

India

FOR THE

No. 56. NEW SERIES.
No. 150. OLD SERIES.]

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, JANUARY 27, 1899.

[REGISTERED AS A (PRICE..... Rs.
NEWSPAPER. (BY POST, 9d.)

Notes and News	41	The Calcutta Municipal Bill: Further	48
The Calcutta Municipality Bill	44	Meeting of Protest	48
An Undesired Vindication of the		Mr. Bamesh Dutt, C.I.E., at Man-	48
Indian Parliamentary Committee,		chester	48
by E. H. Pickersill, M.P.	45	The Fourteenth Congress: Presi-	48
The Mutiny at Delhi	46	dential Address by Mr. A. M. Bose ..	48
Chronicle of the Week	46	Public Meetings on Indian Ques-	48
Letter to the Editor: Assessments	46	tions: The Work of the British	48
and Money-lenders	47	Committee	51
		Advertisements	52

NOTES AND NEWS.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON told his constituents at Chiswick on Wednesday evening that "if the past year has been one of general progress throughout the British dominions, in no part of our empire has the advance been more marked than in our Indian dominions." This is the sort of statement which requires what Huxley calls justification not by faith but by verification. But the optimist of the India Office seems merely to have meant that no other part of the empire had had to battle at one and the same time with famine, plague, and war. He went on to say that he was not hostile to Indian aspirations nor to any change which can tend to the "elevation" of the Indians. We make a note of the words, but where are the deeds to support them? Lord G. Hamilton's "earnest desire is to advance in every way that is feasible the moral, intellectual, and material condition of India's many nationalities." Where are the manifestations of this excellent desire? Are we to find them in the imprisonment of the Natus without trial; or in the new law of sedition; or in the Press prosecutions; or in the creation of intimidating "Press Committees"; or in the overthrow of local self-government? Lord G. Hamilton seems to perceive the contrast between words and things, for when he comes to eulogise existing methods in India it is not by comparison with his high professions but only by comparison with the anarchy and oppression which preceded British rule. Viewing the matter in this light he "wonders, not at the defects of the system we have reared, but at the amazing success it has achieved"—which merely shows how easily he is pleased. A sane and modest view would (without manufactured hysterics about subversion of British rule) take note of what thoughtful men in India have to say on the "amazing success."

Some of the comments of the Anglo-Indian Press on the Congress are not without instruction. The *Times* of India in a hostile article has one passage of very different purport. "Once more we are reminded of Sir William Lee-Warner's protest that more voices and not fewer need be raised in India for the enlightenment of rulers and people alike." It is surely curious to demand "more voices" while those that are already raised are treated with contumely or disregard. By comparison the *Englishman* is quite sympathetic and, though disagreeing with the President's views on the Calcutta Municipal Bill, it warmly supports him in condemning the Law of Sedition and the Forward policy beyond the North-West Frontier, on which points it affirms that he represents non-official Anglo-Indian opinion as well as that of supporters of the Congress. It is interesting to note that far from finding fault with Mr. Bose on the ground of vagueness, as the *Times* did, it declares that he supported his views on the last named questions by bringing forward "solid facts." The *Madras Mail* professes to see a falling-off in the influence of the Congress, in which perhaps the wish is father to the thought; and it then proceeds to find the causes of this imaginary state of affairs. One of these it finds in the existence of elected members in the Legislative Councils, who can raise all questions of administration, at least once a year, thus rendering the Congress less necessary. It professes great delight at this reform, but overlooks, what one of the Congress resolutions would have told it, that the reform has still to be accomplished in the Punjab, for there the councillors have not the right of

interpellation, nor have the people the right of recommending those whom they deem fittest to represent them in the Council.

One criticism on the Congress appears in several different places. It is argued that Provincial Congresses, each speaking with assured knowledge of the wants of its own district, would have much more weight both with the Government and the public, whereas now the small attendance from the parts of the country most distant from the meeting place deprive the gathering of all authority on questions concerning those districts. Now it is obvious that there are many conveniences in such local gatherings. But, in the first place, the very sacrifices the delegates have to make to attend the National Congress are a proof of their earnestness which cannot fail to have its effect on the public; and secondly the Congress should be national because it deals with the subjects which concern the whole of India. If we omit resolutions of compliment and condolence and those relating to the business of the Congress, we find that, leaving the omnibus resolution aside, sixteen were submitted to the delegates, and of these eight were applicable to all India, while only two—those in favour of making the legislative machinery in the Punjab and Berar the same as in other Provinces—concerned one Province only. The omnibus resolution dealt with seventeen different points, of which at least twelve applied to the whole country, while again only two had a single Province in view. Why, then, should not these national questions, in which all parts of India have an interest, be dealt with in a National Congress? In business which concerns the whole of India, why should not India speak with one voice?

At bottom the objection resolves itself into the old contention that India has no unity of interests or desires, the old wish to keep the various races and religions, provinces and cities apart. It is the old argument that India is not one nation but a congeries of hostile races, each of which must be studied separately and not one of which has anything in common with the others. This is a strange blindness in the Anglo-Indians, who cannot see that the most effective and probably the most enduring part of their work has been to infuse a new spirit of patriotism into the Indians—a patriotism cemented alike by the benefits the English have conferred and the sufferings they have inflicted on the people. There is no such means of drawing the divergent elements of a society together, of giving them a unity of purpose and inspiring them with the same feeling and passions, as the enjoyment of common benefits and the suffering from common oppressions. The business of the Congress chiefly concerns all India because all India is getting more and more to realise the interests which every part has in common; and the national character of the Congress is only one more expression of the same truth. It is true that in one Congress one Province, and in the next another, will have but a small representation; even then the Congress will be better able to deal weightily with those questions which affect many parts of the country than would a meeting of representatives drawn from one Province alone.

Of the questions which did not professedly affect the whole of India several were of the highest interest to all Indians. For instance the resolution for the repeal of the Bombay Regulation under which the Natus were imprisoned, and the corresponding Regulations in Madras and Bengal only in terms related to the three Provinces, yet there could not have been one that more deeply moved the delegates from all parts of India. The Indians have reached the stage in which a wrong done to one is a wrong done to all, and what is this but to say that India is already a nation? It is true that even in those resolutions which extended to all Indians, all were not equally in-

terested; that some have to pay as salt-tax a mere trifle of 500 per cent. on the value, while others have to pay 2,000 or even 4,000 per cent., yet we can hardly doubt that all alike will be willing from their hearts to support the very moderate suggestion of the Congress.

Many resolutions of course appear year after year either separately or in the omnibus resolution, and will continue to appear until the grievances to which they refer are redressed; for were they to be omitted, some would be found to say that the grievances were no longer felt. But among the grievances which have now come to the front there are three which, though actually concerning only certain places, potentially may in the future concern any place in India. It cannot be known where plague may next break out, or what city may be almost reduced to bankruptcy by the expenses thus entailed; and so any city may find itself compelled to seek help from the common purse. It cannot be known where next the freedom of the Press may be threatened by Press Committees. It cannot be known what municipality will be next attacked, or what further inroads on local self-government will be made. Happily the Indians are beginning to learn, slowly but surely, that they must stand or fall together.

The London *Times* should see the *Madras Times* (which, be it observed, is an Anglo-Indian paper) on the character of the address of the President of the National Congress. The *Madras Times*, with all its Anglo-Indianism, does not find Mr. Bose's address "vague and colourless," but on the contrary declares that it is "historic and analytical, and one by one it draws up different definite 'charges' against the Government, and sets out, in clear style, such as should make the address at least as useful to the Government as to the Congresswallah, the list of things that the people of India, represented by the Congress, regard as grievances." Let our *Times* note that—the opinion of an opponent on the spot. Let it note further that our contemporary of Madras finds that the burden of the address is "that the policy of the Government of India within the last two years has been of a retrograde sort," and, what is more, admits that, whether for good or for evil, "a sort of reversion of policy has set in."

Further, the *Madras Times*, looking with eyes not of "imported Englishmen," but of "the people of this land," tells us how it regards two alleged examples of reversion of policy. First:

Take the Calcutta Municipal Bill, which is being rushed through to the indignation of the people of Calcutta. Self-government is the desire of all civilised people, and the slight measure of self-government that has been given to India in the matter of its municipalities has been highly appreciated. Elections for municipal membership are attended with the keenest excitement, as was evidenced in Madras in the recent excitement of the Norton v. Govindaswami struggle. The testimony in most Government reviews of municipal procedure is to the effect that the elected members do much more earnest work than the official members, and the municipality of Calcutta, in its successful battle with the plague, has shown that it can rise to an emergency. Nevertheless, a "Municipal Bill" has been introduced which will practically annihilate self-government in Calcutta, reducing the elected members to a mere third of the number and putting an official in the chair. Whether it is a movement for good or evil, time may show; but that it is a retrograde movement is at any rate a fact.

Secondly, take the case of the long imprisonment of the Nattu brothers without a trial, and even without any intimation as to what offence they were charged with. The *Madras Times*, Anglo-Indian as it is, says:—

The Magna Charta is not in force, to be sure, in India; but it was certainly a retrograde policy to suddenly arrest two men in the iron-mask sort of fashion and put them away. It is a policy that was suppressed in England nearly seven centuries ago, and it was certainly a retrograde policy, and in our opinion a serious mistake on the part of the Bombay Government in hysterics to enter upon such a very un-English procedure in 1897. It was less than that that was done in the case of Dreyfus against which all England cries out; and, if it is argued that the Nattus were aliens, it may be answered that quite as much so, as being a Jew, was Dreyfus regarded as an alien in the eyes of the French nation.

More than that: "where the president scores a point"—a third point—"is in the expression of indignation that while England pays money to Crete, pays money to Egypt, pays money to the West Indies, India, in spite of the poverty of her half-starved rayats, should not only not be given contributions, but should be made to bear the whole charge of the wars that England chooses to wage upon her frontier, and that the Viceroy should himself have deliberately refused to entertain the idea of a contribution

that would have been most equitable." Not much sign of vagueness or lack of colour there, we fancy.

We are glad to find that the important addresses delivered by the Chairman of the Reception Committee and the President of the Congress have been distributed broadcast at home by the British Committee, and have given rise to some useful comments in the English Press. The *Investors' Review*, for example, in an article headed "The Indian Congress," writes:—

The British Committee of this important gathering has forwarded to us a report of the speeches delivered by the Hon. N. Subba Rao Pantulu, B.A., B.L., and Mr. A. M. Bose, at the meeting of this Congress held last month. It is a pity intelligent electors throughout the kingdom could not have an opportunity of perusing these speeches. The very fluency of the English language in which they are delivered would astonish most of them, coming as it does from the mouths of Native gentlemen. There is a dignity, also, and a sense of moral responsibility in these addresses which marks them as the utterances of men who have the interest of their country at heart. A nation is surely growing up in India under our rule, although we are yet but half aware of it. Nothing seditious, nothing subversive of British authority, is to be found in the speeches; but on the contrary temperate remonstrance and complaints couched in reasonable language.

The *Investors' Review* proceeds to deal with Mr. Bose's timely remarks on the exclusion of Indians from the Engineering Class at Roorkee—a proceeding which throws an interesting side-light on Lord Curzon's advice the other day to the youth of Bengal to enter the best engineering colleges. The *Investors' Review* asks:—

What reason can the British administration of India give for a step of this sort unless it be a determination to exclude Natives from the profession of engineers within the Peninsula? We do not believe that Indian civilians keep boarding houses here in order to take the money of the Native gentlemen, who, by such a decree, will be forced to come to this country in order to acquire a knowledge of the engineering profession. Do they want, though, to keep the whole available posts in India exclusively for themselves, their sons, and connexions? Probably; and yet they ask us to admire the philanthropic character of our rule. We are "educating the Natives up?"—to do what? To take a larger share in the business and government of their country? No; it would seem merely to despise us.

