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Mr SPEAKER (NaN.NaN pm) - Is it the pleasure of the House that the Prime Minister have leave to move his motion without notice?

Honorable members. - Hear, hear!

Mr SPEAKER (NaN.NaN pm) - Leave is granted.

Mr HUGHES (—) (NaN.NaN pm) - I move -

That this House approves of the Treaty of Peace between the Allied and Associated Powers and Germany, signed at Versailles on the 28th June, 1919.

Plunged as I am into an atmosphere with which I am very familiar, yet from which I have been absent for many months, I feel that I must preface what I have to say in regard to the motion by expressing my satisfaction at being once more among those with whom I have been associated so long:

Since I left for England no less than four men who have been members of this House during the period in which most of us have had the honour of representing the people here have died. I refer to Lord Forrest, Sir George Reid, Mr. Manifold, and Mr. Palmer. Their deaths have come in at least two cases without warning. All were men who did their work manfully, and endeavoured to serve their country to the very best of their ability. I wish to express my deep regret at their death, and to say how much I sympathize with those whom they have left behind.

I find myself to-day confronted with a task which, for many reasons, presents a thousand difficulties. I have laid on the table of the House a copy of the Treaty of Versailles, which is not as other Treaties that have marked the cessation of war and the making of peace between contesting nations in the days that have gone. It is a document of monumental importance, the like of which the world has never before seen. It not only makes peace between Germany and the Allied and Associated Powers, but it also reapportions great areas of territory in Europe, Asia, the Pacific, and Africa.

It is the charter of a new world. We must examine it in that light, if we wish to ascertain whether it is worthy of the ideals for which the Allies fought and the sacrifices which they made to realize them.

It would be quite impossible to present to this House the reasons for the acceptance of this Treaty without a glance at the circumstances which existed at and before our departure from Australia, and also of those which immediately preceded the negotiations, long drawn out, of which this Treaty is the result. Before my right honorable colleague (Sir Joseph Cook) and myself left Australia, the fortunes of the Allies had reached their nadir. Its no abuse of words to say that their position was almost desperate. How desperate it was, can hardly be realized by those who have lived these five years in a land remote from the faintest echoes of this world-wide strife, and who, sheltered behind the barrier of the valour and heroism of the millions who fought so gloriously for freedom and for those other great ideals upon which civilization rests, pursued the even tenor of their way, basking in sunshine, and enjoying indeed a prosperity which was unhappily not shared by the great majority of the peoples of the world.

A month or so before we left Australia, and at the very time when a Recruiting Conference, called by His Excellency the Governor-General, was being held at Government House, in this city, the great German offensive was launched against the sorely-tried British front. On the 21st March, 1918, the legions of the enemy, inspired by the hope of speedy victory, and having at their disposal an overwhelming superiority of numbers at that point, hurled themselves against the Fifth Army, which, resisting valiantly, was, after some days, bruised and beaten, and driven back in headlong retreat. It is well-nigh impossible for honorable members to realize to the full all that the piercing of the Allied line meant, not merely to Europe and to the capital of France, which it directly threatened, but to all the world. Let me try to set out, as well as I can in the poor words that I can summon at this
moment, the position as it then was. There is no need for the language of exaggeration. It was a posi-
tion full of appalling and imminent dangers that the mere recital of them is enough to make us all thank God that

We have escaped them, and that we are here to-day in this free Australia of ours, established in a citadel over
which the flag of liberty flies, and in a country which will ever remain the home of free men, unless by our own
cowardice and our own apathy, 'we admit the enemy within our gates.

Imagine this far-flung line of the Allies, the legions of the enemy having broken through it, the Fifth Army in
headlong retreat, and these mighty German legions pressing on, flushed with victory, and confident of success.
Imagine the city of Amiens, some 50 miles or more distant from Paris, a junction of railways and roads, which
commanded practically the whole of the country between there and Paris, and which was indeed the gateway
of the citadel itself. Imagine the roads and the countryside filled with flying fugitives, with men who had resisted
valiantly, but who had at length broken before the weight of overwhelming numbers. And then imagine a handful
of Australian soldiers, brought down hurriedly from the north, and launched against this advancing tide of the
Huns. A few miles from Amiens, at a little, village called Villers-Bretonneux, the German soldiers had reached
the ridge which overlooks Amiens and the country for miles around, when they were met by the Australians
advancing through the retreating soldiery of the defeated British Army. These men went forward a* confidently
then, in the hour of reverse and deadly peril, as they had at any time during, this great war.

It is a fine thing to be able to say of this small community of 5,000,000 people that at that hour, when every
circumstance tended to damp the courage of the most indomitable, her young soldiers went forward and held
the German legions, so that not from that day did they advance one yard. The very day on which my colleague
and I left these shores was fought the battle which proved to be the turning point of the war on the Western
Front. About Villers-Bretonneux, along the ridge in front of Amiens, and among the hamlets scattered in the
neighbourhood, was fought and won that great fight which determined our fate and the fate of all: free men; and
from that day, inch by inch, the legions of the enemy were pressed back and back. The whole of the Australian
Army was brought down and placed in position in front of Amiens, and for a time the two lines swayed backwards
and forwards; neither side seeming to gain the advantage; but in the end, little, by little, that indomitable will
to conquer, that resource and initiative, and that invincible valour, which mark the Australians, overcame all
resistance, and backwards, faster and faster, the army of the Huns was forced, until, at the culminating point of
the war, the offensive of 8th August was launched, resulting in the final destruction of the last hopes of victory
for the Germans; and Australians, Canadians, British, and French pressed onwards, broke the Hindenburg line,
and brought victory within our grasp.

At the time my colleague and I left Australia, and, indeed, in the days following our arrival in London, it
seemed that nothing but a miracle could save the Allies. Certainly, nothing but a miracle could have given us
complete and decisive victory, without a long and fearful struggle drawn out over a series of dreadful months
or years. No man would have ventured to say that what was done was possible in the time in which it was
done, or in the way in which it was done. A miracle was needed, and lo! a miracle was performed - a miracle of
valour, heroism, and sacrifice - and every Australian citizen must surely be proud to know that in this glorious
achievement the Army of Australia played a great and noble part.

