognisant of every fact, took no steps and asked for no redress or compensation. What can be said about a case like that? Nothing whatever, except that it is one of the incidents inseparable from the existence of a lawless population in a mining town where the scum of the earth is congregated. Now, summing up the situation, I find it is like this. We have herea people over whom England has under no circumstances a shadow of any claim except that which has been exercised by the strong hand. Before 1877, England had no scruple of a right inside the Transvaal. The annexation of 1877 was a piece of as open and impudent a piracy as has ever been committed. It was carried out in spite of the immediate protest of the Boer citizens. Whatever rights England has acquired since then, whatever claims may be made of shadowy rights and uncertain powers, they can all be traced up to that tainted fountain-head of an act of open spoliation committed upon the Boers by Sir Bartle Frere in 1877—action which was taken, as we know, in excess of Government instructions to that “prancing pro-consul,” as he was called at the time. From 1877 onwards there have been relations more or less perplexed and disturbed between England and the Transvaal. Those relations in 1881 were that a withdrawal of all claims to interfere in certain matters was made by England. In 1884 a larger withdrawal was made; and both of those withdrawals—remember that they were not withdrawals of historic claims to rights exercised from time immemorial, but of claims of recent birth, and only exercised by virtue of powers conferred by this high-handed act of rapine on the part of the English administration—both of those withdrawals stand in force at the present day. Every one of those matters which have been made the ground of complaint by Uitlanders come within the category of subjects control over which England formally gave up in 1881 and 1884. That is the position from a legal standpoint. From the broader standpoint of humanity we are told that, after all, these things are merely the working out of a law of nature; that here we have once more an instance of the survival of the fittest; and that the vigorous and illustrious English race is now about to step

[*Mr. Holman.*

in and wipe out this effete and crumbling power, which has too long cumbered the ground. The law of the survival of the fittest is, of course, a fact; but it is a fact which it has been the crowning triumph of civilisation to make more and more conformable to the requirements of justice and of equity. Here the fittest does not survive. The man with the loudest voice, with the strongest determination, with the most impudent disregard for the rights of his fellow-men, is not the man who gets the ear of the Chairman when a delicate point of order is to be decided; but justice is done, and the rules of the House are carried out. To-day, while the fittest survives, it is the fittest, not in endowment of brute force, but of social equipment. The man who survives in the struggle for existence to-day is not the man who goes forth, as Dr. Jameson went forth on his raid, with his pistols in his belt and his sabre at his side, prepared to ride roughshod over humanity, but the man who conforms to the usages of society; and the fittest nation to survive is that nation which, in all its dealings with its fellow-nations, is actuated by the highest regard for every jot and tittle of international law. Just as to-day the robber, the burglar, and the bushranger, in spite of their courage and energy, are held down and thrust into the outer darkness, and have to meet the punishment which justly waits upon them at the bidding of society at large, so, with nations, the day of buccaneering has gone by; and it is the duty of every man who values human progress to build up more and more an understanding between the peoples of the world; to turn the human race into one gigantic nation, with a community of laws and of intellect, so that questions of difference, instead of being settled by the sword, may be settled by the humane and peaceful method of arbitration.

Mr. BARTON: If the Government are willing, I shall now move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. LYNE: I am quite willing!

Mr. COPELAND: I understand that the Premier has received a cablegram of a very important character from the Imperial Government, which it is only right he should announce to the House.

Mr. LYNE: I have not received a cable from the Imperial Government.

Debate adjourned.

## ADJOURNMENT.

Motion (by Mr. LYNE) proposed :

That this House do now adjourn.

Mr. COPELAND (Sydney—Phillip) [11.25]: I understand that the Premier has received an important cablegram from the Imperial Government dealing with the subject which has been under discussion this evening, and I think that it is his duty to communicate it to the House. The news has gone all round the Chamber, and I have seen the hon. member showing the cablegram to other hon. members.

Mr. LYNE: I have not received any cable from the War Office; all I have is a copy of a cable which will appear in to-morrow morning's newspapers, and which was sent to me early in the evening.

Mr. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK: They will appear in the fiction columns!

Mr. LYNE: The cablegrams to which I refer are these:

The *Globe* states that the Boers have offered a reward of £5000 for the capture of Mr. Cecil Rhodes dead or alive.

Mr. Chamberlain, in view of the Boer threats to murder English subjects, has warned President Kruger that he will be held responsible for acts contrary to the laws of civilisation.

Nine thousand Kaffir miners, commanded by two Englishmen, walked from Johannesburg to Ladysmith, a distance of about 300 miles.

French Canadians are enthusiastically joining the Canadian contingent for South Africa.

Those are ordinary press cablegrams.

