

Chamberlain's Defence.

The more the question between the Boers and ourselves is looked into, the more plain does it appear that right is on the side of the British.

Mr. Chamberlain recently explained the situation in the House of Commons, and extracts of his remarks are here given. Among other things, in an able and concise speech he said:—

The first principle is this, that if we are to maintain our position with regard to other nations, if we are to maintain our existence as a great power in South Africa, we are bound to show that we are both willing and able to protect British subjects everywhere when they are made to suffer from oppression and injustice. (Loud cheers.) That is especially incumbent upon us, because equality promised to the two white races by President Kruger was the foundation of the negotiations upon which the independence of the Transvaal was conceded; and it was promised to the British subjects in South Africa by Mr. Gladstone, the head of the Government which made the convention. That, then, is the first principle. It is a principle which prevails always and everywhere, and in every difficulty we may have with another country; but it prevails with especial force and emphasis in this case, where our relations to the Transvaal are so special and peculiar. The second principle is this: It is in the interests of South Africa, and in the interests of the British Empire, that Great Britain must remain the paramount power in South Africa. Let me at once say that when we talk of South Africa we always make a particular qualification or exception. What we mean is, not the German possessions, not the Portuguese possessions, but the two Republics and the British colonies. I think everyone must admit that that great principle is one which both sides are determined to maintain. Why do we maintain it? Because, as the leader of the Opposition said most wisely, the peace of South Africa depends on our accepting the responsibility of that position. These, then, are the two principles, and we are at war now because the oligarchy—it is nothing more than an oligarchy; it is a Republic, but not a democracy—because the oligarchy at Pretoria—very often, I am afraid in its own personal interests—aided and abetted by President Steyn, and by advisors outside the Republic, have persistently pursued, from the very day of the signing of the convention of 1881 down to now, a system, a policy, which was instinct with evasions of its obligation, by which it has broken its promises, by which it has placed gradually but surely British subjects in the Transvaal in a position of distinct inferiority, by which it has conspired against and undermined the suzerainty or paramountcy which belongs to the Queen.

The leader of the Opposition said at Ilford, "The British subjects have not the very elements of civil rights or civil freedom." The right honourable member for Fife (Mr. Asquith) said, "They were denied those civil and political rights which we are accustomed to regard as the necessary equipment of a civilized and social community." Lord Rosebery says, "They are under intolerable conditions of subjection and injustice." Sir W. Harcourt, in a letter to the Times, speaks of the "grievances which we all admit." That, then, is granted. With very few exceptions, we all agree as to the magnitude of the grievances. Does the House for a moment suppose that these grievances are a personal matter—that we are concerned simply because Jones in the Transvaal, who is a British subject, suffers some inconvenience, pecuniary loss, or personal degradation? That in itself would be important enough. After all, we do not forget the hackneyed phrase that it is something still to be a British citizen. But there is something much more important than that, and that is what I wish to impress upon the House, for it is the root of the matter. What is to be our position in the world? What is to be our position in Africa—that is sufficient for my present purpose—if we submit to this inferiority? Is peace to be preserved under such conditions? Is racial animosity to be avoided? Why, the leader of the Opposition has again and again referred in terms none too strong to the evil of racial animosity. The racial animosity which has been the curse of South Africa is based upon contempt. Hate is bad enough, but I would sooner have the hate of any man than his contempt. And so it is with nations. These animosities are bitter and increasing, and will increase as long as one white race in Africa has a contempt for another. Is it denied? It was to his views on that point that I referred when I spoke of the right honourable member for Aberdeen. This morning in the Daily News the quotation was given to which I refer, and I agree with every word of it. The right honourable gentleman said in his book, for which all of us have the greatest admiration as giving the best account of the political situation in South Africa at that time, "It must be admitted that the event belied some of their hopes"—he is speaking of the hopes of that government of which I was a member when the convention of 1881 was concluded. "They had expected," he says, "the Transvaal people would appreciate the generosity of the retrocession as well as the humanity which was willing to forego vengeance for the tarnished lustre of the British arms. The Boers, however, saw neither generosity nor humanity in the conduct of the English government. Jubilant over their victories, like the Kaffirs in the South Coast wars, they failed to realize the overwhelming force which could have been brought against them. They fancied themselves entitled to add some measure of contempt to the dislike they already cherished for the English, and they have ever since shown themselves unpleasant neighbours."

