

Mr. BUCHANAN said that was exceptional work, and was not continuous. When a dam was made there was an end of it. He could not admit that any great want of employment had been occasioned by the drought. But the drought had passed away. There had been floods, even at Dubbo, where it was generally so very dry. Rain had fallen all over the country, and we should see whether that would make work plentiful. Free trade had nothing to say for itself now. It cut a very sorry figure. It had to hide its diminished head. Not one of those who were so boastful about the success of free trade when we had three or four millions sterling flowing into the Treasury dare open his mouth now when our streets were crowded with unemployed mechanics. Ship-loads of furniture and boots and shoes were coming into the country and every article which those mechanics could be employed to manufacture was made abroad. How could our mechanics live if everything we required was manufactured in foreign countries? So long as all this importation went on there must be a dearth of employment in this country. Where were the people to find employment? What could they do? Could any one point to any young country in the world which had attained any high degree of prosperity without protection? The distress in the country would be infinitely greater if it were not for the small modicum of protection which we had. If it were not for that small modicum of protection, the tobacco factories would be closed, and all the people employed in them would be turned adrift; the sugar-mills and the paper-mills would be closed. It would be the same with regard to the rope manufactories and the kerosene works. What a depth of misery and distress should we not sink into if that small modicum of protection were taken away! What would free trade do for us? It would cause overwhelming and universal ruin. If a scientific tariff were devised by a skilled and able statesman, within a year of its being brought into operation the whole country would be studded over with manufactories.

Notice taken that there was not a quorum present.

Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House at 6:45 p.m.

[*Mr. Buchanan.*]

Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday, 29 April, 1884.

Real Property Act: Mr. Edwards' Application—John Conroy's Conditional Purchase—Victorian Coal-mining Company's Railway Bill (No. 2)—Titles Conferred on Colonists—Permanent Artillery Force—Railway to Oberon—Volunteer Corps—Mr. Frank Hobbs's Conditional Purchase.

Mr. SPEAKER took the chair.

REAL PROPERTY ACT: MR. EDWARDS' APPLICATION.

Ordered (on motion by Mr. MURRAY):

That there be laid upon the table of this House copies of all reports, papers, letters, plans, tracings, and memoranda concerning or relating to Mr. James G. Edwards' application to bring certain portions of land situated in the parish of Gordon, originally granted to William Roberts, under the provisions of the Real Property Act.

JOHN CONROY'S CONDITIONAL PURCHASE.

Ordered (on motion by Mr. SLATTERY):

That there be laid upon the table of this House copies of all papers and documents having reference to the application of John Conroy, dated the 7th September, 1882, to conditionally purchase 112 acres of land in the district of Burrowa.

VICTORIAN COAL-MINING COMPANY'S RAILWAY BILL (No. 2).

Bill presented (by Mr. CAMERON, for Mr. FLETCHER), and read the first time.

TITLES CONFERRED ON COLONISTS.

Mr. BUCHANAN rose to move:

(1.) That in the opinion of this House the practice of the English Government of conferring titles upon any of the people in this country is inconsistent with the spirit of our democratic institutions, and ought to be discontinued.

(2.) That the above resolution be forwarded to his Excellency the Governor for presentation to her Majesty the Queen.

He said: As showing that I consider this a matter of importance I may say that I have proposed a motion similar to this on many occasions, and it is my intention to continue agitating the question until the absurdity ceases altogether. We are here forming a society based on the principles of pure democracy, and the attempt of the Government of England to introduce a spirit of aristocracy among us is not only an insult to us but it has also in a very high degree tended to deteriorate and injure the society which we are organising.

I need not point out to honorable members who have lived in England the very great deterioration the society of that country has suffered owing to the existence of various titles—titles which have no meaning whatever, which do not indicate anything, but which are recognised with a sort of superstitious awe and reverence; the consequence is that false objects of respect are held out to the people, and society is injured in a very great degree by the false state of feeling into which the people are deluded. I would like to ask any honorable member who has lived in England if he can forget the spectacle of a vulgar Englishman pandering to a lord. A more degrading, more humiliating, more utterly contemptible sight was never seen. When I speak of Englishmen I include Irishmen and Scotchmen, who in this respect are perhaps a degree worse than the rest. The effect of this system of originating titles in society is that the recipients of them are held up to the vulgar as objects of great reverence and even worship. Let a titled person in England be ever so worthless or disreputable, the moment the title sounds in the ear of the vulgar mob that moment is the worthless, disreputable person esteemed, glorified, and honored. That is the effect of the system as it prevails in England. The worthy, honest, upright man, the man of perfect integrity, the man who is really worthy of honor, esteem, regard, and high respect is probably unnoticed, and would not allow himself to be degraded by a title. A worthless, disreputable blockhead of a lord comes along, and, in consideration of the title of lord, the people who regard not the honest, upright man of integrity, literally go down upon their knees before the owner of a worthless title. This is what I protest against; this is what has degraded, injured, and lowered the society of the mother country. The extent to which the effect of this system prevails has brought about a state of things which men with independence of mind and with large notions of things cannot but view with feelings of humiliation and regret. This feeling towards a titled person has entered into the very constitution of the people; it has grown with their growth; they have inherited it from their forefathers. They cannot help bending, being unable to stand straight when

they are presented to a titled person. It is humiliating, and in the last degree degrading to the character of men, that such a state of things should exist. This is the state of the matter in England. Even there the titles which are sent out to this colony are held in very small estimation; although they are so eagerly coveted by the people of this country. These titles are regarded even by those who dispense them with the utmost possible contempt. It is known that Sir Robert Walpole, when any pertinacious place-hunter became troublesome, held this very honor of knighthood *in terrorem* over them. Sir Robert used to say, "Tell him if he does not take himself off we will knight him"; and as a rule the threat had the desired effect. This honor of knighthood is also held in considerable contempt in England. There are numerous instances of Englishmen of note declining to have themselves lowered and degraded by it. Take the case of the celebrated Charles Kean, who point blank refused to have his name degraded and the stage lowered and insulted by the title. The British Government, finding that they could not degrade the stage, descended into the orchestra, singled out the leader of the orchestra, and conferred the honor upon him, a fiddler.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Who was the musician!

Mr. BUCHANAN: Sir Michael Costa.

Mr. O'CONNOR: One of the grandest musicians of all time!

Mr. BUCHANAN: One of the grandest blockheads! When Charles Kean had refused to be degraded by this insult the Government were forced into the orchestra. There are numerous instances in English society in which men of character would not have it. Michael Faraday would not be degraded by any such thing. Baronetcies and other titles were offered to him and he declined them, and he was one of hundreds who have refused to allow their names to be smeared with such a thing. Well, this new wealthy, rising democracy of Australia I do not wish to see injured or in any way lowered by the institution of a system which has brought nothing but contempt; nothing but ignominy upon large masses of the people of England. I should like to ask the Government what are the causes and reasons for the dispensing of these titles

here. It seems to me a problem beyond solution. Gentlemen are honored—God save the word!—I should say dishonored—by this stigma; there are men so honored, as they call it, and every one lifts up his hands and wonders how it has been brought about—wonders what is the cause of it, what are the services which have led to it. The late Mr. William Forster, a gentleman of very distinguished intellect, who rendered very great services to the country, who held the office of Premier, and who enlightened society by the vigour of his intellect, by the power of his pen, and in various ways was an honor and credit to society, and we do not hear a word of such a man as he being offered such an honor; but if a menagerie comes here, and any fussy, stupid fellow goes fussing about the menagerie, and gets up banquets to himself and to the leaders of the show, and is very indefatigable over it, the upshot is that he is made a C.M.G., whatever that may be. This is the laughable part of the thing. Then, again, some exhibition takes place where all the toys and dirt of the country are collected together, and straightway certain persons act as if this was the only means of gaining distinction by interesting themselves in this affair and by making themselves conspicuous. This seems to me to be the only method by which these honors and distinctions are conferred. I should like to have an explanation as to how it is that such is the case. No one can deny that what I am saying is the truth, and does it not with tenfold force show the folly, the absurdity and the degradation that is brought upon the country by the imposition of these distinctions? When we know what has taken place, surely it becomes every honorable member of the House who has any interest in the country at all, who has any anxiety to see it honored and respected, to raise his voice on this subject, to tell those who are responsible that we do not want these titles here, that we require no such distinctions at all, that this is a democracy, and not an aristocracy—that the distinction we prize is that of worth and honor, which is sufficiently glorious for any man to strive to obtain. One would have thought that in this young, vigorous, and rising democracy it would not have been the radicals who would have struggled after these

[*Mr. Buchanan.*

titles, but the empty-headed noodles occasionally visible in our society, and who affect to call themselves Conservatives and high Tories. But what are we to say when our two most distinguished radicals, John Robertson and Henry Parkes, are the first to try and get hold of these paltry, insignificant handles to their names? I cannot imagine what prompted these two men not to trample such an insult under foot—how they could be so far misled, deluded, and hoodwinked into accepting such a folly. But there they are; they are possessed of it, and my revenge is that they are doomed to carry on their shoulders for the rest of their natural lives the burden of knighthood—a punishment sufficiently severe. The conduct of Mr. Francis, of Melbourne, was a splendid contrast with theirs. He had the manliness, the fine conception of his position, to refuse a title almost in the terms of this motion. He said he refused it, as being inconsistent with the democratic character of the country he lived in, and he did refuse it, and he has all the merit of refusing it. But what can we say when we find Irish rebels accepting this paltry, wretched distinction? Sir Charles Gavan Duffy, forsooth! Sir John O'Shanassy! I do not know whether Sir John O'Shanassy figured as an Irish rebel, but, at all events, we know that Duffy did. And what a falling off was there? To find this same Duffy, who stood in the criminal dock at Dublin, on his knees accepting this wretched, miserable distinction at the hands of a government that he alleged had brought so much ruin and injustice on his country! Let any one contemplate the picture of Duffy the patriot standing in the dock ready to pour out his heart's blood in his country's cause and contrast it with that of Duffy the funkey on his knees accepting a wretched, insignificant title from the chief of what he alleges to be a base, bloody, and brutal government! When young Irelanders saw this miserable, humiliating spectacle well might they say:

The flaming patriot who so lately scorched us in the meridian shines temperately to the west, and is scarcely felt as he descends.

So much for Sir Charles Gavan Duffy. It is a consolation to me and others that other men besides Mr. Francis have refused this gewgaw. I dare say that there are many aspirants after the same

empty, wretched bauble, and on the division we shall see how things stand, because of course there are those who are expectant to get this so-called honor some day who for some sort of nondescript service hope to have their names decorated with the spurious distinction I am exposing, ridiculing, and denouncing. That division I hope will take place to-night, and it will show how things stand. I hope there are some gentlemen here who have spirit enough to second the motion, and to force the Government to say how these paltry distinctions are disseminated, and how it is that they come to be given in quarters which create an extraordinary feeling of surprise throughout all ranks of society. I do not know how we are to stop the absurdity. I believe it will go on until separation from the mother country takes place; and I do not think that separation is far distant if I may judge from what is going on all around me. At all events, even separation, which I hold to be an advantage to the mother country and to this country, if it takes place, would be a cheap price to pay for the extinction of the absurdities I have been exposing. That this question of separation will be the only argument or ground on which these idiotically stupid titles will be put an end to I have no doubt; and if it does not take place we do not know what the end of this mania for titles may be, as we have it on record that on the first attempt at passing a constitution here there was a proposal that we should have a house of peers with titles in keeping with the formation of such an institution. That was proposed by Mr. Wentworth, who is now so much venerated in this country, but which will create surprise when any one comes to read his biography. But as it has been proposed that we should have peers of the realm in Australia, I have no objection to suggest a few titles which may be apt and characteristic. What would people think of his Grace the Duke of Burglary, or the most noble Marquis of Manslaughter, or Sir Robbery, or Viscount Perjury, or Sir Petty Larceny, K.C.M.G.? Would not these be appropriate titles, simple, apt, and harmonious? I leave it to the judgment of those who are advocates for the foundation of a house of peers to say whether these titles should not be adopted. But, as

I was saying, we shall never get this state of things brought to an end until separation from the mother country takes place, and that which is going on at the present time is very likely to bring that about, and the sooner it happens the better it will be for the mother country and for this country. I do not think that the purpose of the motion will be effected until the tie which connects us politically with England is severed. There is a blockhead named Murray Smith who is doing his best to embarrass the English Government, and to embroil England in a war with France. If ever the British Government felt the cumbrance of colonies, she feels it now; she is kept back from hostilities with France only by the good sense, judgment, and moderation of the French Government. What right has England to tell France that she must not send her convicts to New Caledonia? A statement in to-day's papers shows the limited danger to the colonies which exists in connection with the transportation of French criminals to New Caledonia. Of 986 convicts who escaped 926 were recaptured, and the majority of the remaining sixty died, only six having escaped from the colony altogether. This is the danger about which the idiots of agents-general are trying to embroil England and France in war, to which the English Government seem to be weak enough in every sense of the word to be driven by these agents-general! Every one who knows how great and cumbrous a load of distress and difficulty the colonies have been to England all through—and this is an opinion which is not strange in England because it has been expressed by some of the leaders of literature, by Goldwin Smith in particular—must see that the severance of the connection between England and the colonies must be advantageous to all. As I argue that separation will be the only means by which the purpose of the motion will be effected, perhaps I shall be allowed to read a short statement showing how common the opinion that there ought to be separation is among the leading intellects of England—

MR. SPEAKER: It seems to me that the honorable and learned member is travelling rather far from the subject before the House. The motion is to be effectuated by an address to be sent home, that is to

say, by a representation to the Crown that these titles ought not to be conferred. I do not think that the question of possible separation from the mother country as a means to bring about the end stated in the motion is relevant to the motion as it is framed.