The *Morning Leader*, the *New Age*, and the *Reformer* are among the other journals which have written in appreciative terms of the recent Congress.

We take the following editorial comments (headed "The Indian Congress") from the *Investors' Review* (January 13):—

Last week's INDIA complains emphatically about the treatment accorded to this annual assemblage of delegates from all parts of India by the Indian Government and the Anglo-Indian Press. As far as we can judge, there is ample justification for this complaint. It is surely indiscreet, to say no more, on the part of the British rulers of India and their Press in India, or here, to jeer at the attempts made by the Natives to secure constitutional means whereby to make their wishes, aspirations, and grievances known to the ruling power. We find in the number of INDIA before us a summary telegraphic account of the proceedings of the fourteenth annual meeting of this Congress, which was held at Madras at the end of last year. There were over 600 delegates besides about 4,000 visitors, and the proceedings were described as enthusiastic. So far as we can see, nothing in the nature of sedition or disloyalty, nothing even unreasonable or outrageous, in any way characterised the resolutions passed by this Congress. On the contrary, they were perfectly respectful and in order; even the remonstrance about the Press committees secretly appointed and illegal in their nature, as the resolution characterised them, was such as might have been passed in much stronger terms in any public meeting in England. What good can come to us as rulers by sneering, making fun at, and deriding these annual assemblages? Surely none at all. And are not the fussy officials throughout India, who are said to be discouraging the landed proprietors in their districts from having anything to do with this gathering, going beyond their rights? They are certainly acting in a manner calculated to undermine the foundations of our rule, instead of strengthening them. The more the people of India can be persuaded to step out openly and make their wishes known, the better it will be for us. Even if they criticise us hotly at times, the criticism should be valuable in enabling us to see where we may have gone astray in our blind administration, which works in *vacuo*, ignorant alike of popular sentiment and usage. We hope a change may come over our Press in this direction for it would be a pity to see the Indian people persuaded that it was useless for them to make public their desires in any form because they are treated with ridicule or contempt.

The twelfth session of the Indian Social Conference was held in the Congress pavilion at Madras immediately after the conclusion of the Congress business. The President of the year was Rao Bahadur K. Veeraselingam Pantulu, a veteran in the cause, whose name, as the Hon. Mr. N. Subba Rao truly said, "is a household word in the whole Telugu world, and whose works have enriched the Telugu literature of the country." The President pointed out

that the political development of the country must largely depend upon the social condition of the community which supplies the physical, the intellectual, and the moral resources of the Government. While stating fully the importance of the part played by the Conference meetings, he recognised that the real work of improving the social environment lies outside, and he insisted on the essential need for patient, honest, and intelligent work, not only for the success of the social reform movement as such, but as a safeguard against errors of judgment and the result of preconceived theories. Altogether his speech was marked by earnestness and fairness, notably by his frank admission of the difficulties to be overcome, as well as of the slowness and vacillation of friends and neighbours. There is nothing to be gained, rather there is much to be lost, by shrinking from a full recognition of patent facts. The progress is necessarily slow, but at a past time it was much slower. One province or district may have more or less to learn from another: the thing is, "let us all learn from one another."

In the discussion on Higher Female Education, Mrs. W. G. Kamalakar spoke at some length in an admirably practical tone. She regarded higher education as not merely book knowledge and ability to solve mathematical problems, but as including such knowledge "as may strengthen and form the character, expand and cultivate the mind and give a healthy view of life and its duties, teach the importance of all work, and, last but not least, temper the bitterness of life." In working out her propositions, she laid a series of most important considerations before the Conference with striking effect. The working of the Mysore Marriage Laws, happily, has been so judicious as to obviate difficulties that were foreseen and dreaded; and the enlightened statesmen of other Native States are preparing to follow the lead of Mysore. The Conference passed a resolution of regret that the Government of India had refused to sanction the introduction of the Infant Marriage Prevention Bills in the Madras Legislative Council. The Government thought the measures proposed were in advance of public opinion. The movers, however, had ascertained opinion "from everywhere, from even the orthodox community;" and it was pointed out that the legislation of Mysore would equally suit the similar population of the Madras province. The Government will be memorialised to appoint a commission of enquiry to investigate the advance of public opinion on the question, which the Conference properly regards as of fundamental importance. The Government is wise to be careful; it is unwise to be over-careful.

There was some strong speaking on the subject of child-widow marriage, the existing rule being attributed to "an unfeeling condition of the people," and described as "a terrible disgrace to the country." It was stated that ten widow marriages had taken place during the year—five in Bombay and the Berars, two in the Madras Presidency, two in Bengal, and one in the Punjab—while reference was again made to the fact that the Hon. Bawa Khamsingh Badi, the spiritual guru of the Sikhs, had made a strong declaration in favour of the reform advocated by the Conference. In the discussion on total abstinence Mr. A. M. Bose, the President of the Congress, made a very friendly speech expressing "his deepest, heartiest, and most cordial and warmest sympathy with the cause of social reform all over the land," and "his continued and unfeigned admiration for the unselfish labours and devoted zeal of his friend Mr. Justice Ranade, and his heartfelt appreciation of the devotion, the sacrifice, and the sufferings of many of the sympathisers in the cause of social reform unknown to fame, labouring in many different parts of the country." This cordial concurrence of the heads of the political and social movements is extremely gratifying. The rest of the resolutions were old friends, more or less modified in view of the progress of the year. The whole session was marked with great unanimity and enthusiasm, and showed that the work of the Conference is prospering in its hands.

The *Indian Nation* congratulates the opponents of the Calcutta Municipality Bill on the accession of Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee to their ranks. "Already under his guidance,"

it says, "the agitation has gained in system and sobriety." Our contemporary also furnishes some interesting details of the meeting held at the residence of Kumar Radha Prosad Roy, the Rájá of Posta. It notes, as we have already done, that the meeting was attended by "some distinguished representatives of the mercantile and the Marwari community and some of the largest taxpayers of Calcutta." It is interesting to learn that the meeting drew from his habitual seclusion the Rájá Rajendra Narayan Deb, of Sobhabazar, "bending under the weight of about eighty-five years and suffering from infirmities," as well as the Maharájá Jagadindra Nath Roy of Nattore, "one of the premier noblemen of Bengal." These indications go to prove the wide interest and the genuine anxiety of the Native leaders as to the proposal to legislate self-government out of existence in Calcutta.

The *Amrita Bazar Patrika* discusses the question of the sugar industry of India. The extent of land under cane-sugar cultivation, from 1891-92 to 1896-97 inclusive, appears to have been:—

1891-92	3,100,233 acres.
1892-93	2,798,637 "
1893-94	2,897,042 "
1894-95	2,764,656 "
1895-96	2,930,583 "
1896-97	2,651,721 "

There have been desperate attempts to pull up the figures, yet in 1896-97 there were about 280,000 acres less than in the previous year, and 250,000 acres less than the average of the six years. The falling-off is attributed, on these figures, to the importation of foreign sugar. It is said that in fact "more than half of the sugar manufactures" in the eastern districts of Bengal have been closed. The *Amrita Bazar Patrika* complains that the Government apparently has not been even aware of the fact of this declension. "Is this the way to govern an Empire?" it asks. "It is such apathy of the rulers for the true interest of the country that leads the people to grumble and demand some share in the government of the country." Our contemporary reasonably presses for a commission of enquiry.

The *Amrita Bazar Patrika* gives an account of a curious incident that lately took place at Bombay. Mr. Greenhill, assistant station-master at the Victoria Terminus, recently asked some Indian passengers who had already taken their seats in the train to alight and get into another compartment in order to make way for two Europeans. Mr. Rustum Fram, a Parsee school-master, refused to get out, and persuaded his friends to refuse, and that, as the assistant station-master said, "was the cause of all the trouble." It might have been thought that the cause was to be sought somewhat earlier in the proceedings. However, Mr. Fram found himself charged with assault and with obstructing a public servant in the discharge of his duty. But the magistrate before whom the case came described it as trumpety and one that ought never to have been brought before the court. He found that no assault had been committed, the alleged push being an afterthought, and acquitted the accused.

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal addressed a series of meetings in the West of Scotland last week, arranged for him by Mr. W. S. Caine on behalf of the Anglo-Indian Temperance Association. On Thursday, January 19 the Great City Hall in Glasgow, holding over 3,000 people, was crowded from floor to ceiling, and Mr. Pal received a great ovation from the vast audience after an eloquent address in which he dealt with the aims and aspirations of the Indian people, illustrating forcibly their just claim for further instalments of self-government by an able *exposé* of the liquor policy of the Indian Government, which he showed to be entirely opposed to every custom and religious faith of the Indian people. On Wednesday, January 18, Mr. Pal addressed a large meeting at Greenock, on Tuesday at Motherwell, and on Friday he spoke again at Glasgow to a magnificent gathering of 700 of the ladies of the city, connected with the Scottish Women's Temperance Association. The details of the meetings were carried out by Mr. William Johnstone, the Secretary of the Scottish Temperance League.

THE CALCUTTA MUNICIPALITY BILL.

THE history of municipal administration in Calcutta, together with a criticism of the proposed Municipal Bill, is set forth conveniently and lucidly in a pamphlet by Mr. N. N. Ghose, barrister-at-law, which deserves a wide circulation among those who are able to influence or direct public opinion in this country. Mr. Ghose predicts the evils which we ourselves have steadily predicted in case the Bill be passed into law by the Bengal Legislative Council. It "will virtually extinguish local self-government in Calcutta, and will place municipal affairs under the control of a practically irresponsible executive." It "will, besides, very largely interfere with the private liberties of residents of the town, reduce their comforts, add to their vexations, make life costly, affect rights of property;" and it "may even drive out of town those respectable men of moderate means who may be described as the poorer middle-class." Hence, the Bill "has caused intense and widespread alarm in the town." "The constitution proposed," says Mr. Ghose, "is viewed with general alarm, not merely because it virtually destroys local self-government in Calcutta, but also and mainly on the very practical and material ground that when the commissioners have been rendered powerless and the executive supreme, the people, especially the poor people, will have little protection against the exactions of the subordinate officers of the Corporation and the numerous annoyances which it will be in their power to inflict with impunity." There can be no doubt as to the correctness of Mr. Ghose's representations, or as to the solidity of the basis of the people's fears. The numerous meetings of protest held in Calcutta testify to the excited interest of the inhabitants. Unhappily reports of these meetings have not in the ordinary course been furnished to English newspaper readers, who are in every sense concerned to know what is going on in this matter. But for our own notification of some half-dozen meetings—we print another telegram this week reporting a further meeting—they would not have been heard of in this country. Yet there ought to be a fellow-feeling between our own county and town councils and the Corporation of Calcutta in respect of the prized privilege of self-government. Let our readers imagine the public amazement and excitement if the Home Government were seriously considering a Bill to take the very life of self-government out of a municipality of the magnitude and vigour of Glasgow, or Liverpool, or Manchester!

