

points:—That the grievances of the Outlanders were only imaginary since life and property were not in constant danger, and that the taxes were not so exorbitant as to keep English mining companies from paying dividends of from 5 per cent. to 400 per cent.; that the monopolies were not injurious; that international law does not concede a right of paramountcy; that the growth of the Dutch did not endanger the welfare of South Africa; that the oligarchical government was not injurious; that there was violation of the treaties by England; that the Dutch are capable of governing; that the Outlanders do not want the franchise required of the Boer government by England; that the parallel drawn between the United States and England was an assumption as the condition in the two cases are entirely different.

The rebuttal for the affirmative embraced the following: That England has a right to interfere in the external affairs of the government; that the Boers are the aggressors in the struggle; that the domineering policy of Kruger is dangerous to England's welfare; that the Boers broke the treaties as well as the English; that the negative must prove the whole course unjust; that the Jameson raid was not sanctioned by England; that crime prevailed in the Dutch republic; that the franchise was unjust; that England's position required action such as she took; that the English were responsible for the peace of South Africa; that greed was sentiment not injustice; that England was not suzerain in South Africa was granted by the affirmative; that the franchise as required by England was the best; that there was no law protection; and that civilization required that she intervene.