Mr. BUCHANAN: I was about to quote a very high authority to prove that all the leading intellects of England hold that there is no advantage to England, but, on the contrary, the greatest disadvantage in holding the colonies; but I bow to Mr. Speaker's ruling, and will drop that line of argument. I cannot help saying that we have a lot of nondescripts going about London perplexing, annoying, and harassing the English Government, and uttering foolish, senseless, idiotic remarks, such as references to the "empire on which the sun never sets," and such bombast and balderdash. But we shall find some day, and that very shortly, that there is nothing but selfishness at the bottom of the whole thing. A more utterly contemptible feeling of loyalty than that which we see displayed here I have not observed in any other part of the globe. It is loyalty which will turn to the opposite the moment their selfishness is touched in any way, and this will be exemplified, perhaps, sooner than we imagine.

Question proposed.

Mr. COPELAND: I am somewhat surprised that an honorable member who travels about the country so much, and has so much time as the honorable and learned member has to think about political subjects, has not hit upon some subject which might be discussed with more prospect of benefit than there is in connection with this motion, which, as it seems to me, it is a waste of time to discuss. I had not intended to say anything on the subject; but during the course of the speech of the honorable and learned member I was reminded of some of his actions which somewhat contradict his assertions. Recently Lord Rosebery visited the colony, and I do not know that any honorable member or any gentleman in Sydney helped to polish off more champagne in company with that nobleman than did the honorable and learned member.

Mr. BUCHANAN: I never touched a glass in his company in my life!

Mr. COPELAND: I believe that at a certain banquet the honorable and learned

[Mr. Buchanan.

member did all he possibly could to make friends with Lord Rosebery, but whether he succeeded or not I do not know. The honorable and learned member seems to be anxious to get information as to how titles are obtained—he appeals pathetically to the Government for the information. I trust that the Government will not tell the honorable and learned member how titles are obtained, because in my opinion as soon as he gets the information, like many other democrats, he will at once endeavour to secure a title himself. I do not think that there is much in this cry against titles. I am not desirous to secure a title or anything of the kind; I have never been in the habit of doing any flunkyism to lords, knights, or any one else. I should like to know whether the honorable and learned member would like to be addressed simply as David Buchanan, or whether he does not claim to be styled "the honorable and learned member"?

Mr. BUCHANAN: I do not!

Mr. COPELAND: I cannot see that any wrong is done in conferring patents of nobility on men who have done good service to their country. I do not believe that the troubles of Great Britain have been brought about by the fact of there being noblemen in England, Ireland, and Scotland. It may be that trouble has arisen from the fact of vast estates accompanying patents of nobility; but the trouble is in no way associated with the distinction implied in the rank of nobleman, knight, or squire. I shall not have the slightest hesitation in voting against the motion. I am of opinion that those gentlemen who make the greatest cry against the conferring of titles would be the first to accept them if they got a chance. We have all heard of the way in which Americans denounce titles; but now from one end of America to another you will find nothing but titled people. They are all colonels, captains, and doctors.

Mr. BUCHANAN: Professional titles!

Mr. COPELAND: Almost every man you meet is a general; they are as abundant as though they grew upon the tree-tops. It may or may not be a sign of weakness; but most men desire to have conferred upon them a title of distinction, and while human nature remains as it is that feeling will last. It would be a piece of impertinence on our part to dictate to

the home Government what honors they should confer, and I trust that the resolution will be rejected. I cannot help thinking that the honorable member's comments upon this country were, to say the least of them, highly insulting. To suggest the title of "Lord Burglary," and to say that it would be characteristic of the country, is a gross insult. I deny that robbery, burglary, or petty larceny are more characteristic of this country than of the country of which the honorable member is so enamoured, the United States, or any other country. The honorable member's observations upon this head were not only insulting—they were devoid of either wit or truth.

Mr. O'CONNOR: With all respect to my honorable friend, I scarcely know what he means when he refers to "this democratic community." I understand that Sydney, Melbourne, Adelaide, Auckland, and Hobart are as much a portion of the British empire as is London, Dublin, or Edinburgh. I hope that this state of things will remain for many a long day, and that the hair of the honorable and learned member's great grandchild will be as white as my own hair before the colonies are separated from the mother country. No injury will result to either the mother country or the colonies from the continuation of the present state of things. I hope that the grand practice of conferring titles will not be abolished. I do not say that titles should be conferred upon unworthy persons; but even if the honorable member were able to show that that had been done in a few instances it would be no reason for discontinuing the practice. It is one of the earliest of our institutions. Some of the grandest men the world has ever seen have been the recipients of titles. Surely if a man is celebrated for splendid achievements in the battle-field, or if in the senate of his country he has rendered valuable and disinterested service to the state, there is nothing degrading in his receiving, at the hands of her Majesty or her deputy, a mark of distinction in the shape of a title! The honorable and learned member could doubtless refer to some cases in which the distinction has been unworthily bestowed; but what about the splendid services of the men to whom he refers from time to time in his speeches in this House, and of whom all English-

men may be justly proud? Is there any derogation of manliness in the acceptance of titles which are deserved?

Mr. BURNS: I think the House is inclined to go to a division at once; but as the honorable and learned member for Mudjee has referred to some members of this House who have been honored with the title of knighthood, I should like to say a few words. The honorable member referred especially to the knighthood of Sir Henry Parkes and of Sir John Robertson. With regard to Sir John Robertson, I know that ten years prior to his accepting the title it was pressed upon him for his acceptance by a secretary of state. At that time the honorable gentleman for reasons of his own thought fit to decline the title. In the case of another gentleman the offer was made and declined for some years. This motion can have no effect. The Queen is the fountain of honor, and although we find gentlemen of the peculiar idiosyncrasies of the honorable and learned member for Mudjee, who tell us that they look with contempt upon titles—although we find that those who hold forth in this fashion are generally the first to pay honor to those who hold titles—the bulk of men think it a great honor to receive a distinction of this kind from the Queen on the recommendation of her Majesty's Government. What can be a greater honor to a man than, after many years of public service esteemed by his fellow-colonists, to receive from the Queen a title as a mark of her approval of those services in a colony forming a portion of the British empire? The honorable and learned member talks of the colony being democratic. It is democratic in this sense: that the people have more power than the people of any empire under a limited monarchy. And as regards the country of which the honorable member talks so much, there is no country in the world in which titles are more sought after than in the United States. There are any number of generals, captains, and doctors; and titles, whether professional or public, are generally very much sought after. A celebrated writer upon public questions of this kind says that it is one of the instincts of the human race to acquire distinctions of this order. Of what use is it for the honorable member to say that we are nearer to a separation

from the mother country than many people suppose? The honorable member is one of those who hold forth in language of this kind; but whenever a manifestation of loyalty to the Queen or to the British Government is elicited these persons find themselves in a very small minority. I recollect that very many years ago, when at a banquet the toast of the Queen was proposed, the honorable member proposed, by way of amendment, the health of the President of the United States. I thought at the time that it was in very bad taste, and I think that the republic which the honorable and learned member talked about establishing here is very far in the distant future. I believe that the people of New South Wales are just as loyal now as they were when the honorable and learned member preferred the toast of the President of the United States to that of the Queen. The honorable and learned member will find himself very much mistaken if at any meeting he invites an expression of opinion from the public of New South Wales on this question of loyalty. The motion can have no effect. If carried, it would be no more than an expression of opinion. If persons who are selected for titular distinctions choose to decline them, they are at liberty to do so. That has been done in some cases. The late Mr. Francis, of Victoria, a distinguished man, who was for many years Colonial Secretary in that colony, was offered a title on several occasions and he declined to accept it; but that is no reason why a man like Sir James McCulloch and others who prize such distinctions very highly should not accept them. As regards Sir Charles Gavan Duffy, whose case is one I do not care to discuss, it is one of our experiences in the colonies that we find men who, though rebels in the old country, have, after obtaining positions of honor and public trust, come to regard the question of their loyalty in a very different light from that in which they regarded it when at home. Although Sir Charles Gavan Duffy on his arrival in Victoria told the people that he was a rebel to the backbone and spinal marrow, after he had sat in Parliament and occupied the office of Minister he thought proper to accept the honor of knighthood.

Mr. O'CONNOR: After he had refused it two or three times!

[*Mr. Burns.*

Mr. BURNS: I do not think he ever refused it. We generally find that those who talk about spurning such honors are the first to accept them. I believe that Sir Charles Gavan Duffy never refused the title, and I have a keen recollection of the whole matter. I was on a visit in Victoria when the honor of knighthood was offered him, and I heard the whole subject discussed. The reason he gave for accepting the title, I believe, was that his friends thought that it would be an honor to his party. I do not think that a very good reason. If, however, the Queen chose to confer the honor upon him, and he thought fit to accept the distinction, it is not a matter for us to say anything about. As regards the motion, I do not suppose her Majesty would feel much concerned to know that the Parliament of this colony was rather opposed to these titles. Do what you will, there are gentlemen who feel it a great honor to receive knighthood, and the Queen will not lightly grant a title of this kind. Whenever it is recommended that any one should receive a title there will always be a careful inquiry as to whether his services are such as to justify his receiving the distinction.

Mr. BUCHANAN, in reply: The honorable member for East Sydney, Mr. Copeland, and the honorable member for The Hunter have mistaken the character of the American people. The titles of colonel, general, and captain are professional titles, just the same as those of blacksmith or carpenter. You find bakers and grocers all over America as well as in this country, and you might as well call the names of these callings titles. I have been a republican all my life; but I did not, at the banquet referred to by the honorable member for The Hunter, propose the health of the President of the United States as an amendment when the toast of the Queen was proposed. I proposed the toast of the President of the United States after that of the Queen had been drunk. I trust that no community under heaven will ever cease to honor the first magistrate of that great nation. He will be honored and respected everywhere, and more by the crowned heads, probably, than by any others. I still maintain the soundness of my argument that these titles have a lowering effect upon the community, and that they are held up as preferable to that

grandest of all distinctions of being what is described by the poet as the noblest work of God—an honest man. All titles but that fall into utter insignificance. These are the principles held by all republicans, and they will ultimately prevail. We see at the present moment, from the combination of crowned heads and the forces which are taking the field, that a great struggle must come in the future. The great struggle will be the people against monarchy. That will be the struggle of the future, and you will find the armies of the various republics taking the field against the tyrants. The fight will be between the principle of monarchy and that of simple, righteous, honest republicanism.

Division called for; but there not being a second teller on the side of the ayes, the question was resolved in the negative.

PERMANENT ARTILLERY FORCE.

Mr. BUCHANAN rose to move :

(1.) That, considering the extraordinary revelations contained in the papers lately laid before Parliament in reference to the Permanent Military Force, in the opinion of this House that force should be disbanded and abolished with all convenient speed.

(2.) That the above resolution be communicated by address to his Excellency the Governor. He said : I do not think it very complimentary to the House that no member of the Government should be in his place when an important motion like this is under discussion. I think I should be justified in not proceeding with the motion until they come.

Mr. A. G. TAYLOR : They have got the money voted by brute force, and that is all they want !