For the fragmentary development of legislation on municipal matters in Calcutta from the first effort in 1837 down through the next generation, we must refer to Mr. Ghose's enumeration of details. Of the official, centralised system under the Act of 1863 it need only be said that it "proved a failure, as well from a popular as from an official point of view." "The sanitary condition of the town was a scandal and a disgrace": there is but too ample testimony to the view that Calcutta was "the most unhealthy place, the plague spot in Bengal." It was by the Consolidation Act of 1876 that Sir Richard Temple laid a sound foundation of municipal self-government in Calcutta. We need not set forth the constitution of 1876, as it was substantially the same as the existing constitution, which we shall presently describe. For eight years it evoked very little adverse criticism either from the public or from the Government; and when a Commission investigated complaints as to sanitation in 1884, even the harsh majority report did not attribute any alleged evils to the constitution of the Corporation, but actually urged the inclusion of the suburbs within the jurisdiction of the Corporation for the sake of the benefit of "the sanitary improvement that is being carried on in the town." Thereupon was passed the existing comprehensive measure, the Calcutta Municipal Consolidation Act, 1888.

It is important to note the main elements of the present municipal constitution. The municipal Commissioners of Calcutta consist of a chairman, a vice-chairman, and 75 members; they are a corporate body under the style of "The Corporation of Calcutta." Of the 75 commissioners, 50 are elected (2 in each of 25 wards) by male adults paying rates and taxes of a particular amount, or owning or occupying houses assessed at particular amounts; 15 are appointed by the Local Government; 4 are elected by the Bengal Chamber of Commerce, 4 by the Calcutta Trades Association, and 2 by the Port Commissioners.

The number of a man's votes varies with the amount of his rates and taxes, but no one can have more than 12 votes. Commissioners get no pay. The chairman is appointed by the Local Government. The Commissioners appoint at special general meeting to the several offices of secretary, engineer, surveyor, health officer, collector of taxes, and assessor of the town. The executive or general committee, appointed from year to year, consists of 18 members—12 elected by the 50 elected Commissioners, 6 elected by the other 25 Commissioners; and its proceedings must be submitted to the Commissioners in meeting, and it is bound by any resolution by the Commissioners in meeting.

Now contrast with this constitution the proposed "reforms" of the new Bill. The new Corporation is to consist of the chairman and 75 Commissioners, all elected and appointed in the same numbers and proportions, and generally in the same manner as under the existing law. The general committee is to consist of 12 members and the chairman as president. Of the 12 members, all being Commissioners, four are to be elected by the Commissioners elected at ward meetings, two by the Bengal Chamber of Commerce, one by the Calcutta Trades Association, one by the Port Commissioners, and four are to be appointed by the Local Government. The first elections and appointments to the general committee are to be for one year; subsequent elections and appointments for three years. There is to be no vice-chairman appointed by the Commissioners; but a deputy-chairman, with engineering and architectural qualifications, may be appointed by the Local Government, which may also at its discretion dispense with such qualifications. The entire executive power, subject to certain restrictions and conditions, is vested in the chairman, who may delegate to any municipal officer any of his powers, duties, or functions, except those conferred or imposed on him or vested in him by particular sections of the Bill. The general committee—not the Corporation—will appoint to the offices of engineer, surveyor, health officer, collector, and assessor, and to any other offices carrying a salary of Rs. 300 a month or upwards; and every appointment to the office of engineer or health officer, or to any other office worth Rs. 1,000 a month is to be subject to the approval of the Local Government. There does not appear to be any provision requiring, as now, that the proceedings of the general committee shall come before the Corporation for confirmation. But there is a new provision of payment for attendance at the general committee meetings—Rs. 32 a time, and Rs. 16 for attendance in sub-committee. It may be added that the salary of the chairman, hitherto fixed by the Commissioners, is henceforth to be fixed by Government.

Now look on this picture and on that. The constitution proposed, as Mr. Ghose says, is "obviously at variance with the principles of self-government." We have strongly urged this over and over again. But let Mr. Ghose summarise his own points:—

First, the general committee is so constituted that in it the Commissioners elected at ward elections will be a standing minority, being four in number, while the nominees of the Local Government and the trading and commercial bodies will number eight. Secondly, the general committee, though only an executive committee of the Corporation, will be in most matters supreme, that is independent of the control of the Corporation itself. An appearance of self-government is kept up, in so far as it is provided that 50 Commissioners are to be elected by the wards, and 25 only are to be elected by trading and commercial bodies and appointed by Government. But, curiously enough, the proportions are reversed on the general committee, in which the number of representatives of the wards is to that of the other members in the ratio of 1 to 2. The trading and mercantile interests of the town are to be represented by European bodies, whose nominees to the Corporation will have the same ideas, opinions and prejudices as the nominees of the Government are likely to have. And the general committee in which the popular element is distinctly the smallest, is to be practically independent of the Corporation, which, to keep up appearances, is to be predominantly popular in its constitution. The interests of trade and commerce are already guarded by the commissioners for the port of Calcutta. Trading and commercial men have, as individuals, voting power at elections. Their associations are represented by 10 members on the Corporation; and yet it is proposed to give them the power to directly nominate to the general committee as many members, namely four, as represent the 25 wards of the town and the suburbs. And in a system supposed to be one of self-government, the Local Government is to be represented on the general committee by as many members as those that represent all the ratepayers. The Europeans resident in Calcutta have naturally little permanent interest in the town. European commissioners have, so far, taken very much less interest in municipal work than Native commissioners, and the proposed system of payment of fees for attendance at meetings is obviously intended to supply a motive for attention to a kind of work which, on its own merits, has had so little attraction for Europeans.

Mr. Ghose further deals with the main reasons alleged for the new legislation. As we have already shown in these columns, Mr. Ghose shows that facts, "present and palpable facts, give the lie" to the assumption that it is required in consequence of the insanitary condition of the town. That point is beyond the need of insistence. But "assuming the existence of considerable sanitary evils," more is needed to justify the steps proposed. There has been progress in sanitation, progress of the most remarkable kind and degree, progress testified to by Sir John Woodburn himself and by many of the ablest authorities before him. Surely then the point of enquiry ought to have been "whether the progress, with the funds available, ought to have been greater, and whether it has been impeded by any defects in the constitution of the governing body." Yet no such enquiries have been made. Very likely the Native Commissioners do talk a great deal too much for their European brethren; but one would like to know how far such talk is really justifiable, and whether a reasonable time limit would not satisfy the case. Still the real question is whether the work is done, talk or no talk. It is alleged that the Commissioners have interfered with the executive. If so, it would be a simple matter to bring their conduct to the test of the Act, and to enquire further "whether the interferences have been for the public benefit or have tended to the dislocation of useful business." No such enquiry has ever been held, and the Commissioners affirm "that they have never interfered to restrain wholesome activity, but have interfered only to restrain extravagance and blundering, or to stimulate to action a supine and sluggish executive." The Corporation has been condemned unheard. But we trust that the case will obtain a hearing on the merits at Westminster in the first days of the Session, and that Parliament may be enabled to see the facts in their true relation to the campaign of repression that has made such devastating progress during the last two years. If members only knew the facts, they could not fail to perceive that this legislation touches the very heart of the greatest question now in issue before the British public—the stability and permanence of the British Indian Empire.

AN UNDESIGNED VINDICATION OF THE INDIAN PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE.¹

By E. H. PICKERELL, M.P.

DURING the thirteen years that I have sat in the House of Commons, I have heard hundreds of questions asked respecting alleged grievances in India, and I have become painfully familiar with the general type of the Ministerial reply. The facts suggested in the question are almost invariably denied, sometimes with a circumstantial detail which hoodwinks the very elect, and occasionally with no little rhetorical emphasis or indignation; and then the Secretary for India, whether he be Conservative or Liberal, sits down triumphant, perhaps amid the plaudits of those members of Parliament whose first duty is, it would seem, to cheer a Minister if he belongs to their own party. Months, or it may be years, elapse, and at last when the events have long passed out of the public mind, a Parliamentary paper appears, which, by the side-lights that it throws, or by hints and comments casually dropped, shows that after all the questioner was upon the right track, and that the Minister was—*misinformed*. These general observations are specially illustrated by a Blue-book which was published last week, and is named at the foot of this article. It is an annual volume, and is composed of abstracts from the reports on sanitary matters of various public authorities in India, accompanied with memoranda thereupon by the Army Sanitary Commission. I have gone carefully through the whole of it, and I propose to call attention to those passages which, penned by the hands of officials themselves, vindicate the Parliamentary friends of India in many of the cases in which, during the last year or two, they have come into collision with the Secretary of State. Judging by experience, I am not sanguine that this exercise will produce a useful effect upon the persons who are mainly concerned; but that those who have been proved to be right in the past are entitled to a respectful

hearing in the future, is a conclusion which will, I am sure, commend itself to all candid and reasonable minds.

In the first place, I would remind my readers that warning voices were raised again and again respecting the imminence of famine in the Central Provinces, and they were raised in vain. Now let us see what the Army Sanitary Commission two years afterwards say upon this subject. They tell us that, following on a series of bad harvests, the spring crops of 1896 in the Central Provinces failed in all except a few districts. Then hopes were entertained from the monsoon, but the rains ceased early in September, and this promise of relief faded away. The Memorandum then proceeds as follows: "Prices rose to such a height as to be beyond the means of people already reduced to poverty by a continuous succession of crop failures, and before the end of the year 1896 the greater part of the Provinces were in the grip of a calamitous famine." And yet in the very last month of the year 1896, Lord Elgin, who visited the Central Provinces and was urged to relieve the famine-stricken people, declared that he was "struck by the prosperous appearance of the country"!

Secondly, one might have supposed from the representations of Lord George Hamilton that the famine had little or no appreciable effect in raising the death-rate. But in reading this Blue-book, on the contrary, we are struck by constant references to the famine as the cause of a very high mortality. Thus we are told that "the prolonged dearthness of the staple food-grains cannot but exercise a potent influence on the mortality of the poorer classes, seeing that it is not counter-balanced by a proportionate rise in the wages of labour." As regards the Central Provinces themselves, the conclusion of the Army Sanitary Commission is that "whatever other conditions may have been concerned in bringing about increase of the death-rate and diminution of the birth-rate during 1896, it may be accepted as certain that none was equal in importance to privation and distress due to scarcity of food." And again they say, "the high death-rates of August, September, and October were due chiefly to the prevalence of malarial diseases acting on constitutions enfeebled by privation." It is also very significant that in the following passage the Commissioners seem to be judiciously sceptical as to the justice of laying blame on what is always a favourite scapegoat with Anglo-Indian officialdom: "The enormous death-rates of some of the towns, such as Damoh, are said to have been due in part to the influx from neighbouring Native States of 'emaciated and moribund immigrants.'" Thirdly, this Blue-book abundantly vindicates those members of Parliament who protested against the drastic and ill-considered measures taken by the authorities in respect of the plague. The Army Sanitary Commission, in their Memorandum on Bombay, say that the means adopted for the purpose of searching out cases of the plague, and having them segregated, "excited much hostility and opposition among the people, as might have been anticipated by those conversant with the customs and caste prejudices of the Natives, and the modification of these measures was soon found to be expedient." And the Commissioners further say that "the panic among the inhabitants which followed the drastic measures adopted by the authorities led to the flight of thousands from the city into the country, and to the importation of the plague into places hitherto free from it. There was a fear that the panic might extend to the scavengers, in which event the city would have become uninhabitable from the accumulation in it of the unremoved filth." It is very significant that as regards the future the memorandum deprecates the drastic measures favoured by the Sanitary Commissioner of Bombay. "In the light," it is said, "of the further history of the progress of plague in India the Sanitary Commissioner might be disposed to modify his recommendations. The very measures adopted to stamp out the plague have been found to defeat their purpose and aid its propagation." Similarly with regard to the measures contemplated in Madras, the Commissioners say that "the practical experience gained in dealing with plague elsewhere will have taught the need for applying these measures with caution should occasion unfortunately arise." Lastly, with reference to Calcutta the Commissioners remark that "the wisdom of some of the proposals made by the Health Officers with the view of protecting the city from an invasion of the plague seems open to question, especially when looked at in the light of subsequent events." From these quotations and other

¹ "Report on Sanitary Measures in India in 1896-97." Vol. xxx. (Presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of her Majesty.)

evidence it is apparent that the Government of India have been impressed by their recent experiences. For my own part I hope and believe that good will be evolved from the events of the last twelve months. Disturbances of the public peace are not to be lightly regarded, but at the same time it would be particularly absurd and hypocritical in an Englishman to profess to be horrified by acts of violence committed by crowds under great provocation, and similar to those which have played no inconsiderable part in our own "rough island story." The time had perhaps come for the people of India to assert themselves and to let the authorities know that they were not content to be treated like mere "dumb driven cattle." At all events the lesson taught by recent events has not been lost upon the powers that be. A curious and rather amusing illustration of this fact is given on page 254 of the Blue-book. We are told that the scavengers of Madras have become aware of the power which combination gives them and not unfrequently strike work. Whereupon the Commissioners observe: "The application of coercive measures which would seem to be contemplated under the title of a labour law might not improbably be found to aggravate the troubles which such measures are intended to remedy."