I want, in passing, to say a word upon another subject, which has not, I think, been mentioned in the debate or in the blue books. We have talked of grievances. Hitherto we have confined ourselves exclusively to the grievances of the Whites. But the House must bear in mind that when we granted the convention of 1881, and when we substituted

the articles of the convention of 1884, we undertook the protection of the natives of the Transvaal. (Hear, hear.) The natives had been our subjects, and were retroceded to the Transvaal. They were the majority of its inhabitants, and we promised to protect them. How have we kept our promise? The treatment of the natives of the Transvaal has been disgraceful; it has been brutal and unworthy of a civilized power. Why have we not complained? In 1886 I drafted a despatch and sent it to Sir Hercules Robinson, and I instructed him to make representations to Transvaal Government on its conduct to Malabosh and other of the native chiefs and tribes. Then the raid came, and I had to telegraph instructions that that despatch could not, with any propriety, be presented at that time. That is the reason. I give the true reason why we have not made complaints. I do not think for a moment that we have at any time done our duty or kept our promise to those subjects whom we retroceded against their will, and whom we promised to protect. We have heard much about the "great trek." I do not know where those who have mentioned it got their information, but it differs very much from mine. It was caused mainly and chiefly—you can prove it from the Boers' own language—because they wanted, to use a vulgar phrase, to "wallop their own niggers." (Loud Ministerial cheer.) What I want to express here is my own opinion, in the strongest possible terms, that the main reason for the trek of the Boers from British rule was their disinclination to be interfered with in their treatment of the native races. (Cheers.) That is my belief. My opinion is that the independence which we hear so much about, and which the Boers value so highly, is the free right to treat as they like the natives under them. (Cries of "No, no," and Ministerial cheers.) Now, Sir, I have dealt with the first cause of the war—that is, the grievance of the British subjects and the injustice done to the natives.

There has been an object present to the minds of a certain number, perhaps, of Dutch colonists, but at all events, to the whole population of the Transvaal Republic and the Orange Free State—an ideal, which, I go so far as to say, it was very proper of them to entertain, but which it would be most improper and most dangerous for us to encourage—the ideal of a united South Africa and independent Republic, permitting us of their good will to retain our hold on the Cape, so long as our naval protection was necessary to the Republic, but leaving us in one corner of South Africa, and there only as a matter of sufferance. There are people who say, "What a preposterous notion! How could we ever have entertained it! How could we, with our enormous wealth and resources, be alarmed by threats of insubordination on the part of 30,000 (be they more or less, and they happen to be a great deal more) Dutch farmers?" The inequality is not so great as that. It is all very well for certain hon. gentlemen at one time to underestimate the strength of our enemies and at another time to exaggerate it. I hope we take a more reasonable view. What was happening was this: That, by continuous accretions to the military armaments of the two States—especially by the ammunition, the arms, the guns, the artillery, and the men constantly pouring into the Transvaal—the Transvaal had become a few months ago by far the most powerful military State in Africa. Great Britain, with all her resources, could not stand up against her at that time. It was impossible. Of course, we might by an expenditure of blood and treasure, from which every man would have shrunk, have restored our supremacy after it had been taken from us. Does anybody think that that would be a trifling operation? With the whole of South Africa in arms, the whole of South Africa in the possession of the Boers, when we had not men enough to defend it—does anybody think under such circumstances as these, that it would be a small operation, even for a rich country, to put maybe 200,000 or 400,000 men into South Africa? That was the danger. We have escaped, I believe, one of the greatest dangers to which we have ever been exposed in Africa. In our endeavour to maintain peace we have shown endless patience—we have run some risks, but we never have been prepared from first to last, for the sake of peace, either to betray our countrymen or to allow this paramountcy, or whatever you call it, to be taken from us. President Kruger has settled the question. He has appealed to the God of Battle, and I say, sir, with all reverence, we accept the appeal, believing that we have our quarrel just.