Not only on the "Western Front, around Villers-Bretonneux - that glorious name - at Mont St. Quentin or
Peronne, or in the piercing, of the Hindenburg line, did the troops of Australia, take a splendid share in achieving
victory, but also in Palestine, where, perhaps, the greatest victory in the history of all the ages was achieved by
the forces under General Allenby, the flower of whose Army was made up of Australian soldiers. Where Coeur
de Lion' and Napoleon had failed, Allenby succeeded; and as soldiers of Australia in the frozen and sodden
trenches of France and Flanders had endured and battled, so did their brothers press forward under the burning
sun of Palestine, and across its deserts, to achieve a great and complete victory. I want to emphasize once more
the greatness of the victory in Palestine, in which our soldiers had so large a share. It was, a? it were, the finishing
blow that shattered the last hopes of Germany, and snatched from her grasp that Empire of cite. East, which was
her cherished ambition through the long ages, and for which she had been plotting to destroy the world. It was
not merely a victory like that of the Marne, which, although decisive, left the German Army almost intact; it was
a victory that at one fell swoop not only achieved its objective and prevented the onward march of the Turkish
Forces, but absolutely annihilated them; so that, where there was an army, lo! in a few days there were but a few
straggling fugitives. In the history of the world there never was a greater victory than that which was achieved
in Palestine, and in it, also, as in France, the soldiers of Australia played a great part.

When I ask this Parliament to approve of this Treaty, I have a right, as the spokesman for Australia to speak
proudly of what Australia has done through her soldiers, her sailors, and all those who have striven, each in their
own way, to serve their country in its hour of peril - the women, the nurses of Australia, and those who went out
to serve their country, even in the manufacture of munitions, and aid in every possible way in the great conflict
which has shaken the world- to its very foundations. There never was, in the history of the world before this
war, a record like that ` of this young community of 5,000,000 of people. We sent out a greater Army than Great
Britain herself had ever sent out before, and we transported it over 12,000 miles of ocean! We maintained five
divisions .of fighting men at the front line, men who will stand comparison with the finest and bravest soldiers
of any of the Allied and Associated Powers. We need not claim more, distinction than that. It is sufficient, if we
are able to say that 02 the land, and on the sea, and in the air, in every theatre of war - in Europe, in Asia, in the
Pacific - Australia played her part, and that, in the great victory that has been achieved, Australia has done well,
or, rather, her soldiers have done well for her. They have done great things, and have given to all of us freedom
and safety. They have assured to us for ever the possibility of realizing all those ideals which we cherish above
life itself. Only we ourselves, by being recreant to the cause for which they fought and died, can now destroy
this temple of our liberties, the keys of , which they have handed to us stained with their hearts' blood.

Let me remind you of the nature of this titanic struggle. It was not merely, as were other wars, a struggle of
opposing armies, nor even a war between nations : it was a war between clashing ideals, between might and
right, between military Autocracy and Democracy, between those who passionately loved liberty and those
who sought to lay upon the free peoples of the world a despotic yoke, which would have crushed them utterly and
for ever. In such a- struggle, compromise was impossible. There were some who spoke of a compromise Peace.
Those men hide their heads to-day, as do some others who gave us even worse counsel in those dark hours, for
there have come to us now a liberty and a freedom - not, as they were before, ever menaced by a Power that
had vowed our destruction, but liberty, freedom, and safety in a world which has, in will and word, forsworn
the sword and resolved to find, for the settlement of disputes between nations, a way more worthy of civilized
man than the appeal of war. This safety and liberty, and this new world into which we have entered by the blood
and sacrifice of our soldiers, have been given freely to us by those valiant men, nearly 60,000 .of whom will
come back to us no more,, and tens of thousands of whom are maimed and mutilated, and can no longer take
their place in. the industrial army of Australia.

There, rests upon us all a crushing burden of debt, for, if Australia- has done well; she has paid a great price in
blood and in treasure. This was a war against w?ar, and that peace, which all the world, both those who fought
and those who urged us not to fight, alike desired, has come to us. -But it has come, not by virtue of those who
cried, " Lord, Lord," and " Peace, Peace," when there was no peace, but by virtue of those who, in the hour of peril
and deadly conflict, when our liberties and our national safety were in fearful jeopardy, fought even unto death.

When my colleague and I reached London, summoned as we were, with the representatives of all the self-
governing Dominions and India, to gather together with the representatives of Britain, we met in a dark and
fateful hour, for, though the tide of the onward rush of the German legions had been stayed, the heavens were
black with omens of disaster. We considered the war as it then was, the position varying day by day, we holding
our own, every man resolute - I speak of the people of Britain and of France - but with his mind filled with anxiety.
I well remember, even after the great offensive had been launched an the 8th August, sitting at the cabinet with
the general staff and the representatives of that great Navy to which we and the world owe our safety. I well
remember also that we had been considering plans for a 1919 campaign and for a 1920 campaign - considering
whether it was possible, by a superhuman effort, to concentrate our resources, hurl them against the enemy, and
finish the war in 1919, or whether it would be necessary to go on. till 1920. The offensive of 8th August swept all
the dark clouds from the horizon, - the sun beamed gloriously out, ` and we thought no more of war, but of peace.

It is. impossible to understand this Treaty without some preliminary remarks about the Armistice which
preceded it. In October the Germans, being then, indeed, in desperate straits, appealed to President Wilson to
intervene and use his influence with the Allies to make peace upon the basis of his fourteen points. ` There is no
need to remind you of the correspondence which passed between the representatives of Germany and President
Wilson. It is sufficient to say that the Germans, having, indeed, no alternative save a worse one, agreed to accept
the fourteen points as the basis of peace. This the President communicated to the Allies, who met in the Council.
Chamber at Versailles on, I .think, 29th- October, to consider the position as- it then stood. Now, because the
acceptance by the Allies of President Wilson's fourteen points as the basis of Peace very . materially affected the
subsequent1 negotiations; and, indeed, coloured the whole of the Treaty and the conferences which preceded it,
it is proper for me to remind the House, of some of the facts in relation to them.

I shall not burden honorable members with a repetition of those fourteen points ; they are no doubt quite
familiar to them all. But up to the end of October, they had not been brought before the Cabinet of Great Britain,
or France, or Italy, or any of the combatant nations other than America. The Allies were fighting, for a victorious-
Peace - that is to say, a peace which rested upon the lasting foundations of decisive victory, a peace which would
be just, not only to Germany, but also to those whom she had assaulted and foully ill-treated. When President
Wilson's message was received, and the representatives of the Allies met at Versailles, the military situation was
such as to leave no doubt -whatever that a victory, complete and overwhelming, was immediately possible to
Marshal Foch and the Forces under his command. That great soldier, perhaps one of the very greatest soldiers
who has ever lived, had established such a mastery over the Germans that there remained for them no hope, not
only of staying off overwhelming and irreparable military defeat, but of preventing their complete annihilation,
unless the Allies accepted some basis of peace which should leave them in better case.