This Blue-book throws many interesting side-lights upon a question which is much agitated at the present time, namely, the conduct of local government by popular bodies. Some of the reports are obviously written by doctrinaires or military martinets, whose indictments are not at all convincing. Moreover the complaints, such as they are, are precisely similar to those which we have at home, e.g., that the local authorities will not appoint an adequate number of sanitary inspectors, or that the inspectors appointed are not always thoroughly competent men. And further it is frankly admitted that *the real difficulty is want of funds*. The Commissioners refer to the administration of Calcutta in a passage which, in view of the nefarious attempt now being made to destroy representative government in that city, it may be well to quote. They say: "Besides accelerating the inception and prosecution of improvements calculated to exercise a radically salutary influence on the future sanitary condition of Calcutta, the plague scare has given a healthy stimulus to the every-day cleansing of the town. . . . The appointment of a Commission to regulate the erection of buildings is regarded by the Health Officers as the commencement of a new era in the sanitary history of the town." Here we have practically an admission from an official source that the reasons alleged in support of the Calcutta Municipal Bill are entirely unfounded.

THE MUTINY AT DELHI.¹

THE stirring scenes through which Colonel Vibart passed at the time of the Mutiny are a sufficient excuse for the modest and straightforward narrative which he has given in this book. The fight, or rather massacre, in the main-guard at Delhi, the escape of Colonel Vibart and a few others to the bastion, and their subsequent wanderings through the country with every man's hand against them form a series of adventures rivalling any to be found even in the history of that period. To the chief narrative some others of almost equal interest are added, including Colonel Mackenzie's account of the mutiny at Meerut, and Mr. Luke's story—"How the Electric Telegraph saved India"—of the two young telegraph operators at Delhi, who amid all the confusion and danger of the sudden outbreak had the presence of mind to send on the news to Umballa. Those however who desire in reading of the Mutiny to learn something of its causes, or to derive lessons for the future from the troubles of that wretched time, will find little in this book to serve their purpose. Colonel Vibart tells the story of the non-commissioned officer who, asked why the troops at Meerut mutinied, made answer: "Why not? the Commander-in-Chief is up at Simla eating his dinners, and pays no heed to our complaints," and he mentions as possibly among these grievances the greased cartridges, the withdrawal of some privileges in Oudh, and the making of general service beyond the seas compulsory for all future recruits to the Indian army; but he seems himself to be more inclined to accept the view of the old king of Delhi, who when asked

the cause of the atrocities replied: "I don't know; I suppose my people gave themselves up to the devil." Colonel Vibart enters a manly protest against the "extraordinary constitution" of the court by which the king was tried, four out of the five members being officers serving with the British troops, of whom the President alone could have been familiar with the Hindustani language; and he notes that the treatment of the king and his family after they had been transported to Rangoon "was the reverse of that usually accorded to prisoners of royal lineage." As to the killing of the princes the author gives a very decided opinion:—

Hodson's action in taking the law into his own hands on this occasion has been the subject of much adverse comment, and personally I cannot but agree with those who have condemned it as a most injudicious act.

Of the wholesale executions which were carried on almost daily for several weeks after the capture of Delhi he does not conceal his horror, though he believes the majority of those who suffered were guilty:—

These wretches used to be strung up on a gallows . . . in batches of a dozen at a time, and once being on guard with a company of Fusiliers at this post was an enforced spectator of the horrid scene.

This strong sense of justice is all the more to be praised in Colonel Vibart because he seems in spite of his long and distinguished service in the Indian army to have but slight sympathy with the Indian character. It is a curious coincidence, if nothing more, that his party in their flight appear to have met with less kindness than the other fugitives whose tales are told in the book. Thus Colonel Mackenzie, who seems to have a far deeper insight into Indian feeling, tells us:—

I therefore brought the ladies down to the door of the house, and calling to me the troopers commended their lives to their charge. It is impossible to understand the swift torrents of feeling that flooded the hearts of Orientals in periods of intense excitement. Like madmen they threw themselves off their horses and prostrated themselves before the ladies, seizing their feet, and placing them on their heads, as they vowed with tears and sobs to protect their lives with their own.

And speaking of the escape of two other officers he says:—

Their lives seemed lost, when one of their servants, a sweeper, the lowest and most despised caste of Indian domestics, heedless of the certainty that his own life would be sacrificed to the fury of the mob disappointed of its prey, implored them to follow him. . . . The sweeper laid a victim to the rage of the pursuers. . . . No more beautiful deed ever brightened the dark days of the "67" than the self-sacrifice of this obscure and nameless hero."

In all histories of the Mutiny one thing is curiously obvious, the ignorance of the feelings and temper of the troops till just before the outbreak. Mr. Luke remarks:—

This is only one more example of the absolute disbelief which existed among Europeans at that time in the possibility of a general mutiny of the troops, showing how little we knew then of the real feeling of the Native army towards us. And yet we were in a better position to know in those days than we are now, for the personal relations between the governing and governed were more intimate and cordial than at the present day.

And yet there are professed supporters of the British Empire in India who wish the two races to become even less intimate than they are now

CHRONICLE OF THE WEEK.

THURSDAY, January 19.—Mr. John Morley, addressing a meeting of his constituents at Montrose, expressed the opinion that if Imperialism were allowed to overshadow other political principles, it would be of no use to talk further about peace, economy or reform. On the question of temperance he adhered to the proposals of the late Government, and as to old-age pensions he was willing to support any scheme which would satisfy the demands of the national conscience. The people of Ireland would be sure to use local self-government as a means of furthering Home Rule, and Liberals would not be justified in retreating from the consequences of the arguments they had used on this subject.

The Duke of Devonshire opened a new municipal technical college at Derby. He pointed out that we could not have technical, scientific, or artistic training in any valuable degree except as part of a sound general system of secondary education. For this reason he had seen with great satisfaction the attention lately paid to the measure which he introduced into Parliament last year, and hoped very shortly to introduce again, the object of which was to commence the reform and reorganisation of our secondary education.

Mr. Asquith, speaking at Louth, expressed his deep regret at Mr. Morley's announcement of his withdrawal from the councils of the heads of the Liberal party, but concluded that his

¹ The Sepoy Mutiny, as seen by a Subaltern from Delhi to Lucknow. y Colonel Edward Vibart. London: Smith, Elder and Co. 1898.

indictment against the Liberal party that it had become infected with jingoism was unjust. He maintained that if they had remained silent when the Fashoda incident arose they would have been guilty of political cowardice, and that their declarations and action on the subject were in the interest of peace, and had helped to preserve peace. He denied that as a Liberal he had been guilty of any logical inconsistency in rejoicing at the results of the Sudan campaign, and argued that a healthy and reasonable Imperialism was a principle of Liberal foreign policy.

An agreement laying down the principles which will guide the future administration of the Sudan was signed in Cairo by Lord Cromer and the Egyptian Foreign Minister.

FRIDAY, January, 20.—Sir E. Gray, speaking at Liverpool, expressed his regret at Mr. Morley's announcement of his retirement from a leading part in politics, and thought time would show the unreality of much of the present discussion as to what was jingoism and what were the "Little Englanders." He was quite willing that in the future, as in the past, the Liberal party should co-operate with the Irish party, but there should be no dependence. Admitting that Home Rule could not at present be regarded as a practical issue in politics, he believed the Local Government Act would not satisfy Ireland's needs, and would lead to a more moderate and more united demand for Home Rule. He denied that there were any differences among Liberals as to future foreign policy.

SATURDAY, January 21.—Mr. Balfour issued a circular to his supporters announcing the meeting of Parliament on February 7.

The United States Senate passed the Nicaragua Canal Bill, which had yet to be voted upon by the House of Representatives.

A telegram from Canea stated that the new code of civil and penal law would be in full working order in two months' time. Prince George visited Retimo and was warmly welcomed.

MONDAY, January 23.—In the French Chamber an interesting discussion took place on foreign policy, and chiefly on difficulties which had arisen between France and Great Britain. M. d'Estournelles opened the debate with a speech in which he argued that both France and England had committed mistakes in reference to the Fashoda affair, but deprecated a policy of avowed hostility to this country, and condemned colonial megalomania. M. Cochon and M. Raiberti having spoken, M. Ribot at some length defended the French policy in Newfoundland, Madagascar, and Egypt, and insisted that it was one of peace. M. Delcassé followed, and, after referring to the Spanish-American war, the Tsar's proposals, and the Cretan settlement, he discussed at length the Fashoda episode, maintaining the right of France to send the Marchand expedition there; but admitting that, in the circumstances, persistence in that right was not expedient.

At the National Liberal Club, a meeting held under the presidency of Lord Carrington to discuss Liberal policy was addressed by Sir R. T. Reid, M.P., Mr. Labouchere, M.P., Lord Coleridge, Mr. Lloyd-George, M.P., and several other speakers, and considerable diversity of opinion was manifested, particularly with reference to the attitude of the Liberal party on the questions of foreign policy.

The Duke of Devonshire at Birmingham remarked that he did not think it could be contended that the position of the Government at present was weaker than when they entered office, or that there was any sign of that shifting of neutral opinion which usually foreshadowed political change. That seemed to him to indicate that in the opinion of the country the present was not a time when great constitutional or social changes were imperatively necessary, but that the attention of Parliament might be more usefully directed to the perfecting of the national defences, to the strengthening of the unity of the Empire, and to such minor though important reforms as involved no fundamental question of principle.

TUESDAY, January 24.—A special congress of trade unionists met in Manchester to consider schemes for the federation of the trades of the country. There were 280 delegates in attendance. Mr. Davis, chairman of the Parliamentary Committee of the Trade Union Congress, was called to the chair. The first proposal considered was to the effect that the federation should be called "the General Federation of Trade Unions." This was discussed all day and had not been disposed of when the congress adjourned, though two amendments—one of them pointing to sectional as preliminary to general federation—were rejected.