Mr. BUCHANAN : It is a scandalous thing, especially when we know what has been done. I venture to say this : that, with those papers lying before us, the government is simply infamous that does not adopt measures to bring about the abolition of the force at once. Honorable members cannot know anything about it ; they cannot understand the frightful state of things existing in the force. The deplorable, iniquitous, and wretched state of things divulged by these papers ought to show us the state of the force. I venture to say that there is not an honest man who on learning the condition of the force would not be prepared to stand here night

and day rather than allow it to exist twenty-four hours longer. What has happened seems to me monstrous. Four hundred and seventy court-martials taking place—every crime in the calendar committed—desertions innumerable—the force reduced from above 1,000 to 300—the officers all at sixes and sevens quarrelling among themselves, none of them apparently efficient or performing his duty, but every one fighting, wrangling, and quarrelling ; and the whole thing in such a state of deplorable disorganisation and wretchedness that in any civilised society it would not last one moment after the revelations made were known to the representatives of the people. I can scarcely go away from this House without a strong belief that honorable members come here without any knowledge at all, without making any inquiry or attempt to understand what they are doing ; that they follow the Government whatever the Government may do—follow them blindfold through thick and thin ; for if they took up these papers and had a conscience in their hearts or minds I defy them to suffer such an iniquity, such a frightful, deplorable profligacy and villainy to exist without an attempt to stop it. The honorable member, my colleague, for Mudgee (Mr. A. G. Taylor) was treated in a most unexampled way here the other night for opposing the estimate for this very force. Had I been here I should have stood with him as long as my strength permitted, and I should have considered that I was acting in a most patriotic manner. I hear some honorable member say, “Why was he not here?” Well, we are not all independent ; some of us have to labour for our livelihood, and I was engaged in that duty. But I know of nothing—the most vigorous imagination can conceive nothing—more deplorable, more awful than these revelations. It is a stigma, a scandal, a foul blot on the country’s honor and character that such a force should remain in existence. I know of nothing more calculated to vitiate and poison the life-blood of this country’s honor and character than the existence of this force after these revelations ; and yet the Government complacently, as if there were no such revelations, come here and ask the House to vote large sums of money for its support. These are things I cannot understand, and

I say that if there was one member acting a truly patriotic part that night when the military estimates were passed it was the honorable member for Mudgee (Mr. A. G. Taylor), who, instead of being punished, deserved infinite credit, which I have no doubt he will get from those who understand his action and the duty he performed that night. I do not suppose many honorable members have read the papers, and I will read a few questions with the answers to them, asked by the honorable member for Mudgee, Mr. A. G. Taylor. He asked first :

(1.) On what date was the present brigade of artillery formed?—No. 1 battery, 2/8/71; No. 2 battery, 22/8/76; No. 3 battery, 19/6/77. (2.) How many men have enlisted in its ranks up to the present date?—1,089. (3.) How many still remain members of the brigade?—307. (4.) How many desertions have taken place?—386. (5.) How many deserters are still uncaptured?—308. (6.) How many members have died?—12. (7.) How many have been discharged as medically unfit?—37. (8.) How many have been dismissed from the force for breaches of military regulations?—105. (9.) How many courts-martial have been held up to date?—398. (10.) How many courts of inquiry have sat in judgment on alleged misconduct of commissioned officers?—5. (11.) How many non-commissioned officers have been reduced for military misconduct?—30. (12.) How many members of the force have been prosecuted before the civilian criminal courts?—78. (13.) What is the total cost (approximate) of the permanent force since the establishment of the present brigade?—£237,852.

Here is a state of things! What must honorable members think of the government of this force? What must they think of the discipline of the force? What must they consider to have been the loose conduct of officers when amongst such a small body there have been no fewer than 470 courts-martial? Then, I ask: Has it not been tried in the balance and found wanting? Has it not been found woefully inefficient? Has it not in every sense been a disgrace, a scandal to the country? If inquiry into the state of the force has shown that to be the case, how noble and patriotic is the duty that the member performs who tries to put an end to it—to extinguish it for ever! No good can ever come from such a force. There cannot be any hope for it. The officers are inferior; the men are inferior; the discipline is defective. The whole thing is a quagmire of filth and wretched misery and distress—distress caused by continual turmoil and

[*Mr. Buchanan.*

crimes committed by the men—the whole thing disorganised—discipline trampled underfoot—a by-word and a mockery to every spectator—to every man who knows what a military force ought to be. The moment I saw these papers that moment I put the motion on the paper, and it would be the wholesomest act this country could commit to abolish the force once and for ever; and if ever such a force is constructed again, let it be composed of better officers, better men, and on different principles entirely. Let it be a force in which discipline will be effective, not one bringing disgrace upon the country, soiled and heaping contumely upon itself by such scandalous things as these papers disclose.

Question proposed.

Mr. A. G. TAYLOR: This is a resolution which, on principle, I must support. Although it might at present be regarded as inexpedient to bring about a total abolition of the force, there can be no doubt that it requires thorough reorganisation. But I do not see of what use it is to the colony at all. We do not want to squander money for keeping mere ornaments; we do not want mere figure-heads. But, if we have a military force, they must be either for use or for ornament. They would be of no use to us in time of war. People have the idea that they are the nucleus of some possible military body, but they are not trained men. We are paying away our money without rearing or training men, or who, when they are imperfectly trained, desert. In the place of the trained men we have a floating population of johnny-raws. These are the persons it is fashionable to look upon as the nucleus of a standing army. The first corps of permanent artillery was formed in 1871, the second in 1876, the third in 1877, and 1,089 men have been enlisted; and the training, service, clothing and equipment of all these have to be paid for. As the uniforms would not fit all, 1,089 suits of clothing would have to be provided. Allowing 100 for deaths, and the retirement of those who have served their time, we have 307 remaining out of this 1,089. But a return would show that not above twenty or thirty of those remaining have gone through their time. What sort of a force must it be when after three or five years the men see no advantage in enlistment? If there was an

encouragement to fulfil their duties, and become part and parcel of the state, it is quite possible that they would not retire after five years, but would reinlist. Very few have served the full time. Then where is this nucleus of a standing army for use in the time of war? This force is no part of our national life, or of the body politic. We do not require a standing army, or to ingraft on our military forces the most barbarous forms of British usage; especially in the country which extols and boasts of its freedom on every possible occasion. Is it desirable to have martial law here? I can show what tyranny is exercised against the men—badgering and maltreatment enough to break the hearts and malign their reputations are resorted to by feather-bed officers, and this is subject to no espionage; the business is transacted where no press is present to criticise, and Parliament is too feeble to bring about a reorganisation of the force. Returns will show that of the 1,089 which have been enlisted there were only 307 remaining members; 368 have deserted, and never completed their term of service. There are not more than 20 or 30 men who have served the full time. This, again, is a considerable item of expense. One-third have deserted, and that shows there is something rotten in the state of Denmark—that it is not a force upon which much dependence can be placed, especially when we consider that those remaining have had only one or two years' service. Of the deserters 308 remain uncaptured, 12 members have died, 37 have been discharged as medically unfit, and 105 have been dismissed from the force for breaches of military regulations. Although of this enlisted force of 1,089 there were never at one time more than 300 in the service, there have actually been 398 court-martialled. These court-martial proceedings are equivalent to committals at quarter sessions; the officers deal summarily with the accused in most other cases. Fancy that in this young and free country 1,098 have been enrolled, and that as some retired fresh men came in their places, keeping up the number to about 300, and that of those who have been on the rolls nearly 400 have been tried at courts-martial. This is an absurdity. A court-martial is in principle a star chamber, with no press to watch the proceedings, no espionage on the part of the public, no

chance of the accused being represented by counsel, and the questions are put in a stereotype style. It is a disgrace to those who foisted this system on the public service. We find also that last year there was paid £5,834 14s. 11d. to commissioned officers, and £3,870 18s. to non-commissioned officers. Out of £20,000 for the maintenance of the force the privates have exhausted £10,000, and the officers the other £10,000. The commissioned officers exhausted one-fourth the amount which the whole force costs. This shows how the force is perpetuated. If full daylight were let in on the system, it would probably be found that too many members of Parliament were interested in this force.

Sir JOHN ROBERTSON: Name, name; only one!

Mr. A. G. TAYLOR: I have no desire to name.

Sir JOHN ROBERTSON: You cannot!

Mr. A. G. TAYLOR: The honorable member admits one, at all events. That is all the daylight which is let in upon it. But do I not know the character of this House well enough to be aware that unless I had absolute proof of the consanguinity of these officers to members it will be denied?

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the honorable member is justified in applying such terms to members of this House. He is, in fact, stating that although there may be a consanguinity of members of the House with persons in the military force, unless he brought absolute proof of it honorable members would deny it; that is to say, falsely deny it. Such language is not justifiable.

Sir JOHN ROBERTSON: Perhaps I may be permitted to say that the only officer in the service who is related to a member of the House was appointed before that gentleman became a member.

Mr. A. G. TAYLOR: We know, as a matter of fact, that a large amount of the social influence of the aristocracy of the city is brought to bear to keep the force in existence, as a sort of pension ground for broken-down aristocrats. A tremendous amount of lobbying is done every year to get the vote passed. You will see officers behind the bar chatting in the most friendly way with honorable members, while those who have to suffer the hardships of the force cannot get access to the ears of honorable members. The officers

pooh-pooh all the yarns told to honorable members, and say, "We know that you will support us when the matter is brought forward," which is what honorable members do. It is not from personal motives that honorable members act in this way; but it is attributable to a lack of individuality on their part. They drift too easily into a careless performance of their public duties. It seems to me that during late years honorable members have run away with the idea that they have only two duties—one is to write "M.P." after their names, and the other to respond to the toast of "Parliament" at banquets. That is where they shine; but when an important matter is being dealt with in Parliament they are not to be found in their places, or if they are they vote blindly with the powers that be—they do not exercise their own thought, they carelessly allow some one else to frame their thoughts for them. Allah is great, and the present Government is his prophet! This is their idea; but Allah is great when the present Government is not his prophet. Honorable members will not give that careful concentration of thought and judgment which is necessary, or which is expected of them. I know that these remarks are not palatable to honorable members; but I am not considering them. They were content to take up six or seven hours discussing matters relating to the refreshment-room—about the want of politeness on the part of the servants—that this one did not touch his hat to them, and that one did not serve them with their grog with sufficient promptitude; but when we came to the vote for the maintenance of a horrid, mercenary, useless, military system, which increases the burdens of the people, honorable members went home quite satisfied. Here is a pretty return respecting a force the existence of which is merely a subsidy to Government flunkysm. Government House poodles, with swords dangling at their sides, receive money which ought to be spent on the public works, and towards remedying the grievances of this civil service ridden country. Lethonorable members listen to the charges made against members of the force, and mark how anomalous the sentences are, and then ask themselves, "Is it not only natural that these should clear out of the force?"

[*Mr. A. G. Taylor.*

Drunkenness and insubordination, 336 days' imprisonment, with hard labour.

The insubordination may have been that the man called an officer a fool, which may have been the unblemished truth. For this offence the man is deprived of his liberty for a year. God Almighty could not have intended that a man's liberty should be abrogated in this fashion. Because a man chooses to take a drop of liquor too much, and forgets that some powder-monkey with a couple of stripes on his arm has to be spoken to with bated breath, he is punished in this way!

Drunkenness and absence, 126 days' imprisonment, with hard labour.

Disgraceful conduct, eighty-four days' imprisonment, with hard labour.

For the latter offence a lower sentence is imposed than for drunkenness and insubordination.

Leaving his post, riotous in streets, 252 days' imprisonment, with hard labour.

For such an offence a civilian would probably be fined 20s.

Drunkenness and insubordination, 730 days' imprisonment, with hard labour.

There is a nice abrogation of a man's liberty! A sentence of two years' imprisonment imposed in the absence of counsel for the accused, and without a single soul knowing whether justice is done—the jury being packed, consisting, as it does, of officers! Out of all the cases tried by court-martial there have not been more than a dozen acquittals.

Sir JOHN ROBERTSON: The imperial regulations are in force for purposes of discipline here!

Mr. A. G. TAYLOR: That makes them none the less barbarous; they ought not to have been introduced here. We know that it is not so many years ago that a soldier in India was partaking of a meal after a hard day's work when he was directed to take another soldier to the guard-room. He said, "I have been working hard all day; get some one else to do it." The stern command was, "You go, or you will be taken to the guard-room, too." He said, "I will see you damned first." What was the punishment under the imperial regulations then in force? Seven days' imprisonment, with hard labour? No! The man was shot under warrant signed by the Governor-General of India, notwithstanding that the daughter of Sir Hugh Rose begged for a remission

of the sentence. The Governor-General said that discipline must be maintained. Shall we continue to make Britons slaves, to lower the Australian character of the young men of the country by perpetuating this system in order to keep billets in store for poor imbecile wretches, whose only delight in private life is to see other persons touch their hats to them?

Drunkenness, fifty-six days' imprisonment, with hard labour.

Conduct to prejudice of good order, twenty-two days' imprisonment, with hard labour.

We are not told what this conduct was. Probably it was looking sourly at the commanding-officer.

Stealing portion of kit belonging to a gunner — An infamous crime in itself.

fifty-six days' imprisonment, with hard labour.

The offence had nothing to do with discipline; therefore, the light punishment.

Left his picket on barrack-gate when sentry, 112 days' imprisonment, with hard labour.

Insubordination, accompanied by personal violence, 126 days' imprisonment, with hard labour, and fined £1.

Here is a charge to which I wish particularly to direct the attention of honorable members :

Disobedience of orders in being dressed in plain clothes in the streets, forty-two days' imprisonment, with hard labour.

Will any one say that it is right that a man should be sentenced to six weeks' imprisonment, with hard labour, because in idle hours when he was not on duty he did not wish to wear the badge of servitude wherever he went—because he chose to be in plain clothes when he went to see his girl? It is intolerable. If the men were tried in the ordinary way at a police court, I would not complain; the men could have nothing better, as neither the public nor members of Parliament would tolerate such monstrous sentences being given by such a tribunal. The rule that "Whatsoever is, is right" seems to apply to the management of the force as no innovation would be dreamt of.

Drunkenness and riotous conduct, fifty-six days' imprisonment, with hard labour.

Making a false statement, sixty-three days' imprisonment, with hard labour.

This offence was probably saying that it was wet when it was dry!

Feigning disease, ninety-eight days' imprisonment, with hard labour.

Insubordination and breaking out of barracks, 672 days' imprisonment, with hard labour.

Insubordination, 168 days' imprisonment, with hard labour.

Insubordination, damaging Government property (two charges), using threatening language to the provost-general—504 days' imprisonment, with hard labour.