Honorable members know that the Allies accepted the fourteen points, and the world was very much astonished
to learn, and at first did not believe, that by the Allied Note, issued from Versailles on the 5th November, there
had been settled, not only the terms of the Armistice, but really the terms of the Peace. It was thought that the
same procedure would be followed in regard to Germany as had been followed in regard to Austria, Turkey,
and Bulgaria - that there would be an unconditional surrender, leaving the Allies free to make what terms of
Peace they thought fit. But the representatives of the Allies - and I venture not to censure them at all, for upon
them rested a tremendous and awful responsibility - decided to make terms upon the basis of President Wilson's
fourteen points. I have always held that that was an error - of judgment, if you like - for by these fourteen points
adopted as the basis of Peace, none of those things for which Australia had fought was guaranteed, Land, as.
well known to the people of Australia, I took the earliest possible opportunity of making a strong and emphatic
protest against what had been done.

I wish to make clear to the House what I did, for my attitude, as well as my utterances, have been much
misrepresented in Australia. I did not claim that the representatives of the Dominions should have been
summoned to Versailles. Nothing was further from our thoughts. The settlement of the terms of the Armistice
was a military matter, with which I was totally unfitted to deal, as, indeed, were all the representatives of the
Dominions. But in regard to the terms of Peace, the Dominions had been assured - no, every one of them had
a right to expect, apart from any assurance - that they would be consulted before those terms were settled. We
were not consulted, and, speaking in London on, I think, the day following the issue of the Allied Note, I said -

We went into this war to fight for liberty and the rights of small nations. We are a small nation, conscious of our national
spirit, and jealous of our rights and liberties. Germany threatened our territorial integrity and our political liberty. We, along
with the Allies, have won, after four years of fearful sacrifice, a decisive victory. We have a right to demand a victorious
peace. We have a right to demand that in the terms of Peace our territorial integrity shall be guaranteed, that those islands,
which are the gateways to our citadel, shall be vested in us, not because we want- territory, -but- because we desire safety.
The terms of Peace do not guarantee that this shall be done.

Before the war we had the right to make what laws we pleased. These Peace terms seem to imperil, or, at best, impair,
"that right. We claim the right, and shall insist upon it, to make - what Tariff distinctions we like; and we feel sure that
in this demand we shall have, not only the support of the people of Britain, but that of America, that great Republic, the
foundations of whose greatness rest upon their War of Independence, waged to establish this very right. And, lastly, we claim
that indemnities shall be exacted from Germany, who plunged the whole world into bloody war.

Victory is ours - complete and overwhelming. We have fought for liberty, for right, and national safety; yet in the terms of
Peace these rights and ideals are not safeguarded. All is vague and uncertain, where it should be clear and definite.

Australia stands, after four years of dreadful war, her interests not guaranteed, her rights of self-government menaced, and
with jio provision made for indemnities. That is the. position, and it. can hardly -be regarded .as satisfactory.

What Australian will say that I did wrong? Who shall say that Australia, after having suffered over four and a
half years of war, arid having- made such sacrifices, should not be clearly and freely guaranteed those things -
without which she could not live as a free nation? I did not say that President Wilson's fourteen points prevented
us from getting these .-r I said . that they did not guarantee them. They guaranteed to France the>. return of
Alsace Lorraine, and to other nations many things. Later I shall show this House and the country how those
fourteen points hampered and limited us throughout the Peace negotiations, and how great was the price we and
the whole world paid for their adoption. I have always been one of the first to recognise the many and great
services rendered by President Wilson to this world, and rendered by America in the war. I am one of those who
believe that had America had a chance to express her opinion, she, too, like ourselves, would have been in favour
of a victorious Peace, rather than one based on President Wilson's fourteen points.

Because this Treaty and this Conference differed from others in that it rested upon the foundations of open
covenants, openly arrived- at, I need make no apology for stating clearly to this House and to the people of this
Poland is now a nation. The Czecho-Slovaks, the Jugo-Slavs, the Arabs, have been recognised, and the charter is the foundation of many new nations, which our victory freed from the yoke of the foreign oppressor. which the Labour Charter rests, which is to bring to the people of the world some hope of salvation on this earth.; itself the covenant of the League of Nations, which is to banish war from the world, and is the foundation upon which the Labour Charter rests, which is to bring to the people of the world some hope of salvation on this earth.

The draft Treaty was presented to Germany on 7th May, 1919, and was, as you know, the subject of many communications between Count von Brockdorff Rantzau and the Allies. In its modified form it was finally accepted, and signed at Versailles on 28th June, 1919. The Treaty is before the House. It is a document monumental in more senses, than one. It is not only the charter of a new world, it not only contains within itself the covenant of the League of Nations, which is to banish war from the world, and is the foundation upon which the Labour Charter rests, which is to bring to the people of the world some hope of salvation on this earth; but it is the foundation of many new nations, which our victory freed from the yoke of the foreign oppressor. Poland is now a nation. The Czecho-Slovaks, the Jugo-Slavs, the Arabs, have been recognised, and the charter...
of their rights is embodied in this document. I do not know whether honorable members have had an opportunity of reading it through; but, if they have, they will find it monumental in another sense, which I need not further allude to than to remark that it was said to be as large as the Pickwick Papers. I, believe it is. I can say that much of it is not nearly as interesting.

Before we deal with those matters which concern Australia more nearly, let us look at this Treaty in which the fruits of victory have been gathered. Let us look at this charter of the new world, and see whether it is worthy of those great ideals, those principles for which we fought, and for which millions of men died. First of all, how fares Germany under the Treaty? You all know; the whole world knows - except those who blind their eyes to facts - that this Avar was not sprung upon the world out of the circumstances of a moment. You all know it was the consummation of a deliberate conspiracy that had been hatching in this hell of Kaiserdom for forty years; that it was the result of the assimilation by the whole German people of those poisonous doctrines with which they had been saturated, and which had led them to believe that might was right; that they were destined to inherit the whole earth; that they, and they alone, were the anointed of the Lord, and all other nations were degenerate. They believed there was a short and bloody way to greatness. They listened neither to the voice of conscience, nor to the cry for mercy. As I live, I believe that not only did they conspire for forty years to destroy the fabric of Empire upon which we rest, and that freedom which is dearer to us than life itself; but that there was not one detail, of this bloody business that, from beginning to end, was not deliberately planned. I believe that not merely the Kaiser, but the Junkers and the whole military autocracy which surrounded him, were guilty of the assassination's at Sarajevo, the greatest crime in the annals of the whole world.