An appeal, signed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, several of the Bishops, and others, was issued for the raising of a fund of £20,000 to provide the stipend and expenses of a Bishop, who should undertake the oversight of the whole work of the Church of England in Egypt and the Sudan.

WEDNESDAY, January 25.—Lord Kimberley, speaking at Wymondham, expressed his great regret at the retirement of Sir W. Harcourt from the Liberal leadership in the House of Commons, and at Mr. Morley's withdrawal from the active counsels of the party. He stigmatised as barren and unprofitable the discussion as to the difference between a "jingo" and

a "Little Englander;" pointed out that even Mr. Gladstone, in the course of his career, had added not a few territories to the Empire; and contended that it was a grievous mistake to suppose that peace could always best be preserved by maintaining a humble and forbearing attitude.

Mr. Balfour, writing to a constituent in East Manchester on the subject of University education in Ireland, expressed the conviction that it was the religious difficulty alone which at present blocked the way. After setting forth the reasons why, in his judgment, the expedient of leaving the one existing teaching University in Ireland—Trinity College—to meet, by a natural process of expansion, the growing educational needs of the country would not be successful, Mr. Balfour proceeded to suggest that the plan which seemed best to solve the University problem, both for the Presbyterians and other Protestants in the north and for Irish Roman Catholics generally, was to establish by a single Act two new teaching Universities—one in Dublin and one in Belfast—on precisely similar lines, and differing in no particular except the names of the gentlemen first appointed to serve on their respective governing bodies.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR.

ASSESSMENTS AND MONEY-LENDERS.

TO THE EDITOR OF "INDIA."

SIR,—In the short paper in your issue of the 13th entitled "Land Legislation in India," two or three different matters seem to be mixed up; and any effort to assign their respective importance is not rendered easier by certain rather violent expressions, such as "refinement of cruelty," "atrocious blunder," and the like. This short article might be allowed to pass were it not that many of your readers will, as in my case, have linked it on with similar indiscriminate treatment of the same class of subjects in former numbers of your journal. For instance, "Notes" in similar vein. These passages may be recalled by mentioning that the text taken was the Tenancy Bill for the Central Provinces—which is also made the basis of the current article.

In several passages, as above indicated, three or four diverse subjects are dealt with in such fashion as to distort the reader's appreciation of any one of them. These are, the undue enhancement of land revenue on re-assessment; the chronic indebtedness of the rayat; the place of the *soukar* in India of the villages; and, more especially, recent enactments to restrain the cultivator from mortgaging his right of occupancy (erroneously described as "his only property on earth") and to prevent the *soukar* from foreclosing and thereby extinguishing the rayat's "property"—thus leaving the cultivator a hopeless slave. Your contributor does not seem to be aware that for at least twenty years past the alienation of the rayats' rights in his "settled" land, and the entire transfer thereof to the money-lender, has been recognised as one of the gravest evils, or rather symptoms of impoverishment afflicting rural India, from the Punjab to Madras. Those who, by such enactments as this Central Provinces Bill, and the Decan Conciliation Act, seek to restrain the remorseless logic of the English commercial land system with its rigid application of an insolvency law, unsuited to the consuetudinary agricultural economy of India, have well considered the objection made so much of by your contributor. They do not think the "money-lender will be prevented from coming to the aid of the cultivator," although the latter be prevented from mortgaging his land to such an extent that the *soukar* can "confiscate" it through the Courts. That destructive, disintegrating effect of applying exotic Western, rigid, sordid methods to Indian villages and districts has gone on too long; and your contributor need not imagine that there will be any going back on the wise provisions now being generally adopted in order "to defeat the money-lender who seeks to grab the cultivator's land."

Possibly, indeed probably, should these measures to prevent the alienation of the rayat's fields result in the *soukars*' stinting their advances in bad seasons, such result would rapidly ripen the too slow-growing plans for establishing communal or other agricultural banks so long advocated by Sir William Wedderburn and other Anglo-Indians who do know the India of the villages.

Now as to your contributor's oft repeated assertions regarding "the enormous enhancements of revenue secured by recent settlements." This is in each case a question of fact; and when any enhancement not warranted by "increase of prices" and new market facilities, provided is assessed or levied, we are all agreed in condemning such illegality, which is confiscation—in the strict sense of that term—of the cultivator's toil and little savings, not of his "property in land." This has been forbidden not only by Executive orders, but by statutes again and again, e.g., in the Bombay Presidency in Sir Philip Wodehouse's time. There is no need to confuse the issues by mixing up this fundamental right with the efforts to prevent the *soukars*' confiscations through the insolvency court. But this question of illegal enhancement of land assessments, "enormous" or less excessive, is not quite so clear

and absolute as stated in these "Notes" before me. Here we come upon one of the many apparent paradoxes that present themselves in the tangled web of Indian fiscal administration. Let me put this matter in its paradoxical and illogical, but real form. The revenue officers who make these assessments, so freely and sometimes justly denounced, can and do in most cases carefully show cause for such advance—in the (apparent) rise of prices and improved communications. Even an experienced revenue officer such as Mr. Romesh C. Dutt would generally find it impossible to refute the chain of reasoned facts on which such assessments are founded. And yet, over and over again, these assessments, even when strictly based on those statutory principles, have failed and had to be revised or superseded. Why is this thus? It would take a column to answer the question, and still we should find some baffling unknown quantity wanting. The *rayat* ought to be able to pay these assessments with ease; but he *can't*. The rates are just and equitable but he can't find the *cash*. There is behind and beneath all these perplexities the financial and economical condition of India—in fact the bottom is out of the whole system. Surely amongst all the wild guesses towards patching this bottomless condition, none can be stranger than that suggested by these "Notes" in India—to allow the money-lender a free hand in confiscating the *rayat's* "only property on earth."—Yours, etc., SENEX.

THE CALCUTTA MUNICIPAL BILL.

FURTHER MEETING OF PROTEST.

"THE DEATH-KNELL OF LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT."

[BY CARLE, FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.]

CALCUTTA, January 24.

A further meeting has been held here to protest against the Calcutta Municipal Bill. The chair was taken by Rájá Sir Radhakantas Natmandir Rai Jatindra Nath Choudhury, a zemindar, who said that the principle proposed in the Bill tolls the death-knell of local self-government in India. He compared the introduction of the Bill to the passing of sentence upon a prisoner without framing the charge against him. A memorial was adopted regarding the provisions contained in the Bill with reference to the water supply.—*By Indo-European telegraph.*

MR. ROMESH DUTT, C.I.E., AT MANCHESTER.

A correspondent writes: At Brook Street Free Church, Manchester, an address on a purely secular subject is delivered on one Sunday in the month. The subject of the January lecture was "British Rule in India," and the lecturer was Mr. Romesh Dutt. There was a fairly large gathering in the evening (January 22), and as Mr. Dutt spoke from the pulpit, he was listened to with great interest and unflinching attention.

Mr. Dutt began by dwelling on the vastness of the Indian Empire, its great population, its ancient civilisation, and importance to the trade and commerce and the power of England. British rule, he said, had secured, among others, two important blessings to India, viz., peace which had not been interrupted within the frontiers of India within the last 40 years, and a system of western education which had brought India closer to Europe and to modern civilisation. But he regretted to add that peace had not brought with it plenty; and western education had not yet replaced despotism by western methods of self-government and representation. Mr. Dutt dwelt on the frequent famines in India within these 40 years which he could remember, and spoke from personal knowledge of the famines of 1860, 1866, 1874, 1877 and 1897. He quoted the opinion of John Bright that the poverty of India (shown by these frequent famines) was owing to "some fundamental defect" in the system of rule; and he pointed out that the fundamental defect of British rule consisted firstly in its expensiveness, and secondly in its exclusiveness. Speaking of the expensiveness of British rule, Mr. Dutt dwelt on the annual drain from India to this country, on the needless frontier wars, on the conquest of Baluchistan and Burma at the expense of the Indian revenues, on the proposed conquest of Tibet and the proposed railway to China. All these transactions outside India, undertaken at the cost of the Indian taxpayer, led to a steady and continual increase of the land assessments at each recurring settlement, impoverished the cultivators and made famines inevitable. Speaking of the exclusiveness of British rule, Mr. Dutt regretted that after 40 years of the Queen's direct rule in India, after 40 years of continuous peace and of the spread of English education, the people of India were still debarred from any real share of control in the management of their own concerns. He pointed to the events of the last three years which seemed to show that we were actually going back, and that we desired to make our rule in India even more despotic in the future. He referred to the recent withdrawal of the liberty of the Press, a liberty which India had enjoyed for 60 years, and to the Bill which contemplated the withdrawal of

municipal self-government in Calcutta, after self-government had been in successful operation for over 20 years. Mr. Dutt hoped and believed that these retrograde measures were the result of that wave of Jingoism which had swept over England, and which was passing away. He concluded by reading passages from his book "England and India," showing that England was now at the parting of the ways in reference to Indian administration; that a continuance in the despotic form of administration would create discontent and disloyalty in the future; and that a policy of trust and confidence in the people, and of the extension of self-government, would consolidate British rule and fix it on the strongest of foundations, viz., the loyal co-operation and support of the people themselves. Despotism and Russian methods would ruin British Rule in India; the extension of popular rights would save it and strengthen it, as it had done in the British Colonies. A pamphlet on the Calcutta Municipal Bill by Mr. N. N. Ghose was distributed to the audience at the close of the speech.

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

FOURTEENTH SESSION.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT, MR. A. M. BOSE.

(Continued from page 39.)

Ladies and gentlemen, we all know what happened in the past, when not long after the inception of the forward policy and the embroilment with Afghanistan, Mr. Gladstone came into power in 1880. The Government of that day made a contribution of five millions to India towards the cost of the Afghan War. We know too that the policy of retrogression, of reversing the principles of the past which we are deploring, has been followed in the case also; that even in a year when in addition to the calamity of the frontier war India has been afflicted with famine and pestilence, with earthquake and cyclone, with every trouble indeed that can cause misery, suffering and loss to an unhappy people, the Government have declined to make any contribution towards the expenses of that war. England, which every year makes a grant to the revenues of Cyprus, which instead of becoming a "place of arms" has become a place of a very different description; which this year out of an overflowing treasury has made a gift of nearly a million pounds to Egypt for her wars; which this year too has made a large grant to the West Indies, a considerable portion of which has further been promised to be annually repeated, for—I may as well enumerate some of the purposes—for her agricultural department and agricultural instruction, for her former subsidies for local revenues, for assistance towards farming and working central factories, for making roads and purchase of lands—England which has done all these things, making new precedents for helping other countries, through her Government resisted and successfully resisted the motion made early this year to follow the old precedent even at a time so calamitous as the present, of helping India. I think we may probably spend a minute or two in considering this case of help to the West Indies. Mr. Chamberlain in proposing the grant in the House of Commons defended it on two grounds. First, on the ground of the loyalty of the islands, a loyalty which they manifested immediately afterwards, not by gratitude, but by deep dissatisfaction at the amount of the grant not being larger, and by the loud expression of a desire for annexation to the United States—we have not heard if there have been any prosecutions for sedition there. And secondly on the ground of their value to England. As to the comparative value to England of the West Indies and of India, in spite of my temptation to say much I will content myself with only one significant sentence from the *Forward* of the 8th of October last:—"The West Indies are utterly worthless to great Britain, and it would be a relief if we could transfer them to the United States."

