

Messenger and Visitor.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER,
VOLUME LXI.

THE CHRISTIAN VISITOR
VOLUME L.

Vol. XV.

ST. JOHN, N. B., WEDNESDAY, JUNE 21, 1899.

No. 25

France and the Dreyfus Case. One of the most noteworthy of recent events in the political world is the defeat and resignation of the French ministry led by M. Dupuy, which occurred on Monday of last week. The attack upon the Government in the House of Deputies was ostensibly connected with disturbances which had occurred the preceding day in connection with the Long Champs demonstrations and with the Government's responsibility for the conduct of the police. There appears to be no doubt, however, that the real cause of the ministry's downfall was the Dreyfus question, upon which the attitude of M. Dupuy and his colleagues had not been sufficiently pronounced to please extremists on either side, and the adverse vote of Monday was due to a union for the moment of elements which have no common principle of cohesion. The Montreal Witness sums up as follows the history of the Dreyfus case, considered as to its effects upon the internal political life of the nation: "Two presidents and three ministers have fallen owing to the Dreyfus affair. Five or six ministers of war and half as many ministers of justice have been driven from office by it. Two generals of the central staff have resigned on account of it. One judge of the Supreme Court has ruined his career by scandalously stepping down from the bench in order to discredit the court of which he had been a member. There have been three suicides of officers or military secretaries in consequence of the disclosures. And there have been any number of political and military reputations blasted during the course of it. And all these events and incidents have been attended with more or less of the dramatic circumstances which attracts world-wide attention to French affairs." The end is not yet. The Court of Cassation having decided in favor of a new trial, Dreyfus has been liberated from imprisonment on Devil's Island and is being brought home to France. There appears to be little doubt that a new trial must result in Dreyfus' acquittal, and just as little that the real culprits, whose condemnation and punishment are demanded in the interests of justice, are certain chiefs of the army and the men for whose iniquity they have made themselves responsible. What the result will be is a question upon which the best informed and most prudent writers are slow to express an opinion. President Loubet is a man of some strength of character and probably desires that justice shall be impartially and effectively administered, but whether he can command the services of a Government with virtue and strength enough to carry out such a purpose remains to be seen.

The Boundary Question. In the course of an article on the Alaskan Boundary question 'The London Times' says: "American and British authorities differ as to the interpretation of the treaty by which the limits of American territory upon the coast are defined. The merits of the legal controversy it is for international lawyers to decide. We in England believe that our case for the British possession of certain valuable ports of entry, including Skaguay and Dyea, at the head of the Lynn Canal, is very good. In America the contention is that these ports have been occupied by the United States, that they are regarded as American territory, and that to surrender them would cost President McKinley's Government the political support of the states of the Pacific slope. To say this is to say that it is practically impossible for the American commissioners to accept an arrangement which would involve a voluntary surrender of the ports in question. If the commission fails of its

object and the governments agree to go to arbitration, the terms of the award must, of course, be accepted on both sides. Believing, as we do, that the British case is very strong, we have every interest in going to arbitration, provided that the terms of reference are satisfactory. Those of the Venezuelan precedent might be fairly accepted on both sides. At present, however, it is understood that the United States Government declines to go to arbitration on any terms, which we would accept." It is probably quite true, as 'The Times' states, that the influence which makes the United States unwilling to arbitrate concerning such places as Skaguay and Dyea in the disputed territory comes from the states of the Pacific slope. It is a thing strongly resented by certain newspaper writers and politicians in the United States that Canada should have any influence in the counsels of the nation of which she is a very considerable—and in this case the most interested—part, in determining its attitude toward the boundary question, but we do not hear that they have discovered that there is anything to find fault with in the attitude of the United States upon this matter being determined by the interests or prejudices of the Pacific States. The fact is that it is not Canada, and not the interests of the United States as a whole, but sectional interests of one kind and another in the latter that stand in the way of a settlement of most of the points of difficulty between the two countries.