How fares it, then, with Germany? Is she able again to assault the world? If she is, we have fought the war in vain, and this document, monumental though it may be, offers us idle words of freedom. When the war broke out, Germany was the greatest nation the world had ever seen, and was able to put into the field armies the like of which no other nation had contemplated. These armies were led by men whose business was war, by men who had devoted their whole lives to this one object. The fabric of Germany's greatness rested on the foundation of militarism. Where is the German Army today? But a little while ago the thunder of its guns, the tread of its mighty legions, shook the firm earth. Where is that host to-day? All beaten and scattered and thrown to the four corners of the earth. Under the Treaty it is forbidden that Germany shall have an army of more than 100,000 men. But has the Army of Germany gone? Has it been shattered? Has it disappeared? Is it wiped out? Let me put the matter as I see it: It is true that Germany has been defeated as no other nation has been defeated in the history of the world. No other nation ever came toppling down from such a pinnacle of greatness in one fell swoop as did Germany. Only twelve months ago she had the second greatest fleet in the world. It was a fleet built for the destruction of Britain and the British Navy, without which we could not, nor can we even now, hold this country. Where is the German Navy to-day? Consider, if you will, bow abject must be the humiliation, how powerless must be the position, of a country which, would agree to hand over its Navy as the Germans did, under the terms of the Armistice imposed by Foch and Beatty. Is there a man of our race with one drop of blood in his veins who could conceive of the British doing such a thing? While there was a sailor able to sail the sea that could not have happened to its.

The Germans have been beaten, humiliated, and utterly crushed. Their Navy has passed. It does not exist. It has been blotted out as though the sponge of God had been wiped across the slate of circumstance. Their Army, we are told, has been reduced to 200,000, and, as my colleague (Sir Joseph Cook) reminds me, after March, 1920, is to be reduced to 100,000. But while that is so, every German soldier who fought in the war, and was not crippled or killed, is still there. Every officer is there, and the will to war exists. I hope that there is no man or woman in Australia so credulous as to listen to the babble that comes from the lips of those in Germany who call themselves Socialists, and who declare that they have cleansed their hearts and purged themselves of all their iniquities, and desire now but to live at peace with the world. They are still at heart what they always were. There must be a new generation of Germans before we can say that there is a new Germany with a new heart.

Mr SPEAKER (Hon W Elliot Johnson) (—) (NaN.NaN pm) -. The right honorable member's time has expired.

Extension of time granted.

Mr HUGHES (—) (NaN.NaN pm) - Has Germany, despite her will to repeat her crime, the power to do so? Let me put the position more briefly than it is set out in the Treaty. The provinces of Alsace and Lorraine, torn from France in 1871, have been, restored to her. The Saar Valley, containing mineral deposits of great value, goes to France for fifteen years, and thereafter its fate shall be as the inhabitants may by plebiscite decide. The fate of Schleswig-Holstein, the Danish portion of Germany, is to be determined by plebiscite. German Poland goes to the Poles. The whole of Germany's colonies have been wrested from her. All her ships exceeding 1,600 tons -
all her mercantile marine, with which she was attempting, and with which she hoped, not merely to rival, but to outstrip Britain - have been taken from her. She has no merchant ship of more than 1,600 tons. Those vessels of her Navy already handed over have, by her own act, been sunk. Her Army, as I have said, is to be reduced to 100,000 men. She cannot fortify the west bank of the Rhine, nor the east bank within 50 kilometres of the river. The strategic position under the Treaty is such that all the bridgeheads, all the points of vantage, are now controlled by the Allies. Her guns are surrendered. Her stores of explosives are taken away. Her arsenals are watched. Her Army is scattered. Her spirit is broken. She has the will, the lust, for vengeance, the desire to kill; but, for this generation, at all events, she is impotent. For a time, then, at least, and, we hope, for ever, the world, under the Treaty of Versailles, will be safe from new aggression by Germany.

But there are other guarantees for the world's peace. One of these is the League of Nations. The League of Nations, to which 'all those' who signed this Treaty set their seal, and which, by acceptance of this Treaty, you adopt, is a League of free, nations, which bind themselves together to preserve the peace of the world, and to substitute for war, as a means for the settlement of international disputes, 'saner and more civilized methods. The League of Nations does not attempt to govern the world. It attempts, rather, to set up the machinery by which civilized men, if they will act as Christianity and common sense dictate, may avoid war. It lights the way to a better road; It does not make that road, nor does it carry us along it. We must walk. But if the whole of the nations of the earth are really desirous to co-operate in this great work, then the League of Nations is truly a charter of liberty - a charter of civilization - of not less value to the world than was Magna Charta to the men of our race; not less great than the setting up of the rule of law for the rule of force among our own ancestors in the old days of tribal struggle and barbaric strife.

The League of Nations comprises at the outset some thirty-two nations, including the Dominions of the British Empire and India, and we have signed the covenant as separate nations. We have separate representation on the League of Nations. The constitution of the League consists of an Assembly to which each nation is entitled to send so many representatives, and of a Council that is limited to the representatives of the five great Powers, together with the representatives of four small Powers who are elected by the Assembly to sit upon it. The Council will hear, if I may use an analogy, the same relation to the Assembly as the Government or Executive Council bears to an Assembly either in our religious or political organizations. Then there is to be created an international tribunal, upon which eminent jurists of the world will sit for the purpose of trying disputes that may be brought before them.

It would be impossible for me within the time at my disposal to traverse such a great question as this in all its details. I can only say that the League of Nations may be regarded, as the foundation of the new temple of civilization. It is for the World to erect on that foundation an edifice worthy of the ideals for which the Allies have fought, and of the sacrifices by which those ideals were maintained. If the world should take another road; if it should seek, as men have sought from the very beginning, to settle their quarrels, by the sword, the League of Nations will prove to be but a house of cards - a glorified Hague tribunal. But perhaps - indeed I fervently hope so - the world has grown wiser as the result of the spectacle of horrid and bloody slaughter which we have witnessed during the past five years. Perhaps it has now taken to heart the great lesson that those who fight with the sword shall perish by the sword, that civilization cannot permit force to rule the world, and that right must prevail, cost what it may. So these nations are leagued together in order to preserve right, and to settle their differences by the sober light of reason rather than by an appeal to the sword.