Mr. NORTON (Northumberland) [11.28]: I cannot say that the head of the Government is to be complimented upon his action in reading such thoroughly unofficial telegrams. They are simply war scares, and I could manufacture a much better bulletin any day of the week, and I have done it for newspapers over and over again. The aspect of affairs is serious enough in all conscience, without reading to the House what the *Globe* jingo pink sheet of London has to say, until its news is confirmed from official sources. I respectfully submit that when Parliament is seriously considering a matter upon which the hon. member has deliberated, with a loyalty which does him credit, and upon which I shall deliberate with a loyalty which I trust will do me credit, *Police Gazette* news should not be read to us to influence our deliberations. Further, the head of the Government is not to be complimented upon the disposition which he

continually shows to allow the business of the Government to be taken out of his hands by members on the other side of the House.

Mr. LYNE: Is the hon. member in order in making such a charge?

Mr. SPEAKER: The action of the Ministry is fair matter for criticism by the hon. member, and therefore I do not think the hon. member is out of order.

Mr. NORTON: I now reiterate with great respect —

Mr. COPELAND: It has been an invariable custom for the Premier to convey any information he has to the House!

Mr. MILLER: Never!

Mr. NORTON: Believing I am right, I say there is a disposition being shown to take the business out of the hands of the Government, and I for one, if I shall not be out of order—and, of course I am a novice at this business—trust the Government will show no disposition to accept the amendment sincerely moved by the hon. member for Phillip Division.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I do not think the hon. member is in order in discussing that matter, because it is an order of the day for consideration to-morrow. I do not think the resolution which has been under discussion to-night can be touched upon now.

Mr. NORTON: I imagined that it could not, and that was why I hinted that I thought I was out of order. I hope the Premier will not think that I have made these remarks in a disrespectful spirit. The situation is in all conscience serious enough without reading to the House what the *Globe* newspaper in London says—that £5,000 is offered by the Boers for Cecil Rhodes's head. What do we care about Cecil Rhodes's head? What we are troubled about are the lives of human beings, and the care of the widows and orphans who will be created by this war.

Mr. COPELAND: Cecil Rhodes, I suppose, is not a human being!

Mr. NORTON: Cecil Rhodes, in my opinion, if it is worth hearing, is one of the most reckless, although capable, cold-blooded monsters that have ever disgraced the name of a Britisher—for false pretence, for fraud, for violence done to human rights, no matter whether they be black or white. I will not bow down to this modern colossus of Rhodes that is set up for our adoration. I admire the British

spirit that actuates the hon. member for Phillip Division. I admire the spirit of fair play that generally actuates him, but I think he is blinded in this matter. There are rights which we have to consider, and although our loyalty may lead us to condone in the extremity, everything which has been done, we have no right to attempt to bolster up or to extort from this House a decision by such a bastard bogus cable message as this. The hon. gentleman has been in official life, and he knows very well that he would not act on such information as that, that he would attach no importance to it. It is a mere newspaper paragraph, and the hon. gentleman who carries weight in this House and this country has shown an indecent haste, an indecent desire to pander to what, I presume to term, the jingo spirit, by having such a so-called message as that read to the House at a time when we are deliberating on whether or not we shall participate in this great crisis in the empire's affairs which exists in South Africa. I think the situation is quite serious enough without our yielding to every tinpot canard and rumour which is put abroad. We have had the columns of the public press stuffed with lies that have had to be contradicted almost the next day. The Boers' cause is bad enough in all conscience, and I believe that this cable from first to last is a damnable lie; but having said that much I am quite prepared to go further and state that if the Boers do venture to go to such extremes as that, to single out one Britisher for assassination by placing a price on his head, the retort of Mr. Chamberlain would be a very proper one. I look upon it as part of a policy of the Israelitish gang of buccaneers who have been subterraneously preparing this crisis and deluging the newspapers of England —

Mr. QUINN: I rise to order. I ask your ruling, sir, as to whether the hon. member is not discussing the question which is set down for consideration to-morrow?

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member was discussing the righteousness of the action of the Boers when he was interrupted. I think he should leave the question alone; he will have an opportunity on another occasion to discuss it.

Mr. NORTON: I bow, sir, to your decision. I have said all I wish to say on the subject at present.

[*Mr. Norton.*]

Mr. COPELAND: I hope I may be permitted to point out to the hon. member for Northumberland that there was no likelihood of a division being taken to-night. The debate was adjourned when I appealed to the Premier to read the cablegram, and therefore I could not possibly, at any rate not justly, be charged with attempting to influence the debate in any way whatever.

Mr. MILLER: What was the motive, then, in asking that the cable be read?