For insubordination sentences of 182 days, 168 days, and 119 days' imprisonment were given.

Breaking out of barracks, 336 days' imprisonment, with hard labour.

This did not mean breaking out of barracks in the sense in which you would talk of a man breaking out of prison: The offence was simply leaving the barracks against orders. Honorable members cannot defend such a sentence; they may not vote for the motion, but they must feel that such a system ought not to be encouraged.

Insubordination, accompanied with personal violence, 252 days' imprisonment, with hard labour.

Drunk, insubordination—168 days' imprisonment, with hard labour.

Here is a remarkable item :

Smoking in the streets, not guilty.

This verdict not being satisfactory, the court reassembled on a subsequent day and passed a sentence of fourteen days' imprisonment, with hard labour.

Concealing disease, fifty-six days' imprisonment, with hard labour.

Probably some poor fellow did not wish to go to hospital to be maltreated under the old military hospital system, about which so much has been written; he preferred to treat himself, and for doing so is deprived of his liberty for fifty-six days.

Improperly in possession of articles the property of a comrade, twenty-one days' imprisonment, with hard labour.

A light sentence because the charge was one of theft!

Insubordination, allowing one of the picket to get drunk—fifty-six days' imprisonment, with hard labour.

Drunk and soliciting money from the public.

Two men were tried on this charge in one day, and one was fined £1, and the other was fined £1 and sentenced to fifty-six days' imprisonment in addition. What justification is there for the difference in punishments?

Selling the property of a comrade, fourteen days' imprisonment, with hard labour.

Being improperly in possession of articles the property of a comrade, thirty-five days' imprisonment, with hard labour.

Smoking in the streets, twenty-eight days' imprisonment, with hard labour.

Absence, altering pass without authority—fifty-two days' imprisonment, with hard labour.

The latter charge involved the heinous offence of forgery, hence the small sentence.

Familiarly associating with a gunner, reduction to the ranks.

The offence, probably, was shaking hands and saying "good day." This is a land of democracy. We boast of our freedom, yet we perpetuate a military system under which if a man with one stripe on his sleeve says to a man without a stripe, "Good day; come and have a drink," he is reduced to the ranks; he is not wanted as an officer; there is not proper conservatism and pride about him. We know that one officer has been refused promotion on the ground that he was too familiar with the men under him.

Desertion, making away with kit, disgraceful conduct (two charges), misappropriation of money (two charges)—588 days' imprisonment, with hard labour; reduced to the ranks, stoppages, and discharged with ignominy.

That might be a just sentence for a serious crime; but how was it determined? By a jury who were the officers, and in reality the prosecutors. No opportunity is given to the prisoner to peruse it; it is not shown to him until after it has been sent to the Governor, who, as a matter of course, concurs in any sentence however barbarous.

Desertion, making away with kit—280 days' imprisonment, with hard labour, stoppages, and discharged with ignominy.

Insubordination conduct to the prejudice of good order and military discipline, fifty-six days' imprisonment, with hard labour.

Striking with his fist, and kicking his superior officer, 336 days' imprisonment with hard labour, and discharged with ignominy.

Resisting escort, escaping from confinement, desertion, making away with kit—226 days' imprisonment and stoppages.

Desertion, making away with kit—168 days' imprisonment with hard labour, to be discharged with ignominy.

But here is an entry to which I will direct the special attention of honorable members. I have mentioned long terms of imprisonment for drunkenness, impertinence, insubordination, speaking disrespectfully of an officer, and offences of that kind. What do honorable members think of this?

[*Mr. A. G. Taylor.*

Stealing a cheque, making a false entry in the register, fourteen days' imprisonment with hard labour and reduction.

This was an offence by an officer —

Mr. WRIGHT: Was he a non-commissioned officer?

Mr. A. G. TAYLOR: I believe so; but surely the offence is as grave a one as drunkenness, and, if that is so, fourteen days' imprisonment was scarcely a sufficient punishment.

Mr. WRIGHT: But the man was reduced!

Mr. A. G. TAYLOR: And reduction follows in the case of drunkenness, so that in that respect the punishment is not more severe in the one case than in the other.

Desertion, losing kit, while in confinement writing on the wall remarks reflecting on his superior officer, attempting to escape, destroying Government property, imprisonment with hard labour, 357 days; stoppages, and discharged with ignominy.

I undertake to say that 300 of those days was for writing on the wall remarks reflecting on a superior officer.

Disobedience of orders when in confinement, 186 days' imprisonment, with hard labour.

When a man is in confinement he is naturally inclined to be mutinous, and one would think that under these conditions disobedience of orders would not be considered a very grave offence. Here is a record of almost 400 cases in which grave punishment was inflicted; the return does not include the many offences punished by summary jurisdiction. It has been necessary to hold a court-martial in this large number of cases in order to keep in order a small force of 300 men. If we are to have a force at all, the system must be thoroughly reorganised; it must be established upon a better basis; it must be invigorated with a spirit of freedom; and we must abolish that accursed, barbarous court-martial system which will one day be abolished in England, and which it should be our pride to put an end to at once. Then, as regards the punishment of offences, if a man is found smoking in the street, let him be censured for the first offence, and inflict a small fine for the second. If he offends a third time, let him be called upon to do by way of punishment a certain amount of work. But the law which deprives a man of his good conduct stripes, and which imprisons him for 282 days with hard labour

because he smokes in a street—in his own time, when he is off duty—is a most barbarous law. The reiteration of this punishment for drunkenness goes to show that the punishment has no effect by way of reformation. If lighter punishments were inflicted, if a better system prevailed, we should have a better force. If it is to be preserved at all, let it be preserved in all its usefulness. I could conceive of something in the shape of a standing army which men would have some inducement to join, and in which they would be induced to remain. Let the men have opportunity for study; induce them to look with pride upon their profession; and at the end of a certain term draft them into the police force, or give them some manual occupation in the civil service. If they are sufficiently studious, and are able to pass the civil service examination at the University, why not give them clerical employment in one of the departments? Let the men regard it as a privilege to remain in the service. Make them glad to join and sorry to leave your permanent force. Then you would be doing some good. In Victoria, unless matters are altered, the men regard it as a degradation to leave the corps. They regard it as a very good thing to be a member of the corps. Directly a man offends he is dismissed. Thus they keep good men in the force. But in this colony they say to an offender, "We can see that you are not fitted to become a soldier; we can conceive of nothing which will make you conform to our harsh military discipline. No doubt it will be necessary to dismiss you eventually; but before we let you go we will take good care to break your heart." It is a system of breaking hearts, mangling reputations, and trying by brute force and physical power to keep together a body of well disciplined men. That plan has succeeded only partially in continental countries; but it never will succeed in a British community—to say nothing of a colony in which, as a rule, wages are good and employment not scarce. The men are made by the most effectual means to see that it is not to their interest to remain members of the corps. I intend to say little about the recent vacancy in the rank of captain. I referred to it before, and I showed that the same amount of quarrelling, heart-burning,

bickering, and jealousy exists among the officers up to the Governor himself. I have shown that for three years this position has remained vacant, and it is still vacant. The House has expressed a strong opinion upon the subject, but it has not yet been dealt with. I presume that the Government have not yet grappled with it. No doubt the difficulty has been created through some partial minister "kow-towing" to the Governor. But the head of the Government should have sufficient firmness to insist upon the vacancy being filled at once. Now, a few words with reference to the application of these barbarous rules. At the Easter encampment, a year ago, a man was arrested for drunkenness. He was not in a condition in which it would have been advisable to confine him in a tent; and there being no guard-room at hand, I am informed on good authority, the man was tied to a tree for seven hours—in fact, for the night. The man was either dripping wet at the time of his arrest, or it was raining at the time. He was suffering from a bad disease, which was naturally aggravated by this treatment, and he was taken into hospital, where he has since died. The man was deliberately murdered. This would not take place if some species of public espionage were exercised over the system. We should remember that the daylight of press criticism is not let in upon the corps—that they are a hollow circle, in which no one but themselves can know what takes place, and we should institute a searching inquiry before we maintain such a corps. Here is a case of insubordination: A man received three years' imprisonment for a forgery. After serving that sentence he joined the artillery, and, to his credit be it said, he raised himself to the position of a non-commissioned officer. In a quarrel he one day made some very humiliating remarks concerning a private who afterwards told another private about the forgery, and he said he did not mind what was said to him by a forger. The result was that he was charged with making use of improper language concerning his superior officer. He received a sentence of about 300 days' imprisonment. The facts which I have placed before honorable members go to show that the corps is a wasteful extravagance; that it is not properly managed; and that it is

advisable for the Government, if they want to keep the service going, to endeavour to put it upon a better and a more economic basis. I yesterday gave notice of a resolution to that effect, intercepting supply. I believe that it is of no use to keep up the force as it now exists; that it would be better to rely upon a volunteer system; and that if we are to have the nucleus of a force it would be better to have 100 good, well-trained men than a larger number of men who are coming into and going out of the force every year. If you are going to have a corps which will form an efficient backbone to your military system, you must also have a proper examination for officers as well as for men. I do not believe that the existing corps serves a useful purpose; and believing, as I do, that it is a wasteful extravagance, I have great pleasure in seconding the motion of my honorable colleague.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I am opposed to the resolution. I think it is a necessity of our position that we should have the nucleus of an army, although my great hope as regards the defence of the colony will not rest on our small army so much as on the bravery of our people. To some extent, however, we must be taught, and I shall always advocate the maintenance of a small permanent force. There will always be grievances and hardships in a force of this kind. We can understand that in the older countries of the world men enlist for various reasons; but I have little sympathy with men who, in a country like this, where they can turn their industry to such good account, voluntarily subject themselves to army discipline, and who afterwards complain of its strict character. It would be impossible to conduct a military establishment upon the lines laid down by the honorable member for Mudgee. There must be discipline. Offences which to civilians seem trifling are very grave offences from a military point of view. I understand that the rules adopted in our permanent force are the rules which are adopted throughout the British army, which is known to contain some of the most enlightened and humane men in the empire. We should do nothing to lessen the influence of the officers of the force. It is all very well to call them feather-bed officers; I hope

[*Mr. A. G. Taylor.*

that they will always remain feather-bed officers—that there will be no practical work for them to do; but if I know some of the officers of the force—I do not mean socially, but as British soldiers—we shall not rely upon them in vain in the hour of need. Colonel Roberts has already given an earnest of his bravery in the service of her Majesty, and so long as we have in the force men of Colonel Roberts's character and experience we shall have very little of which to complain. There will be hardships here as there have been everywhere. It is so in England and on the Continent. It is a very hard thing to manage a large body of men who have come from all parts of the globe, and who have different temperaments and different ideas as to their rights. That grand discipline which is seen in every army must be maintained. Unless some better evidence is brought forward than any which we have had to-night I shall feel it my duty to oppose the resolution of the honorable and learned member for Mudgee.

Mr. STUART: I am opposed to the motion; but, at the same time, I confess that I have listened with a great deal of interest to what has been brought forward against the force. I recognise that the honorable member for Mudgee, Mr. A. G. Taylor, speaks from a point of knowledge which it is utterly impossible that I could myself possess. He speaks from a sort of inner knowledge of the force, which he has watched over with much interest. I cannot, however, agree with the conclusion to which he has come, namely, that the force should be done away with. A great deal has been brought forward to show that some degree of reform and amendment is necessary in the working of the system, and I must say that it is very startling to see that so large a number as 390 men have been court-martialled during the few years that the force has been in existence here.

Sir JOHN ROBERTSON: It has been in existence fourteen or fifteen years!

Mr. STUART: The list before us extends over eleven years, from 1872 to 1883. The first case occurred in December, 1871, and that may fairly be put under the year 1872. From that time to the end of 1883 there were 390 cases.

Mr. A. G. TAYLOR: There were only 100 men!

Mr. STUART: I am aware that at first there were 100 men, then there were 200 men, and ultimately 300. Every one must feel extremely pained to find that such a large proportion of the men have been punished for various offences. There are, however, a great many circumstances which may to some extent explain this, so that we need not admit the force to be in the state of demoralisation in which some honorable members allege. The pay which the men receive is small compared with that which men of the same physical powers have been able to earn in civil life. Many a young man, attracted perhaps by the glare and glitter of military appearances, enters upon the military profession and finds that the glare and glitter do not satisfy him, and that he would be more content with the more substantial wages to be earned in civil life, and therefore takes the first opportunity of leaving, or, if he cannot get away, of committing some offence which ultimately leads to his being discharged. These are the temptations and difficulties which, in a young country, we have to encounter. We are told that although a thousand men have passed through the force we have retained only 300 of them; but this to my mind is rather an advantage than otherwise. It is a great advantage if those men remained long enough in the force to be trained. The great German general, Count Von Moltke, has said that if you cannot make a soldier of any man in three years, the sooner you get rid of him the better; and the military authorities in England have recommended that the men in these forces should be engaged for periods of from three to five years—not for a longer time,—and that the object of a force of this kind, where there is no standing army, should be to give three or four years' training. The honorable and learned member for Mudjee shakes his head; but I am not giving my own opinion; I am giving that of the ablest officers in England.