Not all causes can be submitted to this tribunal. Matters which are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of a nation are not proper subjects for inquiry by the League. To that I take no exception, save, of course, to point out that somebody must determine what the term "domestic" means. Other matters - and this was inserted at the instance of the President of the United States himself - such as regional understandings like the Monroe doctrine, are not fit subjects to be submitted to this tribunal! Now, the Monroe doctrine was originally put forward by President Monroe in the days which are gone, and shortly lays down that no European Power can meddle in any matter affecting either of the two American continents, North or South. If we consider how far that doctrine goes, and remember that when it was put forward America had perhaps less than half its present population, we shall see a very striking analogy to the position which we ourselves take, up in regard to the Pacific. For we must recollect that the America have not yet begun to be filled up. In Brazil alone there is room for 100,000,000 people. The whole of the South American continent is covered by the Monroe doctrine. But, of course, that doctrine is one-sided. It does not say that America must not meddle with affairs in Europe, but merely that Europe must not meddle with affairs in America. Farther, the Monroe doctrine is upon no foundation of international law that I know of. I have never heard of any authority upon international law venturing an opinion to the contrary. It rests entirely upon the declaration of a President of the United States of America. Therefore, it is proper that a
like doctrine should be promulgated on behalf of Australia. I say - and this surely is a matter far outside of party politics - that, so far as the Pacific is concerned, at least within the area and sphere of our influence, it, too, is covered by a doctrine that it is for us to settle, and for nobody else. It is as well to make that point clear, at the outset. While the Monroe doctrine exempted the whole of the two Americas from the jurisdiction of the League of Nations, we will not allow anything relating to our sphere in the Pacific to be regarded as a proper subject for submission to that tribunal.

The League of Nations will not govern, but will merely recommend and advise. It does not limit the world's armaments but it is to formulate plans for reduction of armaments as a recommendation to be considered by the various nations. Any scale of armaments which a nation then; agrees to adopt and stand by cannot be exceeded without the concurrence of the Council. In that way, and step by step, which, after all, is the only certain way of progress, the world may come out of this welter of war and eternal conflict, into the bright clear day of peace. That is another safeguard against Germany attacking the world. Germany is not a member of the League of Nations, nor will it be admitted as a member until it has shown by its deeds that it has repented, and is willing to carry out the provisions of this Treaty.

There is still another guarantee, which, in my opinion, is very necessary. Time does not permit me to paint a picture of France as it is today, but it is impossible to exaggerate the horrors of war as it has passed over that country. No picture of the conditions as they exist there today could be too pathetic or too awful. France, which has been a battlefield for a thousand years, has had slain in this war, 1,500,000 of the flower of its manhood, to say nothing of those who have been disabled. Its fairest provinces have been torn out of recognition. Its factories have been smashed - deliberately smashed - and pillaged by those bandits who were France's commercial competitors, in order to prevent it from again entering the commercial sphere on a footing of fair equality with them. 'France, bleeding from a hundred wounds, indeed, bled nearly white, and oppressed with a frightful burden of debt, has said; "Yes, it is well for you who live far off to speak of the League of Nations, or speak of the changed heart of Germany, but for us it is a very different matter. We require some guarantee, something like the Cross of Christ or the Hoc of Ages, some lighthouse in the darkness, something that will guard and guide us, and never fail us." And so Great Britain and America have signed separate Treaties with France, by which they have bound themselves to go to the assistance of France in the event of an unprovoked attack by Germany. We in Australia are not bound by the terms of that Treaty unless we ratify it. I ask this Parliament to ratify it.

Briefly put, the position is this: The Treaty has removed the menace of war from the world by inflicting on the greatest military Power the world has seen a blow which has shattered its greatness, and humbled it to the dust. Its Navy is at the bottom of the ocean; its mercantile greatness on the seas has been dragged from it, and its mighty legions have been scattered to the four winds of Heaven. Upon it there rests a heavy burden of war debt, its own and part of that of the Allies. The League of Nations is arrayed against it, and finally, if ever again Germany, taking courage, and spurred by the lust of revenge, should strike at France, then France, America, Great Britain, and I hope also the whole of the British Empire, are ready to prevent her from doing so. For the time being the world is safe, and we may wipe war from our minds, and turn to the consideration of the problems of peace.

Let me come directly to the position of Australia. What have we got out of the war? I have endeavoured, although it was not necessary - because honorable members knew for themselves - to show what Australia has done in the war. We went into this conflict for our own national safety, in order to insure our national integrity, which was in dire peril, to safeguard our liberties, and those free institutions of government which, whatever may be our political opinions, are essential to our national life, and to maintain those ideals which we have nailed to the very topmost of our flagpole - White Australia, and those other aspirations of this young Democracy. We asked for these things. Australia has incurred a huge burden of debt through no fault of her own, for we were guiltless of the shedding of blood in this campaign; we did not provoke the war - whoever is guilty we were not. In regard to this huge burden of debt of £350,000,000 under which this young community must stagger, it was right that we should also demand that Germany should pay for what the war has cost Australia.

Now, what have we got? In speaking on this point, let me first refer to our national safety. In order that Australia shall be safe, it is necessary that the great rampart of islands stretching around the north-east of Australia should be held by us or by some Power in whom we have absolute confidence. When the Armistice terms were decided on the 5th November, I protested because our national safety was not guaranteed, insomuch as there was no assurance that the possession of these islands would be vested in us, and afterwards, when we went to the Conference, we sought to impress on those Council of Ten the position as we saw it, and fought for this guarantee...
of our national safety. One of the most striking features of the Conference was the appalling ignorance of every nation as to the affairs of every other nation, its geographical, racial, and historical conditions or traditions. It was difficult to make the Council of Ten realize how utterly the safety of Australia depended upon the possession of these islands. Perhaps there are very few Australians who realize that New Guinea is greater in size than Cuba, the Philippines, and Japan, except Sakhalin, all rolled into one; that it is only 80 miles from our northern shore, and that those who hold it hold us. Recollect that our coast line is so vast that to circumnavigate Australia is a voyage as great as from here to England, and no 5,000,000 people can possibly hold this continent when, 80 miles off, there is a potential enemy. Well stretched out from New Guinea there are New Ireland and New Britain. There are literally hundreds of other islands stretching out and out, every one of them a point of vantage from which Australia could be attacked. The possession of those islands was necessary, therefore, for our safety. We sought to obtain direct control of them, but President Wilson’s fourteen points forbade it; and, after a long fight, the principle of the mandate was accepted. Then the nature of the contest changed, and, since the mandate principle was forced upon us, we had to see that the form of the mandate was consistent, not only with our national safety, but with our economic, industrial, and general welfare.