DIAMOND DYES are Home Protectors.

Imitation Dyes Are Vile Deceptions.

The thousands of women in our Canadian cities, towns and farming districts stand in need of the protection afforded by the never-fading Diamond Dyes. These marvellous coloring agents have been before the public for over twenty years, and have always been true to name and promises made. The magnificent colors and shades produced by Diamond Dyes are everywhere extolled, and the colors have in every case proved fast under the action of sunlight and soap. The plain and simple directions on every package of the Diamond Dyes enables a child to use them with perfect success. There are imitations of Diamond Dyes sold by some dealers for the sake of long profits. These imitations are deceptions, and wherever used they cause annoyance, ill temper and loss of money and valuable materials. The colors are muddy and dull, and they cannot stand washing with ordinary soap. To insure perfect protection and security, ladies should ask for the Diamond Dyes and take the trouble to see that the name "Diamond" is on each package. A little care in this direction will save a vast amount of trouble.

No loafers to tattle your business if you trade with Jewett the Jeweller.

PERSONAL.

W. A. Burden, Fredericton spent Sunday at the Aberdeen.

F. R. Butcher, St. John, registered at the Carlisle on Monday.

From R. Sprague, Boston, arrived at the Carlisle on Monday.

John Connor who has been on a visit to Chicago and the West has returned to Woodstock.

R. W. Shaw and G. H. Hall drove over from Houlton on Sunday and put up at the Carlisle.

L. R. MacLaren, representing S. R. Pendleton of St. John, spent Sunday at the Aberdeen.

F. B. Meagher, Inspector of schools arrived at Woodstock on Saturday and registered at the Carlisle.

Rev. J. K. Fraser, who has been spending the past few months in Woodstock, the guest of Rev. G. D. Ireland, left for St. John on Saturday last.

John M. Currie, manager for Rhodes Currie & Co., Amherst, N. S. stopped off at Woodstock on his way home from New York and spent Sunday with his friend B. M. MacLeod, manager of the Bank of Nova Scotia.

Mr. Currie sang a solo in the Presbyterian choir on Sunday evening.


At the Carlisle: A J. King, D R. Clarke, Halifax; H H. Austin, W B. Howard, W J. Robertson, W Hatfield, G P. Trites, Chas E. Farrand, D J. Doherty, D McQueen, St. John; E A. Carpenter, Brook Me.; Fred J. Boyer, Victoria; Chas W. McAnn, Kaslo B.C.; C K. Burt, C H. Owen, E B. Nixen, H J. Finch, P B. Wood, G R. Wood, Toronto; V E. Gnaedinger, S G. Crivier, V E. Gowland, Nathan Laird, Montreal.

At the Aberdeen.—A Shanks, Caribou; F C. Rogers, Bristol; T Borden, Cornwallis, N S.; D W. Green, Frank Carpenter, Walter Connell, Houlton; S. Arcott, Benton; John Grant, A O. Donnell, Debec; Jas. Sions, Grand Falls; G A. Peters and wife, Sherbrook; Chas. Osgood, John Gillen, Hartland; C G. Brackett, Newport, M.; A C. Burpee, Gibson; A. Thompson, W A. Burden, D B. Green, Fredericton; H. Akin, Fredericton; G E. Hoerner, F J. Aylward, Toronto; C B. Williams and wife, Quebec; H L. McLean, G D. Frost, St. John; L R. MacLaren, Moncton; Jas. Rogers, J A. Pelletier, Montreal;

Our connection with a wholesale house enables us to buy cheap you get the benefit at Jewett's.