ENGLISH FEELING ON THE ACTION OF THE GOVERNMENT.

So glaring is the injustice that has been done to India that, I may be mistaken but I honestly believe, the bulk of the Unionist Members would have joined the Liberals and Mr. Sir Henry Fowler and Mr. Samuel Smith in voting a grant, but for the unhappy and retrograde attitude of the Government and the pressure of party influence. This is what the *Saturday Review*, a Conservative organ and a supporter of the Government, says referring to their conduct in this matter:—"It is a miracle," says that paper in its issue of the 26th of February last, "that in the face of such acts of injustice as this we can still maintain our Imperial rule in India." I do not quote this to endorse this, but to show how widespread is the sympathy amongst Englishmen with India, and how keen was the indignation felt at this reversal of Mr. Gladstone's policy of 1880 even amongst the supporters of the Government. I wonder what our Press Committees, busily engaged in delivering lectures on good taste and decorum to the conductors of newspapers, and our Indian Government would have done if language a hundredth as strong as this had appeared in any Indian paper. I wonder too whether an order will be passed to prevent the exportation into India from England of "seditious" papers commencing with the *Saturday Review* going through. I am afraid, a pretty long list, and ending, let us say, with the *Review of Reviews*, whose words of bitter and fiery denunciation against what it calls the "criminal imbecility" of the Administration I will not quote; and of speeches and writings too like those of such dangerous Conservatives as, let us say, begging their pardon, the honourable member for Cardiff or a late Chief Justice of Bengal.

ATTITUDE OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

Ladies and gentlemen, the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer at Bristol, some little time before the opening of the Parliament, led us to hope for a contribution from the Imperial Treasury. But our own Indian Government, we are told, did not want any help. A Government that has put its hands on the money immediately necessary for want of money. A Government that is unable to discharge one of the elementary duties of a civilised Government by placing its administration of justice on a proper

footing, on account, as it says, of want of funds; a Government against the "shearing" policy of which at every revision of provincial contracts we have heard eloquent and vigorous protests from a late Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal and from other high authorities; a Government pressed by the heavy demands not only of war but of a combination of dire calamities unparalleled in the annals perhaps of any country in the world; a Government which is obliged to borrow; a Government which has been compelled to close its mints and to raise artificially the value of its coin to the detriment of many interests, and specially the interests of the poor, in order to avoid serious financial disaster; a Government that had the precedent before it of a similar grant of assistance such a Government declining to receive any help from the English Treasury or to be relieved of any portion of its military expenditure seems, I must confess, to our humble understandings, about the most extraordinary phenomenon one could think of; and so indeed it seemed to very many people in England both inside and outside Parliament. True, a leading Anglo-Indian journal advised their not accepting any help on the ground that this might lead the House of Commons to enquire into or meddle with their doings, or, as it put the matter, "the mischief of Parliamentary interference with Indian affairs" would thereby be exaggerated a hundredfold." But I cannot believe that the many distinguished men who constitute the Government of India could possibly have acted under the influence of such a motive. But I am sure they will forgive us for saying that, in view of this proceeding and in the absence of further light, the people of this country cannot repose that confidence in them as the protectors of their interests and the guardians of their rights which it ought to be their duty to repose.

SOME EFFECTS OF THE FORWARD POLICY.

In connexion with the burdens imposed by the Forward Policy on the finances of the country and their blighting effect, one has only to turn to the so-called discussion on the Budget in the Provincial Councils to see how many are the measures whose necessity is admitted by the Government but which cannot be carried out for want of means—and even these represent but a small fraction of all the important needs of the country for its development, progress and prosperity. In Bengal the Government appointed some years ago a Commission called the Salaries Commission which reported on the necessity, in the public interests, of an increase in the pay of the ministerial or subordinate establishments. The *Pioneer* not long ago, if I remember aright, pointed out the absolute necessity of this increase, and the serious evils to the administration of the country resulting from the present inadequate scale of pay. The Government has over and over again in the Council Chamber admitted the urgency of the reform, but pleaded its want of means to carry it out. But, brother delegates, I need not take up your time by bringing coals to Newcastle, by giving instances of what is so perfectly familiar to you. But permit me to refer to one matter which took place in the course of this year, not so familiar to us, unique in its history, and buried in the multitude of answers to Parliamentary questions.

A CENTRAL LABORATORY.

Last year a memorial was presented to the Secretary of State for India signed by the leading scientific men in England, including such names as Lord Kelvin, Lord Lister, Professors Ramsay, Roscoe, Foster, and a great many others, asking for the establishment of a Central Scientific Laboratory for advanced teaching and research in India. The memorialists pointed out the great importance of the proposal not only in the interests of higher education, but also in the interests of the material advancement of the people. It is impossible to conceive of a proposal more influentially supported than this, or more important to the vital interests of the country; and Lord George Hamilton forwarded the memorial with his recommendation, as I gather from Mr. Schwann's question a few months ago in Parliament, to the Government of India. But the hon. member who formed the answer to his question, that the Indian Government was unable "to entertain so costly a scheme," on the ground that the initial cost of such an establishment would be six lakhs of rupees or about £40,000. Why if even two millions had been granted from the Imperial Government to relieve the resources of the Indian Government strained to meet the costs of the frontier war, not only could this "costly scheme" have been started, but nine-and-forty other measures of benefit to the country of a similarly costly character could have been carried out. Allow me, brother delegates, the privilege of being your mouthpiece to convey to these eminent men the expression of our heartfelt gratitude for the interest they have taken in India's welfare, and to express my earnest hope that their efforts and their representation will yet bear fruit, and ample fruit, in the better time to come.

TECHNICAL EDUCATION.

I need not dwell before you, ladies and gentlemen, on the imperative need of technical education which is, in a literal sense, of vital importance to the teeming poverty-stricken millions of India, the imperative need of improving the old industries and introducing new ones, of teaching the people how to utilise, with the help of modern science, the many rich and undeveloped resources of the country. This has indeed been admitted on every hand. I remember well the conversation which some of us had with Lord Dufferin shortly before his retirement.

To do anything further the cause of technical education, the importance of which to India he fully realised; but he had every confidence his successor would earnestly take up the question. Lord Lansdowne has come and gone, and his successor too—to whom we cordially wish every happiness after his many arduous labours amid the storm and stress of these years—will in a few days bid farewell to the scene of his labours; but the question of technical education stands practically where it did for want of means to promote it.

Brother delegates, I will not take up more of your time by continuing this review of the past. I will leave it to you to remark how, if I have been mistaken or, however unwittingly unjust in that review, I shall be glad to have the mistakes pointed out, and to be convinced by the weapons of reason and argument.

BACKWARD OR FORWARD.

As one glances back over the history of these retrograde and repressive measures and sees that the stream of reaction is yet running, the question arises to the mind, and I ask our rulers, nay all Englishmen, seriously to consider it, whether backward or forward is to be inscribed as the motto on the banner of England in its future administration of this great country. Are we to march backwards into the methods of despotism, to the weapons of coercion, to the policy of distrust; or are we to march onwards in the path which was traced out by those noble Englishmen who have been the founders, the consolidators, the saviours of the Empire, the path which leads to advancing and not to receding freedom; to greater trust in the people, to rights enlarged and not to concessions withdrawn? For it is at once a melancholy and a curious feature of the present situation that we stand here not merely in defence of the liberties of the people of India, but in vindication of the policy, the sagacity, the wisdom, and the foresight of those illustrious men.

INDIAN FEELING.

To fulfil England's mission in India, much, very much remained to be done. We were eagerly and longingly looking forwards to the steady and progressive carrying on of that work, but in its place has begun this process of pushing backwards, this process of distrust and repression. Will Englishmen place themselves for a moment in our position, look with our eyes, and try to realise what their feelings would have been under the circumstances? For that after all is the question we all wish to understand, and not to misunderstand the situation. There is much of the same human nature in the East as in the West. Is it any wonder that the process I have mentioned, and some speeches to which I will not more particularly refer which we have heard from the Council Chamber, should have caused widespread pain, surprise, regret, and anxiety, yea, in some quarters even bitterness? Let me give an illustration of this feeling of pain which struck me very much at the time. An Indian gentleman wrote to me in England a few months ago. He is not an "agitator," whatever that word may mean. He is a gentleman unknown to fame, who takes no part in public meetings or in the discussion of public questions, but quietly does the work of his office. He wrote to me about his brother then staying in England, but in the course of his letter he mentioned about the recent proceedings of Government and concluded with these words: "Are you a friend to British rule? Try your best to induce the authorities to withdraw the suicidal policy of Government. If you are an enemy, well my advice is keep quiet and let things take their course." May I ask the authorities, if these words should by some chance happen to meet their eyes, to seriously consider the import of the sentence I have quoted, written in confidence, wrung in the anguish of his heart from a simple and quiet citizen, deeply attached to the British rule. I trust my friend will forgive me for having quoted that sentence from his private letter. Let me quote another gentleman—not a nameless or a featureless one now—who having served the Government with honour and distinction in charge of several most important districts, having risen to the highest post in the Executive Service of the Government to which a native of India has yet been appointed, has recently retired from the Service—need I say I refer to our distinguished countryman Mr. R. C. Dutt. I congratulate my friend on his being unuzzled. I trust he will now be in a position to render even greater service to the Government he has served so long and so faithfully by his informed exposition of the effects of their recent policy, the fruits of his long and bitter experience of office. Speaking of the condemnation of our new system of Selection at a meeting held in London on June 20 last, Mr. Dutt said, with the authority of intimate knowledge, "It is with deep regret that I have to say that I can hardly remember any time—and my memory goes back to the time of the Mutiny—when the confidence of the people of India in the justice and fair-play of English rulers was so shaken as it has been within the last two years." And he goes on to deplore the policy of suspicion and repression adopted of late by the Government which has led to this most unhappy result.

It is the saddest of thoughts to my mind, the thought, ladies and gentlemen, that the very means which, no doubt from the best of intentions, the Government have adopted to root out what they believe to be want of affection or disaffection in this country, will tend not to attach but alienate, not to cure but to create those very evils they dread, to suppress it may be expression of discontent but to drive it deep beneath the surface.

THE EDUCATED CLASSES.

Ladies and gentlemen, turning again to the words of that touching appeal in the letter of my correspondent, it is because we are friends to British rule, it is because all our highest hopes of the future, and not our hopes only but the hopes of generations to come, are indissolubly bound up with the continuance of that rule, with the strengthening and the bettering of that rule, with the removal of all and every cause which may tend to the weakening of that rule, that we speak out, and point the impolicy, the unwisdom, yea the danger of the recent course of administrative and legislative proceedings, that we are trying to the best of our power, and so limited by the Indian authorities, to induce the great body of justice-loving and generous-minded Englishmen, both here and in England, to withdraw from that course, and find the path of safety, of honour, of mutual advantage and the truest and the most abiding glory, in going forwards in fearless confidence, trusting the people, extending the bounds of freedom; not forging new fetters, but gradually removing those that exist; not taking away, but adding to the rights of the people, helping on the cause of India's regeneration with the passionate longing and the loving ardour that comes from consciousness of a duty and a solemn responsibility from on high. The educated classes of India are the friends and the foes of England, her natural and necessary allies in the great work that lies before her. It is in their hearty, devoted and loving co-operation that the welfare and the progress of the country so largely depends. All that they ask for is that England should be true to herself, that she should not forget the teachings of her history and the traditions of her past,

that British rule should be conducted on British principles, and not on Russian methods. Is this, ladies and gentlemen, sedition, or is it the highest homage which India can pay to England, the dawning of that glorious day, proudest in the history of England, foreseen as in a vision by Macaulay, when instructed in European knowledge we might ask for the blessings of European institutions? The educated classes wish and long for the strengthening and not the loosening of the bond which unites the two countries, and which is the guarantee not only of order but of progress; and they look forwards to the time when they too can claim the rights and share the glories of citizenship in the proudest Empire that the world has ever seen. Let it be the part of wisdom, of prudent statesmanship and political foresight, to foster and not to crush this feeling; to extend the hand of fellowship and loving, ministering help, and not hurl insults or the weapons and methods of coercion which wound but cannot heal.

