

On which side do we find the conciliation which shows the desire for peace? Beginning with the restoration of Transvaal independence, after Great Britain had suffered several humiliating defeats in petty engagements, and at the moment when she was at last in a position to avenge them, we have following in quick succession the enlargement of Transvaal territory and the reduction in England's privileges by the Convention of 1884; again a further addition of territory, although by the last Convention the Boers had agreed to be content with the boundaries then laid down; and repeated breaches of the Convention by the Boers, and years of injustice to British subjects patiently endured by their Government. These constitute a considerable manifestation of peaceful purposes on the one side; what is there on the other? I can find nothing. I cannot even discover that the Boers or their friends claim that they did anything to demonstrate a like purpose on their part, except the hollow offers of franchise in the last few months. All their most vehement champions can advance is that *the Boers did not wrong the Outlanders, because the Outlanders were entitled to nothing.*

The Boers and their friends say "England was preparing for war." And why should she not? With the Transvaal armed to the teeth, with munitions of war pouring in every day, what would they have had us do?

Our possible antagonist was already fully prepared. Since when has it been inconsistent with pacific designs to take reasonable precautions against obvious danger?

Mr. Bryce complains that England was not sufficiently patient with these tyrant tricksters. He tells the oppressed and despised Outlanders that Kruger must die some day and they should have waited for his demise, because it is unlikely that another such despot would succeed him. This, truly, is a novel doctrine for free-born Englishmen! And meantime British subjects would be dying, . . . for years other British subjects had died, fearing that the proudest tradition of British citizenship had been belied; that at last the ears of the motherland were deaf to her children's cries.

Patience, forsooth! With whom? Is it this autocrat Kruger; the glib quoter of Scripture; the chief agent in stirring up the bloodshed of 1881? How much patience did he show toward us then? There was no oppression of the Boers by England; their lives and property and liberties were safe; bankruptcy had given place to prosperity; the Zulu horde which threatened their destruction had itself been crushed by British money and British blood. But, they say, the promised Constitution had been delayed; some English officials were unwisely arrogant and peremptory; and for these small sins Kruger turned his rifles upon the men who four short years before had rescued his country from financial ruin and its people from massacre!

And what of Mr. Chamberlain, who has been accused of forcing on this war to gratify his personal ambition; who, contrary to every