

## III.—PLEDGES GIVEN TO UITLANDERS BY REPRESENTATIVES OF THE SUZERAIN POWER.

Author.	Nature of Pledge and References.
<i>The Root Cause of Trouble.</i>	
Mr. Chamberlain ...	"The people of Johannesburg laid down their arms in the belief that reasonable concessions would be arranged by your intervention; and until these are granted, or are definitely promised to you by the President, the root cause of the recent troubles will remain."—C.-7933, pp. 55, 57.
Sir Hercules Robinson (Lord Rosmead)	"I have privately recommended them [the Reform Committee] to accept ultimatum."—C.-7933, p. 33. But add with reference to "privately."—C.-8063, p. 40. "I intend, if I find that the Johannesburg people have substantially complied with ultimatum, to insist on the fulfilment of promises as regards prisoners and consideration of grievances."—C.-7933, pp. 39, 60; and C.-8043, p. 40.
Lord Loch ...	C.-8159; add also his speech in the House of Lords, 1896.
Sir Jacobus de Wet ...	C.-8346; but compare C.-8423, p. 138.

## IV.—BREACHES OF THE CONVENTIONS.

## OF THE SPIRIT AND LETTER.

*Equality taken for granted in granting Independence.*

The Transvaal was given its independence under its liberal Constitution, which distinctly laid down that the children of the suzerain should be on an equality in all things with the Boers, whom, of her own movement, Great Britain had made into a free nation. The right of self-government is, by the Convention, conferred upon the "inhabitants," not a section of them. A glance at the list of Uitlanders' grievances given above (see pp. 1 to 6) will show how far that understanding has been observed in *spirit*. And, loosely drawn as the Conventions were, there are certain definite breaches of the *letter* also, which will be found below.

Passing by such former breaches as the several "treks" into Bechuanaland and Zululand, and the "commandeering" of British subjects, the letter of the London Convention has been infringed by—

*Dynamite.*

(1.) The dynamite monopoly, which (see Mr. Chamberlain's despatch, C.-9345, p. 227) is a violation of Article XIV.

*Cape Boys.*

(2.) Ill-treatment of Cape boys and other British subjects of colour (see Mr. Chamberlain's despatch, C.-9347, p. 229: "However long-suffering Her Majesty's Government may be in their anxious desire to remain on friendly terms with the South African Republic, it must be evident that a continuance of incidents of this kind"—i.e., murder—"followed by no redress, may well become intolerable").

*Press Law.—Aliens Expulsion Law.*

(3.) By provisions introduced into the Constitution since the Convention in 1884, the Uitlander is, in Mr. Chamberlain's words, "not only deprived of any effective political representation, but has also been placed, by recent legislation, under new liabilities if he appeals to public opinion, or attempts to bring his complaints to the notice of the Government." It is contended that all the franchise legislation since the Convention is a breach of that instrument. The Press Law (No. 26 of 1896) and the amending Law (No. 14 of 1898), enabling the President to prohibit the circulation of printed matter; the Alien Expulsion Law (No. 25 of 1896) and Law 1 of 1897, laying down that the Courts have no power to refuse to apply a resolution of the Volksraad because it is, in their opinion, invalid, and instructing the President to dismiss any Judge who, in his opinion, returns an unsatisfactory answer to questions put to him on the subject by the President; and the laws curtailing the right of public meeting have all destroyed or impaired safeguards of public liberty and right, and are all breaches of Article XIV. of the Convention.

*Article XIV.*

(4.) Finally, as Article XIV. gives right of entry and domicile and exemption from exceptional taxation "to all persons, other than natives, conforming themselves to the laws of the South African Republic," it is plain that all the grievances of this character set forth above are infringements of the letter as well as of the spirit of the Convention.

Did the Convention contemplate that the Boers should (a) destroy the right to the franchise; (b) cripple the independence of the Supreme Court; (c) arrange taxation so as to throw nine-tenths of it on to the unenfranchised; (d) make men liable to arbitrary expulsion without trial; (e) muzzle the Press; (f) cripple the right of public meeting; (g) make only burghers jurors? Was this liberty conferred upon the Boers by the Convention?

Owning half the land, all the mines and commerce, contributing nearly the whole of the revenue, deprived of all representation, taxed by the minority far in excess of the legitimate requirements of Government, burdened with unjust monopolies, grievously injured by illicit liquor traffic, denied education in their native language, subject to arbitrary expulsion, the rights of a free Press and free public meeting mutilated, the Courts of justice subject to any chance resolution, jury-trial by peers denied, menaced by forts and the threat of military force, the present position of the Uitlanders, deprived of their arms, is to-day not such as could possibly have been contemplated by those who framed the Convention.