Two principles arose here, to which I may direct attention. One was the open door. It was sought to couple this mandate with the condition of an open door for men and for goods. It is undesirable, for many reasons, to dwell very long on that point; but I ask my fellow citizens throughout Australia to realize what an open door for men and goods into those islands would mean. Our control of trade and navigation would be gone, and within 80 miles of us there could come pouring in those who, when the hour should strike, could pounce on us on the mainland. We fought against the open door, and the mandate was at length obtained in the form in which it now stands, which substantially is this: We have the same rights to make laws over the islands as over the mainland; indeed, the Commonwealth has wider powers there to make laws, because its jurisdiction on the mainland is limited. As a matter of actual fact, we may make over the islands exactly the same kind of laws as a State could make before Federation in Australia, subject only to five reservations. There can be no sale of firearms to the natives; we cannot raise native armies except for the mere defence of that territory; we cannot sell alcohol to the natives; we cannot raise fortifications; and there cannot be any slave trade. Those, of course, were conditions so entirely acceptable to us that they were not limitations at all on the sovereign power which was necessary for our salvation. That mandate is now embodied in the covenant. It has been definitely bestowed upon us, but the document which officially makes us the mandatory, with the actual terms of the mandate, have not yet been approved by the Council of Five; but that is a foregone matter, and I am authorized to say that the terms are as I have stated them. Our national safety, therefore, is assured, as far as 5,000,000 people can assure it. The next point we had to deal with was the White Australia policy. Honorable members who have travelled in the East or in Europe will be able to understand with what difficulty this world’s assemblage of men, gathered from all the corners of the earth—men representing 400,000,000 Chinese, men representing Japan, men—representing India, Siam, Hay ti, and Liberia; men representing partially coloured populations—were able to appreciate this ideal of those 5,000,000 people who had dared to say, not only that this great continent was theirs, but that none should enter in except such as they chose. I venture to say, therefore, that perhaps the greatest thing which we have achieved, under such circumstances and in such an assemblage, is the policy of a White Australia. On this matter I know that I speak for most, if not all, of the people of Australia. There are some at the two extreme poles of political opinion who do not hold those views, but their numbers, thank God! are quite insignificant, and their influence, I hope, even less important. I am, perhaps, taking too much of the time of honorable members, but I feel it due to the House, and indeed, to myself, that they should know the position as I know it, in order that they may judge this Treaty and judge me and my colleague, who come here to give an account of our stewardship, and because also, after all, this is the foundation of all that Australia stands for. Remember that this is the only community in the Empire, if not, indeed, in the world, where there is so little admixture of race. Do you realize that, if you go in England from one county to another, men speak with a different accent? That if you go a few miles men speak with a different tongue; that if you go from one part of France to another, men can hardly understand one another? Yet you can go from Perth to Sydney, and from Hobart to Cape York, and find men speaking the same tongue, with the same accent. Place on that bench men from Alice Springs, Cape York, Hobart, and Adelaide, and you cannot distinguish them in speech, form, or feature. We are all of the same race, and speak the same tongue in the same way. That cannot be said of any other Dominion in the Empire, except New Zealand, where, after all, it can be said only with reservations, because that country has a large population of Maoris. We are more British than the people of Great Britain, and we hold firmly to the great principle of the White Australia, because we know what we know. We have these liberties, and we believe in our race and in ourselves, and in our capacity to achieve our great destiny, which is to hold this vast continent in trust for those of our race who come after us, and who stand with us in the battle of freedom. The White Australia is yours.
You may do with it what you please; but, at any rate, the soldiers have achieved the victory, and my colleague and I have brought that great principle back to you from the Conference. Here it is, at least as safe as it was on the day when it was first adopted by this Parliament.

I desire to indicate to the House some of the difficulties which confronted us in our struggle. The Japanese delegation, moved an amendment to the Covenant of the League of Nations as follows:

The equality of nations being a basic principle of the League of Nations, the high contracting parties agree to accord as soon as possible to all alien nationals of States members of the League, equal and just treatment in every respect, making no distinction, either in law or in fact, on account of their race or nationality.

I think I am entitled to tell the House something of the story of the struggle for the White Australia. That amendment was put forward in a dozen different ways. It was modified again and again. It came now directly from the quarter I have mentioned, and again indirectly from other quarters. Pressure was brought in this and in that direction. One modification suggested was that it should only apply to alien national's resident in this country. I said then, an.i I knew I spoke for Australia, that no matter how much the amendment was altered, no matter what words were used, I would not accept it.

It was quite within the competence of the Japanese delegation to make this proposal, and, as I told Baron Makino, I understood their position perfectly. So far from censuring him, I did not even criticise him. I met him plainly, telling him my position, from which I never receded. Others encouraged him and then left him. I made clear to him my attitude, and I never altered it. Now, after we have fought for the principle of a White Australia - and I hope we always shall fight, for it - I think it only right, in order that all misunderstandings may be cleared up, and our friends and Allies may not misconceive our position, to repeat what I said to Baron Makino and to the agents of the Japanese press. Baron Makino said that the Japanese were a proud people, and had fought by our side in this war. They regarded it as intolerable that they should not be treated as the equals of us and other races. ' I replied that I would be one of the first to recognise them as our equals. I hoped - and I hope so still - that they would always remain our friends and Allies. I recognised to the full what they have done in the war. No one had a greater admiration than myself for the habits of industry and perseverance x of the Japanese race. Australia was bounded by the same ocean' and hemmed about by the same conditions as was Japan. " But, " I added, " the history of your people has its roots in far different soil. I hope they will always be our friends and Allies. But in ordinary everyday life, men do not invite all their friends into their houses, nor even when they invite them into their houses do they make them permanent residents therein." Because I do not invite every man in this Parliament into my house, it cannot be said that I do not regard him as my equal. I may select whom I please to enter my house; that has always been regarded as the right of every free man. We are not, therefore, to be regarded as unfriendly to Japan, or as looking down upon the Japanese people when we say, " Your ideals, your institutions, your standards, are not ours. do not say that ours are greater or better than yours; we only say they are different. Our paths lie in different directions. Our destiny beckons us, and we must tread the road along which we are led by the impulses and instincts which come from our history and our race. " That is the position of Australia towards Japan. We hope that not only with Japan, but with all nations, we shall remain for ever on terms of the most perfect friendship. " We claim the right, however, to say in regard to Australia who shall enter and who shall not. This is our house. To keep it ours, our soldiers have sacrificed their blood, and they have placed the keys in our hands. The war was waged for liberty. "We had this right before the war, and we claim to retain it now.