Mr. BUCHANAN: The short-service system is condemned!

Mr. STUART: Not as regards the colonies, where only a small force can be maintained. The object should be to keep the men in the force long enough to acquaint them with the military art, and to accustom them to military discipline. They should then be replaced by others.

The latest report on the subject recommends that this course should be pursued, and that what is called a reserve force should be formed under which men who have been trained their full time should receive a sort of retaining fee of £20 a year subject to their making their appearance two or three times a year. By this means we should get a body of men scattered throughout the various walks of life throughout the country who would be ready for service whenever a demand should be made upon them. If the thousand men referred to have been properly trained, we are accomplishing the very thing which the military authorities in England recommend. As regards the various degrees of punishment to an outsider, they seem rather startling, startling in their degree and startling in their inequality; but no one knows better than the honorable and learned member for Mudjee that no one can judge as to the fitness of a sentence in any particular case unless he knows all the circumstances of the case, but the circumstances are not given in the return. It appears startling that one man for "desertion and making away with kit" should get sixty-eight days whilst another for the same offence should receive a sentence of 252 days, and be discharged with ignominy at the end of that period. To the casual observer the two offences seem precisely the same, but what are the surrounding circumstances? One may have been a first offence, and the other may have been a repeated offence. In one case the offender may have been a young man who has been led away by others; in the other the offender may have been a ringleader. We are not in a position to judge, therefore, whether the sentences have been rightly proportioned or not. I think that the honorable member for Mudjee, Mr. A. G. Taylor, made a mistake in saying that the officers are both the judge and jury. I am not very well acquainted with military law or practice, but I always understood that in a court-martial the officers who heard the case reported the matter to the commanding officer, who assigned the punishment.

Sir JOHN ROBERTSON: Those who try are not the accusers!

Mr. STUART: They surely cannot be the accusers, the jury, and the judges!

Mr. A. G. TAYLOR: Some prosecute and others are the jury!

Mr. STUART: Surely the honorable member does not wish us to believe that all those officers conspire together to crush down any man who is brought up, and that they make up their minds to give sentence against a man merely on the evidence of his accuser! Surely they go into the evidence!

Mr. A. G. TAYLOR: I mean that it is unsafe to give this power to them without a jury!

Mr. STUART: Of course; there is a difference between military and civil trials. In a civil trial a man is brought up for contravening a law against society. In a military court offences are dealt with which would not be regarded offences in a civil court; yet they are crimes in a military sense. In a military court disobedience of orders is just as great a crime as many a serious offence against society for which a man is tried in a civil court. Who knows what disobedience might lead to? It is of the very essence of military life that authority must reside in those in whom it is placed; and those who receive orders must yield implicit obedience. They must not stop to question; they must go and do. Disobedience, therefore, is a serious crime. What I think would tend very much to clear up the matter would be to ascertain what is the state of the corps as compared with a similar body of men in the imperial service.

Sir JOHN ROBERTSON: It is a great deal better!

Mr. STUART: That is just one of the points which ought to be cleared up. It will not do to compare the number of charges made against a body of military men with those brought against an equal number of civilians. It will be found that nine-tenths of the charges in the list are charges unknown to our civil courts. There is one, "Improperly dressed." That is a breach of the regulations which is punishable in a body of military men. But who dares to charge any one in civil life with being improperly dressed unless he is indecently dressed? So long as he complies with decency what business is it of any man how he dresses? It is different, however, in military life. It is the same with nine-tenths of the charges made; they are petty charges as compared with charges made in civil life. I cannot say that the punishments seem petty; on the

[*Mr. Stuart.*

contrary, they seem in many cases to be severe. How far experience has shown a necessity for severe sentences I do not know, but it would tend very much to clear away many of the mists which surround the matter if any one could give us the experience of military life elsewhere. But I join issue with both honorable members with regard to the efficiency of the force. I do not know that either of the honorable members are better judges than I am, and I confess I know nothing at all about it; but I take the evidence of those who know. Many officers of the highest ability and of European reputation, who have visited the colony of late years, have critically examined into the condition of the force, notably a distinguished officer from India, of high rank, and belonging to the same branch of service, namely, the artillery, and in his report on our small force he speaks of it in the very highest terms. And so with many other officers from England who have visited us. The force is small, but the training of the members, the work they perform, their precision, and the ability with which they carry out their various duties, have been spoken of in the very highest terms of commendation by those well qualified to give an opinion. I am not aware that any one of these officers has ever visited us without bearing favourable testimony with regard to our military force. Of course I quite understand those who ridicule all idea of our being prepared for any emergency wishing to do away with the force, and, after it, all our volunteers and every means of defence we have. There is a certain logical consistency in that. The honorable and learned member for Mudgee, I believe, considers that it would be far better not to make any defensive preparations at all, not to look so far ahead as to see that a time of danger from without may come. The honorable member holds these two opinions: that we ought to be altogether independent of England, and that England ought to defend us.

Mr. BUCHANAN: Hear, hear! while we are connected; if we were separated, you would see what sort of an army I would support!

Mr. STUART: The honorable member will no doubt be at the head of the gallant band who, after our separation from the

mother country, will take care of themselves. But while our connection with England continues—and long may it continue—and long may it be our part merely to prepare against the evil day,—I believe England will not withhold her help; but we should be in a poor position if we had to say to her, “We have shut our eyes to this fact; you warned us that a day of evil would come; but we were so engrossed in amassing money that we have neglected all preparations; our forts have been dismantled or have been left a prey to any marauders who may attack us; for heaven’s sake send us some help!” Would not England be more ready to help us if we had done whatever we could for our own protection, even if it were little so long as it had been done under the direction of officers in whom she herself had confidence? I hope that this discussion may have the effect of working some reformation and improvement in the force, in making it more efficient and more an object of desire for young men whom I should like to see attached to it, as the honorable member for Mudjee advocates.

Mr. R. H. D. WHITE: I am aware that great difficulties exist in connection with the management of our defence forces. I can remember the time when the Imperial Government furnished us with troops, which were afterwards withdrawn because we declined to provide for their maintenance, and we were consequently left to our own resources. Our position is a very peculiar one. We do not know the day or the hour when we may be called upon to defend ourselves, and what we have to consider is how far we shall have to depend on our own resources, and how far we may rely on the assistance of England. In the management of our force we have adopted the finest system of military discipline in the world, that of England; but if the regulations are considered stringent, or the punishments too severe, they may be modified. My opinion is that many of the regulations are very severe, and that they have been put in force occasionally with greater severity than the occasion demanded, although I am quite alive to the necessity for a strict maintenance of discipline. I am in favour of a militia force as preferable to either a purely volunteer or regular force, and formed by taking a certain proportion of

the population, as one in twenty, or thirty, or fifty, and compelling them to serve a certain time for the benefit of the country. And as we are maintaining a system of education at the public expense, I think the boys in our public schools should in addition to being properly drilled be compelled to serve so many weeks as some compensation for the advantages they receive in the shape of free education. Although I am of opinion that our defence forces need reorganisation, it is necessary to continue them in their present form for this year at any rate, and until whatever changes may be determined on can be effected. At the last encampment I had a good opportunity to observe the working of our volunteer force, and though I do not speak as a man who has had military experience, but simply as one who was a captain of volunteers for some years, I can say that I never saw military movements better executed. The same opinion was expressed by others well qualified to judge. I think, therefore, that the volunteers are deserving of consideration and support; but at the same time I should like to see the force reorganised on a different basis. As we are at present situated, we do not know when we may be brought into a scrimmage with the French in consequence of their prisoners coming upon our shores, and it is becoming on our part, therefore, to do all that we can to place our defences on a satisfactory footing.

Mr. BURDEKIN: I have no intention to vote in a way contrary to that in which I voted the other night on this subject; but I think that if the honorable member for Mudjee (Mr. A. G. Taylor) had made the same speech then as he did to-night he would probably have obtained more support for his motion than that it received. I have not read the return he quoted, and was astonished at some of the disclosures the honorable member read to the House. It seems that for some offences, which people in civil life look upon as trivial, sentences for a whole year are awarded. In some instances for very light offences there are sentences of two and three months’ incarceration. If you want to get in this country a force that will be content to remain in military service, and be a credit to us, some course must be taken to mete out punishments for offences

more in accordance with the judgment of the people. Discipline must be maintained in every force; men must not run counter to instructions. But we must recollect that we have a very independent spirited people to deal with, who would naturally feel military control burdensome, and we must not look at every trivial offence as serious. I think this discussion will do a great deal of good. If, however, we are to induce the best class of men to remain in the force, we shall have to alter very much the system of punishment. The honorable member for Mudgee (Mr. A. G. Taylor) said that while over 1,000 men have passed through the ranks, only 300 remain; but I do not look upon that as showing that the force has been unsuccessful, considering that a new force had to be established, that it has been in existence thirteen years, and that the period of service being five years it has terminated at two or three different times, and many men have been disbanded. As we do not expect within any short time to be called upon to keep up a large standing army it is not an advantage to our citizens to make them so thoroughly soldiers as not to be able to do the ordinary duties of citizenship. Punishments by court-martial have been awarded in 375 cases, which seems a large number. It must, however, be recollected that the men from whom the corps were formed were unfitted by their previous undertakings to submit to severe discipline, and no doubt they rebelled when they first came under it as it was hard for them to submit to; and so the courts-martial were numerous at first. But I think the apparently trivial charges upon which the men were severely punished would so disgust them as to lead many of them to desert. It must also be considered that although 1,000 men have passed through the ranks these have the advantage of being trained men. Some of them have served four or five years and others ten years; so that whenever the time comes to require their services they will pay us well for all they have cost us. In a country like this of general prosperity, and where wages in ordinary seasons are high, where men's industry and perseverance obtain large rewards, it is not surprising that you do not induce soldiers to keep in the ranks as in other countries, where the soldier's pay would be

[*Mr. Burdekin.*

considered better compared with the wages of ordinary labour. But take the force as a whole they are a credit to us, and I look upon them as the nucleus of a large force when it is required. I do not mean to say that I look upon the force as perfection, and what has been said this evening will, I hope, lead to an improvement, so that honorable members will be better satisfied when another return is put before us. I am persuaded that the resolution will not be carried; but I am also sure that the discussion it has evoked will do good.

Sir JOHN ROBERTSON: Before I offer any opinions of my own upon the necessity for a military force, I should like to show how adroitly the honorable member for Mudgee, Mr. A. G. Taylor, has succeeded in throwing dust in the eyes of the House with regard to the existing force. The honorable member said that 1,089 members had been enlisted, and there were only 307 in the ranks now. One would suppose from this that all the others had left after enlisting. Nothing of the kind. How many times have these 307 been counted in the 1,089? The fact is, that in order to induce the men to remain, they obtained better terms. This, I have no doubt, has led many of the men to enlist two or three times, which would reduce the number of those who are set down as having enlisted very considerably. There is another matter to be considered. One reason why there are only 307 remaining is because there is provision made for only 300 men. One would consequently have thought that these 1,089, which the honorable member speaks of, would not have existed together at any time in the force. Some of them were enlisted three times. Those who have served three or five years received extra pay if they remained; but some of them preferred to do something better than soldiering. It is not a very choice occupation. In the old country when a young man is fit for nothing else he enlists for a soldier. This gets rid of the complaint the honorable member made about the small number now and the large number who have enlisted. Now as to what ought to be done with this force. The honorable and learned member for Mudgee (Mr. Buchanan) I know is opposed to all military forces, therefore he is perfectly consistent in the course he is now pursuing. But why should the over-

burdened tax-payers in England pay for defending us? I should be ashamed to lay down such a doctrine, and the honorable member himself would be ashamed of it, but that he is a republican. His whole speech was republican in character, and he would make no provision for our defence. But suppose he is a republican, and wishes that we should one day set up for ourselves with that form of government, it is preposterous to think that we should need no defence. We must have soldiers. The great republic of the United States, which I suppose will be our model, does not do without soldiers, and their military regulations are much more stringent than those under the Queen's Government. I suppose, then, that when the honorable member is president of an Australian republic he will have an army like that of America in which punishments are more severe than in that of the Queen. What are these regulations which the honorable member for Mudjee, Mr. A. G. Taylor, exhibited with so much unction? Why they simply provide that this force shall be brought under certain rules called the articles of war. Those articles are not made for this force, they are the regulations provided for the British army. Does the honorable member think that he knows what is necessary and right better than the great soldiers of the empire—what are proper regulations for a military force? He never reached a position in the force high enough to know much about internal organisation, or so as to be a better judge than the great officers of the empire who provided these regulations. They seem to me to be very strict indeed; but I am no judge of this kind of matter. But the honorable member put the question over and over again whether we were to have in this "new, young, and free country" regulations like these. Why not? If they are necessary for military organisation and discipline in any country, why not as necessary in this "new, free, and young country" as anywhere else? Does he not know that in this "new, free, and young country" men are not allowed to take liberties with women in the streets. Why not deal with them as he likes, or take any one's property he likes, in this "new, young, and free country?" Men here require restrictions as much as any where else. The talk, then, about this "new,

young, and free country" is all claptrap. There is no man in the House I like to hear better than the honorable member when he is moderate; but the position he took with regard to this force was ridiculous. We have by the will of Parliament gone to great expense in providing batteries for the protection of our city. Are we to have a force to keep these batteries in order, or are we to spike the guns, disband our force, and open our gates to every ruffian fillibuster who may come here and say to him, "Take what you like, do what you like, we are cowards and incapable of defending ourselves." Is that the state of things which the honorable member would like in this "new, young, and free country?" I hope that this young and free country will guard its rights and liberties against fillibusters—against all manner of people who may chose to come here for plunder. It is not respectable, it is not decent for people in our position to be entirely without means of defence. How would my honorable colleague (Mr. A. G. Taylor) like it if some ruffianly fillibuster were to come here and carry off his sister before his eyes? We ought to be ashamed of ourselves for talking about not wanting means of defence. My honorable colleague objects to the military force altogether. This is singular, seeing that he was once a member of the force; he must have been an egregious enthusiast to join the force; I was never such an enthusiast. The honorable member spoke very unfairly about the officers of the force. I venture to say that there is not a word of truth in any allegation which has ever been made, that any political influence was used to secure the appointment of any of these officers. I know that it is not true. Nearly all the officers were appointed when I was Colonial Secretary, and I have seen the papers setting forth the grounds on which they were appointed. I know that the greatest care was taken to obtain the services of none but men who had the highest qualifications; invariably this was so. The position of subaltern was kept vacant for months owing to the difficulty of finding a person sufficiently up in military business to take an appointment of the kind. I happen to know that the gentleman who occupies the position of subaltern had very high credentials.

