EVENTS.

Published Weikly

ARNOTT J. MAGURN, Editor.

VOL. 8 AUG. 13, 1905 No. 7

HERE was a debate in the British House of Commons on the new Transvaal constitution but it was not very satisfactory. The truth is that the House of Commons is discussing a sham constitution created by a government that has no right to hold office. Everytaing about the con stitution in the Transvasi and the Government at home is provisional and fugitive. Mr. Lyttelton found an ingenious justification for his constitution, in the argument that the detestation with which the independent British and Boers alike regard Lord Milner's government and system has served to reconcile racial fends. There is nothing new in the suggestion and remark has been made before on the success with which the Government had succeeded in combining the Boer farmers and the British artizans. But it is novel coming from aColonial Secretary. Perhaps the most important speech was Mr. Chamberlain's. Two years ago Mr. Chamberlain said there was no danger to Imperial interests in giving self government to the two new colonies. On Thursday he attacked the government on two grounds. He said the Government had gone too far in its concessions in this constitution, and that the experiment would have been far better tried in the Orange River Colony. His remarks on this subject, and the praise he bestowed on the Boer administration in the Orange Free State are the most complete vindication of General de Wet's complaints. The Boers will not find anything in the speeches of British politicians which they cherish move carefully for purposes of controversy than this important admission by Mr. Chamberlain.

N the House of Lords, the Duke of Devonshire made "one more attempt to dis-

cover to the opinions of which sections of their nominal followers His Majesty's Ministers at present inclined," by moving two resolutions, namely, "that this House disapproves of any proposal to establish a general or penal tariff," and "that this House disapproves of any system of Colonual Preference based on taxation of food." He was, of course, unsuccessful, though he spoke with unusual warmth about the manner in which an attempt was being made to commit the country to Protection through the Colonial Conference. He analyzed the relations of Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Balfour with scarcely concealed contempt for the latter and unconcealed resentment against the former. His resolutions, he said, were intended to afford to the Government simple and effectivemeans of asserting whether they were prepared to stand by their own policy. The most significant speech in the debate was that of Lord Robertson, who said that as a loyal, member of the Tory party he had a right to know whether the party was to be ruined by being secretly "identified with a general penal tariff. It was hard to discover, he said, how the Unionist tenure of office was justified in the eyes of men of honor. There was now a vast amount of irresponsible and speculative wealth anxious to interest itself in our politics. To introduce a ruinous system of corruption was not fit work for the Tory party. He spoke eloquently of the degeneration in the "Arthur Balfour whom twenty years ago he semembered with enthusiastic admiration." Lord Grimthorpe strongly of the Government's manœuvres to stifle discussion. The debate was carried on by Lord Goschen, Lord Ridley and Lord Spencer. Lord Lansdowne spoke without saving anything in particular except the diplomatic sentence that his party intended to stand by its supporters so long as their support was given, and the previous question -was carried by a majority of 64.

E propose to have something to say next week with respect to the Contagious Diseases Hospital in Ottawa, which is owned by the taxpayers and ad-