I pass on to the question of reparation. I was Chairman of the British Reparation Committee, and Vice-Chairman of the Allied Reparation Commission. On the British Reparation Committee I had the privilege of being associated with men who had great experience in the financial world. I found that Germany, to put it mildly, had many friends in England. Of course, I do not mean to be understood in any other sense than that they seemed very anxious to lighten the burden to be imposed on Germany's shoulders. I took the view then, and I take it now, that Germany should be treated as any other offender against the law, whether it be the law of nations or the law of a country. The German people have committed an offence, nay, a crime, the most bloody and desperate the world has ever known, and they must pay the penalty. They have inflicted upon England a crushing burden of £6,500,000,000. They have slain 600,000 of her men, and sunk to the bottom of the sea 7,000,000 tons of her shipping. They have destroyed France - I was going to say body and soul, but they cannot kill the soul of France.

Mr HUGHES (—) (NaN.NaN pm) - I always took the view, therefore, that Germany should pay. She had wrought this havoc, and it was for us to present the bill: " This is the damage you have done, and, so far as
it can be measured in money, this is what you have to pay." It was for her, then, to establish, before a proper tribunal, how far her capacity to pay fell short of her obligations. But others did not take that view. The British Reparation Committee, of which I had the honour to be Chairman, brought in a report which was submitted to the British Government, the details of which I am not permitted to communicate further than to say that it was based upon the lines I have just now stated.

The Separation Commission, when it met in Paris, proceeded to consider this matter, and the American delegation took the view - a view, mark you, that I had foreshadowed on 7th November, 1918 - that by the acceptance of President "Wilson's four points, the Allies had renounced all claim for the general cost of the war, and could ask for no more than compensation for damages to persons and property of civilians, and damage caused by special acts and outrages contrary to international law. I quote the words of Mr. Dulles, the American legal representative on the Commission. He said -

Why have we proposed reparation in a certain limited sense only? It is because we do not regard ourselves as free. We are not here to consider as a novel proposal what reparation the enemy should, in justice, pay. We have not before us a blank page, upon which we are free to write what we will. We have before us a page, it is true, but a page filled in with handwriting, and bearing the signatures of Mr. Wilson, Mr. Orlando, Mr. Clemenceau, and Mr. Lloyd George.

That, I think, speaks for itself. In that view the American delegation continued through the long-drawn-out labours of the Reparation Commission. To the end they persisted in excluding the cost of the war. Ultimately the Reparation Commission made its report, with a comprehensive reservation by the American delegation.

The Council of Four, as it was then, did not accept the Reparation Commission's report; but itself drew up a scheme, which is embodied in the Peace Treaty. In Article 232 of that document it is shortly set out that Germany is not asked to pay anything beyond civilian reparation excepting for damages in categories set out in Annex I., and in that annex the general costs of the war are omitted.

Before I come to the details, so far as they affect the Commonwealth of Australia, let me point out what our position was. Our claim was for £464,000,000. "That is made up of £364,000,000 actual war expenditure! and £100,000,000, being the capitalized value of pensions, repatriation, and loss to civilians and civilian, property, and so on, incidental to the war. At one stroke £364,000,000 of that amount was struck out. The total cost of the war to Great Britain was £6,500,000,000, and, with the exception of the comparatively small part which represents the capitalized value of pensions and repayment for property damaged, including ships lost - which, although comprising 7,000,000 tons, did not amount to more than £300,000,000 - that whole amount is wiped out.

Honorable members will, therefore, see that it was a very serious thing for Great Britain, and for Australia, that President "Wilson's four points should be accepted, and the costs of the war excluded from the amount of reparation demanded. Once I was asked in France, but not by a Frenchman, "What would happen, if you insisted upon Germany paying this huge debt, to a German family of five? Would you reduce them to slavery?" I said, "I am not here to safeguard the interests of a German family of five; I am here to safeguard the interests of an Australian or British family of five. If it be borne to a question whether my countrymen shall be reduced to slavery or those of Germany, I shall not hesitate. They are blood-guilty, and we are innocent. The crime is theirs, and they must pay."

The position of Australia, then, is that our claim is cut down from £464,000,000 to £100,000,000, or thereabouts. I am stating the amounts from memory, and would not have honorable members, and certainly not the members of the Reparation Commission, regard these amounts as more than mere estimates.

The practical effect of the acceptance -of that basis of reparation, which was insisted upon by the Americans, and accepted by the Council of Four, is that, of the great burden of debt - the greatest that ever fell upon the shoulders of 6,000,000 people in the history of this world - four-fifths will have to be borne by us in any case. We cannot hope to get relief to the extent of more than £100,000,000.

I come now to the details. Under clause 235, it is provided that up to the end of April, 1921, the Germans shall pay 20,000,000,000 gold marks, which means £1,000,000,000 sterling. Honorable members, and the Australian people, will be much interested to know what share they are going to have of that sum. From this £1,000,000,000 there are very important deductions to be made. In the first place, the cost of the Army of occupation has to be deducted from it: secondly, the cost of food and raw materials to Germany is to be deducted from it; and, thirdly, the sum of £100,000,000, paid to Belgium, is to be deducted from it. There may be other deductions: I do not know. But I think we shall do well not to expect that there will be available for distribution to all the belligerents, under all the categories in Annex I., anything more than, say, about £800,000,000. If I am asked how much we
shall get of that, I tell honorable members, candidly, I do not know. Once one has eliminated the cost of the war, and has allowed compensation for damage actually done to physical property - to houses, buildings generally, fields, and so on - one disturbs, completely, the equilibrium. Britain, which has spent far more on the war, say, than France, finds at least £5,000,000,000 of her claim struck off. France, on the other hand, which has suffered in civilian damage incomparably more than England, receives this amount for restoration, for re-building. I am not complaining of that. I am only stating the facts; so that what will be available for Britain, I do not know. But, of what is available for Britain, we shall get our share. Probably - or possibly - we may receive, between now and the end of April, 1921, anything from £5,000,000 to £8,000,000. I say, we may. How much we shall get afterwards, I do not know. The rest of the payment is spread over a period of thirty years. How much Germany will pay, I do not know; for' although the categories of damage have been set out, there is no reliable estimate yet of the amounts claimable under those categories; and the Germans were given four months from the signing of this Treaty in which to challenge any particular item. It is, therefore, impossible to say what is the total amount of reparation Germany will pay.