He was appointed in defiance of the opposition of the colonel. It seemed to me that the gentleman had better qualifications for the position than any other of the applicants for it, and the proof of this is the fact that when an examination took place the colonel was obliged to give him the highest praise. He is a captain now. These facts show that there never was any personal feeling or political influence in connection with the appointments. I was surprised to hear my honorable colleague (Mr. A. G. Taylor) say that the force is an inferior one. I was not surprised at anything my other colleague (Mr. Buchanan) said, because he usually raves at all military forces. The martial ardour of my honorable colleague (Mr. A. G. Taylor) was so strong that he was induced to join the force, and I think it is very unfair for him to run down his old comrades, and say that they are an incapable body of men. I have heard military authorities, who have seen the best forces of the world, speak in the highest terms of our artillery force. A finer lot of young men could not be found in any service in any part of the world.

Mr. A. G. TAYLOR: They are never together for more than a year!

Sir JOHN ROBERTSON: The fact is that the young men will not join the force for a long period. The flower of the young men of this "new, young, and free country" do not like to be tied down to military service for a long period; some retire at the end of four years' service; some desert, and some pay £20 to be allowed to retire. There is nothing in the fact that the men do not remain in the force. No one can dispute the fact that we have as good an artillery force as there is in all the world; the real fault of the force is that there is not enough men in it. My honorable colleague complains of the court-martial system. If there is anything unsatisfactory about the force, it is this system, the reason being the smallness of the number of officers from whom the court has to be selected. If there were more officers for the purpose of court-martial, it would be much more satisfactory. I was surprised at my honorable colleague alleging that the same people were the accusers, the judges, and the jury. The honorable member knew that such was not the case; he must have

[*Sir John Robertson.*

known that an officer who makes a charge against a man cannot sit on the court-martial.

Mr. A. G. TAYLOR: I did not say that he could!

Sir JOHN ROBERTSON: The honorable member said that those who made the charges became the judges and the jury and dealt with the unfortunate individuals. That is not the case. These officers are just as distinct in their feelings towards each other as are my two honorable colleagues. No one will accuse my honorable colleagues of running together, or of having any sympathy with each other. It would be just as reasonable to make such an accusation against these officers. They are just as distinct, as watchful, as jealous, I might almost say as unfair, with respect to each other, as are my honorable colleagues respecting each other. The officers having nothing to do with each other; they are men of honor and gentlemen. When they sit in court-martial they are sworn to do what is just, and in no way can any one of them have anything to do with any case in which he has made the charge. I do not know whether it is or is not necessary to have such stringent regulations in force; I am not a sufficiently good judge on the subject to express an opinion respecting it. The regulations seem to me to be very severe; but that is not what we are dealing with now. It is not proposed that the articles of war shall be considered with a view to their modification, but that the force shall be disbanded. Not a word has been uttered in justification of such a proceeding. An effort has been made to show that the regulations require amendment.

Mr. A. G. TAYLOR: The Colonial Secretary has promised to consider the matter!

Sir JOHN ROBERTSON: I would not give a halfpenny for the Colonial Secretary's promise; I do not think that he pretends to know anything about military matters. At any rate he will not vote for the motion, but my honorable colleague will do so, and on entirely different grounds from those on which the mover of the motion founded it. My honorable colleague (Mr. A. G. Taylor) cannot vote for the motion on the ground that he is opposed to a military force being in existence, because we know that

in the exuberance of his young nature he made himself probable food for powder and shot. There are some matters in connection with the force which are in a very unsatisfactory state; there is a state of things which would not be allowed to exist in any other country—I refer to the fact of the non-appointment of a captain, notwithstanding that the position has been vacant for four years. I do not see any ground on which this can be justified, seeing that four officers who are candidates for the position have passed a far more stringent examination than is ever exacted in England. Why is it that not one of these officers has been considered fit for the position?

MR. STUART: The honorable member's Government did not take any action in the matter!

SIR JOHN ROBERTSON: The honorable member does me an injustice. If he will look at the papers, he will see that I wrote a minute on the subject.

MR. STUART: I did not refer to the honorable member. I said "the honorable member's Government."

SIR JOHN ROBERTSON: In my minute I put the whole matter straight. Mr. Arthur Le Patourel applied for the position, although he was one of the gentlemen who failed to pass the necessary examination. The objection made to the appointment of one of the four officers who passed the examination was that the examination was not strict enough, yet although it was not strict enough one of the gentlemen who failed to pass it was recommended to me for appointment to the position. This is the minute which I wrote:

It seems to me extraordinary that such an application as that alluded to in the accompanying paper could possibly come before me, recommended for approval by two officers holding positions respectively of such importance as Colonels Roberts and Spalding hold.

I have conferred with Colonel Christie, Colonel Spalding, and Colonel Scratchley, and lastly with his Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, and have gathered that four officers passed the qualifying examination hitherto held necessary before appointment as captain, with the exception of its final approval by his Excellency the Commander-in-Chief and by the Colonial Secretary; but that the officer whose marks, &c., stood highest was objected to on grounds peculiar to himself, and that it was considered undesirable to promote either of the other three officers whose marks were sufficiently high otherwise to warrant it on the ground, as I understand,

that the subjects on which they were examined were not sufficiently difficult for the object desired.

Mr. Arthur Le Patourel, the officer now recommended for a captaincy, was not able, as I understand, to pass even the insufficient or too easy examination alluded to.

No one can say that the three officers who did pass it so far could not have passed a more severe examination, yet none of them, it seems, have been considered fit, while an officer not able to pass is "most strongly recommended." Surely I cannot with propriety be asked to pass over three officers, who, so far as I know, are unobjectionable in conduct, in favour of an officer whose conduct is, I understand, equally unobjectionable, but who has not, as they have shown themselves by examination, to be equal to the qualification hitherto considered sufficient!

I should like to receive promptly a further report on this matter, and a statement why one of the three officers who were found equal to the standard hitherto considered sufficient for a captaincy was not recommended.

Then we have a long letter from the acting commandant to the Principal Under-Secretary. This officer unquestionably takes the part of the three officers who passed the examination. To that letter I appended this minute:

The period of the absence of Sir Henry Parkes from the colony is so near its close that I am unwilling to do other than leave the matter with him.

The acting commandant certainly did not recommend that the three gentlemen who had passed the examination should be passed over.

MR. STUART: He suggested that a new examination should be held!

SIR JOHN ROBERTSON: That was an alternative course. He made two other proposals, I believe. Here is his minute:

With reference to the Colonial Secretary's minute of the 12th instant, calling on me to state the best course to be pursued with regard to the captaincy now vacant in the permanent artillery, I have the honor, bearing in mind the fact that the law on the subject would appear to bar the promotion of any subaltern who is not at once qualified by examination and by favourable report as to his fitness, to report that there seem to be three courses open: the first, to uphold the decision arrived at with reference to the last examination and direct the assembly of a fresh board of examination at the end of such a period (say, from three to six months) as will give all the subaltern officers of the corps an ample and equal opportunity for study, and after the receipt of the report of such board give the step to the senior who passes and is in other respects considered eligible; the second, to hold the examination of October, 1880, to be good, and promote at once the senior officer then reported qualified by the board who was at the same time in other respects considered fitted for

advancement, namely, Lieutenant H. P. Airey. The third course would be, while again holding the proceedings of the board assembled in October, 1880, to be good, to now, on the ground of the lapse of time, *reconsider* the personal eligibility of the subaltern officers whom the board reported to have qualified, and for this purpose call on the officer commanding the permanent artillery to furnish a fresh report with reference to the conduct and qualifications of the four officers referred to, in view of giving the vacancy to the senior who may now be considered unobjectionable.

The commandant upon his return to the colony very properly said, "If I am to be censured in this matter, let me be suspended, and let an inquiry be held." There is no question in my mind that a mistake was made by the Colonial Secretary of the late Government some two or three years ago; but is that any reason why the present Government should perpetuate the mistake? Of what use are changes of government if everything which has been hitherto done is to remain unchanged? Is it right that the permanent force should remain uncontrolled by the proper number of officers? If there was not a man in the force fit for appointment to the rank of captain, surely some one should have been appointed from elsewhere? Is it right that the three gentlemen who passed the examination, and against whom nothing can be said, should rest under the ban of inefficiency. They have passed an examination which I allege is a stricter examination than is passed in England.

MR. STUART: Why did you not appoint one of them?

SIR JOHN ROBERTSON: That has nothing to do with the matter; but even suppose I had made a mistake, is the honorable gentleman going to continue in office for an indefinite period without correcting an error into which the late Government fell?

MR. STUART: It is difficult to understand where the error is!

SIR JOHN ROBERTSON: It is quite plain to me where it was made; it was made when a determination was arrived at.

MR. STUART: It was made in not appointing Lieutenant Baynes, I think!

SIR JOHN ROBERTSON: That may be. I was nearly saying the same thing. The error was made in not appointing one of the four officers who passed the ex-

amination. It seems to me that other things being equal the highest of these four officers in the examination should have been appointed. It is true that there was a charge against him; I do not know that it was an important one; but it would seem that from a military point of view it was a reason why he should not receive the appointment. But what was there against the other three officers who passed the examination? The late Government made a great mistake in not appointing one of these gentlemen; and if I had filled the position of Acting Colonial Secretary for another month one of them would have been appointed. My honorable friend came into office to correct the abuses and mistakes of a long-time Government, and if he thinks that Lieutenant Baynes should have received this appointment, why did he not give it to him before now? If it is right, let it be done; if it is not right, let something else be done. There are several propositions before us. One is that if we are to have a permanent force at all we should have a well-officered force; and if there is not a man in the force who is competent to be appointed to the rank of captain, surely some one else who is competent can be found. At the time the mistake to which I have referred was made the Colonial Secretary of the late Government had a great deal of public business upon his hands; he was engaged in passing through this House many important measures; and he had at the same time to contend with ill health. The Colonial Secretary, however, says that he knows what ought to have been done—that Lieutenant Baynes ought to have been appointed.

MR. STUART: I did not say so positively!

SIR JOHN ROBERTSON: There is no getting out of this position: that if Lieutenant Baynes is not fitted for the appointment some one else is fitted for it. The Government could have obtained a gentleman from England three or four times over in the time they have had at their disposal. Why should our permanent force be made the laughing-stock of all the other colonies? Surely we ought not to be placed in this position: that four officers have passed the necessary examination, and that not one of them can obtain the vacant captaincy. The late Govern-

[*Sir John Robertson.*]

ment have been accused of doing wrong in regard to many matters, and in these matters the present Government have thought it well to take different action; why do they not correct the mistake made by the late Government in this particular instance? It is about four years since the vacancy occurred, and that is rather too long a period for the captaincy to remain vacant.

MR. STUART: Your Government ordered the examination to take place in February, 1881!

SIR JOHN ROBERTSON: The Government ordered nothing of the kind. The matter never came before the Government as a government. The Minister charged with that duty ordered the examination. I do not want to find fault with him; but he certainly made a mistake. The Colonial Secretary points out the mistake, yet he will not correct it. The Government have had ample time to deal with the matter. They have had a seven months' recess, and in the course of that time they could surely have made this appointment. The senior lieutenant now takes the position of captain. He may be a very excellent man; but I do not think he was one of those who passed the examination. I do not think honorable members are justified in railing at our permanent force. Having regard to its size, I think it is one of the best forces in the world. With the exception of my honorable colleague, Mr. Buchanan, no honorable member has attempted to show that the force is not required. My honorable colleague, Mr. A. G. Taylor, did not say so. He merely endeavoured to show that it was inefficient. I believe that the force is efficient. I believe that Colonel Roberts is a first-class soldier; but it never can be conceded that an officer in his position should be allowed to rule the roost. Would a captaincy in a British regiment be allowed to remain vacant in consequence of some preference on the part of the colonel? I think Colonel Roberts and Colonel Spalding are very much to blame for trying to induce the Government to appoint Lieutenant Le Patourel, who had not passed the examination. I am satisfied that Colonel Richardson and Lieutenant-colonel Christie are entitled to one of two things: that the censure upon them should be withdrawn, or that they should be suspended pending an inquiry.