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

Brother delegates, the Indian National Congress has been described, and rightly described, as the noblest achievement and a crown of glory for British rule in India. And yet how great has been the ignorance, how gross the misrepresentations which have from time to time assailed it. I will not notice these misrepresentations of ignorance and prejudice. They have often been noticed before. But if it is at times disheartening to find this great movement, which ought to have been welcomed as a valued help, subjected to unworthy attacks, let us remember that this has been the fate of every great movement which has made for human progress or human welfare. It is cheering, on the other hand, to find ample recognition of the aims and the work of the Congress from many quarters. I might quote the opinions of many high authorities, but I will content myself with placing before you the generous testimony of one eminent man. Sir Richard Garth, a good Conservative, who I believe was a Conservative Member of Parliament before he came out to hold the exalted office of Chief Justice of Bengal, said a few years ago, replying to an attack which had been made on the Congress: "I will tell you what they have done. They have dared to think for themselves; and not only for themselves, but for the millions of poor ignorant people who compose our Indian Empire. They have been content to sacrifice their own interests, and to brave the displeasure of Government, in order to lend a helping hand to those poor people. They have had the courage and the patriotism to denounce abuses which have disgraced our Indian rule for years past; which have been condemned by public opinion in India and in England, and to which the Indian Government appear to cling with a tenacity which seems utterly inexplicable. They have dared to propose reforms which, despite the resistance of the Government, have been approved by Parliament, and to endeavour to stay that fearful amount of extravagance which has been going on in India for years past, and has been the means, as some of our best and wisest counsellors consider, of bringing our Eastern Empire to the verge of bankruptcy." May the blessing which is the portion of those who lift up their voice for the weak of this world and help on the cause of the helpless, attend Sir Richard Garth in his retirement for this manly and noble vindication of the Congress against the misrepresentation, based on ignorance, of many in high place; for his strong words of condemnation, spoken with the experience and the authority of a position highest in the land, of the miserable system which combines judicial and executive functions in the same officer and which of late has been further extended by our Government, and for his many other services to the cause of the people of India. And permit me, brother delegates, in this wish to include the many other noble-hearted Englishmen—their number is few, and their number, ladies and gentlemen, is growing every year and pretty fast—who have lent their generous advocacy to the views of the National Congress and to the cause of Indian progress.

A DREAMER OF THE WEST.

Brother delegates, I dare not say I doubt if many of you have done, a remarkable speech delivered in London by one of these noble-hearted Englishmen to whom I have referred, our good friend Professor Muriison. In the course of that speech he said that "he looked forward to the time when they would have a Secretary of State and a Governor-General of India who would recognise clearly that it was impossible to govern the Indian Empire without the cordial co-operation of the Indian people, and who would send for the President of the National Congress, and say, 'Come, my friend, have we not both the same interests at heart? Are we not both men of affairs? Come, let us reason together.'" I see also from this report that this sentiment was loudly cheered. I think, ladies and gentlemen, after this we have no longer the dream of the West. It appears that there is a dreamy West too, and Professor Muriison is one of its dreamers. I am afraid it will be a very long time before that dream of the friendly conference he speaks of will come true. Not that any Viceroy would not find it of advantage to consult any of the distinguished men who have preceded me in the chair—I make, I can make absolutely no claim for myself—to take representatives of educated India into his confidence, and to enter into that partnership of cordial co-operation that our friend speaks of; but it is not, ladies and gentlemen, always good things or desirable things that are the things of this actual world.

SYMPATHY THE CURE.

Brother delegates, I trust you have made the situation created by recent proceedings sufficiently clear. It is one of those causes anxiety to every friend of India and of England. But the remedy too is clear, and the narrative itself unfolds it. Sir Francis Maclean, the present Chief Justice of Bengal, is reported to have said at a meeting held at Calcutta, I believe early this year when the Sedition Bill was before the public, that "He had heard a great deal recently since coming to India of sedition and measures in connexion with it; but it seemed to him the only rational way of putting down sedition was by sympathy, boundless sympathy with the people in their needs and their sufferings and with their legitimate hopes and aspirations." These words deserve to be inscribed in letters of gold; and permit me, ladies and gentlemen, to offer to Sir Francis Maclean on your behalf our thanks for this noble utterance breathing the instincts of true statesmanship. Yes, it is

sympathy, boundless sympathy with the people in their needs, and sympathy too with them in their legitimate aspirations that is wanted—and then from that sympathy will naturally come as raindrops from the descending cloud, the many measures that are required to promote their interests and redress their grievances. With truer knowledge and keener sympathy, many things will assume a different aspect, and our rulers will, if I may respectfully be permitted to say so, see things with new eyes. Then, indeed, will all the unrest that we have so much heard of, of late, vanish as before a magician's wand, as darkness before the rising sun. For, indeed, love and sympathy work miracles in the political, no less than in the moral or spiritual world. There can be no surer or firmer foundation for earthly power than the affection and confidence of the subjects. I am reminded of the Chief Justice of Bengal, let me quote a few lines from Mr. Chamberlain's great speech at Glasgow, delivered on November 3 of last year: "The makers of Venice, with whose peculiar circumstances as a commercial community, dependent for its existence on its command of the sea, we have much in common, declared it to be their principal object 'to have the heart and the affection of our citizens and subjects'; and in adopting this true principle of Empire they found their reward in the loyalty of their colonies and dependencies when the Mother City was threatened by enemies whom her success and prosperity had raised against her." This, indeed, ladies and gentlemen, as Mr. Chamberlain has said, is the "true principle of Empire," to possess the hearts of citizens as well as of subjects and to win as its reward the loyalty alike of colonies and of dependencies.

And the same thing has been said in India, too, by all her wisest administrators. Let me refer here to a pamphlet written not many years ago, by a man honoured and trusted alike by Government and the people, Chairman of the Calcutta Corporation, and then Member of the Board of Revenue—the late Sir Henry Harrison—under the *nom-de-plume* of "Trust and Fear Not." It was written in support of a movement initiated—I am not sure to say successfully initiated—for the admission into the ranks of Volunteers of Indians possessing such qualifications of position, character, education and physical fitness as the Government might see fit to prescribe. I would venture respectfully and strongly to recommend that little book to our rulers. I have not seen more cogent reasoning, more convincing wealth of illustration, and truer or sounder principles for Indian administration than are contained in that work.

AN APPEAL TO ENGLISHMEN.

May I, ladies and gentlemen, make in this connexion an appeal to all Englishmen in India, and specially to the conductors of the Anglo-Indian Press. In the term Englishmen, I need say, that here and throughout this address I include Scotchmen and Irishmen and men too from Wales. They are the strong and the highly-placed. Their voice is listened to, whilst ours is unheeded. Is there no responsibility before God and man on them by reason of this very power that they possess, this very influence they wield—responsibility not to widen the gulf between the races or make difficult the work of the statesman by unkind word or unkind deed, but to extend the hand of sympathy and help the people of India to rise once again in the scale of nations? If they mix with the people and come really to know them, they will perhaps find much to study, much to interest them and to make life even in India worth living, much to learn, to love and esteem, and even to admire. At least such has been the experience of many Englishmen who have tried the process. How often have I noticed with regret that the attacks and sarcasms of some member of the Anglo-Indian Press have led perhaps to similar effusions or rejoinders in some Indian print. How one longs for men like Knight and Riach—to name the two I have personally known in my part of the country—men who wrote with knowledge and sympathy, who loved the people of India, felt in their conscience the burden of their responsibility to them, and proved that their rights—men who have left this world followed by the gratitude of thousands of their fellow-men. I do not know if those who, either in India or in England, advocate the cause of the unrepresented people of this country and use the powers that God has given them on their behalf, realise how they help towards making deeper the foundations of the Empire, in forging links of more than steel which fasten the bond which binds England and India together. Once an honoured missionary, he belonged to the Church of England, who had championed the cause of the people in my Province, was sent to gaol on the prosecution of some of his own countrymen; but the name of Long went down deep into the hearts of the people, the cause for which he suffered, triumphed gloriously in the end, and his name is remembered in affectionate gratitude and sung in rustic ballads to this day. Let a nation which is Christian endeavour truly to show the ideal of Christ, to carry out the divine command of doing to others what they would have wished done to themselves, in the exercise of its power, in its attitude towards Indian aspirations.

Ladies and gentlemen, we want Englishmen to champion our cause; we want Englishmen who have held aloft the standard of freedom and progress in every part of the world and have fought and suffered in that cause, to take up the cause of India—she has special claims on them—and advocate her rights. And I feel confident that as knowledge spreads, as the sense of the rightness of the cause rests on them, the shackles, and the mists of prejudice and ignorance roll away, such men will arise and answer in gladness and joy to our call.

REFORM OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCILS.

Brother delegates, I will not dwell on the necessity which recent events have only served to emphasize of the further need of reform in our Legislative Councils. The subject has often been before us. But let me draw your attention to the question of the constitution of our Executive Councils, and ask the Government on your behalf whether the time has not fully come for remodelling them, and admitting an adequate Indian representation on those bodies. It is these bodies that shape and guide the whole of the administrative policy of the Government, and decide questions of supreme importance to the happiness and well-being of the people—questions

often of far greater moment than those that come before the Legislative Councils. At present out of the two hundred millions and more of India's people, not one solitary individual finds a place in any of those Councils; and as we know, the Legislative bodies exercise no sort of control, direct or indirect, over them. Their deliberations are in secret chambers, and not even the faintest echo of suggestion, information, or criticism can reach them from a public more ignorant of their proceedings, than of the movements of the double stars or the composition of the Milky Way in the far-off heavens. It is, ladies and gentlemen, necessary to point out, it is necessary to argue the point, that the most honest and impartial and fair-minded of tribunals cannot decide justly or do right unless every information is placed, every interest represented and every side of the question discussed before it? Is this not the explanation of the mistakes—I need not refer to the policy of these two years which I have fully discussed—of the grave mistakes which have admittedly been made in the past and which, as I have shown, were subsequently rectified when further light was sought from independent public opinion under pressure from England? We are fully aware of the need for the expansion and reform of our Legislative Councils. There is need, grave need, brother-delegates, for the expansion and reform of our Executive Councils also, and it may be, of their formation where they do not exist, with adequate Indian representation in them.

DIRECT REPRESENTATION OF INDIA IN PARLIAMENT.