Great Britain and the Transvaal. During the past week or two the attention of the reading world has been strongly attracted again to the South African Boer republic, known as the Transvaal, and especially to the relations of President Kruger and his Government to the Government of Great Britain. These relations have become so severely strained that the situation is generally spoken of as a "crisis" and the probability of war freely discussed. The trouble in the Transvaal, as is well known by all who have given any attention to the subject, is connected with the Uitlanders. These "Uitlanders" are the foreign element in the Boer republic. They occupy a district of country known as the Rand, in which is situated the large mining town of Johannesburg. Many of these people are British subjects and there are not a few Americans. British and American capital is also largely invested in the mining operations in which these people are for the most part engaged. The position of the Uitlanders in the Transvaal and their grievances against the Boer Government are summed up by Mr. Henry Norman as follows: "The Uitlanders in the Transvaal are four-fifths of the population and pay nine-tenths of the taxes. They have converted a bankrupt, pastoral community into one of the richest areas in the world. Yet they have no share in levying or spending the oppressive taxes they pay; they have no control over the payment of officials; they have no voice in educational grants; their children above the third standard can only be educated in the degrading Boer patois, which is unintelligible even in Holland; they have no voice in the municipal government of Johannesburg which they built; their press is gagged; public meetings are prohibited, and they have no right to a trial by their peers. For dynamite, a necessity for mining purposes, they have to pay exactly twice the market value, the difference going into certain favored pockets. Finally, they are openly insulted and derided by Boer officials. When one of their number is shot, like Joel by Von Veldheim or Edgar, by a Boer policeman, the prisoner is acquitted. The

Transvaal is armed to the teeth with all the most modern appliances and munitions of war. Johannesburg itself is dominated by a fort armed with quick-firing guns, all of which the Uitlanders have paid for. It is, of course, out of the question to expect that an energetic community, in which the British and Americans predominate, will consent to live forever under such conditions."

The present acute stage of the trouble in the Transvaal has been reached after—and partly as the result of—a conference between President Kruger and Sir Alfred Milner, Great Britain's High Commissioner at Cape Colony. The conference was held recently at Bloemfontein with the hope of reaching a satisfactory adjustment of the difficulties, but completely failed of that result. Among the manifold grievances of the Uitlanders that which was principally discussed at the Bloemfontein conference had reference to the franchise. Sir Alfred Milner's proposal was that the right to vote should be given to every foreigner who had resided for five years and had declared his intention of residing permanently, and who took the oath to obey the laws, undertake all the obligations of citizenship, defend the independence of the country, was of good character, and possessed a certain amount of property or income. Moreover, he asked that seats in the Volksraad [the Transvaal Parliament] for the Uitlander districts be increased, in number, there being now only two. These seemingly very reasonable concessions were wholly rejected by President Kruger, and in his counter propositions the acquisition of citizenship in the republic was so hedged about with conditions as to make it all but impossible for Uitlanders. Even such concessions was made conditional upon England's consenting to submit the London Convention, upon which the British suzerainty over the Transvaal is based, to the arbitration of some foreign power; and upon England's consent also to President Kruger's request for the incorporation of Swaziland into the Transvaal. In the face of such propositions, nothing of course could be accomplished by the conference, and it remains to be seen whether the resources of diplomacy in the hands of Lord Salisbury and Mr. Chamberlain will be sufficient to effect such a settlement as will satisfy the demands of British honor and British interests in South Africa. It is believed in some quarters that a despatch from the British Colonial Secretary to the Transvaal Government constituting practically an ultimatum from Great Britain has been for some time in the hands of Sir Alfred Milner, pending the result of the Bloemfontein Conference, and that now that this Conference has resulted in nothing satisfactory, this despatch will be, or perhaps has already been, submitted to President Kruger. The position of the Transvaal Government from a legal point of view seems to be a strong one, since by treaty arrangements, Great Britain can claim to control only the foreign relations of the Boer Republic, and the status of the Uitlanders in the Transvaal is plainly a matter pertaining to its internal economy. Moreover Great Britain would if possible avoid war with the Transvaal, not only because there would be no glory in fighting the little republic, but because it would be likely to arouse the Dutch element in British South Africa and stir up strife not easily allayed, and also because such a war in South Africa might be seized upon as an opportunity for the enemies of Great Britain to make trouble for her elsewhere. On the other hand, it becomes a question whether Great Britain can decline to interfere to redress the grievances of the Uitlanders—many of whom are her own subjects—and still maintain the prestige essential to the protection and development of her South African interests.