I hope the Colonial Secretary will see his way clear to appoint a captain forthwith.

MR. GARVAN: Though I do not see my way clear to vote for the resolution I still have entire sympathy with the mover of it, and also with some of those gentlemen who have supported it. I see growing up in this young country a tendency towards the establishment of a strong military organisation, which, unless it is put down with a firm hand—unless there is a strong expression of disapproval on the part of the representatives of the people—will grow to be as great a burden on the people as the large military organisations are in Europe. If there is one thing more than another which is grinding the vitality out of the nations of Europe, it is the maintenance of their immense military organisations. The circumstances of Europe render it absolutely compulsory. They are compelled to live under that tyranny, under the weight of a heavy taxation, whether they wish it or not; but in this young colony, with no neighbours except friends, there is no necessity for the establishment of a military organisation. As a protection against foreign invasion it is an absurdity. During the time of our infancy until now, if there had been any intention on the part of our enemies to invade this country, they could have done it with impunity. But there is a greater, a stronger, and a more effectual protection than that. We have been able to establish a sense of right and justice throughout the world, which has been our strongest protection in the past, and which has every year become more and more operative. One of the evils which will result, if we encourage this military spirit, will be that rival colonies will do the same; and if there is one thing more than another which will divide the colonies it is the keeping up of rival military organisations, and so surely will the influence of this organisation be felt in the taxation of the country. Military men, perhaps perfectly honest in themselves, tell us that it is absolutely necessary to the wellbeing of the country to magnify our military establishments, but if there is one curse which more than another threatens the colony it is the growth of the military system. It would be unwise to wipe it out altogether. I should like to see the military spirit encouraged. I should like to

see the children drilled in connection with our public school system, so that our youths could grow up with all the training necessary to make their services available should they ever be required. I do not believe that during the lifetime of this generation there will be any danger of a foreign invasion, though the dread of it is sometimes very greatly magnified. It is done with perfect honesty, and with some show of argument, but I believe it is based upon a supposition which is never likely to be realised. We are told by a great authority—Sir John Robertson—that the motion is not decent; but I can see no want of decency in it at all—the very reverse. There has been a little too much blame thrown on the officers. I blame neither the officers nor the men. They are the result of the system, and if any one is to blame it is the legislature. Even if I decided as a matter of policy to wipe out the system altogether, I would do it in a fair and legitimate manner; not in any spirit of temper, but with more calmness and deliberation than are shown at present. I should like to see a committee appointed to inquire carefully into the whole matter,—perhaps not at present—there is no time for it,—but at some future period. I should hope that the result of the deliberations of the committee would be to show us that this military organisation in its present magnitude is not necessary. I do not think that the strict discipline which has been enforced is necessary or even wise here. The circumstances of this country are undoubtedly different, although the statement has been sneered at, from those of England, where the military rules enforced here have been established. Where these rules have been in force the very fact of a man being in humble circumstances rendered him unfit to lead British soldiers. Every officer had to buy his position. I do not think any one will maintain that such a rule as that ought to exist here. However, I do not see my way clear to vote for the resolution as it is now proposed. I think it is too drastic a proposal. The persons who hold positions in the force hold them by virtue of the determinations of the Assembly, and it would not be fair to wipe them out at once. I, however, felt it necessary to state generally what my views on the subject were.

[*Mr. Garvan.*

Mr. BUCHANAN, in reply: The honorable member for Mudgee, Sir John Robertson, speaks very facetiously about the principles of republicanism; but if I hold those principles I am in good company. I have a prodigious body of the world with me; and, furthermore, two of the most brilliant members of the Government of England, of which Mr. Gladstone is the Premier, and Mr. John Bright, a republican also, are in favour of the principles which I have been advocating here. If England holds the colonies under her sway, England is bound to protect them. What would be thought of France if she did not protect New Caledonia? She has regiments of soldiers there. I maintain that it is the duty of England to provide us with defences; and we have no such duty to perform as long as we maintain the British connection. The honorable member for Mudgee, Sir John Robertson, defended our military system; but what is the system which he defends? It consists of a few hundred men, and, during the few years it has been established, no less than 398 men have been court-martialled, and 386 desertions have occurred. Here is a spectacle of an army or a body of militia! When the honorable member defends this force he is standing on the rottenest possible ground, and he himself gave an illustration which is utterly damning to the system. He has launched upon it a more perfect condemnation than any one else has. He has shown that an officer who failed to pass a very simple examination has been recommended by two of the officers to be promoted over the heads of four other officers who had passed the examination.

Sir JOHN ROBERTSON: We never appointed him, though!

Mr. BUCHANAN: I do not care who appointed him. We are condemning the mismanagement, the misgovernment, the infamous procedure that has gone on from the first in connection with this force. Does any one want any more facts than these to plunge the whole system head and ears into perdition and infamy? I should like to know what there is in all this talk of the honorable member for Mudgee? He is the latest condemner of the system which he professes to defend. All we say is that the papers disclose such a frightful state of disorganisation

and disorder that no man with any sense or reason can do anything short of condemning it. There is no purgatory of opinion on this subject; nothing short of utter damnation will do. The thing is monstrous. The honorable member for Eden is quite with us in condemning the system, but he is nervous, and afraid to attack it. If a diseased limb is mortifying, and you hesitate to amputate it, the most serious consequence may follow. If you want to save the system, do away with this force, and establish some other. The honorable member for Eden ought to vote with us, because the system is utterly rotten and beyond all improvement. There is no other course but to abolish it.

Question put, whereupon the House divided with the following result:—

| | | |
|------------|----|-----------------|
| Ayes | 7 | } Majority, 25. |
| Noes | 32 | |

AYES.

| | |
|----------------|-----------------|
| Buchanan, D. | Vaughn, R. M. |
| Proctor, W. C. | <i>Tellers,</i> |
| Stokes, A. | Targett, W. S. |
| Sutherland, J. | Taylor, A. G. |

NOES.

| | |
|------------------|---------------------|
| Abbott, J. P. | Mitchell, J. |
| Burns, J. F. | Olliffe, J. B. |
| Burdekin, S. | O'Mara, T. C. |
| Cameron, A. | Poole, W. T. |
| Chapman, M. | Robertson, Sir John |
| Cohen, H. E. | Smith, S. |
| Combes, E. | Stuart, A. |
| Copeland, H. | Teece, W. |
| Dibbs, G. R. | Trickett, W. J. |
| Farnell, J. S. | Wisdom, R. |
| Fremlin, A. R. | Withers, G. |
| Gibbes, F. J. | Wright, F. A. |
| Griffiths, G. N. | Young, J. H. |
| Hammond, M. J. | |
| Machattie, R. R. | <i>Tellers,</i> |
| McCulloch, A. H. | Garvan, J. P. |
| Merriman, G. | Stephen, S. A. |

Question so resolved in the negative.

RAILWAY TO OBERON.

Mr. TARGETT rose to move:

That the survey of the proposed light line of railway to Oberon should be resumed as early as convenient.

He said: This survey was partly carried out some months back; but for some mysterious reason known probably to the Minister for Works, the surveyor was withdrawn without any explanation being given to the people of the district. Nothing has been said as to when the line will be carried out. The district is one of the

most important on the western line, and it is high time that it received accommodation in the shape of a light railway or a tramway. I am aware that the system of constructing feeders has not so far proved a great success; but I do not think that we should condemn the whole system because of one or two failures. The district of Oberon is a fine agricultural district as well as a prosperous pastoral country, and I do not suppose that there are such magnificent forests of timber in any other parts of the colony, and exploration has shown that those forests might be tapped by a line following the Dividing Range. Owing to the severity of the climate in winter, it is difficult for a large number of settlers to get their produce to the western railway. A short railway of 12 or 16 miles would remove this great disadvantage, and at the same time open up one of the best districts of the colony. In spite of the great drought feed and water have been abundant there all through the present season. I do not intend to speak at any length on the subject, as I have been informed that the Government do not intend to offer any opposition to the motion.

Question proposed.

Mr. WRIGHT: I merely rise to say that the Government have no objection to the survey proposed by the honorable member being carried out, though what action they may take subsequently is a different matter.

Mr. S. SMITH: I am glad the Minister for Works has consented to make the survey. As honorable members are aware, Oberon is close to the Fish River Caves, which are among the finest natural objects in the world.

Mr. COMBES: I can bear testimony to all that the honorable member for Hartley has said with reference to the quality of the land in the Oberon district. I do not think it is possible to find a better description of country for the growth of certain cereals and vegetables. It is very heavily timbered; but when once it has been cleared the land is of excellent quality. A road is certainly very necessary; and, as I hold that the best—and in the end the cheapest—road is a railway, I think that a light line of railway might be constructed with advantage to open up this large and valuable district.

Mr. POOLE: I feel that it is ungracious on the part of any honorable member to oppose the making of a survey; but whatever may be the merits of this particular line, I think in view of the startling fact that all our light lines of railway have been unmistakable failures, we ought to be careful before we sanction the construction of any additional ones. The lines from Blacktown to Windsor, and from Campbelltown to Camden, it is well known, do not pay working expenses.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

VOLUNTEER CORPS.

Mr. STOKES rose to move:

(1.) That in the opinion of this House all applications coming from incorporated towns for the enrolment of volunteer corps under the Volunteer Force Regulation Act of 1867 should be accepted by the Government, provided the application is supported by the signatures of eighty men who are eligible and willing to join in the formation of the corps named in their respective applications.

(2.) That the foregoing resolution be communicated by address to his Excellency the Governor.

He said: I have been induced to bring this resolution forward by observation of the fact that all applications for the enrolment of volunteer corps in country towns meet with opposition in the brigade office, so that without some such expression of opinion on the part of the House as the motion will convey there is no hope of getting volunteer corps enrolled in country towns. I do not, by this motion, propose the inauguration of any new system, but wish simply to give effect to the 5th section of the Volunteer Act of 1867, which provides:

It shall be lawful for the Governor on behalf of her Majesty to accept the services of any persons desiring to be formed under this act into a volunteer corps whether naval or military and offering their services to the Governor through the officer commanding the volunteer force. And on such acceptance the proposed corps shall be deemed to be lawfully formed into a corps under this act as a corps of that force.

One would imagine that all applications made for permission to form volunteer corps would be at once complied with by the Colonial Secretary; but many applications have been refused because the brigade office has reported against them. I submit, however, that by the establishment of these country corps we should incur no further expense, while the

numerical strength of our defence force would be greatly increased. We have eighty-one incorporated towns outside the county of Cumberland, of which sixteen have volunteer corps enrolled, leaving sixty-five yet to make application. Assuming that the whole of these had volunteer corps, the total number of volunteers enrolled would be 5,460. But the most sanguine supporter of the volunteer system could not expect the whole of these sixty-one towns to claim the privileges of enrolment within the next ten years, and I have, therefore, selected twenty-one towns as likely to make application during the next three years. These are: Albury, Armidale, Grafton, Tamworth, Wallsend, Wagga Wagga, Young, Carcoar, Bourke, Dubbo, Forbes, Glen Innes, Grenfell, Hay, Inverell, Molong, Muswellbrook, Parkes, Penrith, Waratah, and Wellington. Assuming that volunteer corps will be formed in these twenty-one towns during the next three years, the result will be an addition to our defensive strength of 1,764 men at a cost of £21,168, or 5½d. per head of our population. Six corps have been formed under the present Government at the following towns, namely, Kiama, Mudgee, Morpeth, East Maitland, Singleton, Ulladulla, and Bulli. I have no doubt the Honorable the Colonial Secretary will justify the formation of five corps in the northern and coast districts, as against one in the western and one in the southern district; but I defy the honorable gentleman to justify the formation of a corps at Bulli, a town of 600 inhabitants, when he has refused applications from such towns as Grafton, with 3,891 inhabitants; Albury, with 5,715; Dubbo, 3,199; Tamworth, 4,700; Young, 2,600; and many others, which were important towns before the barren hills of Bulli were ever known to the speculators who have established a colliery there. The passing of the motion would place the matter of the formation of country volunteer corps on a satisfactory basis instead of leaving it dependent, as at present, on the caprice of a minister. A great deal of antagonism exists between the permanent and the volunteer forces, and you might as well try to mix oil and water as unite the two. The twenty-one corps which I have assumed will be formed within the next three years if the motion passes will

increase our volunteer force by 1,764 men, making a total strength of 4,091. This number, at £15 per head, would involve an expenditure of £61,365, as against the present expenditure of £85,093; that is to say, under a purely volunteer system we should have 1,385 more than we have at present, with a saving of £23,728 upon our present expenditure. I have taken £15 as the cost per head, only one-half of which, however, is paid to the volunteer, the remainder being allowed for clothing and departmental and other expenses. I hope the House will see the necessity of adopting the motion, seeing that it will have the effect not of inaugurating any new system, but of giving vitality to the 5th section of the act, under which section our volunteers are enrolled.