Mr. COPELAND: I did not know what was in the cablegram. Why should I not know its contents as well as the Premier? The information had been conveyed to some hon. members, and I wanted to get it conveyed to all. I did not know where it came from. I was told that it was a cablegram from the Imperial Government; but now I understand that it is not from that Government.

Mr. MILLER: It is a bogus cablegram!

Mr. COPELAND: I do not say it is a bogus telegram. I dare say these gentlemen of the press are accustomed to manufacturing bogus telegrams.

Mr. MILLER: And the hon. member always believes them, too!

Mr. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK (Rylstone) [11-38]: I merely rise to indorse to a certain extent what been said by the hon. member for Northumberland, and to say that I think a great deal too much importance has been attached to this cablegram, seeing that it has not come from any official source to the Premier. To-night some little disturbance occurred, and I rose on several occasions, in common with a number of other members, to take a point of order as to certain statements by interjectors on the other side of the House, and I must say, in common justice to the hon. member who was addressing the Chair, and on whose behalf it was proposed that a number of hon. members should speak, that he was inveigled into making certain statements by a fire of interjections.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I do not think the hon. member is justified in referring to another debate on a motion for adjournment. The hon. member will have an opportunity of speaking when the debate is resumed.

Mr. J. C. L. FITZPATRICK: I wish to direct the attention of the Premier to a circular which has been industriously sent to hotel-keepers, particularly to country publicans, which, I think, ought to be

brought under the notice of the Board of Health, or those authorities whose duty it is to deal with such matters. The circular is sent out by a Melbourne company, who offer for a fee of £1 to supply recipes, through the agency of which brandy, gin, rum, whisky, and other intoxicating liquors might be manufactured at a very cheap cost. I think this is a matter which ought to be brought under the notice of the health authorities, so that they may see that no deleterious articles are sold to people when purchasing liquors at hotels. The articles, the manufacture of which is referred to in that circular, will probably be sold in many country hotels, and the sale of legitimate liquors may be discontinued. No doubt in the back-blocks hotels the people get plenty of bad liquors, as well as in the threepenny bars of Sydney, without their having to consume such mixtures as are indicated in the circular. I think the Premier might look into the matter, and see whether there is any reason to fear that liquors manufactured in the manner suggested are going into general use.

Mr. LYNE (The Hume), Colonial Treasurer [11.22], in reply: I will take steps to have some inquiry made respecting the circular which the hon. member has read. I would say one word with regard to the mountain that has been made out of a molehill as to the telegram which I read. I should have read that telegram in the House earlier had it been one sent to me by the Secretary of State for the Colonies; but it was simply a telegram to the press, and I did not think it worth while to read what hon. members will see in the newspapers in the morning.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

House adjourned at 11.43 p.m.

## Legislative Council.

*Thursday, 19 October, 1899.*

Koorawatha-Grenfell Railway—Joint Stock Companies Act  
—Federal Constitution Bill—Fisher Trusts Declaratory  
Bill—Troops for South Africa—Workmen's Compensation  
Bill (second reading)—Macleay River Harbour  
Works Bill (third reading)—Third Readings.

The PRESIDENT took the chair.

### KOORAWATHA-GRENFELL RAILWAY.

The Hon. J. WATSON asked the VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL,—Have all the conditions imposed by the act for the construction of the railway from Koorawatha to Grenfell been complied with?

The Hon. J. A. K. MACKAY answered,—Yes.

### JOINT STOCK COMPANIES ACT.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RENWICK asked the VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL,—(1.) Is he aware that the Joint Stock Companies Act of 1891, 55 Victoria No. 19, has expired by effluxion of time? (2.) Is it the intention of the Government to revive this act, in view of its importance to various financial institutions and the public?

The Hon. J. A. K. MACKAY answered,—(1.) I am aware that the 3rd section of the Joint Stock Companies Arrangement Act of 1891 has become inoperative. (2.) The matter is under consideration.

### FEDERAL CONSTITUTION BILL.

The Hon. N. HAWKEN: I wish to ask the Vice-President of the Executive Council, have the Government received any intimation from the British Cabinet of difficulty with the Federal Bill, as containing certain provisions of serious Imperial concern?

The Hon. J. A. K. MACKAY: I would like the hon. gentleman to put the question on the business-paper in the usual way. I can hardly answer it off-hand.

### FISHER TRUSTS DECLARATORY BILL.

Bill presented by the Hon. Dr. Cullen, and read the first time.

### TROOPS FOR SOUTH AFRICA.

The Hon. J. A. K. MACKAY rose to move:

That this House is of opinion that New South Wales should equip and despatch a military force for service with the Imperial army in South Africa.

He said: I do not think I need take up the time of the House at any great length, because, I believe, every hon. member realises the importance of the present situation, and is prepared to give the forces of New South Wales an opportunity of standing shoulder to shoulder with the