WANTED RELIABLE MEN
Good honest men in every locality, local or travelling, to introduce and advertise our goods tacking up show-cards on fences, along public roads and all conspicuous places. No experience needed. Salary or commission \$50 per month and expenses \$2.50 per day. Write at once for full particulars.
THE EMPIRE MEDICINE CO., London, Ont.

EXAMINED FREE



Satisfaction Guaranteed
Our guarantee means something.

We are not here to-day and away to-morrow; you know just where to find us.
Comfortable vision or your money back. No guess work.
Accurate, scientific measurements and tests. Difficult cases a specialty.

Carr & Gibson,
Jewelers and Scientific Opticians,
Woodstock, N. B.

Business Wanted

IN THE LINE OF PAINTING YOUR SLEIGHS AND PUNGS.

It does not pay you, gentlemen, to run your Sleigh or Pung until it is threadbare. If you do they will all go to pieces at once; while if you had them looked over and painted in time, you would save money. I have my coat off, and am well stocked with Fine Colors and Varnishes, and want to paint your Sleigh or Pung this winter in an up to date style, for the lowest possible price.

I take this opportunity to thank you for past patronage, and I make every effort to please those who favor me with a call.

JOHN McKENZIE,
Carriage and Sleigh Painter,
LOANE'S FACTORY,
Connell St.

"FIT-REFORM" GARMENTS FOR FALL AND WINTER, ARE READY.

No matter what your chest measure, to all practical purposes you are one of four figures: "regular," "stout," "tall" or "short."

"Fit-Reform" garments are cut in each and in variations of each.

The garment nearest your figure is tried on, then altered (if necessary) to fit your personality.

That's progressive ready-made—that's "Fit-Reform" and it is sold at ordinary ready-made prices.

Suits—\$10, 12, 15.
Overcoats—\$10, 12, 15.
Trousers—\$3, 4, 5.

FIT-REFORM WARDROBE. B. B. MANZER.

A STRONG PULL.

We have been making a strong pull and a long pull for the cream of the custom tailoring trade our efforts have been SUCCESSFUL. In order to accomplish this we have endeavored to give Newest Styles, the best Goods, the best Workmanship, without FANCY PRICES. We are not running any philanthropic organization. We find it pays, and we do not propose to abate one jot in our efforts to maintain the position we have won by sheer merit in the trade. Competition of course must be considered in every business, but it is something about which we do not trouble ourselves unduly. All our efforts are focussed in the endeavor to turn out at the lowest possible cost the BEST GARMENTS that skill and ingenuity can devise. So we haven't much time left us to trouble about competition. But we know that talk has no value unless there is something solid to back it up with, and make good the words that have been spoken. We have the goods bought before the rise in wool and shall continue to make them to order at the same prices as heretofore. With these we bid for your trade.

R. B. JONES,
Manchester House.

OUR ROAD WAGGONS

Are right up to date, And give every satisfaction.

Samples of them may be seen with
W. WEBSTER ROSS, Hartland,
M. A. SMITH, East Florenceville,
T. CHAL. MILBERY, Bath,
J. FLETCHER TWEEDDALE, Perth,
DAN. B. HOPKINS, Aroostook Junction,
GEO. H. WEST, Grand Falls,
or at our warehouse and showrooms here in Woodstock.

We also sell Buggies, Express Wagons, Farm Wagons, Deering Mowers Reapers and Binders, Cultivators, Plows, Harrows, Churns, Single and Double Harness, and many other lines of goods. So do our agents.

We are moving this week to our new premises on Connell Street. Come in and look things over.

Balmain Bros.

May 24, '98.
Victoria-Montreal Fire Insurance Co.

AUTHORIZED CAPITAL, \$1,000,000. CAPITAL FULLY SUBSCRIBED, \$400,000

George Anderson,
Manager for THOS. A. TEMPLE & SONS,
General Agents for the Maritime Provinces, 92 Prince William Street, ST. JOHN, N. B.

Don't buy your spectacles as you do gum from "Nickel in Slot" machine, go to Jewett the optician.