Question proposed.

Mr. STUART: I do not see how the House can agree to the motion which has been brought forward because the Government have for the present refused to accept the services tendered by certain gentlemen in Forbes, through the honorable member, for the establishment of a volunteer corps in that town. The question is entirely one of degree, as to how far the House is willing to go in the establishment of volunteer corps. A sum of money was voted on last year's Estimates for the formation of new corps, and about ten applications were received, one of them being from Forbes. The question then the Government had to determine was which of the proposed new corps would be likely to be most efficient. A corps established in any town remote from other towns where corps have been established is not only expensive in consequence of the difficulty of giving proper drill instruction, and so forth, but it is also weak in point of efficiency owing to its inability to work in concert with other corps. It is the amalgamation of corps into a regiment which causes individual corps to become thoroughly efficient. They may be efficient enough as regards drill and the peculiar duties belonging to members of a corps, but they are, from want of practice, inefficient for work in the field. They must work in concert with other corps. There are certain duties and movements and practice which can only be carried out in regiment or brigade. If there were corps in some parts of the

interior, it would be impossible to work with other corps in forming a regiment, and with other regiments a brigade. After consultation with the military authorities, the places to be preferred for establishing country corps appear to be those where, from proximity to or accessibility by railway or sea, the corps there could be made to work with other corps more easily than those established in isolated places. Of the various corps to which the honorable member alludes, some would be unable to work in regiment or brigade with other corps. It is quite possible that there may be less population in some of the places than at Forbes; but I think the honorable member is entirely out in his calculation with regard to Bulli. In Bulli proper there may be no more than 600 persons; but there are upwards of 400 miners there, and, therefore, there must be more than a population of 600 in the immediate neighbourhood. It happens to be divided into several villages in close contiguity, so that the population of the locality can scarcely be brought under one head. Accessibility to other corps would not only promote efficiency, but also lessen the expense. As to the funds available, the Government could go no further than the money voted admits of, therefore they could not accept the whole eight or ten corps who offered their services, because the outlay would have gone beyond the vote of Parliament, which, as the honorable member knows, is limited. I have told the honorable member that I should take an opportunity to test the views of the House as to the extent to which it was willing to extend the organisation of volunteer corps. Owing to some clerical error the additional amount was not put on the Estimates-in-Chief; but I may inform him that there will be put on the Additional Estimates a sum of money for the purpose of establishing other new corps. Whether the House will accede to that remains to be seen. It is arguable whether we ought to rush into further expenditure of this kind or go on by slow degrees only. The resolution, if carried, would pledge us to the support of twenty different new corps, and each one has as much right to be accepted as Forbes would have. Each corps costs the country about £1,700. It consists of from eighty to eighty-five members—in theory, 100. To

begin with the men have £12 apiece, and officers receive certain extras. Then there are the clothing and the arms, so that altogether a corps does not cost less than £1,700. Whether the House is prepared to add £30,000 to the cost of our volunteer arrangements and organisation I do not know; but I think I have misread the feeling of the House if I conceived that it is prepared to go to that extent. I think if we establish four or five corps each year that we are doing the utmost that can be expected, and all that can be considered wholesome for the country. Military authorities tell me that it is comparatively useless for a corps to work alone; to be of any value to the country they must work with other corps. If they could not reach others without considerable expense for a long land journey, what is to be done? When Forbes is united with the rest of the world by railway—as I hope shortly will be the case—probably it will be the proper time to accept the services tendered by the inhabitants there. It is meritorious in them to have tendered their services; but we want not the tender of services only, but the tender of services that can be made really efficient. It must be observed that if the resolution passes it will be immediately necessary to place a large sum of money on the Estimates for the purpose of carrying it into effect. I do not see that it would be wise or prudent at present to do so, and I cannot, therefore, give my assent to the resolution.

Mr. STOKES: Do I understand the honorable member to say that he will place a sum of money on the Estimates for a corps at Forbes?

Mr. STUART: I did not say so. I said an additional sum would have been placed on the Estimates-in-Chief, but by some clerical error it was omitted, and that I would place on the Additional Estimates a sum of £2,500, which will be sufficient for the formation of four additional corps during the remainder of the present year. As applications are made so they will be taken into consideration, and then if Forbes is found to be one of the best districts in which to establish a corps which can be worked efficiently it will be one of the four, but that will altogether depend on the reports which may be received. Suppose the House carried the vote, it will then be the duty of the Government

[*Mr. Stuart.*]

to apply to the commandant for a report on the relative advantages of the particular corps offering themselves. If Forbes is one of the best, it will be selected. If other places offer a better opportunity of profitably disposing of the money voted by the state, their claims cannot be overlooked.

Mr. POOLE: I am one of those who think the time has arrived when we are numerous and wealthy enough to protect ourselves; and I also think—and it is not a new idea—that our people generally ought to be encouraged—or if necessary a little gentle coercion used—to take up military duties. If it is worth while doing anything, it is worth while doing it well. Although I cannot agree with the mover in his desire to sweep away the Permanent Military Force, I think we ought to do what we can to popularise the volunteer force. I think it would be wise, too, that the bulk of the volunteer companies should not be raised along the coast lands. If we really want their aid, we should then feel and know that there are a number of country corps that we could fall back upon in case of reverses along the coast line. I agree with the Colonial Secretary that this is a question of money, but I think we can popularise the system of volunteering, and make it effective throughout the country if the House would afford the additional money required to carry out that view. I think some steps should be taken earnestly and systematically to enrol a far greater number of men than we have. Whether the present volunteer system is the best that we can have is a question I do not care to go into; but for reliance we should have a greater number of men trained to arms than we at present possess. Notwithstanding the counsel given to the Colonial Secretary by military authorities, of which he is head, we really have a serious danger to face, and our military force is not sufficient for effective defence. Although I do not agree with the honorable member for Forbes in his desire to sweep away the permanent force, I think his proposal would be a step in the right direction, and I intend to vote with him on the motion.

Mr. YOUNG: I also am in favour of keeping up the volunteer system, and even if we should never require it in self-defence, the principle deserves encourage-

ment. The drill improves the physique of our young men, and gives the best outlet for their energies that they can have ; and, generally, it improves society. But there seems to be a great deal of force in what has been said by the Colonial Secretary as to the formation of so many additional corps. I doubt whether, under present circumstances, the House would agree to establish twenty-one additional corps which, by the terms of this resolution, the honorable member for Forbes would have us undertake. If they were formed in one year, it would be an increase of cost for volunteers of fully £35,000, and I am sure that the House would not submit to such a large increase in any one year. There is also a great deal of force in what was said by the Colonial Secretary, that if isolated corps are formed they cannot be expected to be of much advantage in the defence of the country. As we are tied down to a small vote, care ought to be taken that all the corps supported should be useful in the time of need. Perhaps it would be better to adopt some modified arrangement with regard to corps in country towns who might be content with a proportionately smaller amount of pay than that of corps on the coast line. If £12 a year each member is paid for those whose services are likely to be of the greatest use, one-half that expense might be sufficient for inland towns where they cannot be of so much value. Their patriotism, perhaps, would not ebb away if they were told that they must be satisfied with less pay than that of volunteers in the coast towns. If such a system could be adopted, the House might agree to a vote large enough to establish these corps in country towns. The colony has liberties worth defending, and we are in such a position that we ought not to expect the mother country to protect us at her own expense. I know, however, the difficulty of getting volunteers and permanent forces sufficiently numerous and efficient for our protection ; but I am glad to see that there is a disposition to look the thing in the face, and that our means of defence have been so increased as to show that we intend to defend ourselves whatever may happen. I cannot support the resolution, as it would be a hard and fast direction to the Government to make immediate provision

for these new volunteer corps. I would suggest that the motion be withdrawn, and that the honorable member should be content with having obtained an expression of opinion on it.

Mr. BURDEKIN : I agree that in general the Government should foster the formation of these volunteer corps in country towns. There is, however, no doubt a great difference in the value of isolated corps, and those so situated as to be able to operate with other corps ; and instead of having the maximum pay of £12 a head, that amount ought to be reduced to some extent for the inland towns not easily accessible. If a difficulty with any foreign nation occurs, it will be useful to have a body of trained men that we can call upon to aid in our defence. We are extending our railways every day, and these isolated bodies may very soon be connected. Efficient volunteer corps cannot be formed in a month or in a year, and they ought to be ready and effective when the need for their service comes. We have a small body of artillery, a small body of infantry, and only a small number of volunteers accessible to each other, and if the resolution were carried out it would increase our effective force amazingly. The statement of the Colonial Secretary that the extra expense which would be incurred would be £30,000 certainly makes the matter one for serious consideration. I would suggest that in country places no subsidy be allowed to those who desire to enrol themselves.

Mr. STUART : People will not become volunteers on that condition !

Mr. BURDEKIN : If men are anxious to distinguish themselves as volunteers, I do not think that the discontinuance of the trumpery subsidy which is paid would influence them. The men could be drilled and supplied with clothing at the expense of the Government, and this is all that they ought to expect. The formation of these corps will have this advantage : young men who have undergone a certain amount of drill at school will become members of them, and will acquire a thorough knowledge of military movements ; they will become fit for active service, for employment as policemen, or as members of the permanent force ; besides this they will spend, profitably, time which otherwise would be wasted.

Mr. STOKES, in reply : In view of the expression of opinion given, and the promise made by the Colonial Secretary, I wish to withdraw the motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. FRANK HOBBS'S CONDITIONAL PURCHASE.

Ordered (on motion by Mr. S. SMITH, for Mr. GARRETT) :

(1.) That a select committee be appointed, with power to send for persons and papers, to inquire into and report as to the conditional purchase made by Mr. Frank Hobbs (No. 76-16) of 640 acres, at the Glen Innes Land Office ; and also as to the circumstances under which a certificate of conformity of the said conditional purchase was issued to Mr. McMaster.

(2.) That such committee consist of Mr. Copeland, Mr. Farnell, Mr. Spring, Mr. A. G. Taylor, Mr. Burns, Mr. Murray, Mr. Machattie, Dr. Ross, and Mr. Garrett.

House adjourned at 10.17 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Wednesday, 30 April, 1884.

Consolidated Revenue Fund Bill (No. 5)—University of Sydney—Third Readings—Railway from Murrumburrah to Blayney—Criminal Law Amendment Bill—University Extension Bill (second reading)—Bathurst Presbyterian Church Grant Resumption Bill (second reading)—Walsh's Grant Bill (second reading)—Companies (Extra Colonial Registers) Bill.

The PRESIDENT took the chair.

CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND BILL (No. 5).

Royal assent to this bill reported.

UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY.

Mr. STEWART asked the REPRESENTATIVE OF THE GOVERNMENT,—(1.) How much money has been expended by Government upon the Sydney University and its surroundings since the year 1850 ? (2.) How much money has been paid to the senate of the University by the Colonial Treasurer for the same period ? (3.) What is the estimated value of the land dedicated to the University by Government ? (4.) What is the total amount of the fees received by the University since 1850 ? (5.) What is the total number of students upon whom the University has conferred degrees after attendance at lectures and examination ?

Mr. DALLEY answered,—(1.) £84,902 16s. 10d. (2.) £180,666 13s. 4d. (3.) I cannot state what the value is, as no estimate has ever been made. (4.) Lecture fees received since 1851, £25,553 19s. 7d. ; matriculation fees, £1,855 1s. ; degree fees, £1,765 16s. Total, £29,174 16s. 7d. (5.) Degrees conferred after attendance at lectures at examination : bachelor of arts, 323. After examination : master of arts, 178 ; bachelor of laws, 18 ; doctor of laws, 12 ; bachelor of of medicine, 11 ; doctor of medicine, 12. Total, 554.

THIRD READINGS.

Boroughs of Randwick and Paddington Bill.

Singleton Gas Bill.

RAILWAY FROM MURRUMBURRAH TO BLAYNEY.

Mr. DALLEY rose to move :

That this House approves of the plans, sections, and book of reference of the second part of the proposed railway from Murrumburrah to Blayney—being a length from Young to Blayney, a distance of 92½ miles—laid before the House on 9th April last, in accordance with the 9th section of the Government Railways Act 22 Victoria No. 19.

He said : This railway extension was in the first place authorised by a loan vote which included the construction of the line. This was in 1881 ; and in the same year the then Secretary for Public Works, Mr. Lackey, proposed a motion authorising the construction of the line. The line commences by a junction with the Great Southern Railway near Murrumburrah, at 250 miles from Sydney, and after passing through Young, Cowra, and Carcoar, for 110 miles, joins the Great Western line at Blayney. I find from the report of the Engineer-in-Chief for Railways that for 46 miles the earth-works of the line are of a light character, for 39 miles of an average kind, and that for the remainder of the distance the earth-works will be heavy. But one expensive bridge will be required, and this will be over the Lachlan ; and but one tunnel about 12 chains in length. The line passes through a more than ordinarily rich country, containing great agricultural, pastoral, and mineral resources ; and the population of this country, and the interests which the construction of the line will necessarily develop, would abundantly justify its