There is one other matter in this connexion that I should like to place before you. The question of a further re-distribution of seats is likely soon to be before the English public. It has already begun to engage attention. But whether that be so or not, it seems to me that for a proper representation of Indian views and Indian wants, a certain limited number of seats in the House of Commons—may be so few as, say, fifty—ought to be assigned to the inhabitants of some of the chief cities of India. We have the right to ask for this representation which will secure for us a hearing before the Assembly which is the ultimate arbiter of our fates, but which at present is forever anxious it may be to do justice and to give its due weight to Indian views, has no opportunity of knowing those views from persons speaking with knowledge and with authority on our behalf; and I am convinced this would be of great advantage to the furtherance of our legitimate interests and to the removal of our wants. If we can send a Sir Richard Garth or a Sir John Phear, a Hume or a Reynolds, if we could have sent a Cairne or a Naoroji, a Bradlaugh like Northampton had at length returned him, or a Fawcett when Hackney had rejected him, not to speak of many others I could easily name, including many earnest and influential English friends of India—and send all these as our own representatives—can any one doubt what a potent factor for good, both to England and to India, for justice and fair-play, would be brought into existence? And it would not only be in the House of Commons, but in the country too that they would speak with authority, and command attention to our grievances.

It is true the Colonies are not represented in the House of Commons, but their Budgets are not discussed, nor their policy determined at Westminster; and as for the possible objection that, as in the case of Ireland, the presence of our representatives in Parliament might be used as an argument against the existence or the expansion of our Councils in India—it would be enough to say that objection could only apply if India were to be represented in the House like Ireland, in proportion to her population. But no one dreams of that. It is as a means to an end, a means, just and necessary in itself and effective for its purpose, that I suggest this for your consideration. And even if this concession were to be granted for a limited period, I would gratefully accept it. I will only add that I have talked with many friends in England who strongly agree as to the justice, and even the necessity, of this reform, if Indian views are to receive a proper hearing and Indian interests are to be furthered. No doubt as Sir Henry Fowler once said in an eloquent and memorable peroration, they are all members for India. Yet I think Sir Henry Fowler and most members of the House would be glad to have some members for India to represent the vast interests of that country affected by the decisions of Parliament, whose claims to the title might be less questioned, whose assistance would be sought, and from whom they could have the inestimable advantage of hearing something more than mere official versions of the matters that came up before them. And if this be an anomaly, all that I can say is that this is an anomaly which has reason and justice on its side and which is rendered necessary by what has sometimes been called the anomaly of an Indian Empire, that the British constitution has many anomalies which have much less to say for themselves and much less ground for their existence than this.

ORGANISATION AND CONTINUOUS WORK FOR THE CONGRESS.

Brother delegates, I wish now to invite your attention to a most important matter. As I look round at this magnificent assembly gathered from the most distant parts of the country, as I see enthusiasm depicted on every face, the question presents itself to my mind: is this Congress to be a mere three-days' affair? Is there to be no continuity, no plan, and no method in its everyday work? We have achieved much during these years we have met. We have placed on record our views on all important questions of the day and even of the years to come, we have seen carried out some of the most important objects which have engaged our attention, and, to my mind, far more important than all this, we have succeeded in bringing together and knitting in bonds of loving regard, of mutual esteem and fraternal co-operation, representatives from every part of this vast country, infusing national life, strengthening the bonds of common citizenship, kindling the fire of loyal and patriotic service. But, ladies and gentlemen, the time has come when if we are to reap the full fruits of our deliberations and to give living force to our resolutions, we must have a standing organisation, to carry on the work of the Congress from year's beginning to year's end, to carry on that work continuously, steadily, earnestly, sending agents and missionaries in different parts of the country, spreading information, awakening interest, issuing

leaflets and pamphlets, educating the public mind, drawing attention to the many wants and grievances of the dumb masses, pointing out the duty we owe to Government, and helping the Government to the best of our power in its endeavours for the better administration, the better education, the better sanitation of the country—and we must have men wholly devoted to this most important work. As I am standing before you, my mind goes back to the great gathering at Leicester in March last, the National Congress, I may say, of the Liberal party, which it was my privilege to attend and to address as a delegate from Cambridge. There are many points of resemblance that struck me between the annual meeting of the National Liberal Federation and the Indian National Congress. That meeting, like Federation and the Indian National Congress, that meeting, like ours, holds its session for three days, and meets at different places from year to year, passes resolutions on subjects of interest to the party, and its number of delegates, I was struck to find, was very much what our number usually is. But behind all this what a difference! What a busy, active, powerful organisation with a secretary and a staff of officials wholly given to its work, with a publishing department, with its separate staff of officials, with its council meetings held throughout the year and directing its operations, with its army of agents and workers, and its branches at work all over the country. And the same is the case with the great Conservative party whose organisation won such splendid results at the last election.

PUBLIC MEETINGS ON INDIAN QUESTIONS.

THE WORK OF THE BRITISH COMMITTEE.

Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji will address a meeting of the North Islington Liberal and Radical Association at Holloway Hall on February 6.

Mr. Naoroji's series of meetings in the North of England last week are described as a great success. The audiences were "large, attentive, earnest and sympathetic."

Commenting on Mr. Naoroji's address at Darwin, the *Darwen News* (January 21) writes:—

The address given in the Bolton Road School on Thursday evening by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji was most instructive, and our report in another column is worth perusal. To Lancashire people, India opens up vast fields of commercial enterprise, and the lecturer clearly showed that the English rule in India did not tend either to the prosperity of Lancashire trade with India, or to the prosperity of the Hindus themselves. . . . The duty imposed upon England, and the way in which England had hitherto failed, were clearly shown in Mr. Naoroji's speech. Mr. Naoroji certainly surprised his audience, and he also instructed them. For a septuagenarian he has remarkable vitality, and his speech gave evidence of an impassioned patriotism for India which gained him great sympathy.

On Sunday next, January 29, Mr. Romesh C. Dutt, C.I.E., will address a meeting of the Lewisham and Lee Liberal and Radical Club, London.

On January 16 a lecturer on behalf of the British Committee addressed a crowded meeting at Stoke on "India and its people." The lecture was illustrated with lime-light views of the temples, palaces, cities and villages of India. Mr. J. Goulds presided.

On January 17 a lecturer on behalf of the British Committee spoke on the same subject at Mevagissey, Cornwall. The largest room in the place was filled to overflowing, and both lecture and views were much appreciated by the audience.

On January 18 a lecturer on behalf of the British Committee delivered a lecture at the St. Austell Liberal Club on "Some Liberal Reforms for India." Mr. H. Griffin presided, and in the intelligent discussion that followed the lecture much interest was aroused on the subject of India—the land question being specially dealt with.

On January 19 a lecturer on behalf of the British Committee delivered a lecture on "India and its people," illustrated by lime-light views, in the Lecture Hall, Devonport, when the aspect of Indian village life was prominently brought before the audience. The lecturer discussed principally the great poverty of the mass of the people and measures for preventing famines.

On January 20 a lecturer on behalf of the British Committee gave a lecture at Bordesley Liberal Club, Birmingham, on "English Rule in India." Mr. Bentley presided over a good attendance, and said in conclusion that he wished the largest hall in Birmingham had been filled that night to hear such a clear account of British doings in India and to rouse thousands of their fellow-citizens on behalf of their Indian brethren as they in that club had been roused.

Meetings during the past week have been arranged at Hanley, Bilston, Burton-on-Trent, Padiham, Liverpool, Horwich and Denton.

A lecturer on behalf of the British Committee writes (January 23): "The lantern lectures are crowded out. I had an audience of 500 or 600 people on Sunday night, and 350 last night—all the room would hold."

JUST PUBLISHED.

With Maps, Plans, Portraits, and Illustrations, 8vo, 8/6 net.

THE CAMPAIGN IN TIRAH 1897-98.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE EXPEDITION AGAINST THE
ORAKZAIS AND AFRIDS UNDER GENERAL SIR
WILLIAM LOCKHART, G.C.B., K.C.S.I.

Based (by permission) on Letters contributed to the TIMES,

By **COLONEL H. D. HUTCHINSON,**
Director of Military Education in India.

DAILY CHRONICLE.—"We are not sure that his very carefully compiled and very well written work will not ultimately rank as the best account of this our finest instance of mountain warfare. . . . Must be a real pleasure to all students of military history."

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED, LONDON.

NOW READY.

Price One Shilling and Sixpence, net. In India, 1 Rupee.

CONGRESS GREEN-BOOK: No. 2.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE.

EVIDENCE-IN-CHIEF OF THE FIVE
INDIAN WITNESSES.

Large foolscap, 116 pp.

Published by the

BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

This Volume may also be obtained from the Secretaries of the Standing Congress Committees at Calcutta, Bombay, and Madras. Remittances should accompany application.

N.B.—The postage of each copy is 4d., in addition to the price stated above.



is what its name implies **FEVER DESTROYER,**
and Cures Malarious, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers, Colds, etc.

I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari." Both in India and Africa I have found it the best REMEDY FOR FEVER.
"Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for 4 dozen, per value payable parcel. I think there is more than magic in it.
C. S. BARKER, Chairman.
North Bagan Barracks, Devonport.
C. E. WOOD, apt. 22nd North Staffs. Regt.
G. L. SARKISIAHOW.

For **INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.**

Cuddalore Municipal Councillors' Office.—"I have much pleasure in stating that your 'Omum-Carpoor' was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage.
Prices of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM-CARPOOR" 8 ans. Rs. 1/8 Rs., 2/2 Rs., and 11 Rs. per bottle. N.B.—1 dos. sent post free. To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors,

HENRY'S GREAT INDIAN REMEDIES COMPANY, 43, King William St., London, E.C., and 27, Second Line Beach, Madras.

NOTICE TO ADVERTISERS.

Applications for rates for Advertisements in "INDIA," should be made to

THE MANAGER,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers,
Westminster, S.W.

Advertisements should reach the Office not later than first post on Thursday in order to ensure insertion in the issue of the following day.

JUST PUBLISHED. Crown 8vo, 5s.

RĀMAKRISHNA: HIS LIFE AND SAYINGS.

By **THE RIGHT HON. F. MAX MÜLLER, K.M.,**
Foreign Member of the French Institute; Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford.

* * Rāmakrishna, whose life is described and whose sayings have been collected in this volume, was one of those Indian ascetics and sages who are known under different names, as Sannyāsins, Mahātmans, or Yogins. He was born in 1833, and died in 1886.

LONDON: LONGMANS, GREEN & CO.

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS: ITS AIMS AND JUSTIFICATION.

[Being a reprint of certain articles on the subject in the *Statesman and Friend of India.*]

By **ROBERT KNIGHT.**

CALCUTTA: Published at the *Statesman* Office.

The above will be sent to any address on receipt of 1d. stamp for postage. Application should be made to the Manager of "INDIA," 84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S

PECTORAL BALSAM.

A BOON TO SUFFERERS FROM ALL DISORDERS AND COMPLAINTS OF THE LUNGS AND CHEST.

For Cold in the Head, Coughs, Heaviness, Asthma, Hooping Cough, Bronchitis, Sore Throat.

DR. W. VENOR says: "I have used it myself and prescribed it for many patients, and can very strongly recommend it for Bronchitis, Asthma, Indigestion. It will not cure Asthma or Indigestion, but a single dose I have found gives an immediate relief.—31st March, 1889.

P. C. GHOSE & CO., NEW MEDICAL HALL, MEERUT.

TOOTH-ACHE

CURED INSTANTLY BY

BUNTER'S NERVINE
Prevents Drury, Saves
Extraction, Sleepless Nights
Prevented.
Neuralgia Headaches and all Nerve
Pains removed by BUNTER'S
NERVINE. All Chemists, 1s-1/4d.

Omum-Carpoor
TRADE MARK