There is one point of which my colleague (Sir Joseph Cook) reminds me,. It is this: Curiously enough, the calculations regarding the power of Germany to pay - as made by various parties, some English, some of other nationalities - were grossly below what I thought was fair and possible. One must await the verdict of the years that are to come. But I think time will show that Germany could have paid very much more than the Allies are asking her to pay. For I say this emphatically: of all the nations who enter into this new war, this commercial war, this war of life and death for all the peoples of the earth, Germany is the best equipped, even now. She is the best organized nation in the world. Her factories are intact; those of France are ruined. It is true that she has a heavy burden of debt, but her people are amongst the most industrious in the world, and they lend themselves, by their very nature, to regimentation, to organization, better than do our people, or, perhaps, the people of any other race. The value of money has gone down, and the value of goods has gone up. The sovereign to-day is worth very much less than it was five years ago; and if, for example, Germany had a surplus of £500,000,000 a year in 1914, and if the sovereign has depreciated so that its value to-day is only - let me say, for the sake of argument- 10s., then it is clear that for the same output of goods Germany can produce the equivalent of twice that amount of money. And it is in terms of money that Germany's obligations are reckoned.

Again, let us consider what this past five years of war have revealed to us. There are almost no limits to the possibilities of increased productivity of labour. In Great Britain a daily miracle has been performed. Labour has turned out, under organized and up-to-date methods, many more times the amount of wealth than before the war. This process is going on; and the world will be forced into better methods. Therefore, I think it will be found that Germany could have paid more than she will pay. One interesting commentary upon it all is this: One of the witnesses examined before the Committee over which I had the honour to preside in London, expressed the view that at the most Germany could not pay more than £1,500,000,000. Seeing that my own view was that she could pay about twenty times that amount of money. And it is in terms of money that Germany's obligations are reckoned.

I leave this branch of the subject with one parting observation. If this peace be unjust, it is not unjust to Germany. It is very unjust to those free people who had to fight a battle of life and death for their very existence. It is unjust to those who have been burdened with an undue standard of living, to those thousands of millions of people who did not cause or provoke the war, and who did all they could to avoid it. We had to enter the conflict or perish. To ask us to pay, and call that justice, would be to abuse the word. This Peace, whatever may be said, is not a harsh Peace to Germany, and it is not a just Peace to us.

It is impossible for me, in the time at my disposal, to deal fully with every part, and every aspect of this great document, but I have endeavoured to give a clear general outline of its main features, especially as they affect Australia.

Before concluding, I must briefly refer to the Labour Charter which will be found in Part XIII. of the Treaty. We have built on the foundation of the Peace Treaty a Charter of Labour for the people of the world. We have made an honest endeavour, as far as was possible, consistently with the sovereign rights of each individual country, to create conditions in every country whereby the standard of living will be raised, and the conditions of labour generally improved. An effort has been made to regulate the employment of women, to prevent the employment of children, and to conserve the health of the people. The International Labour Organization established by the Treaty will enable Labour to be articulate and find expression, so that its needs throughout the world may be satisfied and its just rights accorded to it.
Of course, for us in Australia the Labour Charter does not mean so much as it does to other nations less happily situated. It is always the privilege of those who have fought the battle, and have - at any rate escaped the deep abyss, to help their less fortunate others. I am sure everyone in Australia rejoices in the fact that we are entitled to separate representation on the International Conference of Labour, the first meeting of which is to be held at Washington on the 24th October of this year, when we hope that representatives of Australia will be able to be present.

In conclusion, I have taken you over this vast panorama of events and circumstances leading up to the war. I have dealt with the guilt of Germany, the peril in which we stood, the valour of those who led us out of deadly danger into the haven of peace and victory. I have told you the story of the signing of the Armistice, the holding of the Peace Congress, and the representation, at a world's gathering at which a thousand million people were represented, of Australia with her 5,000,000 of people, who were fighting for ideals which none can appreciate save we ourselves. Victory has come and peace. Is the peace worthy of the victory? Is the Treaty worthy of the sacrifice made to achieve it? I shall not measure, or attempt to measure, that sacrifice by money. I put that aside. The sacrifice is to be counted in the lives of our bravest and best, who died that we might live. Thousands of them lie buried in foreign soil. Over their graves there is no monument, but their names will live for ever.

Australia has the right to be proud of the heroism of her soldiers and sailors in the great war - for her sailors, as well as her soldiers, have fought valiantly. Australia's contribution on sea to the might of a glorious Fleet was magnificent, and the fight which destroyed the Emden will live for ever in story.

What has been won? If the fruits of victory are to be measured by national safety and liberty, and the high ideals for which these boys died, the sacrifice has not been in vain. They died for the safety of Australia. Australia is safe. They died for liberty, and liberty is now assured to us and to all men. They have made for themselves and their country a name that will not die.

Looking back, through the vista of years of trial, tribulation, and turmoil, into that Valley of the Shadow of Death into which we and all the free peoples of the earth were plunged, we may now lift up our voices, and thank God that, through their sacrifice, we have been brought safely into the green pastures of peace.

We turn now from war to peace. We live in a new world: a world bled white by the cruel wounds of war. Victory is ours, but the price of victory is heavy. The whole earth has been shaken to its very core. Upon the foundations of victory we would build the new temple of our choice.

Industrially, socially, politically, we cannot, any more than other nations, escape the consequences of the war. The whole world lies bleeding and exhausted from the frightful struggle. There is no way of salvation, save by the gospel of work. Those who endeavour to set class against class, or to destroy wealth, are counsellors of destruction. There is hope for this free Australia of ours only if we put aside our differences, strive to emulate the deeds of those who by their valour and sacrifice have given us liberty and safety, and resolve to be worthy of them and the cause for which they fought.

Debate (on motion by Mr. Tudor) adjourned.